CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter the researcher presents research finding, hypothesis testing and discussion. The research finding discuss about the result of data analysis. The discussion section consists of discussion about the research finding.

A. Research Findings

The present research designed to find out the ability of the tenth grade at MA At Thohiriyah Ngantru in academic year 2016/2017 in narrative speaking skill when they were taught speaking by using Talking Stick Method and when they were taught speaking by using Conventional Method.

The subjects of the research consist of two classes. The data were described into two tables. The (Table 4.1) showed students' score and achievement in experimental class and the (Table 4.8) showed the students' score and achievement in control class. The data of this research were the pretest scores and posttest scores of experimental and control groups. The scores are presented as follows :

1. **Data of Experimental Class**

Experimental class was a class which taught narrative speaking skill by using Talking Stick Method. The subject experimental class group consisted of 16 students. Students' score of pre – test and post – test can be seen on the table below :

Table 4.1 The Students' Score of Experimental Class (Pretest and Posttest)

No	Students	Pretest	Posttest
1	AHP	33	53
2	APA	48	65
3	BRNM	52	73
4	FF	28	38
5	IA	60	76
6	MKN	62	76
7	MNVA	25	36
8	MNH	36	55
9	NADLA	54	74
10	NAD	50	72
11	RFK	38	50
12	RK	47	58
13	TK	50	48
14	WNA	65	78
15	YF	60	69
16	YA	52	71
		Σ X = 760	Σ Y = 992

Based on the (Table 4.1) above, it showed that the lowest score in pre - test was 25 and the highest score was 65. Beside that, the highest score of post - test was 78 , the lowest score was 36.

a. Pretest of Experimental Class

Table 4.2 Descriptive Statistic of Pretest

Statistics

Pretest_experimental

N	Valid	16
	Missing	0
Mean		47.50
Median		50.00
Mode		50[a]
Std. Deviation		12.231
Sum		760

Based on the (Table 4.2) above, showed that the mean of students score in pretest was 47.50; the median was 50; and the mode was 50. The standard deviation was 12.231 and the sum was 760.

After getting the statistical data, the researcher constructs a group frequency distribution with the helped of SPSS program 16.0 version. The frequency distribution of experimental class students' score in pretest can be seen in the (Table 4.3) as below :

Table 4.3 Frequency of Pretest

Pretest_experimental

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	25	1	6.2	6.2	6.2
	28	1	6.2	6.2	12.5
	33	1	6.2	6.2	18.8
	36	1	6.2	6.2	25.0
	38	1	6.2	6.2	31.2
	47	1	6.2	6.2	37.5
	48	1	6.2	6.2	43.8
	50	2	12.5	12.5	56.2
	52	2	12.5	12.5	68.8
	54	1	6.2	6.2	75.0
	60	2	12.5	12.5	87.5
	62	1	6.2	6.2	93.8
	65	1	6.2	6.2	100.0
	Total	16	100.0	100.0	

Based on the data of (Table 4.3), it showed that 1 student got score 25, 1 student got score 28, 1 student got score 33, 1 student got score 36, 1 student got score 38, 1 student got score 47, 1 student got score 48, 2 students got score 50, 2 students got score 52, 1 student got score 54, 2 students got score 60, 1 student got score 62, 1 student got score 65.

Based on the experimental class students' score in pretest, the researcher qualified their ability into 5 categories; excellent, good, average, poor and very poor. The categorization can be seen in (Table 4.4) as below:

Table 4.4 The Experimental Group Students' Qualification in Pretest

No	Grade	Qualification	Range of Score	Frequency
1	A	Excellent	85 – 100	0
2	B	Good	84 – 70	0
3	C	Average	69 – 55	4
4	D	Poor	54 – 50	5
5	E	Very Poor	49 – 0	7

Based on the (Table 4.4) above, the result of categorization showed that 4 students in average ability, 5 students in poor ability and 7 students in very poor ability. The result above shows that the many students had very poor ability in narrative speaking skill. It can be concluded that the students have to improve their ability in narrative speaking skill.

b. Posttest of Experimental Class

Table 4.5 Descriptive of Posttest

Statistics

Posttest_experimental

N	Valid	16
	Missing	0
Mean		62.00
Median		67.00
Mode		76
Std. Deviation		13.880
Sum		992

Based on the (Table 4.5) above, showed that the mean of students score in posttest was 62; the median was 67; and the mode was 76. The standard deviation was 13.880 and the sum was 992.

After getting the statistical data, the researcher constructs a group frequency distribution with the helped of SPSS program 16.0 version. The frequency distribution of experimental class students' score in posttest can be seen in the (Table 4.6) as below:

Table 4.6 Frequency of Posttest

Posttest_experimental

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	36	1	6.2	6.2	6.2
	38	1	6.2	6.2	12.5
	48	1	6.2	6.2	18.8
	50	1	6.2	6.2	25.0
	53	1	6.2	6.2	31.2
	55	1	6.2	6.2	37.5
	58	1	6.2	6.2	43.8
	65	1	6.2	6.2	50.0
	69	1	6.2	6.2	56.2
	71	1	6.2	6.2	62.5
	72	1	6.2	6.2	68.8
	73	1	6.2	6.2	75.0
	74	1	6.2	6.2	81.2
	76	2	12.5	12.5	93.8
	78	1	6.2	6.2	100.0
	Total	16	100.0	100.0	

Based on the data of (Table 4.6), it showed that 1 student got score 36, 1 student got score 38, 1 student got score 48, 1 student got score 50, 1 student got score 53, 1 student got score 55, 1 student got score 58, 1 student got score 65, 1 student got score 69, 1 student got score 71, 1 student got score 72, 1 student got score 73, 1 student got 74, 2 students got 76, 1 student got 78.

Based on the experimental class students' score in posttest, the researcher qualified their ability into 5 categories; excellent, good, average, poor and very poor. The categorization can be seen in (Table 4.7) as below :

Table 4.7 The Experimental Group Students' Qualification in Posttest

No	Grade	Qualification	Range of Score	Frequency
1	A	Excellent	85 – 100	0
2	B	Good	84 – 70	7
3	C	Average	69 – 55	4
4	D	Poor	54 – 50	2
5	E	Very Poor	49 – 0	3

Based on the (Table 4.7) above, the result of categorization shows that 7 students in good ability, 4 students in average ability, 2 students in poor ability, and 3 students in very poor ability. The result above shows that the many students had good ability in narrative speaking skill. It can be concluded that the students had good ability in narrative speaking skill.

2. Data of Control Class

Control class was a class which taught narrative speaking skill by using Conventional Method. The subject control group consisted of 14 students. Students' score of pre – test and post – test can be seen on the table below

Table 4.8 The Students' Scores of Control Class (Pretest and Posttest)

No	Students	Pretest	Posttest
1	AIS	58	60
2	AFK	40	42
3	DP	32	40
4	FAF	36	40
5	KFF	40	43
6	MAW	55	50
7	NN	53	50
8	UQA	61	62
9	SU	23	25
10	MAA	62	58
11	RBT	38	40
12	FAA	66	70
13	MADA	52	63
14	RANAH	46	58
		Σ X = 662	Σ Y = 701

Based on the (Table 4.8) above, it showed that the lowest score in pre - test was 23 and the highest score was 66. Beside that, the highest score of post - test was 70 , the lowest score was 25.

a. Pretest of Control Class

Table 4.9 Descriptive Statistic of Pretest

Statistics

Pretest_control

N	Valid	14
	Missing	0
Mean		47.29
Median		49.00
Mode		40
Std. Deviation		12.797
Sum		662

Based on the (Table 4.9) above, showed that the mean of students score in pretest was 47.29; the mode was 40; and the median was 49. The standard deviation was 12.797 and the sum was 662.

After getting the statistical data, the researcher constructs a group frequency distribution with the helped of SPSS program 16.0 version. The frequency distribution of control class students' score in pretest can be seen in the (Table 4.10) as below :

Table 4.10 Frequency of Pretest

Pretest_control

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	23	1	7.1	7.1	7.1
	32	1	7.1	7.1	14.3
	36	1	7.1	7.1	21.4
	38	1	7.1	7.1	28.6
	40	2	14.3	14.3	42.9
	46	1	7.1	7.1	50.0
	52	1	7.1	7.1	57.1
	53	1	7.1	7.1	64.3
	55	1	7.1	7.1	71.4
	58	1	7.1	7.1	78.6
	61	1	7.1	7.1	85.7
	62	1	7.1	7.1	92.9
	66	1	7.1	7.1	100.0
	Total	14	100.0	100.0	

Based on the data of (Table 4.10), it showed that 1 student got score 23, 1 student got score 32, 1 student got score 36, 1 student got score 38, 2 students got score 40, 1 student got score 46, 1 student got score 52, 1 student got score 53, 1 student got score 55, 1 student got score 58, 1 student got score 61, 1 student got 62, 1 student got score 66.

Based on the control class students' score in pretest, the researcher qualified their ability into 5 categories; excellent, good, average, poor and very poor. The categorization can be seen in (Table 4.11) as below:

Table 4.11 The Control Group Students' Qualification in Pretest

No	Grade	Qualification	Range of Score	Frequency
1	A	Excellent	85 – 100	0
2	B	Good	84 – 70	0
3	C	Average	69 – 55	5
4	D	Poor	54 – 50	2
5	E	Very Poor	49 – 0	7

Based on the (Table 4.11) above, the result of categorization shows that 7 students in very poor ability, 2 students in poor ability and 5 students in average ability. The result above shows that many students had very poor ability in narrative speaking skill. It can be concluded that the students' narrative speaking skill from both experimental and control class were almost same in pretest and the students have to improve their ability in narrative speaking skill.

.

b. Posttest of Control Class

Table 4.12 Descriptive Statistic of Posttest

Statistics

Posttest_control

N	Valid	14
	Missing	0
Mean		50.07
Median		50.00
Mode		40
Std. Deviation		12.338
Sum		701

Based on the (Table 4.12) above, showed that the mean of students score in posttest was 50.07 ; the mode was 40; and the median was 50. The standard deviation was 12.338 and the sum was 701.

After getting the statistical data, the researcher constructs a group frequency distribution with the helped of SPSS program 16.0 version. The frequency distribution of control class students' score in posttest can be seen in the (Table 4.13) as below:

Table 4.13 Frequency of Posttest

Posttest_control

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	25	1	7.1	7.1	7.1
	40	3	21.4	21.4	28.6
	42	1	7.1	7.1	35.7
	43	1	7.1	7.1	42.9
	50	2	14.3	14.3	57.1
	58	2	14.3	14.3	71.4
	60	1	7.1	7.1	78.6
	62	1	7.1	7.1	85.7
	63	1	7.1	7.1	92.9
	70	1	7.1	7.1	100.0
	Total	14	100.0	100.0	

Based on the data of (Table 4.13), it showed that 1 student got score 25, 3 students got score 40, 1 student got score 42, 1 student got score 43, 2 students got score 50, 2 students got score 58, 1 student got score 60, 1 student got score 62, 1 student got score 63, 1 student got score 70.

Based on the control class students' score in posttest, the researcher qualified their ability into 5 categories; excellent, good, average, poor and very poor. The categorization can be seen in (Table 4.14) as below :

Table 4.14 The Control Group Students' Qualification in Posttest

No	Grade	Qualification	Range of Score	Frequency
1	A	Excellent	85 – 100	0
2	B	Good	84 – 70	1
3	C	Average	69 – 55	5
4	D	Poor	54 – 50	2
5	E	Very Poor	49 – 0	6

Based on the (Table 4.14) above, the result of categorization shows that 1 student in good ability, 5 students in average ability, 2 students in poor ability, and 6 students in very poor ability. The result above shows that many students had very poor ability in narrative speaking skill. Only one student had good ability. It can be concluded that Talking Stick Method was effective.

B. Hypothesis Testing

The hypothesis testing of this study as follows :

1. Null Hypothesis (Ho)

   "There was no a significant difference score of the students' narrative speaking skill between students' taught by using Talking Stick Method and those taught by using Conventional Method ".

2. Alternative Hypothesis (Ha)

   "There was a significant difference score of the students' narrative speaking skill between students' taught by using Talking Stick Method and those taught by using Conventional Method".

To know whether there were any significant different score of the students' narrative speaking skill between students' taught by using Talking Stick Method and those taught by using Conventional Method, the researcher analyzed the data by using Independent Sample T - test in SPSS statistics 16.0 version. The result can be seen on table as below :

Table 4.15 Group Statistic

Group Statistics

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Students' score	experimental class	16	62.00	13.880	3.470
	control class	14	50.07	12.338	3.297

Based on (Table 4.15), it shows there were two class, it was experimental class and control class. First experimental class, shows N cell there were 16, Mean of score experimental class (62), Standard Deviation for experimental class (13.880), and standard error mean for experimental class (3.470). While, in control class, shows cell there were 14, Mean of score control class (50.07), Standard Deviation for experimental class (12.338), and Standard Error Mean for control class (3.297).

From the result above it can conclude, that there is a significant difference score of the students' narrative speaking skill between students' taught by using Talking Stick Method and those taught by using Conventional Method.

Table 4.16 Independent Samples Test of Experimental and Control Groups

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Students' score	Equal variances assumed	.674	.419	2.472	28	.020	11.929	4.826	2.043	21.814
	Equal variances not assumed			2.492	27.988	.019	11.929	4.787	2.123	21.734

Based on (Table 4.16), that significant level (sig) was 0.020, and it is lower than 0.05 (0.02 < 0.05). Therefore, the null hypothesis saying that there was no a significant difference score of the students' narrative speaking skill between students' taught by using Talking Stick Method and those taught by using Conventional Method was rejected and alternative hypothesis saying that there was a significant difference score of the students' narrative speaking skill between students' taught by using Talking Stick Method and those taught by using Conventional Method was accepted. It was found that there was a significant difference score of the students' narrative speaking skill between students' taught by using Talking Stick Method and those taught by using Conventional Method. Thus, Talking Stick Method was effective toward students' narrative speaking skill.

C. Normality and Homogenity Testing

1. Normality Testing

Normality test intended to show that the sample data come from a normally distributed population. The normality testing in this research To know the normality, the researcher used statistic computation SPSS Statistics 16.0 One - Sample Kolmogrov - Smirnov test by the value of significance (α) = 0.05. The result of normality testing can be seen in the table below :

Table 4.17 Normality Test of Experimental Class and Control Class

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		pretest_ experimental	posttest_ experimental	pretest_ control	posttest_ control
N		16	16	14	14
Normal Parameters[a]	Mean	47.50	62.00	47.29	50.07
	Std. Deviation	12.231	13.880	12.797	12.338
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.171	.193	.144	.168
	Positive	.094	.125	.144	.145
	Negative	-.171	-.193	-.144	-.168
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.685	.772	.539	.630
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.736	.590	.934	.822

a. Test distribution is Normal.

Based on the result of the test above, can be seen that the significance value pretest of experimental group was 0.736, posttest of experimental group was 0.590, pretest of control group was 0.934, and posttest of control group was 0.822, so all of them were more than 0.05. It means that Ho was accepted and Ha was rejected. So, it can be interpreted that all of the data were normal distributed.

2. Homogeneity Testing

Homogeneity testing conducted to know whether the gotten data has a homogeneous variance or not. The homogeneity testing in this research using statistic computation SPSS Statistics 16.0 that is Levene Statistic test by the value of significance (α) = 0.05. The samples can be categorized as homogeneity if

value of significance > 0.05, so it means that the data of sample had same variance. The result can be seen below:

Table 4.18 Homogeneity of Test

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Pretest_experimentalandcontrol

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.213	1	28	.648

From the result above, the test was homogeneity because significant was 0.648, it known that the significant was more than 0.05 (0.648 > 0.05). it means that Ho was accepted and Ha was rejected. So, the homogeneity testing of variance in pretest of experimental and control groups for narrative speaking skill in this research showed that the data had homogeneous variance, so it was qualified to be analyzed.

D. Discussion

Based on the research finding, it showed that the mean scores between pretest and posttest of control group and experimental group was different. The objectives of the study was to know the effectiveness of using Talking Stick Method toward students' narrative speaking skill and to know the significance different score of the students' narrative speaking skill between students' taught by using Talking Stick Method and those taught by using Conventional Method

of the tenth grade students at MA At – Thohiriyah Ngantru in academic year 2016/2017.

In this research, students who were taught by using Conventional Method did not reveal significant improvement. It can be seen from the mean score of pretest was 47.29 and the average score of posttest was 50.07. The gain of the mean score in control class between pretest and posttest was 2.78. Whereas in the pretest of experimental group, the average score was 47.50, and the average score in posttest was 62. The gain of the mean score in experimental class between pretest and posttest was 14.50. It looked that the gain of mean score in experimental class higher than the gain of mean score in control class. The mean score of both groups also look difference value, the result shows that the posttest of experimental group was better than posttest of control group. Then, based on the result of the statistical computation, showed that the result of experimental group after taught by using Talking Stick Method, the significance value is 0.020 which was lower than the significance level 0.05 (0.02 < 0.05). Therefore, the null hypothesis saying that there was no a significant difference score of the students' narrative speaking skill between students' taught by using Talking Stick Method and those taught by using Conventional Method was rejected and alternative hypothesis saying that there was a significant difference score of the students' narrative speaking skill between students' taught by using Talking Stick Method and those taught by using Conventional Method was accepted. It means there was a significance different score of the students' narrative speaking skill between students' taught by using Talking Stick Method and those taught by using

Conventional Method. From the result above, the conclusion was the students get good achievement in narrative speaking skill after taught by using Talking Stick Method. So Talking Stick Method was effective toward students' narrative speaking skill.

By using Talking Stick Method, students felt fun in learning English and they could apply cooperative learning with the other students. It was known from the implementation of teaching by using Talking Stick Method. The first administered pretest for all of the subjects (control group and experimental group), it means to know the students' narrative speaking skill before treatment. Second, gave treatment to the students, the treatment here was teaching narrative speaking skill by using Talking Stick Method for experimental class, and teaching as usual (Conventional Method) for control class. The last step was administered posttest, the posttest was also given for both experimental group and control group to administering their narrative speaking skill after they got treatment whether a treatment by using Talking Stick Method or teaching learning process as usual (Conventional Method).

Here Talking Stick Method helped the students in narrative speaking skill in interesting and communicative way. Students got the opportunity to speak up, it practice the students' narrative speaking skill. Moreover, the students practicing speaking as a habit in speaking class. They would not feel shy to speak in front of the other friends. The students were more active in the teaching learning process. Talking stick was one of method in cooperative learning. Cooperative learning was a general term to strategies learning which it has been planned to bring up

cooperative in group and interaction to the other students for each their purposes, Jacobsen et. al (2009:13). The students interact with each other in the same group to acquire and practice the elements of a subject matter, complete a task or to achieve a goal. By using one of method in cooperate learning, that Talking Stick Method made students confident to speaking.

From the explanation above, it can conclude that Talking Stick Method was an effective method toward students' narrative speaking skill. Such as the previous research which conducted in pre - experimental design by Iskandar (2014) of the tenth grade at MA Al – Qasimiyah Sorek Satu Pelalawan Regency. His research was successes and shows a better result. The mean score of pre – test was 55.60, while post – test the mean score increased become 68.10. Based on the result of the research, the students' score increased after using Talking Stick Method. It mean that Talking Stick Method is effective to be applied in teaching speaking and also had significant effect towards students' speaking ability of the Tenth Grade at MA Al – Qasimiyah Sorek Satu Pelalawan Regency. Meanwhile, in this research a researcher used quasi experimental design research in the form of nonrandomized control group, pretest – posttest design. The result of the students' narrative speaking skill who were taught by using Talking Stick Method was better than those who were taught by using Conventional Method. The mean score of pretest in experimental class was 47.50 and the mean score of posttest was 62. While, the mean score in control class of pretest was 47.29 and the mean score of posttest was 50.07. So, a researcher concluded that Talking Stick Method can improve students' narrative speaking skill.

Over all, the result above imply that the use of Talking Stick Method gave positive effect to the students' narrative speaking skill during teaching and learning process. It has been verified by the result of data analysis that there was significant difference score of the tenth students in MA At - Thohiriyah in academic year 2017/2018 in narrative speaking skill between they who were taught by using Talking Stick Method and those who were taught by using Conventional Method. Thus, it can be conclude that the use of Talking Stick Method was effective to teach narrative speaking skill of the tenth grade at the students in MA At – Thohiriyah Ngantru in academic year 2017/2018.