

CHAPTER IV

DESCRIPTION OF THE RESEARCH

A. Data Description

In order to know the result of the test, the writer provided the score of students which was gained from the test conducted in pre-test and post-test in a table and in order to make the result of the test clearer the writer also provided the comparison table to show the differences between students score in pre-test table and post-test table.

The following table is the table of students score in pre-test which known also as the result of students' speaking score before being taught using "*Find Someone Who*" game.

Table 4.1

Students Speaking Score

The Score of Students Pre-test (X)

NO	Name	Pre-test (X)
1	AAB	33
2	AAPP	49
3	AI	37
4	BA	50
5	BRS	61
6	DF	33
7	DPO	56
8	ETM	50
9	FAA	33
10	GMS	46
11	IFGR	65
12	JAA	37

NO	Name	Pre-test (X)
13	JRS	33
14	KA	48
15	MAA	49
16	MNS	44
17	MV	44
18	NDSR	43
19	NMR	46
20	NNA	65
21	PSF	34
22	SA	65
23	SBKI	71
24	SP	50
25	WA	50

From the table above can be seen that the lowest score of pre-test was 33; meanwhile the highest score of pre-test was 71. And the mean of pre-test was 47,68. In pre-test the highest frequencies of score which occurs four times: 33 and 50 two times : 37, 44, 46, and 49 three times: 65 and six lowest frequencies of score which only occur once there are: 34, 43, 48, 56 and 61. Furthermore, in order to find out the differences between students score, the writer showed the result of students' post-test or the test which conducted after the students being taught using "*Find Someone Who*" game in the following table:

Table 4.2

Students Speaking Score

The Score of Students Post-test (Y)

NO	Name	Post-test (Y)
1	AAB	33
2	AAPP	65
3	AI	52
4	BA	55
5	BRS	50
6	DF	61
7	DPO	69
8	ETM	57
9	FAA	57
10	GMS	46
11	IFGR	69
12	JAA	73

NO	Name	Post-test (Y)
13	JRS	50
14	KA	65
15	MAA	65
16	MNS	55
17	MV	53
18	NDSR	63
19	NMR	61
20	NNA	73
21	PSF	50
22	SA	73
23	SBKI	80
24	SP	61
25	WA	53

From the table of post-test above can be seen that the lowest score of post-test was 33; whereas the highest score of post-test was 80 which indicates that there are some improvement in the score of post-test. The mean of post-test was 59,56. In post-test the highest frequency of score which occurs three times: 50, 61, 65, and 73 two times: 53, 55, 57, and 69. and the lowest frequencies of score which only occur once there are: 33, 46, 52, 63 and 80.

B. Data Analysis

The data which gained from pre-test and post-test will be calculated in order to find out the mean differences between the score from pre-test which taken before the students were given the treatment using "*Find Someone Who*" game and the score from post-test which taken after students were given the treatment using "*Find Someone Who*" game. The following table will show the average score that occur between pre-test and post-test:

Table 4.3*Gained Score of Students' Pre-test and Post-test*

**The Comparison between the Score of Pre-test (X) and the Score of
Post-test (Y)**

NO	NAME	X	Y	D =X-Y	D² = (X-Y)²
1	AAB	33	33	0	0
2	AAPP	49	65	-16	256
3	AI	37	52	-15	225
4	BA	50	55	-5	25
5	BRS	61	50	11	121
6	DF	33	61	-28	784
7	DPO	56	69	-13	169
8	ETM	50	57	-7	49
9	FAA	33	57	-24	576
10	GMS	46	46	0	0
11	IFGR	65	69	-4	16
12	JAA	37	73	-36	1296
13	JRS	33	50	-17	289
14	KA	48	65	-17	289
15	MAA	49	65	-16	256
16	MNS	44	55	-11	121
17	MV	44	53	-9	81
18	NDSR	43	63	-20	400
19	NMR	46	61	-15	225
20	NNA	65	73	-8	64
21	PSF	34	50	-16	256
22	SA	65	73	-8	64
23	SBKI	71	80	-9	81
24	SP	50	61	-11	121
25	WA	50	53	-3	9
N =25		ΣX=1192	ΣY=1489	ΣD = -297	Σ D²= 5773

This table shows that the result $\sum D = -297$ and $\sum D^2 = 5773$

NOTES:

X : Score Pre test

Y : Score Post test

D : Difference between variable X and Y.

C. The Analysis of X and Y Variable of Experimental Class

From the result $\sum D$ and $\sum D^2$ it is mean standard difference of score between X variable and Y variable determining standard deviation (SD_D) with the formula:

$$\begin{aligned} SD_D &= \sqrt{\frac{\sum D^2}{N} - \left(\frac{\sum D}{N}\right)^2} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{5773}{25} - \left[\frac{-297}{25}\right]^2} \\ &= \sqrt{230,92 - (-11,88)^2} \\ &= \sqrt{230,92 - 141,1344} \\ &= \sqrt{89,7856} \\ &= \mathbf{9,48} \end{aligned}$$

To find out the Mean of differences (MD) between variable X and Y, the research used the formula:

$$\begin{aligned} M_D &= \frac{\sum D}{N} \\ &= \frac{-297}{25} \\ &= \mathbf{-11,88} \end{aligned}$$

After gaining the result $SD_D = 9,48$ the writer calculated the standard error from mean of differences (SE_{MD}) between variable X and Y, by using formula:

$$\begin{aligned}
 SE_{MD} &= \frac{SD_D}{\sqrt{N-1}} \\
 &= \frac{9,48}{\sqrt{25-1}} \\
 &= \frac{9,48}{\sqrt{24}} \\
 &= \frac{9,48}{4,90} \\
 &= \mathbf{1,93}
 \end{aligned}$$

The last procedure of the calculation is determining the result of t_o (t observation) of the test by the formula:

$$\begin{aligned}
 t_o &= \frac{M_D}{SE_{MD}} \\
 &= \frac{-11,88}{1,93} \\
 &= \mathbf{-6,16}
 \end{aligned}$$

The result (-6,16) indicates that there was a differences of degree as much as (-6,16) regardless the minus for does not indicates the negative score.

Then to complete the result of the research, the writer finds out the degree of freedom (df) with the formula:

$$df = N-1$$

$$df = 25-1$$

$$df = 24$$

In consequence, based on t_{table} $df = 24$ at level significant 1% and 5% are: t_{table} at significant level 1% = 2,80

t_{table} at significant level 5% = 2,06

In consequence, the result was $2,06 < 6,16 > 2,80$ and it showed that t_0 (t-observation) was higher than t_{table} .

D. Hypotheses

Before concluding the final result from data calculation process, the writer will interpret t_o (t-observation) using the following formulation:

- 1) Formulating alternative hypothesis (H_a): there is significant difference between X and Y
- 2) Formulating null hypothesis (H_0): there is no significant deference between X and Y

The formulations that will be mentioned bellow are the formulation of t_0 hypothesis:

- 1) If t -observation result is higher than t -table ($t_0 > t_{table}$) the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted and the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected. It means that there is significant difference between X and Y.
- 2) If t -observation result is lower than t -table ($t_0 < t_{table}$) the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is rejected and the null hypothesis (H_0) is accepted. It means that there is no significant difference between X and Y.

After completing the calculation process the writer found that the value of t_0 is 6,16 and $df = 24$. In order to know whether the result is significant or not it is necessary to take a glance to t_{table} .

Based on t_{table} $df = 24$ at significant level 1% = 2,80 and 5% = 2,06. In consequence, the significant value indicate that $t_0 > t_{table}$ or $6,16 > 2,80 > 2.06$ thus it means that H_a (alternative hypothesis) is accepted and H_0 (null hypothesis) is rejected or there is significant deference between the result of pre-test and posttest.

From the process of data analysis and discussion above can be seen that the result showed t_0 is higher than t_{table} . it means that there is a significant change in students' speaking score after receiving the treatment using "*Find Someone Who*" game therefore the writer interpreted that the use of "*Find Someone Who*" game is effective for increasing students' speaking skill.

E. Data Interpretation

After calculating and analyzing the data, the writer found that the result showed that the use of "*Find Someone Who*" game can increasing students speaking skill. The result was proven by the improvement of students' willingness to speak in the target language in order to complete their task. Moreover, students seemed enjoying the activity and felt excited for doing the task and for circling around the class to seek for information from their friends. In addition, students felt more comfortable and unburden while communicating in the target language.

This condition contradicts students' condition and response in the pre-test or before the treatment was given to the students. Moreover, in pre-test, most of students showed difficulties in communicating and expressing themselves in the target language; most of them doing the conversation with their friend like reading conversation dialogue and some of them was very halting and can't be said knowing what to say and how to say something in the target language.

On the contrary, in the post-test most of students felt more comfortable to communicate and more creative for developing the topic which is discussed with their pairs. The evidence of students speaking skill improvement can be seen from the differences between students' pre-test score and post-test score. In pre-test students lower score is 33 and students higher score is 71 and in the post-test students lower score is 33 and students higher score is 80. Even though, some students' score still remained the same but most of students speaking score and performance in post-test were better than their score and performance in the pretest.

In consequence, the analysis above explains that "*Find Someone Who*" game effective to increase students speaking skill in the seventh grade of SMPN 1 Kelapa Dua Tangerang. Thus in fact, this study proved the theory of game which stated that using game as a teaching technique can provide the opportunity for practicing the target language and bring joyful feeling for the learners during learning proces.

Moreover, this study also proved that "*Find Someone Who*" game has a lot of advantages over language learning process especially

for teaching speaking such as making students comfortable to communicate in the target language, increasing students cooperativeness and contribution during learning process, and making language learning process more communicative. The research finding has proved Wright *et al* explanation about the advantage of “*Find Someone Who*” game. The result also uphold their argumentation that FSW game is focused on inviting students with challenging activity rather than inviting them through competitive activity that brought negative back-wash effect on students performance. Based on the interpretation above the writer concluded that “*Find Someone Who*” game is effective to increase students’ speaking skill.

