

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the researcher would like to describe about the subject of the research and the result of the research. They consist of profile of the school, research finding, and discussion.

A. Profile of the School

SMK Plus Melati Samarinda gives people the opportunity to learn while working and work while studying to become a tough, skilled, creative and productive young worker to face the challenges of work and business world in the future which is of course very competitive.

SMK Plus Melati is located at H.A.M. Rifaddin street, Harapan Baru village, Loa Janan Ilir sub-district, Samarinda city which was established in 2008 and directly open 3 departments namely Tourism, Culinary Art and ICT. As one of the vocational schools in Indonesia, SMK Plus Melati Samarinda is committed to assisting the Indonesian people in facing all the global economic arrivals by preparing high school graduates as young, talented and talented professionals who will later become the new pillars of the nation's economy.

1. Vision, Mission, and Motto of School

a. vision

The vision of this school are Preparing skilled, qualified, superior, emotionally and spiritually, high discipline, science-oriented and good attitude.

b. Mission

The mission of this school as follow:

- 1). Foster and educate students who are smart and skilled in the intellectual, emotional, and spiritual fields.
- 2). Holding Vocational High School (SMK) education that is superior in quality and leading in the work.
- 3). Fostering and educating students into a workforce ready to plunge into the world of work and or able to create employment, high discipline and good attitude and ability to enter higher education and quality.

c. Motto

The motto of this school is Global Insights and Reliable Work.

2. General Condition of Learners

The state of the students SMK Plus Melati Samarinda based on class as follows:

Table 3.1

Grade	Year 2014 / 2015			Year 2015 / 2016			Year 2016 / 2017		
	M	F	Amount	M	F	amount	M	F	amount
1 st ICT	12	3	17	4	6	10	2	1	3
1 st CA	3	1	4	1	2	3	0	3	3
2 nd ICT	10	4	14	12	2	15	4	6	10
2 nd CA	4	3	7	3	1	4	1	2	3
3 rd ICT	8	4	12	10	3	10	10	2	12
3 rd CA	3	2	5	3	3	1	2	0	2
Total	35	17	52	33	17	40	19	14	33

*Information : Gender ; M is Male and F is Female
 Program of Competences; Information Communication and Technology (ICT)
 Culinary Art (CA)

3. Teachers' Condition

The state of teachers SMK Plus Melati Samarinda can be seen in the table as follows:

Table 3.2

No	Name	Position	Subject	Program of Competences
1	Nur Farikhin, S. Pd. I.	Headmaster	Religion education and moral of 3 rd grade	ICT & CA
2	Mahfud, S.Pd	Deputy head of curriculum	Math of 2 nd and 3 rd grade	ICT & CA
3	Apriansyah, S.Pd	Deputy head of learners and public relation	Indonesia Language of 1 st and 2 nd grade	ICT & CA
4	Muji Hariandi, A.Md	1. head of ICT Program	Vocational of competence field	ICT
		2. Homeroom XII and X of ICT Program		
5	Evi Setiyowati, S.Pd.T, M.Sc	Head of culinary art (CA) program and homeroom of 3 rd , 1 st of CA	Vocational of competence field	Culinary Art
6	Prastiwi Utami, A.Md	Homeroom 2 nd grade	Vocational of competence field	Culinary Art / CA

7	Ali Syaifudin Hamsa, S.Si	Teacher	Chemist	Culinary Art / CA
8	Mohamad Mansyur, S. Pd.	Teacher	Natural sciences	ICT & CA
			Entrepreneursh ip	ICT & CA
			Physics	ICT
9	Nining Suningsih, S.S	Teacher	English	ICT & CA
10	Rudin Lapandewa, S.Pd	Teacher	Math of 1 st and 3 rd grade	ICT & CA
11	Rahmiati, S.Pd	Teacher	Indonesia language of 3 rd grade	ICT & CA
			Art and culture	
12	Abdul Haris, S.Kom	Teacher	Vocational of competence field	ICT
13	Sumardiati S.Kom	Teacher	Vocational of competence field	ICT
14	Dr. Heni Pratiwi, S.Kom, M.Pd	Teacher	Vocational of competence field	ICT
15	Mei Nonik Dwi Handayani, A.Md	Teacher	Vocational of competence field	Culinary Art / CA
16	Vivin Okta Viyanti, S.Pd	Teacher	Citizenship education	ICT & CA
17	Diah Rahmawati	Teacher	Social sciences	ICT & CA

	N., MM			
18	Mardiansyah, S.Pd	Teacher	Physical education	ICT & CA
19	Ike Nur Afniya Yavada, S.Pd.I	Teacher	Islamic of 1 st and 3 rd grade	ICT & CA
20	Gardner Steven Arbineno, S.Th, M.Fil	Teacher	Christian Education	ICT & CA
21	Dra. Lestari Handayani, M.Psi	Teacher	Counseling guidance	ICT & CA
22	Dhani Purbo Habsari, S.E	Head of administration	Accounting	Culinary Art / CA
23	Rizky Rahmat Saputra, A.Md	Administration staff & Operator	Head of laboratory	ICT

4. Condition of School's Facilities and Infrastructure

The state of facilities and infrastructure SMK Plus Melati Samarinda can be seen on the table as follows:

Table 3.3

No	Facilities and Infrastructure	Condition		
		Damage	Good	Total
1	Classroom		22	22
2	Teachers' room		2	2
3	Headmaster's room		1	1
4	Library		1	1
5	Student health unit room		1	1
6	Administration room		1	1
7	Laboratory room		8	8
8	Toilet for students and teachers		20	20
9	Desk and chair for students		500	500
10	Desk and chair for teachers		30	30
11	Auditorium		3	3

B. Research Finding

Finding refers to the description of data or information that researcher collected based on the research problem. The data collected in this research were speaking test to the subject namely the third grade students at SMK Plus Melati Samarinda in academic year 2017-2018. The data was in the form of spoken procedural which was in term of its component of speaking such as: pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, and fluency. The data were collected as follows:

1. Pronunciation

Pronunciation: the way for students to produce clearer language when they speak.

Table 3.4 the percentage of student's pronunciation scoring

Assessor	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Weak
Rater 1	36.36%	9.09 %	54.54 %	0%	0%
Rater 2	18.18%	27.27%	45.45%	9.09%	0%

Based on the first rater, there are 36.36% students got excellent, 9.09% students got very good, 54.54% students got good, 0% students got fair, and 0% students got weak. Meanwhile, based on the second rater, there are 18.18% students got excellent, 27.27% students got very good, 45.45% students got good, 9.09% students got fair, and 0% students got weak.

2. Vocabulary

Vocabulary: List of words with their meaning.

Table 3.5 the percentage of student's vocabulary scoring

Assessor	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Weak
Rater 1	27.27%	18.18 %	54.54 %	9.09%	0%
Rater 2	9.09%	27.27%	45.45%	9.09%	0%

Based on the first rater, there are 27.27% students got excellent, 18.18% students got very good, 54.54% students got good, 9.09% students got fair, and 0% students got weak. Meanwhile, based on the second rater, there are 9.09% students got excellent, 27.27% students got very good, 45.45% students got good, 9.09% students got fair, and 0% students got weak.

3. Grammar

Grammar: the description of the ways in which words can change their forms and can be combined into sentences in that language.

Table 3.6 the percentage of student's grammar scoring

Assesor	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Weak
Rater 1	45.45%	45.45%	9.09%	0%	0%
Rater 2	18.18%	54.54%	18.18%	9.09%	0%

Based on the first rater, there are 45.45% students got excellent, 45.45% students got very good, 9.09% students got good, 0% students got fair, and 0% students got weak. Meanwhile, based on the second rater, there are 18.18% students got excellent, 54.54% students got very good, 18.18% students got good, 9.09% students got fair, and 0% students got weak.

4. Fluency

Fluency: The ability to speak fluently and accurately

Table 3.7 the percentage of student's fluency scoring

Assessor	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Weak
Rater 1	54.54%	0%	0%	9.09%	36.36%
Rater 2	9.09%	36.36%	36.36%	27.27%	0%

Based on the first rater, there are 54.54% students got excellent, 0% students got very good, 0% students got good, 9.09% students got fair, and 36.36% students got weak. Meanwhile, based on the second rater, there are 9.09% students got excellent, 36.36% students got very good, 36.36% students got good, 27.27% students got fair, and 0% students got weak.

C. Discussion

In this research, the researcher found that students' speaking achievement at the third grade of SMK Plus Melati Samarinda in academic year 2017-2018 was the Mean score of fluency is 25 (good), Mean score of grammar is 22.40 (very good), Mean score of vocabulary is 17.72 (good), and Mean score of pronunciation is 21.63 (good). The result of the analysis, as tabulated above clearly showed that:

1. Pronunciation

Pronunciation is the way for students' to produce clearer language when they speak.¹ If a student does not pronounce a word correctly, it can be very difficult to understand him/her. On the other hand, if students make

¹ Lucy Pollard, *Lucy Pollard's guide to Teaching English*, (London: Lucy Pollard Copyright, 2008), p.65.

grammatical mistakes e.g. in a verb tense, the listener still has an idea of what is being said. So, it can be seen that good pronunciation is vital if a student is to be understood.

Table 3.8 the comparative score of pronunciation

NO	STUDENTS' NAME CODE	THE COMPARATIVE SCORE BETWEEN RATER 1 & RATER 2			
		PRONUNCIATION			
		INTERVAL SCORE (18-25)			
		R1	R2	MEAN	CRITERIA
1	AR	24	21	22.5	very good
2	AKI	23	24	23.5	very good
3	AA	25	22	23.5	very good
4	AK	24	23	23.5	very good
5	BAP	20	22	21	Good
6	MZK	20	20	20	Good
7	RGAB	20	20	20	Good
8	RAD	20	20	20	Good
9	TAG	20	19	19.5	Fair
10	TU	24	24	24	excellent
11	ZHW	20	21	20.5	Good
		TOTAL MEAN		21.63	Good

Based on table 3.4 showed that the percentage of the students' pronunciation scoring based on the first rater, there are four students of 11 students got excellent, one student of 11 students got very good, six students of 11 students got good, no one of 11 students fair, and no one student of 11 students got weak.

Based on second rater, showed that percentage of the students' pronunciation scoring. There are two students of 11 students got excellent, three students of 11 students got very good, five students of 11 students got

good, one student of 11 students got fair, and no one student of 11 students got weak.

Based on the table 3.8, the result of comparative score showed Mean score of the students' speaking achievement in pronunciation is 21.63. It is on the range "good level" (20-21). It means that when they are telling procedural, they several pronunciation errors, but main ideas are understood without problem.

2. Vocabulary

Vocabulary means list of words with their meaning. One cannot communicate effectively or express their ideas both oral and written form if they do not have sufficient vocabulary. Without grammar, very little can be conveyed, without vocabulary nothing can be conveyed. David Grambs said that vocabulary is a list of word usually defined and alphabetize as dictionary or special glossary complete work stock of language.²

Table 3.9 the comparative score of vocabulary

NO	STUDENTS' NAME CODE	THE COMPARATIVE SCORE BETWEEN RATER 1 & RATER 2			
		VOCABULARY			
		INTERVAL SCORE (12-20)			
		R1	R2	MEAN	CRITERIA
1	AR	17	18	17.5	Good
2	AKI	19	20	19.5	very good
3	AA	20	19	19.5	very good
4	AK	20	19	19.5	very good
5	BAP	16	18	17	Good
6	MZK	17	16	16.5	Good
7	RGAB	17	15	16	Good

² David Grambs, *Words About Word*, (New York : Mcgraw Hill Book Company, 1984), p.13.

8	RAD	18	17	17.5	Good
9	TAG	17	16	16.5	Good
10	TU	20	19	19.5	very good
11	ZHW	15	17	16	Good
		TOTAL MEAN		17.72	Good

Based on table 3.5 showed that the percentage of the students' vocabulary scoring based on the first rater, there are three students of 11 students got excellent, two students of 11 students got very good, six students of 11 students got good, one student of 11 students fair, and no one student of 11 students got weak.

Based on second rater, it showed that percentage of the students' vocabulary scoring. There are one student of 11 students got excellent, three students of 11 students got very good, five students of 11 students got good, one student of 11 students got fair, and no one student of 11 students got weak.

The result of comparative score showed Mean score of the students' speaking achievement in grammar is 17.72. It is on the range "good" level (16-17). It means that when they are telling procedural, they mostly correct choice of vocabulary and the meaning is clear.

3. Grammar

The grammar of a language is the description of the ways in which words can change their forms and can be combined into sentences in that language. If grammar rules are too carelessly violated, communication may suffer, although, creating a 'good' grammar rule is extremely difficult.

Table 3.10 the comparative score of grammar

NO	STUDENTS' NAME CODE	THE COMPARATIVE SCORE BETWEEN RATER 1 & RATER 2			
		GRAMMAR			
		INTERVAL SCORE (12-25)			
		R1	R2	MEAN	CRITERIA
1	AR	23	22	22.5	very good
2	AKI	24	24	24	Excellent
3	AA	24	23	23.5	very good
4	AK	25	23	24	Excellent
5	BAP	24	23	23.5	very good
6	MZK	22	20	21	good
7	RGAB	21	20	20.5	good
8	RAD	21	22	21.5	good
9	TAG	23	19	21	good
10	TU	24	24	24	excellent
11	ZHW	20	22	21	good
		TOTAL MEAN		22.40	very good

Based on table 3.6 showed that the percentage of the students' grammar scoring based on the first rater, there are five students of 11 students got excellent, five students of 11 students got very good, one student of 11 students got good, no one student of 11 students fair, and no one student of 11 students got weak.

Based on second rater, it showed that percentage of the students' grammar scoring. There are two students of 11 students got excellent, six students of 11 students got very good, two students of 11 students got good, one student of 11 students got fair, and no one student of 11 students got weak.

The result of comparative score showed Mean score of the students' speaking achievement in grammar is 22.40. It is on the range "very good" level (22-23). It means that when they are telling procedural, they have one or two errors, but communication is mostly clear.

4. Fluency

Fluency can be defined as the ability to speak fluently and accurately. Fluency in speaking is the aim of many language learners. Signs of fluency include a reasonably fast speed of speaking and only a small number of pauses and "ums" or "ers".³ These signs indicate that the speaker does not have spent a lot of time searching for the language items needed to express the message.

Table 3.11 the comparative score of fluency

NO	STUDENTS' NAME CODE	THE COMPARATIVE SCORE BETWEEN RATER 1 & RATER 2			
		FLUENCY			
		INTERVAL SCORE (12-30)			
		R1	R2	MEAN	CRITERIA
1	AR	29	26	27.5	very good
2	AKI	30	28	29	excellent
3	AA	30	27	28.5	very good
4	AK	29	27	28	very good
5	BAP	20	25	22.5	Fair
6	MZK	20	23	21.5	Fair
7	RGAB	20	21	20.5	weak
8	RAD	21	24	22.5	Fair
9	TAG	20	21	20.5	weak
10	TU	29	27	28	very good
11	ZHW	29	24	26.5	good

³ H. Douglas Brown, *Teaching by Principles an Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy 2nd Ed*, (New York: Addison Wesley Longman Inc, 2001), p.79.

		TOTAL MEAN	25	good
--	--	------------	----	------

Based on table 3.7 showed that the percentage of the students' fluency scoring based on the first rater, there are six students of 11 students got excellent, no one student of 11 students got very good, no one student of 11 students got good, one student of 11 students fair, and four students of 11 students got weak.

Based on second rater, it showed that percentage of the students' fluency scoring. There are one student of 11 students got excellent, four students of 11 students got very good, four students of 11 students got good, three students of 11 students got fair, and no one student of 11 students got weak.

The result of comparative score showed Mean score of the students' speaking achievement in fluency is 25. It is on the range "good" level (24-26). It means that when they are telling procedural, occasional hesitant but recovered well.

Overall, after giving a speaking test and scoring the result of the test, the researcher displayed the data from both of rater into table as follow:

Table 3.12 Score of the test by rater I (English Teacher)

NO	STUDENTS NAMES CODE	TOPIC CODE	RATER I (TEACHER)				SCORE
			PRO	VOC	GRAM	FLUE	
			18-25	12-20	12-25	12-30	
1	AR	HTMLC	24	17	23	29	93
2	AKI	HTMCS	23	19	24	30	96
3	AA	HTDTUP	25	20	24	30	99
4	AK	HTCR	24	20	25	29	98
5	BAP	HTMMUP	20	16	24	20	80
6	MZK	HTCH	20	17	22	20	79

7	RGAB	HTUP	20	17	21	20	78
8	RAD	HTUPTCP	20	18	21	21	80
9	TAG	HTCLF	20	17	23	20	80
10	TU	HTCAPUP	24	20	24	29	97
11	ZHW	KTCKL	20	15	20	29	84
TOTAL SCORE							964
MEAN							87.63

*Information : PRO (pronunciation), VOC (vocabulary), GRAM (grammar), FLU (fluency).

Table 3.13 Score of the test by rater II (Researcher)

NO	STUDENTS NAMES CODE	TOPIC CODE	RATER II (RESEARCHER)				SCORE
			PRO	VOC	GRAM	FLUE	
			18-25	12-20	12-25	12-30	
1	AR	HTMLC	21	18	22	26	87
2	AKI	HTMCS	24	20	24	28	96
3	AA	HTDTUP	22	19	23	27	91
4	AK	HTCR	23	19	23	27	92
5	BAP	HTMMUP	22	18	23	25	88
6	MZK	HTCH	20	16	20	23	79
7	RGAB	HTUP	20	15	20	21	76
8	RAD	HTUPTCP	20	17	22	24	83
9	TAG	HTCLF	19	16	19	21	75
10	TU	HTCAPUP	24	19	24	27	94
11	ZHW	KTCKL	21	17	22	24	84
TOTAL SCORE							945
MEAN							85.90

*Information : PRO (pronunciation), VOC (vocabulary), GRAM (grammar), FLU (fluency).

Table 3.14 Final score of the test by rater I and rater II

NO	Students' Names Code	FINAL SCORE		
		Score RI	Score RII	Mean Score
1	AR	93	87	90
2	AKI	96	96	96
3	AA	99	91	95
4	AK	98	92	95
5	BAP	80	88	84
6	MZK	79	79	79
7	RGAB	78	76	77
8	RAD	80	83	81.5

9	TAG	80	75	77.5
10	TU	97	94	95.5
11	ZHW	84	84	84
	TOTAL SCORE	964	945	954.5
	FINAL MEAN SCORE	87.63	85.90	86.77

Based on the comparative final score of the speaking test above, to know the students' speaking achievement at the third grade of SMK Plus Melati Samarinda, researcher used the Mean score with the formula below:

$$\begin{aligned}
 M &= \frac{\sum x}{N} \\
 &= \frac{954.5}{11} \\
 &= 86.77
 \end{aligned}$$

Based on the result of analyze above, the Mean score of the students' speaking achievement especially in telling procedural is 86.77. It means the third grade students' speaking achievement is "Very Good". It is on the range between 85-94. Then the researcher determined percentage for each score of final score of students' speaking test base on criteria with the formula as follow:

$$P = \frac{fx}{N} \times 100\%$$

Table 3.15 Table of frequency and percentage of speaking test score

No	Score Range	Criteria	Frequency	Percentage
1	95-100	A = Excellent	4	36.36 %

2	85-94	B+ = Very Good	1	9.09 %
3	80-84	B = Good	3	27.27 %
4	71-79	B- = Fair	3	27.27 %
5	65-70	C = Weak	0	0 %

Based on table above, it can be seen that there is no students who got “weak” criteria or 0%. Three students who got “fair” criteria are 27.27%. Three students who got “good” criteria are 27.27%. One student who got “very good” criteria is 9.09% and four students who got “excellent” criteria are 36.36%.

In conclusion, based on data analysis above, it showed that students’ speaking achievement especially in telling procedural at the third grade of SMK Plus Melati Samarinda is “very good”. It is obviously indicated by the students’ mean score of 86.77 which categorize as “very good” score on range 85-94. Based on the table criteria of students’ achievement there are 4 students who got score between 95-100 (Excellent), 1 student who got score between 85-94 (Very Good), 3 students who got score between 80-84 (Good), 3 students who got score between 71-79 (Fair), and there is no student who got score 65-70 (Poor).