

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This chapter covers about research findings and discussion that include data of research findings, hypothesis testing and discussion.

A. The Description of Data

In this section, the researcher presented the data on the student's speaking achievement between students that taught speaking using Information Gap and those taught without using Information Gap. The subjects of the research consisted of two classes; they were VIII-C as Experimental class and VIII-D class as Control class. The purposed of the researcher was to know the effectiveness of using Information Gap toward eight grade students' speaking achievement at MTs Darussalam Kademangan Blitar. The data were collected from students pre-test and post-test of both classes. The data were described as follow:

1. The Data of Experimental Class

The table bellow showed the students' score of pre-test and post-test of Experimental class that was consist of 37 students of eight grade of MTs Darussalam Kademangan Blitar. The test was speaking Recount text form. The theme of pre-test was "Day Off You Enjoyed" and post-test was "Impressing Holiday". Students' score of post-test and post-test can be seen on table 4.1 as follow:

Table 4.1 The Students' Scores of Experimental Class (Using Information gap)

No.	Student's Name	Pretest	Posttest
1	ABZ	57	64
2	AAN	50	66
3	AA Y	60	75
4	BBA	57	63
5	BKA	70	72
6	DBK	54	60
7	DBS	47	48
8	DNR	37	44
9	DS	54	63
10	FAN	40	55
11	FFP	44	52
12	FFF	70	80
13	HI	54	72
14	H	46	60
15	HNS	55	64
16	IPS	63	65
17	MDYP	52	65
18	MFR	56	60
19	MHA	55	65
20	MHI	47	50
21	MYA	48	57
22	MZE	65	76
23	MIU	52	60
24	MHS	36	56
25	NAVS	65	73
26	NAJ	49	60
27	NHM	47	53
28	NHH	48	60
29	NIF	49	71
30	PNO	54	60
31	RAH	44	55
32	RRS	57	65
33	RSA	44	50
34	R	53	57
35	SIK	63	65
36	TAS	71	73
37	ZM	37	55

The researcher used SPSS 16.0 for windows to know the student's speaking achievement at Experimental class. First, the researcher gave the student's pre-test to know their basic speaking ability. The result can be seen on the table 4.2 below:

Table 4.2 Descriptive Statistic Pre-test of Experimental Class

Statistics		
Pretest		
N	Valid	37
	Missing	0
Mean		52.70
Median		53.00
Mode		54
Std. Deviation		9.079
Minimum		36
Maximum		71
Sum		1950

According to the result of pre-test from the table above, it shown that the sum of data was 1950. The lowest score of pre-test was 36 and the highest score was 71. The mean of data was 52.70. And after the researcher gave the treatment by using Information Gap in teaching

speaking recount text for two weeks, the researcher gave the students post-test. The data in the post test showed on the table 4.3 below:

Table 4.3 Descriptive Statistic Post-test of Experimental Class

Statistics

Posttest

N	Valid	37
	Missing	0
Mean		61.86
Median		60.00
Mode		60
Std. Deviation		8.387
Minimum		44
Maximum		80
Sum		2289

According to the result of pre-test from the table above, it shown that the sum of data was 2289. The lowest score of pre-test was 44 and the highest score was 80. The mean of data was 61.86.

Based on descriptive statistic pre-test and post-test of Experimental class, it shown the *Sum* of data pre-test was 1950 and the *Sum* of data post-test was 2289. *Mean* of pre-test score was 52.70 and the *Mean* of post-test score was 61.86. Then, it can be concluded that the gained score between

pre-test and post-test was 339 and the gained of mean score was 9.16. Hence, there were significance different score between pre-test and post-test.

2. The Data of Control Class

The table bellow showed the students' score of pre-test and post-test of Control class that was consist of 35 students of eight grade of MTs Darussalam Kademangan Blitar. The test was speaking Recount text form. The theme of pre-test was "Day Off You Enjoyed" and post-test was "Impressing Holiday". Students' score of post-test and post-test can be seen on table 4.4 below:

Table 4.4 The Students' Scores of Control Class (Without Using Information gap)

No.	Student's Name	Pretest	Posttest
1	AFA	52	57
2	AAP	57	41
3	CPS	46	53
4	CY	56	57
5	DTA	54	60
6	DP	38	44
7	FH	69	76
8	IFE	62	57
9	IZ	44	44
10	ICIP	52	51
11	JL	50	56
12	KYS	56	69
13	KYS	44	48
14	MFS	47	57
15	MFRK	34	36
16	MR	40	50

No.	Student's Name	Pretest	Posttest
17	MDAS	65	67
18	MIS	43	49
19	MRK	52	48
20	MFA	61	63
21	MRS	40	47
22	MYA	54	56
23	MFNH	51	52
24	MA	40	41
25	NK	64	69
26	NZNA	37	43
27	NOA	60	63
28	NP	51	60
29	NPS	73	71
30	RMMS	70	57
31	SADP	40	54
32	YNP	56	61
33	YSI	47	55
34	YES	45	49
35	ZAF	53	57

The researcher used SPSS *16.0 for windows* to know the student's speaking achievement at control class. First, the researcher gave the student's pre-test to know their basic speaking ability. The result can be seen on the table 4.5 below:

Table 4.5 Descriptive Statistic Pre-test of Control Class

Statistics

Pretest

N	Valid	35
	Missing	0
Mean		51.51

Median	52.00
Mode	40
Std. Deviation	9.936
Minimum	34
Maximum	73
Sum	1803

According to the result of pre-test from the table above, it shown that the sum of data was 1803. The lowest score of pre-test was 34 and the highest score was 73. The mean of data was 51.51. And after the researcher teaching speaking recount text using traditional method, the researcher gave the students post-test. The data in the post test showed on the table 4.6 below:

Table 4.6 Descriptive Statistic Post-test of Control Class

Statistics

Posttest

N	Valid	35
	Missing	0
Mean		54.80
Median		56.00
Mode		57
Std. Deviation		9.235

Minimum	36
Maximum	76
Sum	1918

According to the result of pre-test from the table above, it shown that the sum of data was 1918. The lowest score of pre-test was 36 and the highest score was 76. The mean of data was 54.80.

Based on descriptive statistic pre-test and post-test of Control class, it shown the *Sum* of data pre-test was 1803 and the *Sum* of data post-test was 1918. *Mean* of pre-test score was 51.51 and the *Mean* of post-test score was 54.80. Then, it can beconcluded that the gained score between pre-test and post-test was 115 and the gained of mean score was 3.29. Hence, there was slight significance different score between pre-test and post-test.

B. Hypothesis Testing

The hypotesis testing of this study as follow:

1. H₀ (null hypothesis): there is no significant different on speaking achievement between the students taught by using Information Gap and those taught without using Information Gap.
2. H_a (alternative hypothesis): there is significant different on speaking achievement between the students taught by using Information Gap and those taught without using Information Gap

The hypothesis testing of this study followed the rule as follows:

1. If the significant value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis (H₀) is rejected and alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted.
2. If the significant value is more than 0.05, the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is rejected and null hypothesis (H₀) is accepted.

To know whether there were any significant different students speaking achievement between the students who are taught using Information Gap and those taught without using Information Gap, the calculating result should show whether H₀ is rejected meanwhile H_a is accepted. To analyzed data the researcher by using SPSS 16 for windows, the result can be seen on table 4.7 below:

Table 4.7 Descriptive Statistic of Post-test (Experimental Class and Control Class)

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Expeimental_Class	37	44	80	61.86	8.387
Control_Class	35	36	76	54.80	9.235
Valid N (listwise)	35				

Based on table above, it showed there were two classes, experimental class and control class. Experimental class showed there were 37 students, *Mean* of score experimental class was 61.89, *Standard*

Deviation for experimental class was 8.387. Meanwhile, in control class, shows there were 35 students, *Mean* of score control class was 54.80, *Standard Deviation* for control class was 9.235.

In addition, the result of t-test testing with the helped of SPSS 16.0 *for windows* can be seen on table 4.8 as follow:

Table 4.8 Independent Sample T-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
Student's Score	Equal variances assumed	.213	.646	3.401	70	.001	7.065	2.077	2.922	11.208
	Equal variances not assumed			3.392	68.418	.001	7.065	2.083	2.909	11.220

Based on the table above, the result of t-test can be concluded that significant value (sig-2 tailed) was 0.001, and it was smaller than 0.05 ($0.001 < 0.05$). It means that H_0 was rejected and H_a was accepted. So, it

can be interpreted that there is significant difference of students' score between students taught by using Information Gap those taught without using Information Gap. It means that teaching speaking using Information Gap was effective

C. Discussion

From the reseach finding above, the data were analyzed with SPSS *16.0 for windows*. The student who were taught by using Information Gap made significant improvement, as seen from the mean score of pretest was 52.70 and the mean score of posttest was 61.86. The gain of the mean score of experiment class between pretest and posttest was 9.16. Meanwhile, the students who were taught without Information Gap did not make significant improvement, as seen from the mean score of pretest was 51.51, and the mean score of posttest was 54.80. The gain of the mean score of control class between pretest and posttest was 3.29. Based on the gained score between experimental class and control class, there are significance difference. The gained score of experimental class was 9.16 and the gained score of control class was 3.29. We can conclude that the gained score of experimental class was higher than control class

From the explanation above, experimental class has better speaking achievement than control class on posttest. Since the research used homogenous selection to control extraneous variable and the result of homogeneity testing on students' pretest on previous chapter showed that the

students have homogenous ability on speaking, it can be conclude that Information Gap was effective and not affected by extraneous variable.

Based on the research at MTs Darussalam Kademangan Blitar, it can be inferenced that teaching speaking by using Information Gap was better than without using Information Gap. Furthermore, the students who learned speaking through Information Gap and those who taught without using Information Gap having such a significant difference that the students' speaking scores who were taught using Information Gap was higher than those who were not. It can also be concluded that using Information Gap was effective to teach speaking.

Information Gap can improve students' speaking ability was in line with theory of Harmer (2007: 85) that stated Information Gap is a key to enhancement of communicative purpose and the desire to communicate. In class, teacher gave pairs of students two different task that each student missed some information on their task. So, there is a need and reasons for the students to communicate through the task. Furthermore, Raptou (2002) states that Information Gap activities can also reinforce vocabulary and a variety of grammatical structures taught in class. Students have much the opportunity to use the language which is taught to them to speak in the target language. In this research, the students learned about how to use past tense and conjunction. In addition, Rees (2002) stated that keeping the notion of a gap between students in mind, it is easy to come up with speaking activities that often require very little preparation but can increase the total amount of

student talking time in any lesson. It was easy to apply Information Gap activity because the teacher only gave simple instruction through a piece of paper then students did speaking activities by exchange information they have with their partner.

Briefly, the speaking achievement in the experiment class has proven that Information Gap is effective toward students' ability in speaking. The findings of the present research confirm the findings of preceding studies. The previous study was written by Jondeya (2011), which found that Information Gap can improve students' speaking skill and the majority of students gave positive response toward the implement of using Information Gap. It is also relevant to the finding in the study conducted by Nuraeni (2014) that using Information Gap can make students more interested in learning English and more active and more communicative in the class. So, they will not be bored in learning English especially speaking. Furthermore, Ana (2014) in her study also proved that the Information Gap conducted in pairs or in group gave opportunity for students to speak, increased the students' motivation and confidence, and the students were able to increase their vocabulary. In addition, Information Gap helped the students to achieve the communicative purpose of language.

In inference to the findings and previous study, the use of Information Gap activities successfully improved the student's speaking skill. Information Gap activities provides many opportunities for students to practice their speaking. The activities also increased the students' motivation and

confidence to speak in English. Therefore, as Information Gap activities are useful to be used in the speaking activity, the English teacher is suggested to implement Information Gap activities in teaching learning process of speaking.