## CHAPTER IV

## FINDING AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the researcher presents the finding which has been collected during research, and discussion about the data of the research.

## A. Findings

To know students' speaking achievement before and after using Practice Rehearsal Pairs Strategy, the researcher conducted pre-test and post-test. As previously mentioned, the researcher used testing topic as the instrument in collecting data.

The form of testing topic in pre-test and post-test was a bit different in term of the topic, but the level of describe the picture which the researcher selected in both tests was same, that was about object. In pre-test, the topic were mountain and motorcycle, while in post-test, the topic. In pre-test, the students started prepare and think first about the possible vocabulary used to describe the picture. Meanwhile, in post-test, the students were allowed to make the clues and think the possible vocabulary that used.

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. Table 4.1 shows the students' score before and after using Practice Rehearsal Pairs Strategy.

Table 4.1 The Result of Students' Speaking achievement Before and After Using Practice Rehearsal Pairs Strategy.

| No | Name | Pre Test | Post Test |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A V | 58 | 82 |
| 2 | A N N | 78 | 90 |
| 3 | B R F | 58 | 82 |
| 4 | D W | 75 | 96 |
| 5 | E A | 68 | 87 |
| 6 | ENR | 65 | 85 |
| 7 | E C A | 60 | 89 |
| 8 | FI | 65 | 85 |
| 9 | FNH | 68 | 84 |
| 10 | F K | 64 | 85 |
| 11 | FS | 68 | 92 |
| 12 | U N S | 65 | 80 |
| 13 | IN M | 60 | 84 |
| 14 | K A | 68 | 90 |
| 15 | K K | 56 | 80 |
| 16 | K D Y | 68 | 91 |
| 17 | M K | 78 | 92 |
| 18 | M G S | 65 | 79 |
| 19 | M B | 66 | 80 |
| 20 | M R | 85 | 85 |
| 21 | M F R | 65 | 78 |
| 22 | M N | 74 | 88 |
| 23 | N S B | 64 | 79 |
| 24 | N R R | 68 | 82 |
| 25 | N K | 68 | 80 |
| 26 | P V M | 65 | 82 |
| 27 | R M | 65 | 80 |
| 28 | R D F | 70 | 88 |
| 29 | R S | 60 | 89 |
| 30 | R A A | 68 | 79 |
| 31 | S H | 65 | 79 |
| 32 | S A N | 68 | 80 |
| 33 | S R | 58 | 80 |
| 34 | S Y S | 65 | 80 |
| 35 | T T | 88 | 91 |
| 36 | U M A | 65 | 80 |
| 37 | U W | 65 | 78 |
| 38 | W OL | 60 | 85 |
| 39 | W F I | 70 | 88 |
| 40 | W A | 64 | 79 |
| 41 | Y I | 68 | 80 |


| 42 | Y N S | 70 | 85 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 43 | Y F | 72 | 86 |
| 44 | Z A M | 68 | 81 |
| 45 | Z A | 70 | 84 |
|  |  | $\Sigma=3021$ | $\Sigma=3779$ |

## 1. Result of Pre Test

To make the data set meaningful, the researcher organized the frequency and the percentage of score in pre-test by using IBM SPSS Statistic 16.0. Table 4.2 and Figure 4.1 represent the statistical result.

Table 4.2 Frequency of Score in Pre-test

| Pre Test |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 56.00 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 |
|  | 58.00 | 3 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 8.9 |
|  | 60.00 | 4 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 17.8 |
|  | 64.00 | 3 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 24.4 |
|  | 65.00 | 11 | 24.4 | 24.4 | 48.9 |
|  | 66.00 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 51.1 |
|  | 68.00 | 11 | 24.4 | 24.4 | 75.6 |
|  | 70.00 | 4 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 84.4 |
|  | 72.00 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 86.7 |
|  | 74.00 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 88.9 |
|  | 75.00 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 91.1 |
|  | 78.00 | 2 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 95.6 |
|  | 85.00 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 97.8 |
|  | 88.00 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

As can be seen from table 4.2 and further explained by figure $4.1,1$ student ( $2.2 \%$ ) got 56,3 students ( $6.7 \%$ ) got 58,4 students ( $8.9 \%$ ) got 60,3 students ( $6.7 \%$ )
got 64,11 students $(24.4 \%)$ got 65,1 students ( $2.2 \%$ ) got 66,11 students $(24.4 \%)$ got 68,4 students $(8.9 \%)$ got 70,1 student ( $2.2 \%$ ) got 72,1 student $(2.2 \%)$ got 74,1 student ( $2.2 \%$ ) got 75,2 students ( $4.4 \%$ ) got 78 , and 1 student ( $2.2 \%$ ) got 85 .

This is not a surprising finding considering that students only used their feeling and mixing language during practice of speaking. The students seemed a bit difficult to develop their ideas into a good and detailed speaking.

## 2. Result of Post Test

Table 4.3 Frequency of Score in Post-test


Then, after accepting the treatment (using Practice Rehearsal Pairs Strategy), the students showed good improvement. As can be seen from the table 4.3 and further explained by Figure 4.2, there are 2 students (4.4\%) got 78 , there are 5 students (11.1\%) got 79 , there are 10 students ( $22.2 \%$ ) got 80 , there is 1 student ( $2.2 \%$ ) got 81 , there are 4 students ( $8.9 \%$ ) got 82 , there are 3 students ( $6.7 \%$ ) got 84 , there are 6 students ( $13.3 \%$ ) got 85 , there is 1 student $(2.2 \%)$ got 86 , there is 1 student $(2.2 \%)$ got 87 , there are 3 students (6.7\%) got 88 , there are 2 students ( $4.4 \%$ ) got 89 , there are 2 students ( $4.4 \%$ ) got 90 , there are 2 students ( $4.4 \%$ ) got 91 , there are 2 students ( $4.4 \%$ ) got 92,and there is 1 student ( $2.2 \%$ ) got 96. Table 4.3 and figure 4.2 as follow;

This finding shows that after accepting the treatment, students' score significantly increased. Comparing to the result of pre-test, the result of posttest shows a significant progress. In pre-test, there was no student who got $>88(0 \%)$, while in post-test, the percentage of sample who got $>88$ increased by $30.9 \%(0 \%-19.8 \%)$. Moreover, the lowest score in post-test (78) is larger than pre-test (56) and the highest score in post-test (96) is also larger than pre-test (88). This finding indicates that after using Practice Rehearsal Pairs Strategy, the students' ability in speaking significantly increased proven by the progress of score from pre-test to post-test.

After organizing the frequency and the percentage of score from pre-test and post-test, the range, the minimum and maximum, the sum, the mean, the standard deviations, the variances of the speaking pre-test and post-test scores
of the sample were conducted respectively by using IBM SPSS Statistics 16.0. Table 4.4 represents the result:

Table 4.4 Descriptive Statistics for Pre-test and Post-test

| Descriptive Statistics |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| X1 | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| X2 | 45 | 56 | 88 | 67.13 | 6.437 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 45 | 78 | 96 | 83.98 | 4.624 |

As Table 4.4 shows, it can be described that the mean of post-test scores (83.98) is larger than the mean of pre-test scores (67.13). It indicates that on average, the use of Practice Rehearsal Pairs Strategy has caused the improvement of students' scores, but it is important to know that such a conclusion is only a descriptive conclusion. It should be tested about being meaningful this progress.

Therefore, to know whether Practice Rehearsal Pairs Strategy is significant in students' speaking achievement, the researcher tested the result of pre-test and post-test by using Paired Sample Test in IBM SPSS Statistic 16.0. As what previously mentioned that there are two hypothesis in this study; (1) Null Hypothesis (Ho) stating that there is no any significant difference n students' speaking achievement in describing the picture before and after using Practice Rehearsal Pairs Strategy, and (2) Alternative Hypothesis (Ha) stating that there is any significant difference in students' speaking ability in describing the picture before and after using Practice

Rehearsal Pairs Strategy, the testing was done to know whether the null hypothesis could be rejected or not. Table 4.5 shows the result of the correlation and test.

Table 4.5 Paired Samples Test

|  | Paired Differences |  |  |  |  | t | df | $\begin{gathered} \text { Sig. (2- } \\ \text { tailed) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean | Std. Deviati | Std. <br> Error | $\begin{array}{r} 95 \% \text { Con } \\ \text { Interval } \\ \text { Differ } \end{array}$ | fidence of the ence |  |  |  |
|  |  | on | Mean | Lower | Upper |  |  |  |
| Pair 1 Prete <br> st - <br> Postt <br> est | - 16.84 4 | 5.854 | . 873 | -18.603 | -15.086 | - 19.30 2 | 44 | . 000 |

## 3. Hypothesis Testing

Referring to Table 4.5, we can see that the $\mathrm{t}_{\text {obtained }}$ is 19.302 . The way to test whether null hypothesis could be rejected was by comparing the result of $\mathrm{t}_{\text {obtained }}$ and $\mathrm{t}_{\text {table. }}$. If the result of $\mathrm{t}_{\text {obtained }}$ is larger than $\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}$ at the level of significance 0.05 , the null hypothesis can be rejected. On the contrary, if the result of $\mathrm{t}_{\text {obtained }}$ is smaller than $\mathrm{t}_{\text {table, }}$, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. In consulting to $\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}$, the researcher needed to find out the degree of freedom ( $d f$ ) . As can be seen in Table 4.5 that $D f$ (Degree of freedom) is 44, the researcher consulted to and at the level of significance 0.05 , the value of $\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}$, and at the level of significance 0.05 , the value of $\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}$ is 2.015 . Comparing to the value of $\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}$, the value of $\mathrm{t}_{\text {obtained }}$ is larger (19.302> 2.015). For interpretation of decision based on the result of probability achievement. The null hypothesis couldn't be rejected, if the probability $>0.05$. And, the null hypothesis could
be rejected, if the probability < 0.05 . As Table 4.6 shows, the probability is less than $0.05(0.00<0.05)$. Thus, there was enough evidence indicating that the null hypothesis could be rejected, and it could be concluded that Practice Rehearsal Pairs Strategy was effective toward students’ speaking achievement in recount text.

## B. Discussion

In this study, it was indicated that the result of post-test seemed to be better than the pre-test. It means that the score of post-test were significantly better than the score pre-test at the end of the study. It can be seen from the mean score of pre-test 67,13 and the mean score of post-test 83.98 . This means that the students' mean score improves up to 24.00 point. And also, it can be known that the result of the statistical computing using t -test, the result shows that $\mathrm{t}_{\text {obtained }}$ is higher than $\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}$, it can be indicated that 19.302> 2.015 This means that the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted.

That alternative hypothesis can be accepted because there are some advantages of having Practice Rehearsal Pairs Strategy in teaching method, and it can be said that the teaching method or strategy effective in teaching and learning. And, it can be said that there is different score to the first graders of MAN 2 Tulungagung between before given treatment and after given treatment by using Practice Rehearsal Pairs Strategy.

In this situation, the result of post-test showed that strategy is very influential toward in teaching and learning speaking process. Specially, the raising
of students' progress in speaking, the teaching-learning speaking process to become effective, and it can make students interested. It is appropriate with previous research done by Ana Feriati (2012), and Ahmad Syukron Sidiq (2013) stated that the using of Practice Rehearsal Pairs Strategy was effective and be more interesting toward students' speaking ability in teaching and learning process.

Based on the result of post-test that showed higher scores than the pre-test scores. It indicates that the students were improvement in their speaking achievement after being taught by using Practice Rehearsal Pairs Strategy. The result of research in the class showed that the strategy can make students motivated when they learn to speak. In this case, the researcher as English teacher is explaining the role of Practice Rehearsal Pairs Strategy and asking students to apply this strategy in teaching-learning speaking. Now, the students do not look lazy when they have task from English teacher to speaking practice. Besides, they also prefer English lessons, especially in speaking achievement because; they have a desire to fluently to speak English.

Other advantage of teacher's using Practice Rehearsal Pairs Strategy is that the students become more active, because when teacher teach without using Practice Rehearsal Pairs Strategy the students were very passive. The classroom situation was quiet and the learning process became ineffective. They were afraid to make mistakes in grammar and vocabulary, at make them ashamed.. When the teacher asked students to use Practice Rehearsal Pairs Strategy to learn speak, as long time they become more active and the situation in the classroom as not
silence. This finding is supported by previous finding by Silberman (2009: 75) that Practice Rehearsal Pairs purpose to train conversation or procedure with partner, and convince that both of the partners can do the conversation or procedure. Those improvements were influenced by several things like they had been active in speaking; they had good motivation, and so on.

Besides when the students were given the strategy of Practice Rehearsal Pairs Strategy during the treatment, they have longer time to think about the possible vocabularies to use describe the picture. Besides, the students was more focused in developing sentence, and they were more details belong to describe the picture like they more free to express their ideas with make points the picture which can help them to speak fluently, and accurately. Harmer (2001: 121) declares that there are two elements of speaking which become problems for students. Those elements are accuracy and fluency. So, to fulfill the elements of speaking, the researcher as the English teacher apply Practice Rehearsal Pairs Strategy.

Finally, it was confirmed that using Practice Rehearsal Pairs Strategy in speaking became good strategy to provide students' opportunity to talk in the classroom activity. Based on the result of research finding, Practice Rehearsal Pairs Strategy was effective toward students' speaking achievement. The effect of Practice Rehearsal Pairs Strategy was also could be seen from the quantity of the words which significantly increased in post-test.

