CHAPTER IV

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This chapter discusses the result and the finding of the research which have been conducted by the researcher in SMA Muhammadiyah 7 Surabaya in order to answer the research question that has been mentioned before. To answer the research question about the effectiveness of using small group discussion in teaching speaking recount, there are three components that should be investigated. The first is the improvement of students' speaking skill after the treatment. The second is the class situation and the last is the students' response. The following is the discussion of the finding.

4.1 Finding

This research used One Group Pretest-Posttest Design. It means that it is only used one group or one class to do the research. and it consists of 21 students of tenth-grade students of SMA Muhammadiyah 7 Surabaya as the participants, the classes in this school divided into two class namely; Science class and Social class. The X science was chosen to conduct the research and this class consists of 21 students. This research was held from 3rd May 2018 to 4th May 2018. The diagnostic test was also given to know the general students' ability in English. This multiple choice test consists of 35 questions and The test is modified from TOEFL test. The pretest was given to students to know the students' speaking ability before conducting the treatment using small group discussion. In pretest, the students were assigned to tell their own experience orally. The instruction of giving pre-test was the students tell their unforgettable experience orally in front of the class. After conducted pretest in the experimental class, the researcher conducted a treatment. The treatment was conducted in two meetings which used small group discussion in teaching speaking recount. The next step was giving the posttest to know the students' improvement in speaking recount, which is

asking the students to tell their holiday orally and it continued by giving questionnaire to know the students' response to small group discussion.

4.1.1 The Improvement of Students' Skill Speaking Recount

The students' score was analyzed by using T-test to know whether there was significant difference between pretest and posttest scores before and after applying small group discussion in teaching speaking recount in the experimental class. To answer the research question this study used T-test especially used Paired Sample T-test by using SPSS and T-test using Excell. The result of the data was analyzed using SPSS and Microsoft Excel that can be bellow.

4.1.1.1 Normality

The pre-test and post-test was given to the students to measure student speaking ability. The test analysis used normality calculation to know whether the test is normality or not and it was calculated using SPSS 17.0. So, the formula is Kolmogorov-Smirnov used P value which has significant (Sig.) and the standard of significant is called alpha (α) 0.05 which H0 rejected if P value $< \alpha$ (0.05), it means that the test is not normality, otherwise H1 is accepted if P value $> \alpha$ (0.05), which means that the test is normality. The formulate of the hypothesis is as follow:

> H0 (Sig. *P value* $< \alpha$): The data is not normality distribution
>
> H1 (Sig. *P value* $> \alpha$): The data is normality distribution

The result of the calculation can be seen in the table in the next page.

Table 4.1 Result of Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		pretest	posttest
N		21	21
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	61.1429	76.5714
	Std. Deviation	10.61266	8.12755
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.156	.142
	Positive	.156	.142
	Negative	-.110	-.105
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.714	.649
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.688	.793

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

Table 4.1 above, showed that the result of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test is normality distribution with the Sig (2-tailed) of pretest is P value α (0.688 > 0.05. It means that the data is the normality distribution. So, it means that both of test are valid or the test is understandable by the student. Moreover, the Sig (2-tailed) of posttest is P value α (0.793 > 0.05. It means that the post-test is normality also. So, it can be summarized that both of the tests is normalized because P value of both of test are higher than 0.05.

4.1.1.2 The Student Pre-test and Post Test Score

This subtopic presents about students' score of pre-test and post-test. The pretest was conducted on 3rd May 2018 and post-test was conducted on 4th May 2018. The components of the speaking score are grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, comprehension, and fluency according to Brown (2004:172-173). The categorization of the score in each component is 1 to 5 and every component has their own criteria. The result of speaking score is taken from the total score of each component times four. The detailed can be seen in the appendix 12 and 13. The formula is illustrated as follows:

Total score (grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, comprehension and fluency) X 4

The result of pretest and post-test can be seen as follow:

Table 4.2 The Student's Speaking Score in The Pre-test and Post-test

NO	Student Name	Students' Speaking Score	
		Pre-test	Post-test
1	Student 1	76	84
2	Student 2	60	72
3	Student 3	58	80
4	Student 4	64	76
5	Student 5	62	84
6	Student 6	64	76
7	Student 7	60	76
8	Student 8	80	92
9	Student 9	64	80
10	Student 10	48	68
11	Student 11	52	68
12	Student 12	52	68
13	Student 13	64	84
14	Student 14	52	68
15	Student 15	52	68
16	Student 16	80	92
17	Student 17	40	64
18	Student 18	56	72
19	Student 19	68	80
20	Student 20	56	72
21	Student 21	76	84
Total		**1284**	**1608**
Mean		**61,14**	**76.57**

Table 4.2 shows that the total score of student speaking in the pretest of 21 students is 1284 and the mean is 61.14 and the total score of student speaking in the post-test of 21 students is 1608 and the mean is 76.57. The detail scoring can be seen in the appendix 13 and 14.. On another hand, to know the percentage of students' score improvement of the passing grade in pre-test and post-test. It can be seen below:

Table 4.3 The Students' Score Reaching the Passing Grade

Passing Grade	Students; Speaking Score		Percentage of the Test	
	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Complete ≥75	4	12	19.05%	57.14%

The passing grade of English subject in SMA Muhammadiyah 7 Surabaya is 75. Related to table 4.3 above the students that reach the passing grade in pre-test are 4 students and in the post-test, there are 12 students from 21 students. It means that the students' percentage the passing grade in pre-test is 19.05% and in the post-test as many as 57.14%. So, the comparison of both students' score improvement in passing grade in pre-test and post-test is 38.09%.

4.1.1.3 Paired Sample T-Test Calculation Using SPSS

T-test calculation is used to calculate the students' scores in pretest and posttest. The table below shows the result of Paired Sample-Test between Pretest and Posttest in experimental class. The result of SPSS output can be seen in the next page.

Table 4.4 Paired Sample Statistic

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	pretest	61.1429	21	10.61266	2.31587
	posttest	76.5714	21	8.12755	1.77358

This study took 21 students as the sample. Table 4.4 above illustrates that the mean value of pre-test is 61.1429 with standard deviation 2.31587 and the value mean of post-test is 76.5714 with standard deviation 8.12755.

Table 4.5 Paired Sample Correlation

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	pretest & posttest	21	.924	.000

From the output of the paired sample correlation of table 4.5 above shows about the correlation among pre-test score and post-test score before and after given Small Group Discussion is 0.924. It means that there is correlation differences before and after the student got the treatment by using Small Group Discussion.

Table 4.6 The Paired Sample-Test Result of Experimental Class

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences							
					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	pretest - posttest	-15.42857	4.38830	.95760	-17.42610	-13.43104	-16.112	20	.000

The table 4.6 shows that the mean score of the paired sample t-test between pretest and posttest is 15.42857 with the standard deviation of 4.38830. This research used 95% or (0.95) confidence interval of the difference, it means that it used $\alpha = 5\%$ or 0.05. The sig. (2-tailed) in here shows that 0.000 less than 0.05. Thus, it can be summarized that Ho is rejected and H1 is accepted as can be seen in the table 4.6 above that significant 2-tailed here is .000 < 0.05, so it means that there are significant differences between pretest and posttest score before and after applying small group discussion in teaching speaking recount.

4.1.1.4 T-test Calculation Using EXCEL

This subtopic presents the calculation of the data using T-test and this study used significant α 0.05 and t-table 1.725 (N=21). It is presented as bellow:

A.   To determine the value of Md

Md is taken from the average of pre-test and post-test score. The formula of Md is as follows:

$$\text{Md} = \frac{\sum d}{N} = \frac{324}{21} = 15.43$$

Md= 15.43

The result of data analysis of this research is in the table below:

Table 4.7 The result of data analysis using T-test calculation

No	Student Name	Pretest Score	Posttest Score	D	D^2	d-md	$(d-md)^2$
1	Student 1	76	84	8	64	-10,24	104,8576
2	Student 2	60	72	12	144	-6,24	38,9376
3	Student 3	58	80	22	484	3,76	14,1376
4	Student 4	64	76	12	144	-6,24	38,9376
5	Student 5	62	84	22	484	3,76	14,1376

6	Student 6	64	76	12	144	-6,24	38,9376
7	Student 7	60	76	16	256	-2,24	5,0176
8	Student 8	80	92	12	144	-6,24	38,9376
9	Student 9	64	80	16	256	-2,24	5,0176
0	Student10	48	68	20	400	1,76	3,0976
11	Student11	52	68	16	256	-2,24	5,0176
12	Student12	52	68	16	256	-2,24	5,0176
13	Student13	64	84	20	400	1,76	3,0976
14	Student14	52	68	16	256	-2,24	5,0176
15	Student15	52	68	16	256	-2,24	5,0176
16	Student16	80	92	12	144	-6,24	38,9376
17	Student17	40	64	24	576	5,76	33,1776
18	Student18	56	72	16	256	-2,24	5,0176
19	Student19	68	80	12	144	-6,24	38,9376
20	Student20	56	72	16	256	-2,24	5,0176
21	Student21	76	84	8	64	-10,24	104,8576
	Total	**1284**	**1608**	**324**	**5384**	**-59,04**	**551,1296**

B. To determine the value of t-count

The formula of t-count is:

$$t = \frac{md}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum xd^2}{n(df)}}}$$

Explanation:

Md = Meant from derivation (d) between pre-test and post-test

T = t count

Xd = Deviation difference with deviation mean

Df = or db (n-1)

N = Size of the sample

t-table = 1.725

Analysis:

$$t = \frac{md}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum xd^2}{n(df)}}}$$

$$t = \frac{15.43}{\sqrt{\frac{551.1296}{21(20)}}} = \frac{15.43}{\sqrt{\frac{551.1296}{420}}}$$

$$t = \frac{15.43}{\sqrt{1.31}} = \frac{15.43}{1,14} = 13.53$$

$$t = 13.53$$

According to the analysis above, the value of t-count is 13.53 and t-table 1.725 because t-count > t-table, so Ho is rejected and H1 is accepted, which means that the value of t-count (13.53) is more than t-table (1.725) with significant value 0.05. To sum up, after analyzing the data using t-test above it shows that the use of Small Group Discussion is effective in teaching speaking recount at tenth-grade students.

4.1.2 Classroom Situation

This subtopic describes the class situation during conduct the treatment. This data was taken from the observation checklist and field note completion in the experimental class. The aims of this instrument was to support the data beside students' score in both test and questionnaire. The observation checklist was completed by the observer and the teacher in the classroom during conduct the teaching and learning process and it was done in two meetings. Using small group in teaching speaking seemed to be very good. The students were active to speak and discussed the topic in the small group. As seen in the result of observation checklist and field note that done by the observer and the teacher in the first meeting, during the teaching and learning process, the students delivered some questions to the teacher about the lesson. In the small group, the students worked and discussed together with other members in the small group. Students' enthusiasm was high because all of the group were enthusiastic and active discussing the topic with their friends. Three groups seemed to be active to speak and expressed their ideas with their friends in the small groups. When the students were discussing and working in the small group, the teacher walked around to monitor and help them with the difficulties or if they did not understand what they were going to do. However, there were two groups that seemed not to be active in the discussion. Few of them was not involved in the group discussion and some of them seemed to be shy to express their ideas with other members in their groups, and in the middle of the discussion, some students made a noisy in the classroom. On the other hand, as seen in the result of observation checklist and field note that done by the observer and the teacher in the second meeting, the students worked and discussed together in the small group. When in the first meeting some student did not involve yet in the group, but in the second meeting the students started to involve in a small group and did the task together with their member. The students seemed to be enthusiasm did the task together with their friends in the small group. During the discussion, there were four groups active to discuss and they spoke together in the small group. In general, the students seem to be active and enthusiasm discussed in the small group and did the task

together. one group seemed not to be active to speak with their members and they were like shy to express their ideas, but they seemed tried to involve and participate in the discussion.

4.1.3 Student's Response Toward the Used of Small Group Discussion

A questionnaire was given to the students to know the student's response toward the use of small group discussion in teaching speaking recount. The questionnaire consisted of ten questions that related to the learning process from the pretest, the treatment until the posttest. The questionnaire sheets were distributed to 21 students. The result of the questionnaire and more clearly can be presented in the table below:

Table 4.8 The percentage of Students' Response

QUESTION	RESPONSE			
	YES		NO	
1	16	76.19%	5	23.81%
2	15	71.42%	6	28.57%
3	15	71.42%	6	28.57%
4	15	71.42%	6	28.57%
5	15	71.42%	6	28.57%
6	16	76.19%	5	23.81%
7	17	80.95%	4	19.05%
8	16	76.19%	5	23.81%
9	15	71.42%	6	28.57%
10	16	76.19%	5	23.81%

Table 4.8 illustrates that There were 16 students answered "Yes" and 5 students answered "No". So, around 76.19% said that the student likes studying speaking using small group discussion, but there are 23.81% students did not like Small Group Discussion. Beside that 71.42% of the students from 21 students prefer small group discussion applied in speaking class and 28.57% claimed that they do not agree Small Group Discussion applied in speaking class. It means that 15 students answer "Yes" and 6 students answered "No". Meanwhile, 71.42% of 5 students understand the

material given during speaking class and 28.57% or 15 students do not understand. The students also said that after applying small group discussion in speaking class the students felt their tenses, especially in past tense improve as many as 15 students or 71.42 % answer yes and 6 students or 28.57% answered "No". On the other hand, there were 71.42% of students said that they felt their vocabulary improved and 28.57% said no or as many as 15 students answered "Yes" and 6 students answered "No". In addition, there were around 76.19% the students argued that they have more chance to speak in the small group discussion in the speaking class. It means that as many as 16 students answered "Yes" and 5or 23.81% students answered "No". Moreover, 17 or 80.95% students claimed that they are more confident to speak in the small group in the speaking class and 4 or 19.05% students answered "No. The students also said that they felt more active when using small group discussion in speaking class as many as 76.19% or 16 students and 5 or 23.81% students answered "No". Otherwise, 71.42% or 15 students from the 21 students argued that they have motivation to speak when using small group in teaching speaking and 28.57% students argued that they do not have to motivate to speak or at least 6 students answered "No". The students also agreed that small group discussion can be applying in speaking class. There were 76.19% students answered "Yes" and 5 or 23.81% students not agreed that small group discussion applying in speaking class.

To sum up, from the explanation above it shows that most of the students agree that small group discussion is applied in speaking class because it helped them to understand the lesson especially in the recount, they felt they have motivation in speaking and it can improve their vocabulary. On another hand, the students claimed that small group discussion can make students more active in class, they are more confident to speak with another student in the small group and improve their grammar, especially past tense. Moreover, by using small group discussion in speaking class the students have more time and chance to speak.

4.2 Discussion

After conducted the treatment it was found some aspect that should be improved. The aspects that should be improved by the students are their speaking skill and the students' condition in the classroom during the teaching and learning process. In general, the student were interested when the teacher used small group discussion in teaching speaking recount. It can be seen in the result of the observation checklist and field note that they were enthusiastic, active to speak and discussed the topic when in the small group in the first and second meeting. The students seemed to try to involve, worked and discussed in the small group to discuss with their friends when in the first meeting they seemed not involved yet in the small group. From the whole meetings, it was found that this strategy helped the students to improve their speaking ability especially in speaking recount. The weakness found when conducted the treatment when a few students were not involved in the group yet, not active to speak and also made noise in the classroom in the first meeting, but in the second meeting the students seemed involved in the group and they worked and discussed together with their friends. Furthermore, when conducting the treatment by using small group discussion the researcher found that there was the lack of time allocation, so it is needed more time in students' discussion.

On the other hand, after conducting the treatment using small group discussion, it was found that there was an improvement in students' score in pre-test and post-test. Before conducted the treatment, the researcher gave the diagnostic test to categorize the students in group level. It was used to compare the students' in group level who can reached the passing grade after getting the treatment used small group discussion or not. This test consists of 35 question in multiple-choice form and the test is modified from TOEFL test. So, the result of students' diagnostic test showed that the total score of is 1115 and the average is 53.09524. The minimum score for this test is 34 and the maximum score is 74. To more clear it can be seen in the appendix 15. To categorize the group level from the diagnostic test and to know the students' group

level score improvement and exceed post-test or not. The students' group level can be illustrated in the table 4.9 can be presented bellows:

Table 4.9 The students' group level improvement

No	Students' Group Level	Score	Percentage diagnostic test	Passing Grade of post-test
1	High	68 - 100	4 students (19.05%)	4 students (100%)
2	Middle	34 – 66	17 students (80.95%)	8 students (47.06%)
3	Low	0 - 33	-	

According to the table above shows that there are 4 students or 19.05% included in the high group, which is the score start from 68 to 100. In the middle group, there are 17 students. It means that as many as 80.95%. There is no low-level group. It was found that there are differences significance score after conducted the treatment by using small group discussion. It is can be seen in the students' score on the diagnostic test and post-test was improved. The researcher also found that the high-level students reached the passing grade in post-test. On the other hand, the middle group level got the high score in the post-test after conducted the treatment used small group discussion, but only 8 students in the middle group reached the passing grade in the post-test from 17 students. It means that 9 students of the middle group did not exceed.

The use of small group discussion in teaching speaking recount improve students' speaking skill especially in speaking recount. It can be seen in students score in post-test. In the pre-test only 4 students that exceed in the passing grade, but in the post-test, 12 students exceed in the passing grade. Moreover, the students' response toward this strategy is good enough, which is showed in the result of the percentage of students' responses. Furthermore, the improvement of students' speaking can be seen in the class situation that takes from observation checklist and field note. It showed that

in general the students active to speak, worked and discussed together in the small group.

        To sum up, the used of small group discussion can make the students active in learning English especially in speaking. They have more time and a chance to speak and giving ideas, comment with other members in the small group, because the members of the students in the group were just a few so everybody got a chance to speak. Moreover, it helped improved students' comprehension about the material and build their social and problem-solving skills. The students were also more interested so it might build their confident.