## CHAPTER IV

## FINDING AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter present the findings of the research and the result of analyzing the data.

## A. The Description of Data

Data description purposed to show the result of research. The objective of this research was to know the students' speaking ability taught by using strip-story technique. Besides the objective of this research was also used to identify the significant difference of the students' speaking ability taught by using syrip-story technique and without using strip-story technique. The data of this research consisted of pre test score and post test score of control and treatment group. The result of the research were explained as follows.

## 1. The Student's Speaking Ability when They Learn Using Strip-Story Technique.

a. Pre-test of Experimental Group

Experimental group was a class which had given a treatment in student speaking ability by using strip-story technique. Before the researcher gave the treatment, the researcher would presented students speaking ability score which got from students pre-test by using stripstory technique. For the detailed student's pre-test score in experimental group. Could be seen as follows:

Table 4.1
Students Pre-test Score of X-B

| X-B |  | Element of speaking |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No | Name | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Pronunc } \\ \text { iation }\end{array}$ | Grammar |  |  |  |  |
| ulary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |$)$

Based on the table above, the researcher know that 6 students got
score 50 , there were 10 students got score 60 , only 7 students' got score 70 and 2 students' got highest score 80 . The score presented in the tabel for makes the result easy to understand. The tabel devided by six categories from very poor until exellent. Based on the table above, the researcher concluded the students speaking ability pre-test to the table based on the criteria above.

Table 4.2
The Score's Criteria of Student's Speaking Ability Pre-test

| No. | Criteria of <br> Score | Frequency (f) | Percentages (p) <br> $\%$ | Categories |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $90-100$ | 0 | 0 | Excellent |
| 2 | $80-89$ | 2 | 7.40 | Very good |
| 3 | $70-79$ | 7 | 26.00 | Good |
| 4 | $60-69$ | 10 | 37.00 | Sufficient |
| 5 | $50-59$ | 6 | 29.60 | Average |
| 6 | $40-49$ | 0 | 0 | Poor |
| 7 | $30-39$ | 0 | 0 | Very Poor |
|  |  | $\sum \mathrm{f}=25$ | $\sum \mathrm{p}=100 \%$ |  |

Based on the table above $7.40 \%$ of students' speaking ability was categories as very good score, $26.00 \%$ of students was categories as good score, $37.00 \%$ of students was categories as sufficient categories and $29.60 \%$ of students was categories as average score. The next phase, researcher presented pre-test score in chart below:

Chart 4.1
Students' Pre-test Score

b. Post-test of Experimental Group

Administering a post-test for experimental group to know the effective of student's speaking ability was by using strip-story technique. In this research strip-story technique became very effective to make students able to speak, it's affected to students speaking ability score in post-test. Based on post-test, researcher presented students result as follow:

Table 4.3
Students Post-test Score of X-B

| X-B |  | Element of speaking |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No | Name | Pronunc <br> iation | Grammar | Vocab <br> ulary | Fluency | Compre <br> hension | Score |
| 1 | A B M P | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 80 |
| 2 | A D | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 70 |
| 3 | B F K | 2 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 70 |
| 4 | D N N H | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 70 |
| 5 | F N | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 80 |
| 6 | F Z | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 80 |
| 7 | G S | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 80 |
| 8 | I F N | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 80 |
| 9 | J A F F | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 80 |
| 10 | K R | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 70 |
| 11 | L A P S | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 70 |
| 12 | M A T | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 70 |
| 13 | M B Z | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 80 |
| 14 | M D E | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 70 |
| 15 | M M | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 80 |
| 16 | M R | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 70 |
| 17 | N E | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 80 |
| 18 | N E P | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 80 |
| 19 | P S | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 70 |
| 20 | R A S | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 80 |
| 21 | R F | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 80 |
| 22 | S W | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 80 |
| 23 | W P S | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 70 |
| 24 | Y L S | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 80 |
| 25 | Z S N | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 80 |

Based on the table above, there were many students got score 80 or 15 students, 10 students got score 70. Its meant strip-story become very effective to teach students speaking ability. The table was divided by six categories from very poor until exellent. Based on the result of speaking ability post-test, researcher concluded that the students speaking ability post-test to the table based on the criteria above.

Tabel 4.4
The Score's Criteria of Student's Speaking Ability Post-test

| No. | Criteria of <br> Score | Frequency (f) | Percentages (p) \% | Categories |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $90-100$ | 0 | 0 | Excellent |
| 2 | $80-89$ | 15 | 60.00 | Very good |
| 3 | $70-79$ | 10 | 40.00 | Good |
| 4 | $60-69$ | 0 | 0 | Sufficient |
| 5 | $50-59$ | 0 | 0 | Average |
| 6 | $40-49$ | 0 | 0 | Poor |
| 7 | $30-39$ | 0 | 0 | Very Poor |
|  |  | $\sum \mathrm{f}=25$ | $\sum \mathrm{p}=100 \%$ |  |

Based on the table above $40.00 \%$ of students' speaking ability was categories as good score and $60.00 \%$ of students was categories as very good score. The next phase, researcher presented pre-test score in chart below:

Chart 4.2
Students' Post-Test Score

2. The Student's Speaking Ability when They Learn without Using StripStory Technique.
a. Pre-test of Control Class

Control group was a class without using strip-story technique. Control group had been compared to experiment class to know the differences between experiment classes which was given treatment using strip-story, while control class only gave pretest and posttest. Before the researcher presented the students post-test score, the researcher will presented students pre-test score, the data used as parameter of success from the research.

Table 4.5
Students Pre-test Score of X-A

| X-A |  | Element of speaking |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No | Name | Pronunc <br> iation | Grammar | Vocab <br> ulary | Fluency | Compre <br> hension | score |
| 1 | A M S | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 80 |
| 2 | A R | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 80 |
| 3 | A A T | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 75 |
| 4 | A M P | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 70 |
| 5 | B F K | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 70 |
| 6 | D N Y | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 70 |
| 7 | D F | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 75 |
| 8 | E C | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 70 |
| 9 | F D N | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 75 |
| 10 | F F | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 75 |
| 11 | I FM | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 70 |
| 12 | J R F | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 70 |
| 13 | K S | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 75 |
| 14 | L F D | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 75 |
| 15 | M AA | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 70 |
| 16 | M A H | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 75 |
| 17 | M A P | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 70 |
| 18 | M R A | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 75 |
| 19 | N I Y | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 70 |
| 20 | P B | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 70 |
| 21 | R R A | 2 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 75 |


| X-A |  | Element of speaking |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No | Name | Pronunc <br> aation | Grammar | Vocab <br> ulary | Fluency | Compre <br> hension | score |
| 22 | S A | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 70 |
| 23 | S I P | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 70 |
| 24 | S S | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 75 |
| 25 | Y W P <br> K | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 70 |
| 26 | Y S R | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 70 |
| 27 | Z R | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 75 |

Based on the table above, the researcher knew that 14 students got
score 70,11 students got score 75 and only 2 student got score 80 . The table divided by six categories from very poor until exellent. Based on the result of pre-test score, researcher concluded that the students speaking ability pre-test to the table based on the criteria above.

Tabel 4.6
The Score's Criteria of Student's Speaking Ability Pre-test

| No. | Criteria of <br> Score | Frequency <br> (f) | Percentages (p) <br> $\%$ | Categories |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $90-100$ | 0 | 0 | Excellent |
| 2 | $80-89$ | 2 | 7.40 | Very good |
| 3 | $70-79$ | 25 | 91.60 | Good |
| 4 | $60-69$ | 0 | 0 | Sufficient |
| 5 | $50-59$ | 0 | 0 | Average |
| 6 | $40-49$ | 0 | 0 | Poor |
| 7 | $30-39$ | 0 | 0 | Very Poor |
|  |  | $\sum \mathrm{f}=27$ | $\sum \mathrm{p}=100 \%$ |  |

Based on the table above $7.40 \%$ of students' speaking ability categories as very good score and $91.60 \%$ of students was categories as good score. The next phase, researcher presented pre-test score in chart below:

Chart 4.3
Student Pre-test Score

b. Post-test of Control Group

Administering a post-test for control group was done to know the improvement of student's speaking ability without using strip-story technique. Based on post-test, researcher presents students result as follow:

Table 4.7
Students Post-test Score of X-A

| X-A |  | Element of speaking |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No | Name | Pronun <br> ciation | Grammar | Vocab <br> ulary | Fluency | Compre <br> hension | score |
| 1 | A M S | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 80 |
| 2 | A R | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 80 |
| 3 | A A T | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 75 |
| 4 | A M P | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 70 |
| 5 | B F K | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 70 |
| 6 | D N Y | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 70 |
| 7 | D F | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 75 |


| X-A |  | Element of speaking |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No | Name | Pronun <br> ciation | Grammar | Vocab <br> ulary | Fluency | Compre <br> hension | score |
| 8 | E C | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 70 |
| 9 | F D N | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 75 |
| 10 | F F | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 75 |
| 11 | I FM | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 75 |
| 12 | J R F | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 80 |
| 13 | K S | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 75 |
| 14 | L F D | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 75 |
| 15 | M AA | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 80 |
| 16 | M A H | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 75 |
| 17 | M A P | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 75 |
| 18 | M R A | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 75 |
| 19 | N I Y | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 70 |
| 20 | P B | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 70 |
| 21 | R R A | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 75 |
| 22 | S A | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 80 |
| 23 | S I P | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 75 |
| 24 | S S | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 70 |
| 25 | Y W P K | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 70 |
| 26 | Y S R | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 75 |
| 27 | Z R | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 70 |

Based on the table above, there 9 students got score 70,13 students got score 75 and 5 students got score 80 . Based on the result of post-test score, the researcher concluded the students post-test score to the table based on the criteria below.

Tabel 4.8
The Score's Criteria of Student's Speaking ability Post-test

| No. | Criteria of <br> Score | Frequency <br> $(\mathrm{f})$ | Percentages (p) <br> $\%$ | Categories |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $90-100$ | 0 | 0 | Excellent |
| 2 | $80-89$ | 5 | 18.50 | Very good |
| 3 | $70-79$ | 22 | 81.50 | Good |
| 4 | $60-69$ | 0 | 0 | Sufficient |
| 5 | $50-59$ | 0 | 0 | Average |
| 6 | $40-49$ | 0 | 0 | Poor |
| 7 | $30-39$ | 0 | 0 | Very Poor |
|  |  | $\sum \mathrm{f}=27$ | $\sum \mathrm{p}=100 \%$ |  |

Based on the table above $18.50 \%$ of students' speaking ability categories as very good score and $81.50 \%$ of students was categories as good score. The next phase, researcher presented pre-test score in chart below:


The researcher presented the whole students' score got from research in experimental group and control group as follows:

Table 4.9
Research Score

| X-B |  |  |  | X-A |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No | Name | Pre- <br> test <br> score | Post- <br> tes <br> score | No | Name | Pre- <br> test <br> score | Post- <br> test <br> score |
| 1 | A B M P | 60 | 80 | 1 | A M S | 80 | 80 |
| 2 | A D | 70 | 70 | 2 | A R | 80 | 80 |
| 3 | B F K | 70 | 70 | 3 | A A T | 75 | 75 |
| 4 | D N N H | 70 | 70 | 4 | A M P | 70 | 70 |
| 5 | F N | 60 | 80 | 5 | B F K | 70 | 70 |
| 6 | F Z | 60 | 80 | 6 | D N Y | 70 | 70 |
| 7 | G S | 80 | 80 | 7 | D F | 75 | 75 |
| 8 | I F N | 60 | 80 | 8 | E C | 70 | 70 |
| 9 | J A F F | 60 | 80 | 9 | F D N | 75 | 75 |
| 10 | K R | 50 | 70 | 10 | F F | 75 | 75 |
| 11 | L A P S | 50 | 70 | 11 | I FM | 70 | 75 |


| 12 | M A T | 50 | 70 | 12 | J R F | 70 | 80 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13 | M B Z | 60 | 80 | 13 | K S | 75 | 75 |
| 14 | M D E | 70 | 70 | 14 | L F D | 75 | 75 |
| 15 | M M | 50 | 80 | 15 | M AA | 70 | 80 |
| 16 | M R | 60 | 70 | 16 | M A H | 75 | 75 |
| 17 | N E | 80 | 80 | 17 | M A P | 70 | 75 |
| 18 | N E P | 70 | 80 | 18 | M R A | 75 | 75 |
| 19 | P S | 50 | 70 | 19 | N I Y | 70 | 70 |
| 20 | R A S | 60 | 80 | 20 | P B | 70 | 80 |
| 21 | R F | 50 | 80 | 21 | R R A | 75 | 75 |
| 22 | S W | 60 | 80 | 22 | S A | 70 | 80 |
| 23 | W P S | 70 | 70 | 23 | S I P | 70 | 75 |
| 24 | Y L S | 60 | 80 | 24 | S S | 75 | 70 |
| 25 | Z S N | 70 | 80 | 25 | Y W P K | 70 | 70 |
|  |  |  |  | 26 | Y S R | 70 | 75 |
|  |  |  |  | 27 | Y R | 75 | 70 |

The table showed the comparison frequency data distribution of research sample after treatment used to show that the experiment to finding out treatment speaking ability based on strip-story technique in teaching speaking ability.

## B. Description of test result

This phase consists of student test result both classes. Describing frequencies students' score got from X-B as experiment class and also taken from X-A as control class. The results of test are described as follow:

Table 4.10
Data Statistics of Test

|  |  | X.B | X.A |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| N | Valid | 25 | 27 |
|  | Missing | 2 | 0 |
| Mean |  | 76.0000 | 74.2593 |
| Sum |  | 1900.00 | 2005.00 |

Based on table 4.9, there were 25 students as sample for control class or X-B and there were 27 students as sample for experimental class or X-A. Sum of score for XB were 1900.00 and Sum of score for X-A were 2005.00 where mean score of X-B were 76 and 74.25 for X-A.

Table 4.11 Test Result of X.B

|  |  |  |  | Frequency | Percent |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | Valid Percent | Cumulative |
| :---: |
| Percent |$|$| 10 | 37.0 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 40.0 | 40.0 |
| Valid | 70.00 |
|  | 80.00 |
|  | 15 |
| Total | 25 |
|  | 92.6 |
| 60.0 | 100.0 |
| Missing | System |

Based on table 4.11 presented students score test of X-B where students in this class total is 25 . There were any missing frequency because difference total with X-A and students who pass the test were got score 80 , there were $55.6 \%$ or 15 students, while 10 students or $37 \%$ got score 70 . Missing system involved 7.4\%.

Table 4.12 Test Result of X-A

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | 70.00 | 9 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 |
|  | 75.00 | 13 | 48.1 | 48.1 | 81.5 |
|  | 80.00 | 5 | 18.5 | 18.5 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 27 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Based on table 4.12 presented students score test of X -A where students in this class total is 27 . There were 9 students got score 70 or $33.3 \%$, students got 75 were 13 students or $48.1 \%$ and 5 students got 80 or $18.5 \%$.

## C. Research Analysis

This phase, researcher presented the calculation data taken from research. This phase started with validity of research, reliability also normality and homogeneity. Then finding the result using T-test formula. In this research used software SPSS to account the research data.

## a. Validity of the Test

To find out the validity for each question of correlation between vocabulary, the researcher used Pearson Product Moment Correlation Formula to compute the data. Validation in this research as the result was taken from SPSS 23.00 as follow:

Table 4.13 Correlations

|  |  | X.B | X.A |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| X.B | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .638 |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .001 |
|  | N | 25 | 25 |
| X.A | Pearson Correlation | .638 | 1 |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | .001 |  |
|  | N | 27 | 27 |

The result of validity instrument was 0,638 it found out from manual $\mathrm{r}_{\text {value }}$ meanwhile $\mathrm{r}_{\text {table }}$ is 0.3365 . Based on the result $\mathrm{r}_{\text {value }}>$ $\mathrm{r}_{\text {table. }} 0,638>0,3365$ its mean the test is valid.

## b. Reliability of the Test

Reliability refered to consistency of score obtained by the same persons when they were re-examined with the same test on the different occasion or with different sets of equivalent items.

Validation in this research as the result taken from SPSS 230.0 as follows:

Table 4.14
Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's <br> Alpha | N of Items |
| ---: | ---: |
| .802 | 2 |

The results of calculations using SPSS 23.00 on the reliability test was 0.802. According to Triton (in Ningsih: 2015) the value of cronbach's alpha can be interpreted as follow:

| Cronbach's Alpha | Interpretation |
| :---: | :---: |
| $0,00-0,20$ | Less Reliable |
| $0,21-0,40$ | Rather Reliable |
| $0,41-0,60$ | Quite Reliable |
| $0,61-0,80$ | Reliable |
| $0,81-1.00$ | Very Reliable |

When the reliability score compared with the category of value, reliability calculation result is in the range of values from 0.61 to 0.80 in accordance with the categories of reliability of the results of those values are reliable.

## c. Homogeneity of Test

To compare with homogeneity score from SPSS 23.00 is presents:
Table 4.15
Test of Homogeneity of Variances
X.B

| Levene <br> Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2.044 |  | 2 | 22 |

The homogeneity from this research is 2.044 . Compare with significance 0.5 the homogeneity is $2.044>0,05$. Based on the score above. There are any significant in post-test.

## d. Normality of Test

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

|  |  | Unstandardize <br> d Predicted <br> Value |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| N |  | 27 |
| Normal Parameters ${ }^{\text {a,b }}$ | Mean | 76.0267229 |
| Most Extreme | Std. Deviation | .68174177 |
| Differences | Absolute | .248 |
|  | Positive | .248 |
| Test Statistic | Negative | -.233 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .248 |

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.

The value of the calculation results using SPSS 23.00 on normality test was 0.253 taken from value Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed), compare with significance 0.000 , the result $0.253>0.000$ this value is considered normal and the instrument can be used in research.

## D. Test Hypothesis

The hypothesis testing of this study as follows :

1. When the significant value is less than 0.05 , the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted and null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected. It means that there is significant effect of using strip-story technique toward students' speaking ability.
2. When the significant value is more than 0.05 , the null hypothesis $(\mathrm{Ho})$ is accepted and alternative hypothesis (Ha) is rejected. It means that there is no significant effect of using strip-story technique toward students' speaking ability.

Table 4.16
Paired Samples Test

|  | Paired Differences |  |  |  |  | t | df | $\begin{gathered} \text { Sig. } \\ \text { (2-tailed) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean | Std. Deviatio n | Std. <br> Error <br> Mean | 95\% Confidence Interval of the Difference |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Lower | Upper |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { X.A } \\ - \\ \text { X.B } \end{array}$ | 1.60000 | 6.57013 | 1.31403 | -1.11202 | 4.31202 | 7.218 | 24 | . 002 |

Based on the research analysis as explained, the researcher concludes that there is any significant difference in the students' speaking ability who taught by using strip-story and who taught without using strip-story technique of tenth grade student at SMAN 1 Rejotangan Tulungagung. Based on the result $\mathrm{t}_{\text {sig.value }} 0.002$, while the $\mathrm{t}_{\text {sig.level }}$ for $\alpha=5 \%$ with $\mathrm{N}=25$ obtained 0.05 . It means $\mathrm{t}_{\text {sig.value }}>\mathrm{t}_{\text {sig.level }}$ in other words $(\mathrm{Ha})$ is accepted and $(\mathrm{Ho})$ is rejected. The result of this study $0.002<0.05$. It means that there is different score to
the tenth grade students of SMAN 1 Rejotangan who taught by using stripstory and who taught without using strip-story. The difference is significant. The researcher presented the comparison value both class in the chart as follows:


## E. Discussion

This research is about the use of strip-story technique toward student's speaking ability of the tenth grade at SMAN 1 Rejotangan Tulungagung. This research used quasi experimental design. This section is intended to analyze the result of research finding based on the related theory. All data collected from the research instrument provides information of the research finding. The result of the students' score is calculated by using $t$-test.

The previous researchers also had proved that strip-story can be effective and improve the students' speaking ability. It is supported by some previous studies done related to the implementation of strip-story in teaching writing, a
study conducted by Fikri (2015) the result of the study shows that the students' group who use the strip-story (experimental group) better result than the students' group without strip-story. In other research conducted by Turohman (2012), the result of the study shows that the use of strip story in teaching reading comprehension at the second grade of MAN Cililin was effective. The next research conducted by Prawerti (2012) in this study the researcher applied strip-story in teaching speaking. The result of the study shows the real effectiveness, because it can help the students to improve their speaking ability also motivate the students to speak. The researcher concluded that is strip-story effective in teaching speaking.

Based on the result of pre test and post test that had been done for control group and experimental group, it shows that there was significant difference of the student's speaking ability who taught by using strip-story and who taught without using strip-story. It can be seen from the gained score of each group where the gained score of the students who taught using strip-story (experimental group) was higher than the gained score of the students who taught without using strip-story (control group). Based on the pre-test of experimental class, the table show there are still many students get score 6 students got 50 , there are 10 students get score 60 . Only 7 students' get 70 and 2 students get highest score 80 . The score presented in the tabel for makes the result easy to understand. The tabel devided by six categories from very poor until exellent. There are any significant progress students' post-test score, data presented is students' post-test score from speaking ability by using strip-story
technique. Based on the table above, there are many students get score 80 or 10 students, there are 15 students get score 70. Its means that strip-story technique become very effective to improve students speaking ability. The tabel devided by six categories from very poor until exellent.

There is different score to the tenth grade students of SMAN 1 Rejotangan who taught by using strip-story and who taught without using strip-story

