

CHAPTER IV

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents finding and discussion of the research. The finding describes into the general description of the research area, teacher figures, students condition, and result of the research.

A. School Profile

1. General Description of the Research Area

a. School Identity

Name of School : SMK TI Labbaika Samarinda
School Address : JL. KH. Harun Nafsi Gg. Tugul
The Village : Rapak Dalam
District : Samarinda Sebrang
City : Samarinda
Province : East Borneo

b. Headmaster

Full Name : Ahmad Ade Sulaiman, S.Ag.,S.Pd.,M.Si
Department : State Administration
Official : Leader Yayasan Pendidikan Labbaika
Number : 001.3.05/YPL/NSK/III/2009
Date : March,05, 2009

TMT : March,05,2009

c. Vision and Mission of School

a) Vision of SMK TI Labbaika Samarinda

“form a generation of young people who have competent, intelligent, faithful and pious as well as responsible”.

b) Mission of SMK TI Labbaika Samarinda

- Hosted the learning competency-based with rests on the management quality and the needs of the market.
- Produce graduates quality professional as well who have good morals
- Produce graduates are able to compete good at the national and international
- Develop function of SMK as an institution forming skill student
- Make a religious as aspiration work and disciplined as slogan success

2. The Teacher Figures

Table. IV
Teacher Figures at SMK TI Labbaika Samarinda

No	Name	M/F	Position
1	Ahmad Ade Sulaiman, S.Ag.,S.Pd.,M.Si	M	Headmaster
2	Adlan Fadillah, S.Pd	M	Teacher
3	Andri, S.Pd	M	Teacher
4	Bayu Maulidani, S.Pd	M	Teacher
5	Diyah Ayu Dwi Anggraeni, S.Pd	F	Teacher
6	Eka Purnamasari, S.Pd	F	Teacher
7	Iin Safitri Surya, S.Pd	F	Teacher
8	Khairun Nisa, S.Pd	F	Teacher
9	Lita Sayyidah Roffah, S.Pd	F	Teacher

10	Lydiawati, S.Pd	F	Teacher
11	Mita Antasari, S.Pd	F	Teacher
12	Muhammad Arisandi, S.kom	M	Teacher
13	Nazibullah Rachman, S.Kom	M	Teacher
14	Nur Hasanah, S.Pd	F	Teacher
15	Nur Ramadhani Karimah, S.Pd	F	Teacher
16	Prendik Kristanto, S.kom	M	Teacher
17	Paridawati, S.Pd	F	Teacher
18	Rahimah, S.Pd	F	Teacher
19	Rusmiati Ami Aslamiyah, S.Pd	F	Teacher
20	Siti Suleha, S.kom	F	Teacher

3. Students Condition

Table V
Total of students (academic year 2017/2018)

Class	Σ
Class X	150
Class XI	101
Class XII	72
Sum Σ	323

B. Research Findings

1. The Result of the Research

- a. Pretest result of second grade students at SMK TI Labbaika Samarinda

Table VI
Pre-test result of experiment group and control group

Samples of experiment group	Score	Samples of control group	Score
1	65	1	60
2	55	2	60
3	55	3	55
4	65	4	73
5	50	5	55

6	60	6	65
7	60	7	60
8	60	8	59
9	55	9	60
10	60	10	60
11	76	11	81
12	65	12	65
13	60	13	60
14	74	14	49
15	65	15	65
16	74	16	74
17	65	17	65
18	67	18	67
19	80	19	65
20	60	20	60
21	79	21	79
22	55	22	55
23	55	23	55
24	55	24	55
25	64	25	64
26	59	26	59
27	75	27	75
28	60	28	60
29	75	29	66
30	55	30	55
31	65	31	75
32	70	32	75
33	75	33	75
34	70	34	75
SUM	2184	SUM	2171

1) Mean score of experimental group:

$$M_1 = \frac{\sum x}{N}$$

$$= \frac{2184}{34}$$

$$= 64.8$$

2) Mean score of control group:

$$\begin{aligned}
 M_2 &= \frac{\sum X}{N} \\
 &= \frac{2171}{34} \\
 &= 63.8
 \end{aligned}$$

The data above shows the students' pre-test scores of the experimental class and the control class. The test was given in the first meeting before given treatment. Both the experimental class and the control class got 50 as the poor score of pre-test, and 75 as the pair score. Besides, the mean score of experimental class is 64.8 and the control class is 63.8 Hence, it can be concluded that the pre-test scores of the experimental class and the control class seemed to be equivalent.

b. Posttest result of second grade students at SMK TI Labbaika Samarinda

Table. VII. Posttest Result of Experiment Group and Control Group

Samples of experiment group	Score	Samples of control group	Score
1	95	1	70
2	90	2	75
3	60	3	85
4	100	4	75
5	90	5	85
6	100	6	60
7	100	7	70

8	85	8	84
9	85	9	85
10	90	10	85
11	100	11	70
12	90	12	75
13	60	13	70
14	80	14	79
15	80	15	80
16	85	16	85
17	100	17	75
18	91	18	80
19	90	19	75
20	97	20	73
21	94	21	74
22	98	22	78
23	65	23	75
24	100	24	70
25	85	25	85
26	70	26	85
27	100	27	85
28	90	28	79
29	94	29	84
30	90	30	75
31	75	31	70
32	90	32	80
33	70	33	85
34	90	34	80
SUM	2979	SUM	2641

1) Mean score of experimental group:

$$M_1 = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$

$$\frac{2979}{34}$$

$$87.6$$

2) Mean score of control group

$$M_2 = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$

$$= \frac{2641}{34}$$

$$= 77.6$$

The data above were the post-test scores of experimental class and control class after given treatment. The mean score of the experimental class is 87.6 and the control class is 77.6. Therefore, it can be seen that the experimental class has higher significant score than the control class.

2. Data analysis

After the analysis of two mean scores, it is known that the mean score between experimental group and control group was different, students in experimental group got better result than the students in control group and to examine hypothesis whether it was accepted or rejected, the researcher used statistical data of t-test table for independent sample to calculate the standard error of different between two means.

Table .VIII
The Computation of the t-value for two sample mean

Students number	sector		X1	X2	X1 ²	X2 ²
	Var x1	Var x2				
1	95	70	1.44	-7.68	2.07	58.98
2	90	75	-3.56	-2.68	12.67	7.18
3	90	85	-3.56	7.32	12.67	53.58
4	100	75	6.44	-2.68	41.47	7.18
5	90	85	-3.56	7.32	12.67	53.58
6	100	60	6.44	-17.68	41.47	312.58
7	100	70	6.44	-7.68	41.47	58.98
8	89	84	-4.56	6.32	20.79	39.94
9	85	85	-8.56	7.32	73.27	53.58
10	90	85	-3.56	7.32	12.67	53.58
11	100	70	6.44	-7.68	41.47	58.98
12	90	75	-3.56	-2.68	12.67	7.18
13	95	70	1.44	-7.68	2.07	58.98
14	90	79	-3.56	1.32	12.67	1.74
15	90	80	-3.56	2.32	12.67	5.38
16	85	85	-8.56	7.32	73.27	53.58
17	100	75	6.44	-2.68	41.47	7.18
18	91	80	-2.56	2.32	6.55	5.38
19	90	75	-3.56	-2.68	12.67	7.18
20	97	73	3.44	-4.68	11.83	21.90
21	94	74	0.44	-3.68	0.19	13.54
22	98	78	4.44	0.32	19.71	0.10
23	90	75	-3.56	-2.68	12.67	7.18
24	100	70	6.44	-7.68	41.47	58.98
25	85	85	-8.56	7.32	73.27	53.58
26	95	85	1.44	7.32	2.07	53.58
27	100	85	6.44	7.32	41.47	53.58
28	94	79	0.44	1.32	0.19	1.74
29	94	84	0.44	6.32	0.19	39.94
30	95	75	1.44	-2.68	2.07	7.18
31	95	70	1.44	-7.68	2.07	58.98
32	90	80	-3.56	2.32	12.67	5.38
33	95	85	1.44	7.32	2.07	53.58
34	90	80	-3.56	2.32	12.67	5.38
SUM Σ	2979	2641	-9.04	-0.12	721.46	1339.44

$$t = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum x_1^2 + \sum x_2^2}{N(N-1)}}$$

$$t = \frac{87.6 - 77.6}{\sqrt{\frac{721.46 + 1339.44}{34(34-1)}}$$

$$t = \frac{10}{\sqrt{\frac{20609}{1122}}}$$

$$t = \frac{10}{\sqrt{18.368}}$$

$$t = \frac{10}{4.2857904755}$$

$$t = 2.33$$

The researcher found that the result of this research show the t-test is 3.64 while t-table with degree of freedom (df) with the formula:

$$Df = N_1 + N_2 - 2 = 34 + 34 - 2 = 66$$

Level of significance $t_{table} 1\% = 3,277$ and $5\% = 1.690$

The computation was done in this research, the value of t_{test} formula is 3.64. The score is higher than the value of $t_{table} 1.690$ at the 5 % of level significance of $(3.64 > 1.690)$. The result of t-test indicated that the alternative hypothesis has been formulated in this research is effective to improve students' speaking ability towards the second grade students of SMK TI Labbaika Samarinda in academic year 2017/2018.

C. Discussion

In this section, the researcher discussed the research summarizes the hypotheses. The research is held to answer the question whether the use of picture series is effective to improve students' speaking ability towards the second grade of SMK TI Labbaika Samarinda.

To prove the hypothesis, the data obtained in experimental class and control class are calculated by using t_{test} formula with assumption as follows:

1. If $t_o > t_{\text{table}}$, the Null Hypothesis (H_o) is rejected and alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted. It is proven that picture series is effective to improve students' speaking ability.
2. If $t_o < t_{\text{table}}$, the Null hypothesis (H_o) is accepted and alternative hypothesis (H_a) is rejected. It is proven that picture series is not effective to improve students' speaking ability.

According to the analysis of the results above, there is a significant difference between the post-test score in experimental class and control class. The results show that the experimental class got higher post-test score than the control class. Thus, there is a significant measurement score in the experimental class and the control class. The data are $M_1=87.6$, $M_2=77.6$, $X_1^2=721.46$, $X_2^2=13339.44$, $N(N-1)=1112$, $DF = 66$ with level significance $t_{\text{table}} 5\%=1.690$. The result reports that the t_{test} is higher than t_{table} ($3.64 > 1.690$). It can be defined that teaching speaking ability by using picture series is more effective

than teaching speaking ability without picture series since alternative hypothesis (H_a) was accepted and the null hypothesis was rejected. In other words, teaching speaking ability by using picture series gives positive influence on the students' speaking ability of the second grade in SMK TI Labbaika Samarinda.