

## CHAPTER IV

### RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

In a research, this chapter focus on presenting of finding and the result of data analyze.

#### **A. Finding of Data**

In this research, the researcher got students' score from pretest and posttest of student taught by using Inside Outside Circle Technique and students taught by using Conventional Technique. The students who were taught by using Inside Outside Circle Technique as exsperiment class and the students who were taught by using Conventional Technique as control class. The purpose of this research to know the significance difference of students' speaking ability score of both of class and to know the effectiveness of Inside Outside Circle Technique on students' narrative speaking ability. To clasified the result of students score, the researcher made table creterion to know the students score are good or not. As it is presented in Table 4.1 below :

**Table 4.1 The Score's Criteria**

<b>No</b>	<b>Interval Class</b>	<b>Criteria</b>
1.	86-100	Excellent
2.	76-85	Good
3.	56-75	Average
4.	46-55	Poor
5.	0-45	Very Poor

1. The data of students' narrative speaking ability in experimental class

After conducting pre-test and post-test for experimental class, the researcher obtained the data. The data are as follows:

**Table 4.2 Students' Speaking Ability Score Before and After Being Taught by using Inside Outside Circle Technique**

No.	Name	Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score
1.	APWN	46	59
2.	ASA	52	68
3.	AWR	53	70
4.	DCM	47	55
5.	DRA	50	65
6.	DRP	40	53
7.	EJ	48	59
8.	FI	42	54
9.	GW	40	50
10.	HEF	63	77
11.	KAS	41	56
12.	KNP	61	76
13.	KFR	40	40
14.	LDP	56	71
15.	MKD	42	64
16.	MIM	46	54
17.	MIF	52	59
18.	NAZN	48	62
19.	SMYT	50	68
20.	SI	57	69
21.	VSW	38	44
22.	YAP	40	55
23.	YA	39	50
24.	JMH	49	64
		$\Sigma X=1140$	$\Sigma Y=1442$

Based on the Table 4.2, In treatment class consisted of 24 students as sample of this research. The descriptive statistic and frequency distribution of pre-test and post-test in experimental class is as follows:

a. Pre-test of Experiment Class

To know the descriptive statistic and distribution of frequency pre-test data in experimental class the researcher used SPSS version 16.0 version. And the students' score clasified into five criterions: excellent, good, average, poor, and very poor. The result of the calculation as follows:

**Table 4.3 Descriptive Statistic of Pre-test in Experiment Class**

Statistics		
PRETEST_EXSPERIMENT		
N	Valid	24
	Missing	0
Mean		47.50
Median		47.50
Mode		40
Std. Deviation		7.120
Minimum		38
Maximum		63
Sum		1140

Based on Table 4.3, it showed that the mean students score of pretest was 47.50; the median was 47.50; and the mode was 40. The standart deviation was 7.120; the minimum students score was 38; the maximum students score was 63 and the sum was 1140. After getting the statistical data, the researcher constructed

a group frequency distribution by using SPSS program 16.0 version. The frequency distribution of experimental class students' score in pretest can be seen in the (Table 4.4) as below:

**Table 4.4**Frequency of PretestScore in ExsperimentClass

PRETEST_EXSPERIMENT					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	38	1	4.2	4.2	4.2
	39	1	4.2	4.2	8.3
	40	4	16.7	16.7	25.0
	41	1	4.2	4.2	29.2
	42	2	8.3	8.3	37.5
	46	2	8.3	8.3	45.8
	47	1	4.2	4.2	50.0
	48	2	8.3	8.3	58.3
	49	1	4.2	4.2	62.5
	50	2	8.3	8.3	70.8
	52	2	8.3	8.3	79.2
	53	1	4.2	4.2	83.3
	56	1	4.2	4.2	87.5
	57	1	4.2	4.2	91.7
	61	1	4.2	4.2	95.8
	63	1	4.2	4.2	100.0
	Total	24	100.0	100.0	

Based on Table 4.4 the frequency of pretest in exsperiment class, it showed that 1 student got score 38, 1 students got score 39, 4 students got score 40, 1 student got score 41, 2 students got score 42, 2 students got score 46, 1

students got score 47, 2 students got score 48, 1 students got score 49, 2 students got score 50, 2 students got score 52, 1 student got score 53, 1 students got score 56, 1 students got score 57, 1 students got score 61 and 1 students got score 63.

After know the frequency inTable 4.4 above , the researcher clasified the stduents score based on the standard of students score criteria (see Table 4.1). There was 9 students getting score between 0-45 it means that students' speaking ability was very poor, 11 students getting score between 45-55 it means that speaking ability was poor, 4 students getting score between 56-75 it means the students' speaking ability was average.

#### b. Post-test of Experiment Class

To know the descriptive statistic and distribution of frequency students' post-test data in experiment class the researcher used SPSS 16.0 version. The students' score clasified into five criterions: excellent, good, average, poor, and very poor. The result of the calculation is as follows :

**Table 4.5 Descriptive Statistic of Post-test in ExperimentClass**

**Statistics**

POSTTEST\_EXSPERIMENT

N	Valid	24
	Missing	0
Mean		60.08
Median		59.00
Mode		59
Std. Deviation		9.514
Minimum		40
Maximum		77
Sum		1442

Based on Table 4.5, it showed that the mean students score of post-test was 60,08 ; the median was 59.00; and the mode was 59. The standart devitiation was 9.514; the minimum students score was 40; the maximum students score was 77 and the sum was 1442. After getting the statistical data, the researcher analyzed a group frequency distribution by using 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 Post Test Score in Experiment Class

Posttest					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	40	1	4.2	4.2	4.2
	44	1	4.2	4.2	8.3
	50	2	8.3	8.3	16.7
	53	1	4.2	4.2	20.8
	54	2	8.3	8.3	29.2
	55	2	8.3	8.3	37.5
	56	1	4.2	4.2	41.7
	59	3	12.5	12.5	54.2
	62	1	4.2	4.2	58.3
	64	2	8.3	8.3	66.7
	65	1	4.2	4.2	70.8
	68	2	8.3	8.3	79.2
	69	1	4.2	4.2	83.3
	70	1	4.2	4.2	87.5
	71	1	4.2	4.2	91.7
	76	1	4.2	4.2	95.8
	77	1	4.2	4.2	100.0
	Total	24	100.0	100.0	

Based on Table 4.6 frequency of posttest in treatment class above, it showed that 1 student got score 40. 1 student got score 44, 2 students got score 50, 1 student got score 53, 2 students got score 54, 2 students go score 55, 1 student got score 56, 3 student got score 59, 1 students got score 62, 2 students got score

64, 1 student got score 65, 2 students got score 68, 1 student got score 69, 1 students got score 70, 1 students got score 71, 1 student sgot score 76, and 1 students got score 77.

After know the frequency of pretest scorein Table 4.6 above , the researcher clasified the students' scorebased on that the standard of students score criteria(see Table 4.1). There was2 students getting score between 0-42, it means the students' speaking ability was very poor, 7 students getting score between 46-55, it means the students speaking ability was poor, 13 students getting score between 56-75, it means the student' speaking ability was average. While, 2 students getting score between 76-80, it means the students' speaking ability was good.

## 2.The data of students' narrative speaking ability incontrol class

After conducting pre-test and post-test for control class, the researcher obtained the data. The data are as follows:

**Table 4.7 Students' Speaking Ability Score Before and After Without Taught by using Conventional Technique**

No.	Name	Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score
1.	ADI	47	45
2.	ANM	49	59
3.	ASPN	49	47
4.	AR	42	42
5.	BAS	58	65
6.	DDG	38	42
7.	DCF	49	47
8.	DYS	48	50
9.	DAHI	44	43
10.	ES	43	42



11.	FD	47	47
12.	GSAP	44	50
13.	IZ	47	46
14.	IAP	44	45
15.	LN	46	47
16.	MPSW	42	44
17.	MRHK	64	62
18.	MFR	42	49
19.	MZN	42	46
20.	NLNF	39	42
21.	NIP	44	47
22.	NA	60	53
23.	RSW	52	59
24.	SAP	59	59
25.	SH	44	50
		$\Sigma X=$ 1183	$\Sigma X=$ 1228

Based on the Table 4.2, in control class consist of 25 students as sample of this research. The descriptive statistic and frequency distribution of pre-test and post-test in controlclass as follows:

a. Pre-test of control Class

To know the descriptive statistic and frequency distribution of students' pre-test data in control class the researcher used SPSS 16.0 version. The pre-test score of students' speaking ability divided into five criterions: excellent, good, average, poor, and very poor. The result of the calculation is as follows:

**Table 4.8 Descriptive Statistic of Pre-test in Control Class**

**Statistics**

PRETEST\_CONTROL

N	Valid	25
	Missing	0
Mean		47.32
Median		46.00
Mode		44
Std. Deviation		6.663
Minimum		38
Maximum		64
Sum		1183

Based on the Table 4.8 above, the output descriptive statistic pre-test in control class showed the mean score in pretest was 47,32, the median was 46.00, the mode was 44. Then the standard deviation was 6.663, the minimum score was 38, the maximum score was 6. Meanwhile, the sum was 1183. After knowing about the descriptive data of pre-test, the researcher continued with frequency of pretest score. It can be shown in Table 4.9 below:

**Table 4.9 Frequency of Pretest Score in Control Class**

PRETEST_CONTROL					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	38	1	4.0	4.0	4.0
	39	1	4.0	4.0	8.0
	42	4	16.0	16.0	24.0
	43	1	4.0	4.0	28.0
	44	5	20.0	20.0	48.0
	46	1	4.0	4.0	52.0
	47	3	12.0	12.0	64.0
	48	1	4.0	4.0	68.0
	49	3	12.0	12.0	80.0
	52	1	4.0	4.0	84.0
	58	1	4.0	4.0	88.0
	59	1	4.0	4.0	92.0
	60	1	4.0	4.0	96.0
	64	1	4.0	4.0	100.0
	Total	25	100.0	100.0	

Frequency of pre-test score in Table 4.8 showed that 1 student got score 38, 1 student got score 39, 4 students got score 42, 1 students got score 43, 5 students got score 44, 1 student got score 46, 3 students got score 47, 1 student got score 48, 3 students got score 49, 1 student got score 52, 1 student got score 58, 1 student got score 59, 1 student got score 60 and 1 student got score 64.

After know the frequency of pretest score, the researcher classified of students' score based on the standard of students score criteria (see Table 4.1).

There was 12 students getting score between 0-45, it means the student's speaking ability was very poor, 9 students getting score between 46-55, it means that students' speaking ability was poor. Meanwhile, 4 students getting score between 55-75, it means the students' speaking ability was average.

From the Table 4.9 above, the researcher continued the data presentation of post-test score with descriptive statistics and frequency of post-test score.

#### b. Post-test of Control Class

To know the descriptive statistic and the frequency distribution of students' post test score in control class the researcher used SPSS 16.0 version. The post-test score of students' speaking ability divided into five criterions: excellent, good, average, poor, and very poor. The result of the calculation is as follows :

**Table 4.10 Descriptive Statistic of Post-test in Control Class**

<b>Statistics</b>		
POSTTEST_CONTROL		
N	Valid	25
	Missing	0
Mean		49.12
Median		47.00
Mode		47
Std. Deviation		6.679
Minimum		42
Maximum		65
Sum		1228

Based on Table 4.10 above, it showed that the mean score of students' speaking ability was 49,12, the median was 47.00, the mode was 47. The standart deviation was 6.679, the minumum score was 42, the maximum score was 65. Meanwhile, the sum was 1228. After know the descriptive statistic of post-test, the researchercontinued with frequency of post-test score. It can be showed in Table 4.11 below:

**Table 4.11 Frequency of Post-Test Score in Control Class**

POSTTEST_CONTROL					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	42	4	16.0	16.0	16.0
	43	1	4.0	4.0	20.0
	44	1	4.0	4.0	24.0
	45	2	8.0	8.0	32.0
	46	2	8.0	8.0	40.0
	47	5	20.0	20.0	60.0
	49	1	4.0	4.0	64.0
	50	3	12.0	12.0	76.0
	53	1	4.0	4.0	80.0
	59	3	12.0	12.0	92.0
	62	1	4.0	4.0	96.0
	65	1	4.0	4.0	100.0
	Total	25	100.0	100.0	

Based on Table 4.11 frequency of posttest, it showed that 4 students got score 42, 1 student got score 43, 1 student got score 44, 2 students got score 45, 2

students got score 46. 5 students got score 47, 1 student got score 49, 3 students got score 50, 1 student got score 53, 3 students got score 59, 1 student got score 62 and 1 student got score 65.

After know the frequency in Table 4.11 above , the researcher clasified the students' post-test score based on the standard of students score criteria (see Table 4.1) . There was 8 students getting score between 0-45, it means the students' speaking ability was very poor, 12 students getting score between 46-55, it means that the students' speaking ability was poor. Meanwhile, 5 students getting score between 56-75, it means that the students' speaking ability was average.

## **B. Hypothesis Testing**

The hypothesis testing of this study as follows:

### 1. Null hypothesis (Ho)

“ There was no significant difference score on the students' narrative speaking ability between students' taught by using Inside Outside Circle Technique and those taught by using Conventional Technique”.

### 2. Alternative hypothesis (Ha)

“ There was significant difference score on the students' narrative speaking ability between students' taught by using Inside Outside Circle Technique and those taught by using Conventional Technique”.

To know the significance different score on students' narrativespeaking ability who were taught by using Inside Outside Circle Technique and taught by using Conventional Technique and to know the effectiveness of Inside Outside Circle Technique on students' speaking ability in narrative of tenth grade at state Senior High School, the researcher analyzed the data by using Independent Sample Test in SPSS statistics 16.0 version. The result of Independent sample T-test as follow:

**Table 4.12 The Output of Group Statistic**

Group Statistics					
	GROUP	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
STUDENTS SCORE	EXSPERIMENT	24	60.08	9.514	1.942
	CONTROL	25	49.12	6.679	1.336

From the Table 4.12 above, the *output independent sample statistic* describe about the mean of post-test score in experiment class was 60.08 and mean of post-test in control class was 49.12. Next, the sample sizes or N used for test was 24 (experiment group) and 25 (control group). Meanwhile, standard deviation post-test in experiment class was 9.514 and standard deviation post-test on control class was 6.679. And in this research, the standard error mean of post-test in experiment class was 1.942 and standard error mean post-test in control class was 1.336. For details of the result of Independent sample T-test can be seen in Table 4.13 below :

**Table 4.13 The Output of Independent Sample Test**

Independent Samples 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
STUDENTS SCORE	3.657	.062	4.684	47	.000	10.963	2.340	6.255	15.672
Equal variances assumed									
Equal variances not assumed			4.651	41.097	.000	10.963	2.357	6.203	15.723

Based on Table 4.13, it showed that sig. (2-tailed) was .000 smaller than sig level 0.050 ( $0.000 < 0.050$ ). Therefore, the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) saying that there was no significant difference score on the students' narrative speaking ability between students' taught by using Inside Outside Circle Technique and those taught by using Conventional Technique was rejected and alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) saying that there was significant difference score on the students' narrative speaking ability between students' taught by using Inside Outside Circle Technique and those taught by using Conventional Technique was accepted. It means that there was significant difference score on the students' narrative speaking ability between students' taught by using Inside Outside Circle Technique and those taught by using Conventional Technique.



### C. Discussion

The objectives of the study were to verify whether Inside Outside Circle Technique effective on students' narrative speaking ability of the tenth grade students at SMAN 1 Rejotangan Tulungagung in academic year 2017/2018. From the result of SPSS computation (Table 4.12) the mean of students' post-test score in experiment class was 60.08 and the mean of students' post-test score in control class was 49,12. It means the mean of post-test score in experiment class was better than posttest of control class. .

Besides, from the result of Table 4.13, the sig. (2 tailed) was .000 smaller than sig level 0.05 or  $0.000 < \text{sig level } 0.05$ . Therefore, the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) saying that there was no significant difference score on the students' narrative speaking ability between students' taught by using Inside Outside Circle Technique and those taught by using Conventional Technique was rejected and alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) saying that there was significant difference score on the students' narrative speaking ability between students' taught by using Inside Outside Circle Technique and those taught by using Conventional Technique was accepted. It means that there was significance different score on speaking between the students taught by using Inside Outside Circle Technique and those taught by using Conventional Technique. Thus, Inside Outside Circle Technique was effective on students' narrative speaking ability.

Meanwhile, Inside Outside Circle Technique can give significant effect to the students' narrative speaking ability. It can be shown from their speaking

development in both pre-test and post-test. In pre-test they still get difficulties in expressing their ideas when they was asked to retell their narrative story. In this case, the students only can retell short story which consisted of six up to nine utterances that use limited vocabulary and less appropriate of grammar and pronunciation. However, it was different when they was in the post-test, most of students shows some improvement. They can present more than nine utterances with various vocabulary, appropriate grammar and pronunciation in retelling their story.

Further, in Inside Outside Circle Technique, the students looks so enthusiastic and enjoy in this activity because the activity requires them to move and they can interact with different partner. This atmosphere make their motivation up in speaking and they feel enthusiastic to retell story with their partner, so in this activity they fell enjoy and they can retell their story without being shy and afraid of making mistake. It was also stated by Bennett, B and C. Rolheiser (2001) that many students find it safer or easier to enter into a discussion with another classmate rather than with a large group. Further, Alfiana (2014) in her study also proves that Inside Outside Circle (IOC) technique can improve the students motivation, interest and achievement in speaking at second grade of Senior High School.

From the result above, it can be concluded that Inside Outside Circle Technique effective on the students' narrative speaking ability of tenth grade at state Senior High School 1 Rejotangan Tulungagung. It was appropriate with the

findings in both studies conducted by Khoiriyah (2017) and Alfiana (2014) that the result both of study was Inside Outside Circle Technique can improve the students' achievement in speaking. Thus, Inside Outside Circle Technique can be chosen as one of alternative technique to enhance the students' achievement in speaking.