**CHAPTER IV**

**RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION**

As mentioned previously, this study was aimed at investigating the effect of buzz group toward the students’ speaking ability. The general objective was to find out the effect of buzz group toward the students’ speaking ability in terms of aspects of speaking (accuracy, fluency and comprehensibility). This chapter deals with the teaching and learning process, description of data, the result based on the hypothesis testing, and discussion. To investigate the effect of the teaching method introduced to the experimental and the control group, the comparison of the mean scores of each group was presented.

1. **Teaching and Learning Process**
2. Pre-Treatment

Before the treatment process was done, the researcher observed condition of the students’ speaking ability by using pretest. The result of the pretest showed that most of them were still confused about how to build the idea and speak English well. They also had low ability on the accuracy, fluency and comprehensibility in their speaking.

1. Treatment

After getting the result of pretest, the researcher only gave treatment to the experimental group. The treatment was speaking activity by using buzz group. It was a speaking activity to help the students to improve their speaking ability. Apparently, the students were enthusiastic to discuss the task in buzz group. When teaching and learning process was conducted by buzz group, the students looked to have a lot of ideas and got new spirit to speak in front of the teacher individually. Although, the activity was only simple and cheap, the students wanted to participate and work well to improve their speaking ability. Whereas in the control group, the researcher only gave clear instructions with same questions to the experimental group.
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The steps in giving treatment to the students were as follows:

* + - * 1. Pre-section

The researcher took a topic about how to describe something such as places, people, animals, and electronic media because the topic was the material which must be explained to the students in the second semester of class X. Hence, in this section, the researcher gave explanation to the students about how to describe something orally and what had to be considered when they wanted to describe something. The explanation was easily understood by the students because the researcher gave simple examples for describing places or animals surrounding them like the school’s library or the clever dog. The researcher only needed 10 minutes to explain them. Then the researcher gave a piece of paper which was consisted of instructions, guiding questions, and pictures which related to the questions. In addition, the researcher divided the students into 6 groups to conduct the buzz group activity to gather ideas before they described a certain topic orally. Before the students worked in groups, the researcher explained clearly what had to be done in buzz group activity about 5 minutes. Meanwhile in the control students, the researcher only explained the material with the same topic, the same pictures and guiding questions but without conducting buzz group activity. Then the researcher asked them to find out ideas individually before they described something orally based on the topic given by the researcher.

* + - * 1. Main section

In the main section, the students had to find out the name of person’s occupation, person’s appearance, and characteristics of the occupation because in the first treatment, the researcher asked the students to describe people based on a picture which they were choosen in groups (experimental class) or individually (control groups). For experimental class, the students were able to discuss the characteristics of a certain person in buzz group activity, but they had to create their own description of the person individually. Meanwhile, the control students had done all the task individually. Therefore, for the next meeting, they also had to find out the characteristics of something with different topics before they described a topic orally. Here, the researcher had to control and give guidances to both classes if they might have problems to find the precise word or about the instructions of the task. This section spent about 25 minutes.

* + - * 1. Post-section

After the students finished doing the assignment, the researcher asked every student to describe orally in front of the researcher. This was done to know how the ability of students to describe a certain topic after they worked in groups or without that.

After all was done, the researcher would gave correctness and feed back to all students so that their speaking ability could be better.

1. Post Treatment

After doing the treatment, the researcher gave posttest to all both classes which were experimental and control class. Posttest was used to know the students’ speaking ability by using buzz group and without using it.

The researcher wanted to know how far the students understood the way to describe something orally when the process of treatment was done. Apparently, the result of the test showed that the students’ speaking ability improved significantly.

1. **Description of Data**

As explained to the previous chapter that the general research problem of the present study is “Do the students who are taught by using buzz group get better speaking ability rather than those who are not taught using buzz group?. The tentative answers of the problems are formulated in the forms of hypotheses. Therefore, this part is devoted to discuss about the students’ scores between those who are taught by using and without using buzz group; and the tendency of the research.

1. The students' scores between those who are taught by using and without using buzz group.

In this part, the researcher presented the result of the test both the experimental class and the control class. The researcher was calculating the overall scores of the students before and after conducting the treatment and calculating the mean scores to check whether there was a significant different scores in the students’ speaking ability between those who were taught by using buzz group and those who were taught without using buzz group.

As mentioned previously, the researcher wanted to know whether there were different results between the students who are taught by using buzz group and without using it. The results of test would be presented as follows:

Pretest

Pre – test was done by the researcher in order to know whether there was different result between the both groups before conducting the treatment. The result of test would be presented as follows:

1) Experimental Class (X A)

The total score of pretest in experimental class was 1813, and the mean of the students’ score was 56.6563 (See Appendix 1).

2) Control Class (X B)

The total score of pretest in control class was 1977. Then the result of calculating of the students’ mean score was 54.9167 (See Appendix 2).

In the pretest, the researcher gave a piece of paper which consisted of instructions and pictures related to the topic which must be described orally by the students of both classess. Then the researcher let the students to prepare themselves before describing a certain topic one by one. This oral test was given to know the students’ basic competence and to know their earlier speaking ability before applying the treatment. The time allotment was 90 minutes.

Posttest

Posttest was conducted in order to know whether there was different result for the students who were taught using buzz group and those who were taught without using it. The result of test would be presented as follows:

1) Experimental Class (X A)

The total score of the students’ posttest in experimental class was 2197, and the mean of the students’ score was 68.6562 (See Appendix 3).

2) Control Class (X B)

The total score of the students’ posttest in control class was 2256, and the mean of the students’ score was 62.6667 (See Appendix 4).

The posttest was done after the treatment process had finished. In this case, the researcher used buzz group activity to guide the experimental class in treatment process. Then in the control class, the researcher only gave a task with same topic to experimental class and without giving buzz group activity. It was done to know the final score and to know the students’ difference competence between the students who were taught using and without using buzz group. The time allotment in posttest was 90 minutes.

1. The Tendency of the Research

The tendency of the research in this case is an illustration of the degree of the students’ speaking ability between the students who are taught using and without using buzz group. The procedures used in analyzing the tendency were computing the mean scores and standard deviations of overall scores of speaking which were obtained from each group in the pretest and posttest, and then consulting the value to the classification (category) of speaking ability.

The data in Table 4.1 showed the conclusion of the students’ speaking scores of pretest and posttest, both the experimental and control group, in the overall scores of their speaking ability.

**Table 4.1. The Overall Scores of the Pretest and Posttest of the Experimental and Control Group**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Experimental Group** | **Control Group** |
| Mean | SD | Mean | SD |
| Pretest | 56.6563 | 9.97 | 54.9167 | 8.51 |
| Posttest | 68.6562 | 10.38 | 62.6667 | 9.75 |
| Difference | 11.9999 | 0.41 | 7.75 | 1.24 |

From the analysis above, it proved that the mean difference between the pretest and posttest of the experimental group was 11.9999 while in the control group the mean difference was 7.75. Thus, the mean scores in the experimental group was higher than control group. For the standard deviation point, it could be seen that standard deviation of the experimental group after the treatment (10.38) was higher than the control group (9.75). This result showed that the experimental group was more homogeneous than the control group after receiving the treatment. It means that the use of buzz group made the students’ speaking ability in the experimental group relatively similar level rather than who was in the control group.

To sum up the development of the students’ speaking performance based on the mean of analytically-rated scores presented previously in the Table 4.1, it could be illustrated in the following figure:

**Figure 4.1. Graphic Performance of the Students’ Overall Mean Scores**

 **control**

In terms of speaking aspects, table 4.2 showed the speaking ability statistics of the control groups’ scores. As stated previously, the range of score of each component of speaking based on analytical scoring rubric used in assessing students’ speaking is 1.00 to 6.00 (see table 3.2).

Table 4.2 reveals that the lowest score achieved by the students’ score of the control group in the pretest was 33 and the highest was 73. Meanwhile, in the posttest, the lowest score was 40 and the highest was 80. At the end of the study, the students seemed to perform better in the posttest which was indicated by the higher mean score in the posttest than in the pretest.

**Table 4.2. The Speaking Ability Statistics of the Control Group’s scores**

**Descriptive Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **N** | **Minimum** | **Maximum** | **Mean** | **Std. Deviation** |
| Pretest | 36 | 33 | 73 | 54.9167 | 8.51 |
| Posttest | 36 | 40 | 80 | 62.6667 | 9.75 |
| Valid N | 36 |  |  |  |  |

The calculation of means and standard deviations of the control group in pretest and posttest can be seen on appendix 8 and appendix 9.

In terms of speaking aspects (accuracy, fluency and comprehensibility), table 4.2 showed that the students’ mean score improved. The students’ mean score of the control group in the pretest was 54.91, while the student’s score in the post-test of the control group was 62.66.

Table 4.3 showed the result of the speaking ability statistic computation from the experimental group. The table reveals that the lowest score achieved by the students of the experimental group in the pretest was 37 and the highest was 73. Meanwhile, in the posttest, the lowest score was 47 and the highest was 87. At the end of the study, similar to the control group, the students performed better in speaking ability in the posttest which was pointed out by the higher mean score for each speaking aspects than in the pretest.

**Table 4.3. The Speaking Ability Statistics of the Experimental Group’s Scores**

**Descriptive Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **N** | **Minimum** | **Maximum** | **Mean** | **Std. Deviation** |
| Pretest | 32 | 37 | 73 | 56.6563 | 9.97 |
| Posttest | 32 | 47 | 87 | 68.6562 | 10.38 |
| Valid N | 32 |  |  |  |  |

The calculation of means and standard deviations of the experimental group in pretest and posttest can be seen on appendix 6 and appendix 7.

In terms of the speaking aspects (accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility), table 4.3 revealed that the students’ mean score of the experimental group improved (11.99 points of improvement after the treatment), higher than control group’s improvement (7.75 points of improvement). The students’ mean score in the pretest was 56.65, whereas in the posttest that was 68.65.

From the standard deviation point of view, in the pretest and the posttest, all components of speaking in the experimental were greater than the control group. Table 4.2 and table 4.3 showed the results of standard deviation for both the experimental and control group. This result showed that the experimental group was more homogeneous than the control group after the treatment.

Furthermore, after the treatment the gains of the mean score of the experimental group were greater than those of the control group. The standard deviations of the experimental group were higher than those of the control group. Those mean that the results of the experimental group were more satisfactory than those of the control group. Those implied that the use of buzz group activity in teaching speaking had better quality to improve the students’ speaking ability.

Despite the mean scores of the experimental group were higher than those of the control group, and the standard deviations of the experimental group were greater than those of the control group, it was necessary to find out whether the scores differences were significant or not.

1. **Hypothesis Testing**

As cited before, in chapter I, the research hypothesis was as follows:

* 1. The Null Hypothesis (Ho)

The students of the class X at MAN Kunir Blitar who are taught using buzz group do not get better speaking ability than who are taught without using buzz group.

* 1. The Alternative Hypothesis (Ha)

The students of the class X at MAN Kunir Blitar who are taught using buzz group get better speaking ability than who are taught without using buzz group.

The alternative hypothesis was formulated in the present study was as tentative answer of the research problem. The hypothesis was tested using statistical procedures to verify the tentative answer of the problem. The statistical procedures which were used by the researcher as mentioned previously were t-test.

Table 4.4 revealed about the calculation result of t-test. In this case, this table would show the effect of buzz group in teaching speaking and answer which one the hypothesis was accepted whether the null hypothesis or the alternative hypothesis.

**Table 4.4. The Calculation Result of t-test**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **THE CONTROL GROUP** | **THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP** |
| **Subject** | **Pretest** | **Posttest** | **X1** | **X12** | **Subject** | **Pretest** | **Posttest** | **X2** | **X22** |
| 1 | 53 | 67 | 14 | 196 | 1 | 50 | 60 | 10 | 100 |
| 2 | 67 | 77 | 10 | 100 | 2 | 57 | 67 | 10 | 100 |
| 3 | 73 | 87 | 14 | 196 | 3 | 73 | 80 | 7 | 49 |
| 4 | 70 | 83 | 13 | 169 | 4 | 57 | 60 | 3 | 9 |
| 5 | 50 | 63 | 13 | 169 | 5 | 60 | 60 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 60 | 73 | 13 | 169 | 6 | 57 | 70 | 13 | 169 |
| 7 | 70 | 80 | 10 | 100 | 7 | 73 | 67 | -6 | 36 |
| 8 | 57 | 67 | 10 | 100 | 8 | 60 | 70 | 10 | 100 |
| 9 | 53 | 67 | 14 | 196 | 9 | 57 | 67 | 10 | 100 |
| 10 | 57 | 67 | 10 | 100 | 10 | 43 | 53 | 10 | 100 |
| 11 | 53 | 63 | 10 | 100 | 11 | 60 | 73 | 13 | 169 |
| 12 | 60 | 73 | 13 | 169 | 12 | 53 | 63 | 10 | 100 |
| 13 | 73 | 87 | 14 | 196 | 13 | 60 | 70 | 10 | 100 |
| 14 | 50 | 60 | 10 | 100 | 14 | 33 | 43 | 10 | 100 |
| 15 | 53 | 67 | 14 | 196 | 15 | 60 | 63 | 3 | 9 |
| 16 | 57 | 67 | 10 | 100 | 16 | 50 | 60 | 10 | 100 |
| 17 | 70 | 83 | 13 | 169 | 17 | 57 | 57 | 0 | 0 |
| 18 | 57 | 67 | 10 | 100 | 18 | 50 | 60 | 10 | 100 |
| 19 | 40 | 53 | 13 | 169 | 19 | 70 | 70 | 0 | 0 |
| 20 | 70 | 83 | 13 | 169 | 20 | 57 | 67 | 10 | 100 |
| 21 | 50 | 63 | 13 | 169 | 21 | 47 | 57 | 10 | 100 |
| 22 | 47 | 57 | 10 | 100 | 22 | 50 | 60 | 10 | 100 |
| 23 | 50 | 63 | 13 | 169 | 23 | 33 | 40 | 7 | 49 |
| 24 | 37 | 47 | 10 | 100 | 24 | 70 | 70 | 0 | 0 |
| 25 | 70 | 80 | 10 | 100 | 25 | 53 | 63 | 10 | 100 |
| 26 | 53 | 63 | 10 | 100 | 26 | 40 | 53 | 13 | 169 |
| 27 | 40 | 53 | 13 | 169 | 27 | 50 | 63 | 13 | 169 |
| 28 | 63 | 77 | 14 | 196 | 28 | 40 | 50 | 10 | 100 |
| 29 | 40 | 50 | 10 | 100 | 29 | 50 | 53 | 3 | 9 |
| 30 | 57 | 70 | 13 | 169 | 30 | 60 | 70 | 10 | 100 |
| 31 | 60 | 67 | 7 | 49 | 31 | 53 | 63 | 10 | 100 |
| 32 | 53 | 73 | 20 | 400 | 32 | 50 | 60 | 10 | 100 |
| 33 | - | - | - | - | 33 | 73 | 80 | 7 | 49 |
| 34 | - | - | - | - | 34 | 57 | 67 | 10 | 100 |
| 35 | - | - | - | - | 35 | 57 | 60 | 3 | 9 |
| 36 | - | - | - | - | 36 | 57 | 67 | 10 | 100 |
| **TOTAL** | **1813** | **2197** | **384** | **4784** | **TOTAL** | **1977** | **2256** | **279** | **2895** |
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The degrees of freedom for an independent t-test are the number of cases in the first group plus the number of cases in the second group minus 2.

*df = n1 +n2 –2*

Therefore, degree of freedom in the research can be calculated as follows:

df = 32+36 –2

 = 66

Then from degree of freedom, the researcher uses table of t-values to determine the significance of the research result.

The result of the statistical computation using t-test revealed that the obtained t0 was 4.72. Then the t-values of t0.05 were about 1.67, and the t- values of t0.01 was about 2.39. Therefore, the calculated value (4.72) was much larger than the t-values (t0.05 = 1.67 and t0.01 = 2.39). It means that there was enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis. Then, the alternative hypothesis was accepted. It can be inferred that the students who were taught using buzz group get better speaking ability than those who were taught without using buzz group. In short, buzz group is effective to improve the students’ speaking ability.

1. **Discussion**

This research started from the hypothesis which stated that there is significant difference in terms of speaking ability between the students who are taught using buzz group and students who are taught without using buzz group. The findings showed that the different treatment used for the experimental group and the control group had given significant different result in the students’ speaking ability. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis was accepted.

The analysis pointed out that the students who were taught using buzz group get better score than those who were not taught using it. It can be seen from the mean differences of both groups. It means that the use of buzz group can improve the students’ speaking ability.

In pre-test the mean score of experimental group was 56.656 and the mean score of control group was 54.9167. The mean score of experimental group was similar in pre-test. Then, in the post-test, the mean score of experimental group was higher than the control group. The experimental got 68.6562 and the control group got 62.6667. It can be concluded that buzz group can improve the students’ speaking ability which can be seen in the data proven. Furthermore, those indicated that the both groups had the same average in speaking ability before the experimental group obtained the buzz group as the treatment. However, after buzz group was conducting, the experimental group was able to improve their speaking ability significantly and got the greater score than the control group.

The result of the statistical computation using t-test showed that the obtained t0 was 4.72. Then the t-values of t0.05 were about 1.67, and the t- values of t0.01 was about 2.39. Therefore, the calculated value (4.72) was much larger than the t-values (t0.05 = 1.67 and t0.01 = 2.39), so there was significant difference in the scores between those two groups. This finding implied that there was enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis, and the alternative hypothesis was accepted. It means that the students who were taught using buzz group get better speaking ability than those who were not taught using buzz group.

The goals of buzz group are to improve speaking ability and increase conceptual learning in ways that maximize students’ involvement. It is developed to enhance speaking ability for the students with learning disabilities and students at risk for speaking difficulties. It has also yielded positive outcomes for students’ speaking ability.

As cited in the previous chapter that Slattery and Willis (2009:62) declare that there are four advantages of using buzz group as an activity to teach speaking. Those are as follows :

1. The learners get more opportunities to speak.
2. The learners ask and answer questions actively.
3. The learners learn a lot from each other.
4. The learners gain confidence because they are speaking in private rather than to the whole class.

When the researcher applied the buzz group as the treatment to the experimental group. The reasercher proved that the buzz group had those strengths as Slattery and Willis said. The students were very enthusiastic during teaching and learning process using buzz group because it made them to get easy and had more chances to speak in the class. It also could be seen from their attitude during buzz group being applied which they tried to express their ideas in English without having anxiety. In addition, in the prosess of assessment which the students had to convey their thought orally related to the topic, they seemed to have enough information, and they were confident.

 In addition, effective learning was provided by the facts that buzz group could make the students understood the lesson quite easily since they did not only listen to what their teacher said, but they had chances to discuss and practice speaking in discussion group.

From the discussion above, it could be concluded that the speaking ability of the experimental group was better than that of the control group. This was due to the fact that the experimental group was taught using buzz group and the control group was taught without using buzz group. Thus, the null hypothesis stated that the students who were taught using buzz group did not get better speaking ability than who were not taught using buzz group was rejected. In addition, the students who were taught using buzz group got a significant improvement in their speaking ability.

The result of this research is able to give contribution particularly to the writer, the English teachers, and the students. First, the writer can investigate the effectiveness of buzz group especially in teaching speaking and get the scientific data about it. Then the writer can verify that buzz group is effective and good to teach speaking. Second, the teachers know that buzz group can be an alternative to teach speaking, and teaching using buzz group is simple and not expensive. In addition, it can invite the students to speak confidently so that the teachers will not frustrate when they ask the students to speak in the class. Last, the students can learn English enjoyably because they have opportunities to share their ideas with their friends in buzz group activity. Then, they have a lot of opportunities to practice speaking.

