CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

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

A. Research Findings

To know students' speaking ability before and after using Oral Presentation 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 dicribe the picture which the researcher selected in both tests was same, that was about object. In pre-test the topic was public place, while in post-test, the topic was famous people. In pre-test and post-test the students started preaper and think first about possible vocabulary used to describe the picture.

The pretest conducted on Wednesday, March 30th 2017. The researcher asked the students to present their idea about public place. The students given 5 minutes in presenting the idea in front of the class. In scoring the students' speaking the researcher use speaking scoring rubric which included accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension aspects.

After the reseacher getting the data of pretest, the researcher give treatment to the student by using think pair share strategy in teaching speaking. In giving treatment, the researcher look enthusiastic and motivated to speak in front of the class. Treatment done three time on Monday, April 3th 2017 until Monday, April 10th 2017.. When treatment had finished, the researcher gave posttest to know students speaking ability after taught by using oral presntation strategy.

To know the students' mastery whether it was good or not, the researcher gave the catergory as follow:

Table 4.1 The category of students' score

No	Grade	Level	Range of Score
1.	A	Excellent	84-100
2.	B	Good	70-83
3.	C	Fair	56-69
4.	D	Poor	42-55
5.	E	Very Poor	28-41

1. **Description of Proficiency of Students Before being taught Oral Prsentation Strategy (Pretest).**

   In this section, the reseacher presented the students' speaking ability before being taught by using oral presentation strategy. In this presentation, the reseacher analyzed the collected data through pretest which administered to 35 students. The descriptions were presented in the following table:

   Table 4.2 The students' score before being taught by using oral presentation share strategy (Pretest)

No	Name	Pretest	Category
1.	EI	54	Poor
2.	FAS	57	Fair
3.	GMH	50	Poor

4.	IK	54	Poor
5.	KS	67	Fair
6.	KA	57	Fair
7.	KK	59	Fair
8.	KH	65	Fair
9.	LF	65	Fair
10.	LM	59	Fair
11.	MAF	73	Good
12.	MFD	60	Fair
13.	MA	70	Good
14.	MVJ	60	Fair
15.	MFA	62	Fair
16.	MBM	69	Fair
17.	MDA	67	Fair
18.	MIR	59	Fair
19.	MR	74	Good
20.	MYS	67	Fair
21.	NL	70	Good
22.	NJR	60	Fair
23.	NHR	62	Fair
24.	RWM	60	Fair
25.	RA	70	Good
26.	RD	67	Fair
27.	RS	77	Good
28.	RAS	62	Fair
29.	RB	62	Fair
30.	RTS	65	Fair
31.	RH	70	Good
32.	RMA	65	Fair
33.	SSN	64	Fair
34.	SNK	63	Fair
35	SNA	70	Good

The table 4.2 shows that the minimum score are 50, while the maximum score are 77. There were 8 students include to good category, 24 students fair category, 3 students poor category.

Table 4.3 Descriptive statistic of Pretest

Statistics

Pretest

N	Valid	35
	Missing	0
Mean		63.8571
Median		64.0000
Mode		70.00
Std. Deviation		6.04952
Variance		36.597
Range		27.00
Sum		2235.00

Based on the table 4.3, there are 35 students. This table shown that mean score is 63.8571, the median score is 64, and the mode is 70. It means that average score is 64. There are 17 students got the score under 64. Then, the standar deviation is 6.04952.

Table 4.4 Frequency of Pretest

Pretest

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	50	1	2.9	2.9	2.9
	54	2	5.7	5.7	8.6
	57	2	5.7	5.7	14.3
	59	3	8.6	8.6	22.9
	60	4	11.4	11.4	34.3
	62	4	11.4	11.4	45.7
	63	1	2.9	2.9	48.6
	64	1	2.9	2.9	51.4
	65	4	11.4	11.4	62.9
	67	4	11.4	11.4	74.3
	69	1	2.9	2.9	77.1
	70	5	14.3	14.3	91.4
	73	1	2.9	2.9	94.3
	74	1	2.9	2.9	97.1
	77	1	2.9	2.9	100.0
	Total	35	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.4 above show that 1 students (2,9%) got 50, 2 students (5,7%) got 54, 2 students (5,7%) got 57, 3 student (8,6%) got 59, 4 students (11,4%) got 60, 4 student (11,4%) got 62, 1 students (2,9%) got 63, 1 students (2,9%) got 64, 4 students (11,4%) got 65, 4 students (11,4%) got 67, 1 students (2,9 %) got 69, 5 students (14,3%) got 70, 1 students (2,9%) got 73, 1 students (2,9%) got 74, 1 students (2,9%) got 77.

2. **Description of Proficiency of Students After being taught by using Oral Presentation Strategy (Posttsest)**

In this section, the researcher presented the students' speaking ability after being taught by using oral presentation strategy. The description were prsented in the following table:

Table 4.5 The students' score after being taught by using oral presentation strategy (posttest).

No	Name	Posttest	Category
1.	EI	72	Good
2.	FAS	70	Good
3.	GMH	70	Good
4.	IK	72	Good
5.	KS	75	Good
6.	KA	69	Fair
7.	KK	75	Good
8.	KH	77	Good
9.	LF	77	Good
10.	LM	72	Good
11.	MAF	80	Good
12.	MFD	74	Good
13.	MA	77	Good
14.	MVJ	73	Good
15.	MFA	72	Good
16.	MBM	75	Good
17.	MDA	72	Good
18.	MIR	69	Fair

19.	MR	85	Excallent
20.	MYS	73	Good
21.	NL	79	Good
22.	NJR	72	Good
23.	NHR	69	Fair
24.	RWM	72	Good
25.	RA	74	Good
26.	RD	80	Good
27.	RS	89	Excallent
28.	RAS	73	Good
29.	RB	75	Good
30.	RTS	72	Good
31.	RH	77	Good
32.	RMA	75	Good
33.	SSN	73	Good
34.	SNK	74	Good
35	SNA	80	Good

The table 4.5 showed that the minimum score is 69, while the maximum score is 89. There are 2 students included to Excallent, 30 students included to good, and 3students included fair category.

Table 4.6 Descriptive statistic of posttest

Statistics

Posttest

N	Valid	35
	Missing	0
Mean		74.6571
Median		74.0000
Mode		72.00
Std. Deviation		4.36526
Variance		19.055
Range		20.00
Sum		2613.00

Based on the table 4.6, there are 32 students. This table shown post test that mean score is 74. 6571, the median score is 74, and the mode is 72. Then, the standar deviation is 4.36526.

Table 4.7 Frequency of posttest

Posttest

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	69	3	8.6	8.6	8.6
	70	2	5.7	5.7	14.3
	72	8	22.9	22.9	37.1
	73	4	11.4	11.4	48.6
	74	3	8.6	8.6	57.1
	75	5	14.3	14.3	71.4
	77	4	11.4	11.4	82.9
	79	1	2.9	2.9	85.7
	80	3	8.6	8.6	94.3
	85	1	2.9	2.9	97.1
	89	1	2.9	2.9	100.0
	Total	35	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.7 above show that 3 students (8,6%) got 69, 2 students (5,7%) got 70, 8 students (22,9%) got 72, 4 student (11,4%) got 73, 3 students (8,6%) got 74, 5 student (14,3%) got 75, 4 students (11,4%) got 77, 1 students (2,9%) got 79, 3 students (8,6%) got 80, 1 students (2,9%) got 85, 1 students (2,9 %) got 89.

B. Data Analysis

Data analysis was done to know the different score of the students' score achievement in speaking ability before and after being taught using Oral Presentation technique. Referring to the data in the form of students' score gained from pre-test and post-test.

To find out whether there is different of students' score in speaking ability before and after being taught using Oral Presentation technique, the researcher used percentage formula and divided the test result into five criteria; those are excellent, good, fair, poor, very poor.

To know the correlations between the students' score of pre-test and post-test is described in the following table:

Table 4.8 The result of pretest and posttest

No	Name	Pretest (X)	Posttest (Y)	D (Y-X)	D (Y-X)^2
1	EI	54	72	18	324
2	FAS	57	70	13	169
3	GMH	50	70	20	400
4	IK	54	72	18	324
5	KS	67	75	8	64
6	KA	57	69	12	144
7	KK	59	75	16	256
8	KH	65	77	12	144
9	LF	65	77	12	144
10	LM	59	72	13	169
11	MAF	73	80	7	49
12	MFD	60	74	14	196
13	MA	70	77	7	49
14	MVJ	60	73	13	169
15	MFA	62	72	10	100
16	MBM	69	75	6	36
17	MDA	67	72	5	25
18	MIR	59	69	10	100
19	MR	74	85	11	121
20	MYS	67	73	6	36

21	NL	70	79	9	81
22	NJR	60	72	12	144
23	NHR	62	69	7	49
24	RWM	60	72	12	144
25	RA	70	74	4	16
26	RD	67	80	13	169
27	RS	77	89	12	144
28	RAS	62	73	11	121
29	RB	62	75	13	169
30	RTS	65	72	7	49
31	RH	70	77	7	49
32	RMA	65	75	10	100
33	SSN	64	73	9	81
34	SNK	63	74	11	121
35	SNA	70	80	10	100
	N=35	**$\sum$X= 2.235**	**$\sum$Y= 2.613**	**$\sum$D = 378**	**$\sum$D²=4.556**

Table 4.8 also shows some important points concerning with the result of the computation of *Mx*, *My*, *MD*, T-score, and degree of freedom, they are as follow:

a. Finding *Mx* and *My*

$$Mx = \frac{\sum x}{N} = \frac{2235}{35} = 63.8571$$

$$My = \frac{\sum y}{N} = \frac{2613}{35} = 74.6571$$

b. Finding *MD*

$$MD = \frac{\sum D}{N} = \frac{378}{35} = 10.8000$$

c. Finding T-score

$$t = \dfrac{MD}{\sqrt{\dfrac{\sum D^2 - \dfrac{(\sum D)^2}{N}}{N(N-1)}}}$$

$$= \dfrac{10.8000}{\sqrt{\dfrac{4556 - \dfrac{(378)^2}{35}}{35(34)}}}$$

$$= \dfrac{10.8000}{\sqrt{\dfrac{4556 - 4082}{1190}}}$$

$$= \dfrac{10.8000}{\sqrt{\dfrac{474}{1190}}}$$

$$= \dfrac{10.8000}{\sqrt{0.398}}$$

$$= \dfrac{10.8000}{0.63}$$

$$= 17.142$$

d. Degree of freedom

$f = N - 1$

$= 35 - 1$

$= 34$

It can be seen that the mean of the students' pre-test and post-test score has significant difference scores where $Mx = 63.8571$, $My = 74.6571$, $MD = 10.8000$, T-score = 17.142, and degree of freedom = 34. This means that the mean of pre-test and post-test has increased from 63.8571 to be 74.6571. So, it can be concluded that the small group discussion technique is helpful the students to increase their achievement in reading comprehension.

The score above will be analyzed by using program SPSS 16.0. It is used to know mean of pretest and posttest. The result as follow:

Table 4.9 Paired Sample Statistics.

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pretest	63.8571	35	6.04952	1.02255
	Posttest	74.6571	35	4.36526	.73786

Based on the table 4.9 above, paired sample statistics shown *Mean* for pre-test score (63.8571). While *N* for cell there are 35. *Standard Deviation* for pre-test (6.04952),*Standard Error Mean* for pre-test (1.02255).

The pretest is done before treatment process. This test is given to know the students'speaking ability before they get treatment.

The *Mean* score of postest is 74.6571. *Standard Deviation* for post-test (4.36526), *Standard Error Mean* for post-test (73786).The posttest is done after giving treatment. This test is done to know the students' speaking ability after they get treatment.

Based on the result above, the mean of posttest (74.6571) is higher than the mean of pretest (63.8571). From this result, the researcher conclude that there is improvement of student' speaking ability.

Table 4.11 Paired Samples Correlations

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Pretest & Posttest	35	.790	.000

Based on the table 4.10 above, it shows that the correlations between two scores of pre-test and post-test = 0.790 and sig = 0.000. For interpretation of decision based on the result of probability achievement, that is:

a)   If the sig > 0.05, means H_0 is accepted

b)   If the sig < 0.05, means H_0 is rejected

It shows that sig= 0.000 is lower than 0.05 means that H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted. So, it concluded that there is significant correlation between pre-test and post-test scores.

Based on the table 4.11, *output paired samples test* shows the result

Table 4.10 Paired Samples Test

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences							
					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper	t	Df	
Pair 1	Pretest – Posttest	-1.08000E1	3.73221	.63086	-12.08206	-9.51794	-17.140	34	.000

of compare analysis with using T test. *Output shows mean* pre-test and post-test is 1.08000, standard deviation is 3.73221, mean standard error is 63086. The lower different is 12.08206 and upper different is 9.51794. The result test t = 17.140 with df = 34 and significance is 0.000.

With the guideline of T_{count} and T_{table} where df= 34 got from $T_{table=}$ 1.69. So, T_{count} (17.140) > T_{table} (1.69) means that H_o is rejected and H_a is accepted. Therefore, it concluded that there is the significant differences between pre-test and post-test score where mean of post-test is 74.6571 higher than mean of pre-test is 63.8571 means that teaching speaking skill through using Oral Presentation technique is effective.

C. Hypothesis Testing

From the data analysis it could be identify that:

1. When the value of T_{count} > T_{table} in *df* = 34 with the significant level 0.05. The alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted and the null hypothesis (H_o) is rejected. It means that there is significant different score of speaking skill to

second grade students at MTs AL MA'ARIF Tulungagung before and after being taught using oral presentation technique.

2. When the value of $T_{count} < T_{table}$ in $df = 34$ with the significant level 0.05. The null hypothesis (H_o) is accepted and the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is rejected. It means that there is no significant different score of speaking skill to first grade students at MTs AL MA'ARIF Tulungagung before and after being taught using oral presentation technique.

The mean of total speaking skill test score of 35 students before being taught using oral presentation technique is (63.8571). After getting treatment, the means score of students' speaking is (74.6571). It means that the students' score is improved.

Based on the statistical calculation using t-test, the researcher gives interpretation to t_{count}. First, she considered the *d.f.* with the *d.f.* (35-1=34). She checked to the score of "t" at the significant level of 0,05. In fact, with the *d.f.* of (34) and the critical value 0,05 significant t_{table} was (1.69).

By comparing the "t" that she got in calculation $t_{count} = (17.140)$ and the value of "t" on the $t_{table} = t_{0.05} = (1.69)$, it is known that t_{count} is bigger than $t_{table} = 17.140 > 1.69$.

Because the t_{count} is bigger than t_{table} the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. It means that there is significant different score of students speaking skill achievement of to first grade students at MTs AL MA'ARIF Tulungagung before and after being taught by oral presentation technique.

E. Discussion

From the research method in chapter III in this research, teaching and learning process is divided into three steps. First step is the researcher administrated pre-test by giving speaking test. It is used to know the students' earlier speaking test before they get treatment.

The second is given treatment to the students. The treatment here is teaching speaking test by using oral presentation technique. The material is description. After the student got treatment, they were more enthusiastic to learn speaking test. The last step was giving post-test to the students after they got treatment.

From the research finding in chapter IV, the output data of *Paired Samples Statistics* shows mean of pre-test is 63.8571 and post-test is 74.6571 has increased and if compared the differences both of value is 10.8000. It was found that the students' speaking skill after being taught by Oral Presentation technique had better than the students' speaking skill before being taught by Oral Presentation technique. Therefore, from both mean it can concluded that there is significant differences in the students' achievement of speaking skill means that teaching speaking skill through oral presentation technique is effective.

The standard deviation is to measure how much the variance of the sample. The standard deviation of pre-test is 6.04952 < 63.8571 and post-test is 4.36526< 74.6571 where if the standard deviation is getting higher than the mean it means that the mean is not homogeny and if the standard deviation is

getting smaller than the mean it means that the mean is homogeny. So, it can be concluded that standard deviation of pre-test and post-test was homogeny means that the sample of this research almost has the same mean.

The standard error mean is to measure the accuracy with which a sample represents a population. The standard error mean of pre-test is $1.02255 < 63.8571$ and post-test is $.73786 < 74.6571$ where if the standard error mean is getting higher than the mean it means that the sample is not representative and if the standard error mean is getting smaller than the mean it means that the sample is representative. So, it can be concluded that the sample of this research indicated good sample or representative from population.

Based on the output data of *Paired Samples Test* it was found that $t_{count} = 17.140$ and $t_{table} = 1.69$ and if compared the differences both of value is 16.951. From this comparison, $t_{count} = 17.140$ is bigger than $t_{table} = 1.69$ which means the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted, while the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is significance different score of the reading comprehension of the first grade students of MTs AL MA'ARIF Tulungagung in academic year 2017/2018 before and after being taught using oral presentation technique.

Based on the result of research findings and explanation above, it can be concluded that using oral presentation technique is effective in speaking skill at junior high school especially for the second first students of MTs AL MA'ARIF Tulungagung. It proved that Oral Presentation technique has significant effect to the students' speaking skill. According to King (2002:401)

Oral Presentation is an effective communicative activity that has been widely adopted by EFL conversation teachers to promote oral proficiency. Thus, based on some definitions above, the researcher concludes that oral presentation is an activity of sharing ideas and or information in front of audiences which has purpose to improve students' oral proficiency.

Based on the result of post-test that showed higher scores that the pre-test score. It idicates that the students were improvement in their speaking skill after being taught by using Oral Presentation technique. 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 explaning the role of Oral Presentation and ask students to apply this strategy in teaching-learning speaking. This is in line with the finding of previous research done by Suhardin (2011) that stated that using oral presentation help to teach the students. In teaching speaking, it can improve students' motivation to speak English, and increase their interest to learning English.

Oral presentation technique can improve students' public speaking skill achievement. They were also able to enhance their self-confidence in speaking in front of their classmates (public). This technique helped the students to solve their speaking problem in low of participation in speaking class. By oral presentation, the students were given chance to choose their topic and prepare it to be presented then. So, there were no reasons for low of participation in speaking class.

After the researcher did the research in teaching speaking skill to first grade students at MTs AL MA'ARIF Tulungagung, oral presentation technique can improve students' motivation to speak English, and increase their interest to learning English. So, they can learn to develop their skill in rspeaking, especially of descriptive.Oral Prsentation technique surely showed the real effectiveness in teaching oral presentation because it can help the students to improve their speaking skill achievement, especially of first grade students at MTs AL MA'ARIF Tulungagung.