

## CHAPTER IV

### FINDING AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the researcher presents the finding which has been collected during research, and discussion about the data of the research.

#### A. Findings

In research finding were describing the table of students' score. The researcher wanted to know the effectiveness of short movie as media toward students' argumentative speaking skill by conducting research in MAN 1 Trenggalek. The researcher took two classes as sample, they are MIA 2 as experimental class and MIA 3 as control class.

The form of testing in pretest and post-test was a bit different term of topic. In pre-test, the topic was extracurricular and in post-test, the topic was social media. In pre-tes, the students started prepare and think first about how to speak fluently based on topic was given. Meanwhile in post-test, the students did same activities.

The students' score of pre-test and post-test were analyzed by using speaking scoring rubric. Table 4.1 shows the students' score before and after using short movie as media.

**Table 4.1 Students' Score of Control Class**

No	Name	Score	
		Before	After
1	ASK	37	36
2	AA	51	51
3	AN	40	42
4	ASH	40	40
5	AS	47	47
6	AF	41	41
7	AW	46	43
8	AR	44	40
9	ACK	43	42
10	CFA	40	41
11	DFR	43	43
12	DD	48	48
13	DKC	54	55
14	DEY	50	50
15	FH	58	56
16	FHT	43	43
17	HS	49	49
18	IS	48	48
19	IRA	43	43
20	IL	43	43
21	KSP	44	44
22	LH	46	46
23	LAF	46	46
24	MM	57	58
25	NDP	45	45
26	OLN	45	44
27	QAF	44	44
28	SA	40	41
29	SN	46	44
30	STS	42	42
31	YR	43	44
32	YC	41	38

**Table 4.2 Students' Score of Experimental Class**

No	Name	Score	
		Before	After
1	ABR	46	47
2	AF	45	47
3	ASA	45	46
4	AK	40	46
5	AE	40	48
6	BYA	49	52
7	DN	53	56
8	DYP	50	57
9	FR	42	42
10	FES	54	55
11	GM	48	48
12	HW	48	51
13	ISF	46	49
14	IR	39	50
15	KCA	52	49
16	KHA	53	48
17	LL	58	53
18	LHV	49	53
19	MIM	54	55
20	MAO	57	53
21	MAJ	56	53
22	MBB	59	53
23	NAN	56	60
24	PDR	49	56
25	RA	57	50
26	RDW	47	47
27	RWT	49	56
28	RNN	48	45
29	WAM	55	53
30	WAK	55	51
31	YWP	44	45

## 1. Result of Pre-test

In this research the researcher used two class to know the differences score between class control and class experimental after tough by short movie as media.

To make the data set meaningful, the researcher organized the frequency and percentage of score in pre-test by using SPSS statistic 16.0.

**Table 4.3 Frequency of score pre-test of control class**

		pretest_Con			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	37	1	3.1	3.1	3.1
	40	4	12.5	12.5	15.6
	41	2	6.2	6.2	21.9
	42	1	3.1	3.1	25.0
	43	6	18.8	18.8	43.8
	44	3	9.4	9.4	53.1
	45	2	6.2	6.2	59.4
	46	4	12.5	12.5	71.9
	47	1	3.1	3.1	75.0
	48	2	6.2	6.2	81.2
	49	1	3.1	3.1	84.4
	50	1	3.1	3.1	87.5
	51	1	3.1	3.1	90.6
	54	1	3.1	3.1	93.8
	57	1	3.1	3.1	96.9
	58	1	3.1	3.1	100.0
Total		32	100.0	100.0	

From the table above researcher analyzed that the 1 student (3.1%) got 37, 4 students (12.5%) got 40, 2 students (6.2%) got 41, 1 student (3.1%) got 42, 6 students (18.8%) got 43, 3 students (9.4%) got 44, 2 students (6.2%) got 45, 4 students (12.5%) got 46, 1 student (3.1%) got 47, 2 students (6.2%) got 48, 1 student (3.1%) got 49, 1 student (3.1%) got 50, 1 student (3.1%) got 51, 1 student (3.1%) got 54, 1 student (3.1%) got 57, 1 student (3.1%) got 58.

**Table 4.4 Frequency of Score Pre-test in Experimental class**

		pretest_Exp			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	39	1	3.2	3.2	3.2
	40	2	6.5	6.5	9.7
	42	1	3.2	3.2	12.9
	44	1	3.2	3.2	16.1
	45	2	6.5	6.5	22.6
	46	2	6.5	6.5	29.0
	47	1	3.2	3.2	32.3
	48	3	9.7	9.7	41.9
	49	4	12.9	12.9	54.8
	50	1	3.2	3.2	58.1
	52	1	3.2	3.2	61.3
	53	2	6.5	6.5	67.7
	54	2	6.5	6.5	74.2
	55	2	6.5	6.5	80.6
	56	2	6.5	6.5	87.1
	57	2	6.5	6.5	93.5

58	1	3.2	3.2	96.8
59	1	3.2	3.2	100.0
Total	31	100.0	100.0	

From the table above the researcher can analyze that the student who got score 39 (3.2%) is 1. The students who got score 40 (6.5%) is 2. The student who got 42 (3.2%) is 1 student. The students who got 44 (3.2%) is 1. The students who got 45 (6.5%) is 2. The student who got 46 (6.5%) is 2 students. The student who got 47 (3.2%) is 1 student. The student who got 48 (9.7%) is 3 student too. The students who got 49 (12.9%) is 4. Students who got 50 (3.2%) is 1. Student got 52 (3.2%) is 1. Student got 53 (6.5%) is 2. Student got 54 (6.5%) is 2. Student got 55 (6.5%) is 2. Student got 56 (6.5%) is 2. Student got 57 (6.5%) is 2. Students who got 58 (3.2%) is 1 and the students who got 59 (3.2%) is 1. In pre-test score there are differences of data presentation between control class and experimental class. The data present that he score of experimental class is higher than control class.

## 2. Result of Post-test

**Table 4.5 Frequency of Score in Post-test of control class**

posttest_control					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	36	1	3.1	3.1	3.1
	38	1	3.1	3.1	6.2
	40	2	6.2	6.2	12.5
	41	3	9.4	9.4	21.9
	42	3	9.4	9.4	31.2
	43	5	15.6	15.6	46.9
	44	5	15.6	15.6	62.5
	45	1	3.1	3.1	65.6
	46	2	6.2	6.2	71.9
	47	1	3.1	3.1	75.0
	48	2	6.2	6.2	81.2
	49	1	3.1	3.1	84.4
	50	1	3.1	3.1	87.5
	51	1	3.1	3.1	90.6
	55	1	3.1	3.1	93.8
	56	1	3.1	3.1	96.9
	58	1	3.1	3.1	100.0
Total		32	100.0	100.0	

From the table above researcher analyzed that the 1 student (3.1%) got 36, 1 student (3.1%) got 38, 2 students (6.2%) got 40, 3 student (9.4%) got 41, 6 students (9.4%) got 42, 5 students (15.6%) got 43, 5 students (15.6%) got 44, 1

students (3.1%) got 45, 2 student (6.2%) got 46, 1 students (3.1%) got 47, 2 student (6.2%) got 48, 1 student (3.1%) got 49, 1 student (3.1%) got 50, 1 student (3.1%) got 51, 1 student (3.1%) got 55, 1 student (3.1%) got 56. 1 student (3.1%) got 58.

**Table 4.6 Frequency of Score in Post-test of Experimental class**

VAR00001					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	42	1	3.2	3.2	3.2
	45	2	6.5	6.5	9.7
	46	2	6.5	6.5	16.1
	47	3	9.7	9.7	25.8
	48	3	9.7	9.7	35.5
	49	2	6.5	6.5	41.9
	50	2	6.5	6.5	48.4
	51	2	6.5	6.5	54.8
	52	1	3.2	3.2	58.1
	53	6	19.4	19.4	77.4
	55	2	6.5	6.5	83.9
	56	3	9.7	9.7	93.5
	57	1	3.2	3.2	96.8
	60	1	3.2	3.2	100.0
	Total	31	100.0	100.0	

From the table above researcher analyzed that 1 student (3.2%) got 42, 2 student (6.5%) got 45, 2 students (6.5%) got 46, 3 students (9.7%) got 47, students (9.7%) got 48, 2 students (6.5%) got 49, 2 student (6.2%) got 50, 2



students (6.5%) got 51, 1 student (3.2%) got 52, 6 student (19.4%) got 53, 2 student (6.5%) got 55, 3 student (9.7%) got 56, 1 student (3.2%) got 57, 1 student (3.1%) got 60. In post-test score there were differences of data presentation between control class and experimental class. The score that present in the data of experimental class were higher than control class, because in experimental class the researcher taught them using short movie as media and in control class the researcher taught them without short movie as media.

**Table 4.7 Descriptive Statistic for Control Class**

		Statistics	
		VAR00001	VAR00002
N	Valid	32	32
	Missing	0	0
Mean		45.2188	44.9062
Std. Error of Mean		.85635	.88144
Median		44.0000	44.0000
Mode		43.00	43.00 <sup>a</sup>
Std. Deviation		4.84425	4.98617
Variance		23.467	24.862
Range		21.00	22.00
Minimum		37.00	36.00
Maximum		58.00	58.00
Sum		1447.00	1437.00

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

In control class the median is 44 score, the mode of control class in pre-test and post-test was stable that is 43, it means that the score which often appear was 43. Than the minimum score was 37 in pre-test and 36 in post-test, and the maximum score was stable that was 58. But, the sum was decrease, in pre-test was 1447.00, in post-test was 1437.00. It means that their score was decrease too.

**Table 4.8 Descriptive Statistic for Experimental class**

		Statistics	
		VAR00001	VAR00002
N	Valid	31	31
	Missing	0	0
Mean		49.7742	50.7742
Std. Error of Mean		1.00826	.75876
Median		49.0000	51.0000
Mode		49.00	53.00
Std. Deviation		5.61373	4.22461
Variance		31.514	17.847
Range		20.00	18.00
Minimum		39.00	42.00
Maximum		59.00	60.00
Sum		1543.00	1574.00

In Experimental class the researcher gave short movie to taught them, to know the effectiveness of short movie media to teach argumentative speaking, and the result can be seen in table 4.8 that the mean of pre-test and post-test was increase. In pre-test the score was 49.7742 and in post-test was 50.7742. The median was increase too, in pre-test was 49.0000 in post-test was 51.0000. The

minimum score increased too that was 39.000 in pre-test and 42.0000 in post-test was. The maximum score increased too, that was 59.00 in pre-test and 60.00 in post-test. The result of sum score analysis increased that was 1543.00 in pre-test and 1574.00 in post-test, it means that most of their score increased too.

### **3. Hypothesis Testing**

The Hypothesis testing of this research as follows:

1. When the significant level is less than 0.05, the alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) is accepted and null hypothesis ( $H_o$ ) is rejected. It means that the students of second grade in MAN 1 Trenggalek have better score after taught by short movie as media in teaching and learning process than those students who learning speaking without taught by short movie as media
2. When the significant level is more than 0.05, the null hypothesis is ( $H_o$ ) is accepted and alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) is rejected. It means that the students of second grade in MAN 1 Trenggalek have no better score after taught by short movie as media in teaching and learning process than those students who learning speaking without taught by short movie as media.

Therefore to know whether Short movie media is significant in argumentative speaking skill, the researcher tested the result of post-test of control class and experimental class by using independent sample test in SPSS 16.0.

**Table 4.9 Independent Sample T-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
Post_ Equal Test	1.307	.257	-3.642	61	.001	-4.86794	1.33667	-7.54079	-2.19510
variances assumed									
Equal variances not assumed			-3.635	59.657	.001	-4.86794	1.33922	-7.54710	-2.18879

From the table 4.7, we can see that the significant (2-tailed) is 0.001. When  $\text{Sig. (2-tailed)} > 0.05$ , null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is accepted. Then  $\text{Sig. (2-tailed)} < 0.05$  alternative hypothesis is accepted. Based on the result of independent sample test the  $\text{Sig. (2-tailed)}$  was less than 0.05 ( $0.001 < 0.05$ ) it mean that alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) was accepted and null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) was rejected.

**Table 4.10 Independent Sample Statistic**

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Sum	Mean		Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic
VAR00006	32	1437.00	44.9062	.88144	4.98617
VAR00007	31	1574.00	50.7742	.75876	4.22461
Valid N (listwise)	31				

In Addition, table 4.10 shows that the mean score of students who taught by short movie as media (Experimental class) and the mean score of students who taught without short movie as media (Control class) were different. There was improvement of mean score. It can be seen in Control the score was 44.9062 and 50.7742 in experimental.

So we can conclude that the students the students of second grade in MAN 1 Trenggalek have better score after taught by short movie as media in teaching and learning process than those students who learning speaking without taught by short movie as media.

#### **4. Discussion**

In this study, show that short movie media is effective for argumentative speaking skill, it is proven by the score of pre-test and post-test, the score of pre-test is better than post-test because Beside that the post-test of experimental class was better than post-test in control class. It can be seen from the mean score of control class was 44.9062 and the

mean score of experimental class was 50.7742. It means that the score improved up to 58.680 point. Besides that we can see from hypothesis testing, the significant (2-tailed) is 0.001 it means that less than 0.05 so the alternative Hypothesis is accepted and null hypothesis is rejected. So we can conclude that the students of Second grade in MAN 1 Trenggalek have better score after taught by short movie as media in teaching and learning process than those students who learning speaking without taught by short movie as media and short movie is effective to teach argumentative speaking skill.

By using short movie as media the students were more motivated and interested to study and participate in speaking ability. From the first meeting, when the researcher asks them to do pre-test of speaking, they said that they cannot speak English. Their pronunciation was low and lack in vocabulary. But after taught by short movie, they were excited and give their attention to the short movie and they tried to speak as native, they repeated the pronunciation of native as in the short movie. They have more ideas and confident to speak up.

The Effectiveness of short movie as media toward students' speaking skill also proved by previous study which conducted by Lia Selfia Yunita (2015), entitled "*The Effectiveness of Using Video Youtube Toward Students' Speaking Skill Ability at The Second Grade of MTS PSM MIRIGAMBAR Tulungagung*". In her study state that Youtube video was effective to improving students' speaking skill, And the second study was

done by Ali Mustopa (2016) entitled “The effectiveness of using role-play toward students’ speaking skill achievement at MAN 2 Tulungagung”. The result of that study is effective.

Furthermore, the researcher conclude that using short movie as media is effective to teaching argumentative speaking skill of second grade in Islamic senior high school (MAN 1 Trenggalek)