CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presented findings and discussion of the research based on the data obtained during the research. In this research problem, it consisted on the research findings as follows: 1) Discussion of Data Description and 2) Discussion of Pre-requisite Test.

A. Research Findings

The purpose of this research was to identify a comparative study on teaching listening comprehension by using drilling and dictation. This research was conducted at MTs Darul Huda Wonodadi Blitar from 16 April until the finish, in the academic year 2017/2018. The researcher took two classes as the sample. Those classes were class IX B as the first experimental group and class IX C as the second experimental group. The first experimental group was taught listening without explaining the material about drilling and dictation while the second experimental group was taught listening explains the material about drilling and dictation.

After conducting the experiment, the researcher obtained the desired data. The data which were analyzed in this research are pre-test and the post-test score of the two groups, the first experimental group, and the second experimental group. The pre-test and post-test scores both of the experimental groups were compared by using t_{test} formula. Then, the researcher uses a statistic formula of t-test with significance 5%. The test was arranged in a

question sheet paper for pre-test and post-test. To know the result of the test, it could be presented on the table below:

Table IV. 1

	PRE-	POST-	FINAL
NAMA	TEST	TEST	SCORE
AV	88	70	90
WA	75	80	88
AW	80	86	88
AK	100	66	88
DA	82	36	88
DI	100	86	80
DP	98	96	85
FE	92	74	92
FK	98	84	90
KR	96	94	96
LI	100	72	90
MB	92	70	80
MD	70	80	88
ME	60	56	92
MI	82	64	88
МК	80	62	88

The score of the first Experiment Class

KA	75	82	86
OA	75	68	85
SP	90	68	86
ZA	98	92	88
ZN	100	70	90

In the table IV.1 explain the results of the Pre-test, Post-test and final scores of first experimental class. In this table, the researcher explained the results of the research she did at MTs Darul Huda Wonodadi Blitar. In the first experimental class, the researcher presented the value of the pre-test, posttest and the final score of the research she did.

Table IV.2

The score of the second experiment class

3-	POST-	FINAL

	PRE-	POST-	FINAL
NAMA	TEST	TEST	SCORE
AS	94	86	78
AB	92	74	80
AP	96	92	80
AF	98	88	78
DA	98	74	80
DI	96	90	80
EA	98	94	85

FR	98	90	88
IP	96	86	80
IA	90	92	90
KZ	96	88	80
KA	96	86	85
LH	94	80	75
AF	96	80	80
FS	86	98	85
FR	100	80	84
HA	92	94	80
HB	100	74	87
YA	86	60	86
RJ	94	92	89
SF	98	88	88

Not much different from the previous table in table IV.2 explained the results of the Pre-test, Post-test and final scores in the second experimental class. In this table, the researcher explained the results of the research she did at MTs Darul Huda Wonodadi Blitar in the second experimental class. In the second experimental class, the researcher also presented the scores of the Pretest, Post-test and the final scores of the research she did.

B. Pre-requisite Test

As the requirement the t-test, the data of this research need to be tested for the normality and the homogeneity. The normality testing used in this research is the level of significance of 0.05 ($\alpha = 0.05$), while the homogeneity testing also used the level significance of 0.05 ($\alpha - 0.05$). The following data were the result of normality and homogeneity tests of pre-test and post-test scores.

1. Pre-Test Scores

a The Result of The Normality test

The result computation of normality test could be seen in the appendix

12. In order to make it clear, the summary was presented in table IV.3.

Table IV.3

The result of the normality test

/ed⁵
∕ed⁵

	od
1 DICTAITON ^a . Enter	

a. All requested variables entered.

b. Dependent Variable: LISTENINGCOMPREHENSION

Model Summary^b

Mode	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.360=	.130	.084	11.27947

a. Predictors: (Constant), DICTAITON

b. Dependent Variable: LISTENINGCOMPREHENSION

ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	359.934	1	359.934	2.829	.109=
	Residual	2417.304	19	127.227		
	Total	2777.238	20			

a. Predictors: (Constant), DICTAITON

b. Dependent Variable: LISTENINGCOMPREHENSION

Coefficients^a

			Unstandardize	d Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients		
	Model		В	Std. Error	Beta	t	Siq.
ſ	1	(Constant)	64.772	13.554		4.779	.000
		DICTAITON	.303	.180	.360	1.682	.109

a. Dependent Variable: LISTENINGCOMPREHENSION

Residuals Statistics^a

		Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
	Predicted Value	75.6643	93.8180	87.1905	4.24225	21
•	Residual	-21.71553	15.25884	.00000	10.99387	21
	Std. Predicted Value	-2.717	1.562	.000	1.000	21
	Std. Residual	-1.925	1.353	.000	.975	21

a. Dependent Variable: LISTENINGCOMPREHENSION

		Unstandardiz ed Residual
N		21
Normal Parametersª	Mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	3.92552286
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.209
	Positive	.106
	Negative	209
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.960
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.316

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

a. Test distribution is Normal.

From the table of One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test, it could be seen that the test distribution is normal.

b The Result of The Homogeneity

The result of the computation of the homogeneity test can be seen in the appendix 13. In order to make it clear, the summary was presented in table IV.4.

Table IV.4

The result of the homogeneity test in pre-test

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

NILAI UTS			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Siq.
9.117	1	40	.004

ANOVA

NILAI UTS					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Siq.
Between Groups	586.881	1	586.881	36.626	.000
Within Groups	640.952	40	16.024		
Total	1227.833	41			

The result of the homogeneity test in the test of homogeneity of variances in the levene statistic is 9.117 in the significant 0.04. And the anova in homogeneity test between groups in sum of squares and mean square in the same score that is 586.881. But the anova in homogeneity test within groups in the sum of squares was 640.952 and the total is 1227.833 that were in the different scores.

2. Post-Test Scores

a. The Result of the Normality Test

The result of the computation of the normality test can be seen in the appendix 14. In order to make it clear, the summary was presented in table IV.5.

Table IV.5

The result of the normality test in post-test score

Variables Entered/Removed^b

Mode I	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	drilling ⁼		Enter

a. All requested variables entered.

b. Dependent Variable: listeningcomprehension

Model Summary^b

Mode	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.050ª	.002	050	4.02750

a. Predictors: (Constant), drilling

b. Dependent Variable: listeningcomprehension

ANOVA^b

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regressio	n .758	1	.758	.047	.831ª
Residual	308.195	19	16.221		
Total	308.952	20			

a. Predictors: (Constant), drilling

b. Dependent Variable: listeningcomprehension

Coefficients^a

		Unstandardize	d Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients		
Model		В	Std. Error	Beta	t	Siq.
1	(Constant)	93.114	8.553		10.887	.000
	drilling	.022	.100	.050	.216	.831

a. Dependent Variable: listeningcomprehension

Residuals Statistics^a

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted Value	94.4108	95.2324	94.9524	.19465	21
Residual	-9.23243	5.28649	.00000	3.92552	21
Std. Predicted Value	-2.782	1.439	.000	1.000	21
Std. Residual	-2.292	1.313	.000	.975	21

a. Dependent Variable: listeningcomprehension

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test						
		Unstandardiz ed Residual				
N		21				
Normal Parametersª	Mean	.0000000				
	Std. Deviation	10.99387034				
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.193				
	Positive	.112				
	Negative	193				
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.884				
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.415				
a. Test distribution is Normal.						

From the table above, it can be seen that the data of the post-test scores is in the normal distribution.

b. The Result of the Homogeneity Test

The result of the computation of the homogeneity test can be seen in the appendix 15. In order to make it clear, the summary was presented in table IV.6.

Table IV.6

The result of the homogeneity test in post-test score

Test of Homogeneity of Variances					
NILAI UTS					
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Siq.		
5.794	1	40	.021		

ANOVA

-	NILALUTS					
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Siq.
Γ	Between Groups	521.524	1	521.524	31.467	.000
	Within Groups	662.952	40	16.574		
L	Total	1184.476	41			

The result of the homogeneity test in the post-test of homogeneity of variances in the levene statistic was 5.79 in the significant 0.21. And the anova in homogeneity test between groups in sum of squares and mean square in the same score that is 521.524. But the anova in homogeneity test within groups in the sum of squares is 662.952 and the mean square is 16.574 that is in the different scores.

C. The Description of Data

In the description of data, the researcher used two instruments. The first is observation and the second is a test. To gain data about how the implementation of the using drilling and dictation technique to improved students' listening comprehension, the writer used the observation. On the other hand, to gain the data of the effect of the using drilling and dictation technique to improve students' listening comprehension at the third grades students of MTs Darul Huda Wonodadi Blitar, the writer used the test (pre-test and post-test).

The researcher presents the result of observation towards the teaching-learning process in the B & C class. In this class, the researcher did two times observations. In this observation format, the researcher used pre-observation, observation, an interview.

In this research, the writer used the classroom observation of the using drilling and dictation technique in the teaching process. The observation was done by the researcher. In this case, the observer is the researcher itself. The observation was conducted for two meetings. The observation was given to both experimental classes to know the implementation of the using drilling and dictation technique to improved students' listening comprehension at the third grades students of MTs Darul Huda Wonodadi Blitar. The researcher presents the result of the interview in the following tables:

Table IV. 7

NO	QUESTION FOR THE	THE RESPONSE
	TEACHER	
1.	What do you prepare before	Before carrying out the learning, the
	doing the teaching and learning	teacher prepared some handouts and
	process?	other theories that approach, namely
		the plan for learning devices, media,
		and sourcebooks. The result of the
		first Experiment Class
2.	What strategies do you use when	The strategy applied depends on the
	doing the teaching and learning	material to be presented in the
	process?	example class of strategies that I use
		snowball, blowing, or think pair
		share, cooperative learning etc.
3.	What media do you use in the	The media that I use in the learning
	teaching and learning process?	process can be images, flashcards, or
		videos
4.	What obstacles do you feel when	The constraints that I faced in the
	the learning process is done?	teaching and learning process were
		the limited resources of the books,

The Observation of the Interview Result for the Teacher

		then the module books used for
		printing this year were not very
		suitable in terms of the composition
		so that students or students could not
		learn by using the book without
		guidance from the teacher.
5.	How do you overcome these	To overcome this problem, she
	obstacles?	looked for other sources that are
		relevant so as to support the
		teaching and learning process in the
		classroom
6.	How do students respond when	When teacher reviewed the material
	you repeat the material before?	last week the children responded
		well and noticed it
7.	How do students respond when	When the learning process children
	the lesson takes place?	pay attention well and take place
		smoothly and wisely
8.	How do you assess students	The assessment that she took,
	when following the teaching and	namely the assessment of the
	learning process from the	process in that class can be from the
	beginning to the end of the	cognitive, psychomotor and
	learning process?	affective aspects of each assessment
		there is a rubric and according to the

	basic competencies that exist at the
	meeting.

Based on the table IV.7 it showed that the results of observations from interviews conducted by the researcher to the first subject, namely English subject teachers in the first and second experimental classes. So, the first subject interviewed by the researcher as a resource was an English subject teacher.

Table IV. 8

NO	QUESTIONS FOR THE	THE RESPONSE				
	STUDENTS'					
1.	What do you prepare before you	The students prepare the source				
	learn English?	book and read material that has been				
		explained by the teacher				
2.	How do you evaluate the way	Sometimes the students can catch				
	teachers teach English subjects?	what is explained and sometimes it				
		can't because the teacher's voice is				
		too weak				
3.	Why do you think the way the	The students immediately asked the				
	teacher teaches is not suitable to	teacher when there was material that				
	be applied when learning	was difficult to understand				
	English?					

The Observation of the Interview Result for the Students'

4.	According to you what is a	When the lesson takes place it is				
	suitable way to learn English?	hoped that there will be a game or				
		eyes breaking so that it is not				
		monotonous and saturated				
5.	What obstacles do you feel when	When the teaching and learning				
	the learning process takes place?	process took place, they were				
		always crowded, the teacher's voice				
		was too smooth, sleepy, the air in				
		the class was very hot, a bench				
		friend invited to talk when the				
		learning process took place.				

The table IV.8 presented the results of observations from interviews conducted by the researcher to the second subject, which are students in the first and second experimental classes. So, the second subjects interviewed by the researcher as a resource were the students from first and second experimental classes.

Both are the tables above shows that the observation of the interview results in the classroom that indicates the answer of the teacher and students'. It means that 10% of the research was done by the researcher and 90% of the research above was not done. The explanations of the teacher answer as follows:

- a) The teacher gave the interesting topics taken from their textbook and also based on their syllabus (100%)
- b) The teacher divided the students into a group that consist of five members (100%)
- c) The teacher asked each group to discuss and speak out the topic given among them (100%)
- d) The teacher asked each group to present what result they get from their Group Work in the front of the class (100%)
- e) The teacher finally evaluated the students' listening comprehension after given treatment of group work technique at the end of the research based on speaking aspects assessment (100%).

This chapter presented data and analysis. This research used comparative study design A Comparative study on teaching listening comprehension using drilling and dictation with an audio recording from the British Council in Mts Darul Huda Wonodadi Blitar.

The implementation of this research was divided into two classes, namely the first experimental class (IX B), and the second experimental class (IX C). Before the activities were conducted, the materials and lesson plan were determined to the process of learning.

In this research, the data consisted of a listening test. This part shows the general description of students' score both of the experimental classes. The description was divided into two sections: the pre-test scores and post-test scores. There were 40 item questions of listening test and divided into 15 item questions of multiple choice and 25 item questions of fill in the blanks.

The test was conducted by the researcher before teaching using drilling and dictation techniques. This test was to know the students' listening achievement before students got treatment. After the researcher got scores from pretest, the researcher gave treatment to know the students score after taught by using drilling and dictation techniques.

D. Hypothesis Testing

Stating the null and alternative hypothesis, are follows:

- 1. Null Hypothesis (Ho) that there is no difference on student's listening achievement before and after using drilling and dictation as the techniques.
- 2. Alternative Hypothesis (Ha) that there is a difference in listening achievement before and after using drilling and dictation as techniques. The testing was done to know whether the null hypothesis could be rejected or not.

E. Discussion

The discussion of the data description contained the important point from the computation of the data analysis to the hypothesis testing. the data were obtained from the pre-test and post-test scores in both of the experimental class. The data of pre-test scores in both classes are to know the student's listening test before the treatment. The data of pre-test scores in both experimental class show that the score is 60 up to 100. It means that the lowest score is 60 and the highest score is 100.

The data of the post-test score was to know the student's listening test after treatment. The data of post-test score in both experimental classes is 62 up to 100. It meant that the highest score is 100 and the lowest score is 62.

From the computation of the pre-test and post-test, it shows that the result of the pre-test and post-test scores in the paired sample t-test that uses by the researcher is the mean in the pre-test score is 94,9 and the mean of the post-test score is 85,0. The researcher also gets the computation of the standard deviation in the both of the experimental classes is the pre-test and post-test, the standard deviation of the pre-test is 3,93 and the post-test is 9,00 and the standard error mean in pre-test is 85 and post-test is 1,96.

Table IV.9

The result of the paired samples in pre-test and post-test scores

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	PRE TEST	94.9524	21	3.93035	.85767
	POST TEST	85.0476	21	9.00265	1.96454

Paired Samples Statistics

The researcher also found the computation correlations in the paired sample t-test that in pre-test and post-test. The paired samples correlations of pre-test and post-test with the samples of 21 students. The paired samples correlations of pre-test and post-test are 0.50 in significant 831.

Table IV.10

The result of the paired samples correlations in pre-test and post-test

scores

Paired Samples Correlations

	N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair1 PRE TEST & POST TEST	21	.050	.831

From the computation above the researcher also got the paired difference in paired samples test, that is the mean of pre-test and post-test is 9,90, the standard deviation is 9,64, the standard error mean is 2,10. And a 95% confidence interval of the difference the researcher finds the lower and upper difference in both experimental classes in pre-test and post-test. The lower difference in pre-test and post-test is 5,51 and the upper of pre-test and post-test is 14,29 in significant 2-tailed.

Table IV.11

The result of paired samples differences between pre-test and post-test

scores

			Paired Differences							
•	•					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
			Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper	t	df	Siq. (2-tailed)
	Pair 1	PRE TEST - POST TEST	9.90476	9.64316	2.10431	5.51525	14.29427	4.707	20	.000

Paired Samples Test

Furthermore, the result of the analysis could be clarified by the following reasons. Listening skill is important to explain in chapter II to learn the foreign language. Listening is more than simply taking in the words another person says. It often includes a requirement for us to empty our minds of personal agendas in order to connect directly with another.

Based on the explanation above, in order to facilitate the listeners, the teacher may use teaching media such as audio recording. Audiovisual information in audio recording is important in teaching and learning process, especially in teaching second-language listening.

The explanation above recommended the result of this research that there is a difference in listening comprehension between the students taught by drilling and dictation with the audio recording of the British council. In other words, teaching listening by using drilling and dictation with the audio recording of the British council is more effective than teaching listening without drilling and dictation with audio recording of the British council.