CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. Research Findings

The researcher started to analyze the data after getting the students oral test. The researcher gave score based on four speaking elements (grammar, vocabulary,fluency, and pronounciation) to the students' performance is speaking test. The data obtained from the result of students' oral test are presented in table 4.1. The class consisted of 35 students of MTs Al Ma'arif Tulungagung.

Table 4.1 shows the students' score before using group interaction.

No	Subject	Grammar	Vocabulary	Fluency	Pronunciation	Total Score
1	ARP	65	55	45	65	58
2	APS	55	75	55	60	61
3	AHM	75	75	55	65	68
4	AH	55	80	65	75	69
5	ASN	85	50	65	65	66
6	APO	80	65	75	70	73
7	AVM	75	65	55	7S5	68
8	DNR	65	75	75	75	73
9	DW	55	75	75	65	68

10	EFM	55	85	55	75	68
11	FLA	75	85	65	70	74
12	FRN	75	55	55	55	60
13	FH	80	75	65	75	74
14	GNI	55	55	65	75	63
15	GMF	55	65	70	65	64
16	GS	65	75	60	65	66
17	HJA	65	65	55	75	65
18	II	75	75	55	65	68
19	IM	75	75	55	55	65
20	MAFR	85	55	55	60	64
21	MZH	55	80	60	75	68
22	MSP	55	75	45	75	63
23	MRZ	60	65	50	55	58
24	MIA	75	55	65	70	66
25	MSF	65	55	55	75	63
26	NAP	55	65	75	75	68
27	NAAA	45	85	65	65	65

28	NF	75	85	65	65	73
29	NLV	65	75	45	70	64
30	PSN	65	65	65	75	68
31	RFP	75	55	55	75	65
32	RDI	75	75	65	65	70
33	WRU	85	55	65	70	69
34	WS	85	85	60	65	74
35	YA	65	65	55	75	65

The pretest was given to the students by asking them to make a group interaction and practice a role play. It was done before treatment process. This test was intended to know the basic competence of students before they got treatment.

Table 4.3 Frequency of Pretest

Pretest

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	58	2	5.7	5.7	5.7
	60	1	2.9	2.9	8.6
	61	1	2.9	2.9	11.4
	63	3	8.6	8.6	20.0
	64	3	8.6	8.6	28.6
	65	5	14.3	14.3	42.9
	66	3	8.6	8.6	51.4
	68	8	22.9	22.9	74.3
	69	2	5.7	5.7	80.0
	70	1	2.9	2.9	82.9
	73	3	8.6	8.6	91.4
	74	3	8.6	8.6	100.0
	Total	35	100.0	100.0	

Based on table of pretest above that consist of 35 students. It show that the mean score is 66.68, the median score is 66.00, the mode score is 68, and the total score is 2334. The frequency of pretest after distributed there are 42.9% got the score under the mean. While 74.3% students got score above the mean.

Table 4.4 shows the students' score after being organized in group interaction.

No	Subject	Grammar	Vocabulary	Fluency	Pronunciation	Total Score
1	ARP	70	60	55	70	64
2	APS	65	85	60	65	69
3	AHM	80	80	60	75	74
4	AH	60	85	75	80	75
5	ASN	90	55	60	75	70
6	APO	85	70	80	75	78
7	AVM	85	70	60	80	74
8	DNR	70	80	80	80	78
9	DW	60	80	85	75	75
10	EFM	60	90	60	80	73
11	FLA	85	90	70	75	80
12	FRN	80	60	65	60	66
13	FH	85	80	70	80	79
14	GNI	60	60	70	80	68
15	GMF	65	70	80	70	71

16	GS	70	80	65	70	71
17	HJA	75	75	60	80	73
18	II	80	80	60	70	73
19	IM	80	80	65	60	71
20	MAFR	90	60	60	65	69
21	MZH	60	85	65	80	73
22	MSP	60	80	50	85	69
23	MRZ	65	75	60	65	66
24	MIA	80	65	70	75	73
25	MSF	75	60	60	80	69
26	NAP	60	70	85	80	74
27	NAAA	55	90	75	75	74
28	NF	80	90	70	75	79
29	NLV	70	85	55	75	71
30	PSN	75	70	75	80	75
31	RFP	80	60	60	80	70
32	RDI	80	80	70	70	75
33	WRU	90	60	75	75	75

| 34 | WS | 90 | 90 | 65 | 70 | 79 |
| 35 | YA | 75 | 70 | 65 | 85 | 74 |

The post test was given to the students by asking them to make a group interaction and practice a role play. It was done after treatment process. The test was intended to know the students speaking skill after students got treatment.

Table 4.5 Descriptive Statistics of Posttest

Statistics

Postest

N	Valid	35
	Missing	0
Mean		72.7714
Median		73.0000
Mode		73.00[a]
Sum		2547.00

a. Multiple modes exist. The

smallest value is shown

Table 4.6 Frequency of Posttest

Posttest

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	64	1	2.9	2.9	2.9
	66	2	5.7	5.7	8.6
	68	1	2.9	2.9	11.4
	69	4	11.4	11.4	22.9
	70	2	5.7	5.7	28.6
	71	4	11.4	11.4	40.0
	73	5	14.3	14.3	54.3
	74	5	14.3	14.3	68.6
	75	5	14.3	14.3	82.9
	78	2	5.7	5.7	88.6
	79	3	8.6	8.6	97.1
	80	1	2.9	2.9	100.0
	Total	35	100.0	100.0	

Based on table of pretest above that consist of 35 students. It show that the mean score is 72.77, the median score is 73.00, the mode score is 73, and the total score is 2547. The frequency of pretest after distributed there are 40.0% got the score under the mean. While 54.3% students got score above the mean.

B. Data Analysis

Therefore, to investigate whether Group Interaction is effective on the students' speaking skill, the researcher tested the result of pre-test and post-test by using Paired Sample Test in IBM SPSS Statistics 16. As what previously mentioned that there are two hypotheses in this study; (1) Null hypothesis stating that there is no any significant difference on students' speaking achievement before and after using Group Interaction, and (2) Alternative hypothesis stating that there is any significant difference on students' achievement in speaking before and after using Group Interaaction, the testing was done to investigate whether the null hypothesis could be rejected or not.

The result of data analysis is from student's score of pre-test and post-test as in the following table:

Table 4.7: Correlation

Correlations

		Pretest	Postest
Pretest	Pearson Correlation	1	.959[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	35	35
Postest	Pearson Correlation	.959[**]	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	35	35

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Relying on the table 4.7, the output of *Paired Samples Correlations* shows that there is a correlation between both samples. The numeral both correlation is 0.959 and the numeral of significance is 0.00. The interpretation of decision based on the result of probability achievement is:

    a) If the probability >0.05 then the null hypothesis is accepted

    b) If the probability <0.05 then the null hypothesis is rejected

The standard level of significance is 0.05. if the result of computation shows that the significance 2 tail on the table is lower than 0.05, there is a significant difference on students' speaking score before and after being taught by using group interaction. On the other hand, if the significance 2 tails in the table is higher than the significance level (0.05), there is no significant difference on the students' speaking score before and after being taught by using group interaction.

In table 4.7, the numeral significance level 0.02 is lower than 0.05 and therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. It means that there is a significant difference on students' speaking score before and after being taught by using group interaction. In other words, group interaction is effective to improve the students' speaking score.

Table 4.8: Paired Sample Statistics

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pretest	66.6857	35	4.27559	.72271
	Postest	72.7714	35	3.95627	.66873

The data presented above is the performance scores of the one group of students taken as the sample, before and after using group interaction as the treatment. The mean score of pre-test is 66.68. While the mean score of post-test is 72.77. The number of students (N) both in pre-test and post-test is 35. The standard deviation of pre-test is 4.275 and the error mean is 0.722. On the posttest, the standard deviations 3.956 and the error mean is 0.668.

Based on the result of mean, it can be concluded that the mean score of pre-test is different from the mean score of post-test. Thus it can be concluded that there is increase since the mean score of post-test is higher than pre-test.

Table 4.9: Paired Samples Correlation

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Pretest & Postest	35	.959	.000

Based on the table 4.9 above, shows the correlations between two scores of pre-test and post-test where it seen that the correlation scores of pre-test and post-test= 0.959 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_o is accepted

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

It shows that sig= 0.000 is lower than 0.05 means that H_0 is rejected and Ha is accepted. So, it can be concludes that there is significant correlation between pre – test and post – test score.

Table 4.10 Paired Sample T-test

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences						
					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1 Pretest-Postest		-6.08571	1.22165	.20650	-6.50537	-5.66606	-29.471	34	.000

Based on the table 4.10, *output paired samples test* shows the result of compare analysis with using T test. *Output shows mean* pre-test and post-test (6.085), standard deviation (1.221), mean standard error (0.206). The lower

different (6.505), while upper different (5.666). The result test t=(29.47) with df=34 and significance (0.000).

We can see that the t_{count} is 29.471. The way to test whether null hypothesis could be rejected was by comparing the result of t_{count} and t_{table}. If the result of t_{count} is larger than t_{table} at the level of significance 0.05, the null hypothesis can be rejected. On the contrary, if the resultof t_{count} is smaller than t_{table}, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. In consulting to t_{table}, the researcher needed to find out the degree of freedom. As can be seen in Table 4.10 that (Degree of freedom) is 34, the researcher consulted to the t_{table}, and at the level of significance 0.05, the value of t_{table} is 2.032. Comparing to the value of t_{table}, the value of is larger $t_{count} > t_{table}$ (29.47 > 2.032). Also, the way to test whether the null hypothesis can be rejected is by comparing p-value with the standard level of significance, 0.05. The convention to reject the null hypothesis is when the p-value of the obtained statistics is less than0.05 (Balnaves & Calputi, 2001).

As Table 4.10 shows, the p-value is less than 0.05(0.000 < 0.05). Thus, there was enough evidence indicating that the null hypothesis could be rejected, and it could be concluded that using group interaction was effective on the students' achievement in speaking.

C. The Result of Normality Testing

In this part the researcher discuss about the result of normality testing.

1. The Result of Normality Testing

Normality testing is conducted to determine whether the gotten data is normal distribution or not. The researcher used SPSS.16. *One-*

Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnove test by the value of significance (α) = 0.050. The result can be seen below:

Table 4.11: Normality Testing

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Pretest	Postest	Unstandardized Residual
N		35	35	35
Normal Parameters[a]	Mean	66.6857	72.7714	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	4.27559	3.95627	1.21318585
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.122	.123	.159
	Positive	.122	.115	.121
	Negative	-.106	-.123	-.159
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.723	.728	.939
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.673	.664	.341
a. Test distribution is Normal.				

The sig/p value on pre-test is 0.673 and it is lower 0.05 (0.673> 0.05). It means that H_0 is accepted and H_a is rejected and the data is in normal distribution. Then, for post-test score the value of sig/p is 0.664 and that is bigger than 0.05 (0.664> 0.05). It also means that H_0 is accepted and H_a is rejected and the data is in normal distribution. So, it can be interpreted that both of data (pre-test and post-test score) are in normal distribution.

D. 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 achievement to eighth grade students at MTs Al Ma'arif Tulungagung before and after using group interaction.

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 achievement to eighth grade students at MTs Al Ma'arif Tulungagung before and after using group interaction.

The mean of total speaking achievement test score of 35 students before using group interaction (66.68). After getting treatment, the means score of students' achievement is (72.77). 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). He 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 (2.032).

By comparing the "t" that she got in calculation t_{count} = (29.47) and the value of "t" on the t_{table}= $t_{0.05}$ = (2.032), it is known that $t_{count}$is bigger than t_{table}=29.47 >2.032.

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 student's achievement in speaking of eighth grade students of MTs Al Ma'arif Tulungagung before and after using group interaction.

E. **Discussion**

According to the result of t-test from the pre-Test and post-test, the value of tcount is 29.47 with df = 27 and the value of ttable is 2.032 at the level 0.05. If the sigma (2 tailed) > 0.05, it means that the null hypothesis (H0) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (H1) is accepted. So that there is any significant difference between student's speaking ability before they are taught and after taught by using group interaction. The value of tcount was higher than the t-value of ttable (tcount 29.47> ttable 2.032). It showed that teaching speaking using group interaction have positive effect to improve students' speaking skill. Besides that, the result of the mean of post-test was higher than the mean of pre-test (M2= 72.77> M1= 66.68). It means that there is significant improvement difference between student's speaking ability before they are taught and after taught by using group interaction. In other word, teaching speaking with group interaction was more effective than teaching speaking without using group interaction. In addition, group interaction

improved speaking skill in the second grade of student of MTs Al Ma'arif Tulungagung.

To help students in learning process, the teacher use group interaction, group interaction can motivate students to speaking because it is fun strategy for learning foreign language it is a line with theory Daniel Muijs and David Reynolds (2005:52) also demonstrates Working with other pupils may help them to develop their emphatic abilities by allowing them to see others' viewpoints which can help them to realize that everyone has strength and weaknesses. In this case the researcher as English teacher explained the role of group interactiton and asks students to apply in teaching-learning speaking. Now, the students do not look lazy when they have task from English teacher to speaking practice. Besides, they were also preferred English lessons, especially in speaking achievement, because they have a desire to fluently to speak English.