CHAPTER IV

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

4.1 The Description of the Data

After conducted the research, the researcher obtained two data; the scores of only post-test with standard of minimum completeness (75). The data of two different classes are A as control class and C as experimental class.

4.1.2 The Post-test Score of Control Class

The Students' Speaking Score of Post-Test control class can be seen in the table 3 below:

Table 3

No	Name	Pron	Grammar	Vocab	Fluency	Compre	Score
1	student 1	4	4	4	4	4	80
2	student 2	4	3	3	4	3	68
3	student 3	3	3	3	3	3	60
4	student 4	3	3	3	3	2	56
5	student 5	3	3	4	3	4	68
6	student 6	3	3	3	3	3	60
7	student 7	4	4	4	4	4	80
8	student 8	3	4	4	4	4	76
9	student 9	3	2	3	3	3	56
10	student 10	3	2	3	2	3	56
11	student 11	3	3	3	4	3	64
12	student 12	3	2	4	4	3	64
13	student 13	3	2	3	3	3	56
14	student 14	3	3	4	4	3	68
15	student 15	3	2	3	3	3	56
16	student 16	3	4	3	4	4	76
17	student 17	3	3	3	2	3	56
18	student 18	4	3	4	3	3	68
19	student 19	3	2	3	3	3	56
20	student 20	3	3	4	4	4	72
21	student 21	4	4	4	4	5	84
22	student 22	3	3	3	4	4	68
23	student 23	4	3	4	3	4	76
24	student 24	3	3	4	4	5	72
25	student 25	4	4	4	4	4	80

26	student 26	4	3	4	4	3	72
27	student 27	3	4	3	4	4	72
28	student 28	3	3	4	3	4	68
29	student 29	3	4	3	3	4	68
						Total	1956
						AVERAGE	67,448

standard of minimum completeness (75).

The score in table 3 above is post-test score of Control class after the students' performance in the class. The data shown that the median is 68, the highest score is 84 and lowest score is 56.

4.1.3 The Post-test Score of Experimantal Class

The Students' Speaking Score of Post-Test C class can be seen in the table 4 below:

Table 4

No	Name	Pron	Grammar	Vocab	Fluency	Compre	Score
1	student 1	4	4	5	4	4	84
2	student 2	4	4	5	4	5	88
3	student 3	4	4	4	4	4	80
4	student 4	3	4	4	3	4	72
5	student 5	4	4	4	4	4	80
6	student 6	3	4	4	4	4	76
7	student 7	5	4	5	4	5	92
8	student 8	4	4	4	4	4	80
9	student 9	4	4	4	5	4	84
10	student 10	3	4	4	4	4	76
11	student 11	3	4	4	4	4	76
12	student 12	4	3	4	4	4	76
13	student 13	4	4	5	4	5	88
14	student 14	4	4	4	4	4	80
15	student 15	4	4	4	3	4	76
16	student 16	3	4	4	4	4	76
17	student 17	3	3	5	3	4	72
18	student 18	3	3	4	3	4	84
19	student 19	4	4	4	4	4	80
20	student 20	4	3	4	4	4	76
21	student 21	4	4	4	3	4	76
22	student 22	3	4	4	3	4	72
23	student 23	3	4	4	4	4	76

24	student 24	5	4	4	5	4	88
25	student 25	4	4	4	5	4	92
26	student 26	3	4	4	4	4	76
27	student 27	4	4	4	4	4	80
28	student 28	3	4	5	3	3	72
29	student 29	3	4	4	4	4	76
						Total	2304
						Average	79,448

standard of minimum completeness (75)

The score in table 4 above is post-test score of experimental class after the students' performance in the class. The data shown that the median is 76 , the highest score is 92 and lowest score is 72.

4.1.4   The presentation of students' post-test score of passing grade

The persentation of post-test from the both class between controlled and experimental class are shown as below:

Table 5
The comparison percentage of Post-test
for controlled and experimental class

Passing grade	Both of classes		Precentage of test	
	Controlled	**Experimental**	**controlled**	**experimental**
Complete (grade ≥ 80)	7	25	24,14	86,21

Based on the persentage in table 5 The total number of standard minimum compliteness are 24,14% from control class and 86,21% from experimental class. The best standard of minimum compliteness in control class is 84 and experimental class is 92.

4.2 Data Analysis

4.2.2   Test of varians homogeneity

The homogeneity test was counted using SPSS software 16.0. The test here for knows the variants of the data is homogen or equal. This is the data of control and experimental class after counted scores of the speaking daily of the students score in descriptive place. It was shown on the table below:

Table 6
Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Levene Statistic	Contrl	Exper	Sig.
.125	1	56	.725

The definition of the test above :
Decision: accepted H_0, because Pvalue $> \alpha$ (5%) that is $0.725 > 0.05$

Based on the result of test homogeneity on the table 6 above, H_0 is accepted because P-value$> \alpha$ 0,05 that is 0,725 $>$ 0,05. There is no difference between control and experimental classes; therefore the data is homogen or equal.

4.2.3   Test of normalitas distriubution

The test of normalities distribution was counted the post-test data of controlled and experiment class. The standard of significance 5% alpha (α) 0.05 with the criteria the data distribution is normal if *P-value (sig.)> 0.05* and the data distribution is not normal if *P-value (sig.) < 0.05*. Test of normalities distribution was used Software SPSS 16.0 of Kolmogorof-smirnov test. The hypothesis formulation and the result can be shown below:

H_0: the data is normality distribution

H_1: the data is not normality distribution

Table 7
The result of kolmogorov-smirnov (K-S)
One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		kelas_A	kelas_C
N		29	29
Normal Parameters[a]	Mean	67.4483	79.4483
	Std. Deviation	8.66679	5.82842
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.148	.240
	Positive	.148	.240
	Negative	-.146	-.139
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.798	1.293
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.548	.070

a. Test distribution is Normal.

Decision: accepted H_0 because Pvalue > α (0.05) that is 0.070 > 0.05

The table 7 was shown that the result of kolmogorov-Smirnov is significant because the value of controlled class is 0,548 and experimental class is 0,070. The significant of those classes are more than the significant value (0,05). Therefore H_0 is accepted and the data is normal.

4.2.4 T-test

Related with this data, the researcher was measured the effectiveness of making short film in teaching speaking using T-test with SPSS 16.0. The hypothesis formulation can be shown below:

H_0 : making short film is not effective for students' speaking ability.

H_1 : making short film is effective for students' speaking ability.

As explanation above, H$_0$ pushed away if the *P-value* < α (0,05). It means that making short film is more effective for students' speaking ability at eight grade of experimental class. The result of T-test using SPSS 16.0 is shown below:

Table 8
Table of T-test
Group Statistics

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Class	kelas A	29	67.4483	8.66679	1.60938
	kelas C	29	79.4483	5.82842	1.08231

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
Class Equal variances assumed	4.571	.037	-6.187	56	.000	-12.00000	1.93946		-15.88521	-8.11479
Equal variances not assumed			-6.187	49.026	.000	-12.00000	1.93946		-15.89744	-8.10256

Decision : pushed away H$_0$ because Pvalue > α (0.05) yaitu 0.000 < 0.05

Based on the table 8 above, The result of post-test value are significance between those classes from Equality of variances test is 0.000, whereas P-value is more than 0,05 or P-value > α (0.05), so H$_0$ is pushed away. Meanwhile, the ability of those classes is difference. Therefore, this research can interpret that

making short film for develop students' speaking ability is more effective than without using this method because there are differences in result.

4.2.5 Eta Squared

The researcher was measured eta squared to know the effect size of making short film for students' speaking ability. The aspect scales was of Pallant (2010:243) they are , 0.01 is small effect, 0.06 is moderate effect, and more than 0.14 is large effect. The calculation of this research as seen below:

$$\text{eta square} = \frac{t^2}{t^2 + (N1 + N2 - 2)}$$
$$= \frac{(6.187^2)}{(6.187^2) + (56)}$$
$$= 0.40$$

Based on the calculation above, the eta squared value was shown 0.40 which is higher than 0.14. It means the result is very high because 0.40 was exceed the aspect scale 0.14 is large effect. So, the researcher can concludes that the method is effective with the rejection of null hypothesis.

4.3 Discussion

Based on the data analysis above, the researcher wants to find out the effectiveness of making short film for the students' speaking ability. Back to the design, the researcher used post-test only design. So, the researcher only finds out the effectiveness of the method of comparison group between controlled and experimental group. It is different with pre-test and post-test design that is to find out the improvement of the students' speaking ability. The researcher finds out the result was difference between control and experimental class. So, the alternative

hypothesis is accepted and the null hypothesis is rejected or the data is not equal. If it is not effective, the data is no difference, the null hypothesis is accepted or the data is equal.

The researcher was got the results of some calculations. The first is presentation of post-test between control and experimental class, those are 24,14 % for controlled class and 86,21 % for experimental class. The second is homogenity test, the researcher count the scores of the speaking daily of students' score in descriptive text. The result of the homogenity test of the both class are equal, it means pushed away H0, because P-value > α (5%) that is 0.725 > 0.05. The data of post-test in both classes are equal. The third is normality distribution, the test is to know the post-test data is normal or not. The data of the both class are normal. It means pushed away H_0 because P-value > α (0.05) that is 0.070 > 0.05. The fourth is the researcher used T-test to finds out the effectiveness of making short film for developing students' speaking ability. T-test is important test between the other tests, because the test to determines the goal of the research. The goal was dependent with the pronouncement of the hypothesis. The hypothesis are H_0, it means that making short film is not effective for students' speaking ability and H_1 means that making short film is effective for students' speaking ability. The test was counted using SPSS software 16.0. The result of T-test from the both class is P-value or data significant of post-test is 0.000, pushed away H_0 because P-value > α (0.05) that is 0.000 < 0.05. So, the students' speaking ability is difference between control and experimental class. So, it means that making short film is effective for developing students' speaking ability. The last is the researcher uses Eta Square to knows the effect size how the

effectiveness of making short film for developing students' speaking ability. Eta square have three effect scales of this calculation of Pallant, scale one is small effect 0.01, scale two is moderate effect 0.06, and scale three is large effect 0.14. The result of eta square of this research is 0.40 higher than 0.14. It means that the post-test score between control and experimental class are difference.

Based on the explanation above, the best of the students' speaking ability of the five components is vocabulary skill. It is because the students can develop or get the new vocabularies when they are making script. The point of the other components such as pronunciation, grammar, fluency and comprehension must be balanced.

The students can finish their project well. They have good creative ideas when are making short film. On the other hand, this activity has the weakness. The weakness of this activity is the students have not enough time for making this film. This research needs long time because, the processes of making short film that includes making conversation scripts, process of taking video, editing and finishing need a long time. Maybe the next researcher can determine the time for the research and apply that method to be better than this research.