## CHAPTER IV

## RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Concerning with the statement of the problems, in this chapter the researcher would like to describe and analyze the findings during the research process conducted at MA Assa'diyah Bangil. It intends to answer the problems of the study. In findings, the researcher describes the process of calculating and presenting result of the data. Furthermore, in the discussion the researcher deduces from the research findings.

## A. Research Findings

The researcher had done the research and had gotten the complete data from the research instrument included test. To gain the objectives of the research, the researcher had analyzed the data systematically and accurately. The data then analyzed in order to make conclusion about the objective of the study. The purpose of findings is to answer research question in chapter one.

## 1. Students Pre-test Score

| No. | Name | Score |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | Aulia | 80 |
| 2 | Choirul Nisak | 20 |
| 3 | Ikfi Masrurina | 60 |
| 4 | Linda Rodiatul Azizah | 20 |
| 5 | Masrikhan | 60 |
| 6 | M. Ilham Nur F. | 20 |
| 7 | M. Vanani | 40 |
| 8 | Nur Hidayati | 60 |
| 9 | Nurul Hidayati | 40 |
| 10 | Ririn Nadya | 40 |
| 11 | Roudlotul Baridah | 40 |
| 12 | Sri Wahyuni | 40 |
| 13 | Utiya Laras Wati | 60 |
| 14 | Wakhid | 40 |

Table 4.1

From the table 4.1, there are 14 students; 10 girls and 4 boys. The score of the students around 20 until $80 ; 3$ students got score 20,6 students got 40 ,
score 60 for 4 students, and only a student got score 80 . Those score are gotten from the students before they got treatment about the material. In the table, lots of students got score 40. In rating scale (see Appendix 2), score 40 is POOR level. Just one student who included GOOD level, that is a student who got score 80. There are no students who got EXCELLENT level (score100).

## 2. Students Post-test Score

| No. | Name | Post-test |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | Aulia | 100 |
| 2 | Choirul Nisak | 60 |
| 3 | Ikfi Masrurina | 80 |
| 4 | Linda Rodiatul Azizah | 60 |
| 5 | Masrikhan | 80 |
| 6 | M. Ilham Nur F. | 60 |
| 7 | M. Vanani | 60 |
| 8 | Nur Hidayati | 100 |
| 9 | Nurul Hidayati | 60 |
| 10 | Ririn Nadya | 80 |
| 11 | Roudlotul Baridah | 60 |
| 12 | Sri Wahyuni | 60 |
| 13 | Utiya Laras Wati | 80 |
| 14 | Wakhid | 60 |

Table 4.2
The table above presents the score after the researcher treat the material to the students about role play activity. After they got treatment, tehere are
no students who got score 20 (VERY POOR level) and 40 (POOR level). More than half of students got score 60 (AVERAGE level). There are also students who got EXCELLENT score, although only two students.

## 3. Students Score Improvement

| No. | Name | Pre-test | Post-test | Improvement |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | No |
| 1 | Aulia | 80 | 100 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 2 | Choirul Nisak | 20 | 60 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3 | Ikfi Masrurina | 60 | 80 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 4 | Linda Rodiatul Azizah | 20 | 60 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 5 | Masrikhan | 60 | 80 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 6 | M. Ilham Nur F. | 20 | 60 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 7 | M. Vanani | 40 | 60 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 8 | Nur Hidayati | 60 | 100 | $\sqrt{ }$ |  |
| 9 | Nurul Hidayati | 40 | 60 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 10 | Ririn Nadya | 40 | 80 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 11 | Roudlotul Baridah | 40 | 60 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 12 | Sri Wahyuni | 40 | 60 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 13 | Utiya Laras Wati | 60 | 80 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 14 | Wakhid | 40 | 60 | $\checkmark$ |  |

Table 4.3

The table shows about the improvement of the students' score in pre-test and post-test. All of the students can improve their score from pre-test to
post-test. There are students' score that can improve until two level; three students that got score from 20 'VERY POOR' to 60 ‘AVERAGE' (student 2, student 4, and student 6), a students that got score from 60 'AVERAGE' to 100 'EXCELLENT' (student 8), and a student got score 40 'POOR' to 80 'GOOD' (student 10). Others, they can improve their score only one level.

## 4. Ratio (Comparison) Students Score Percentages

| Score | Percentages <br> Pre-test | Percentages <br> Post-test |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20 | $21 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| 40 | $43 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| 60 | $29 \%$ | $57 \%$ |
| 80 | $7 \%$ | $29 \%$ |
| 100 | $0 \%$ | $14 \%$ |

Table 4.4

As seen in the table 4.4, there are differences in students score percentages. In pre-test, $21 \%$ students got score 20 and there are no students that got score 20 in post-test. In pre-test, $43 \%$ students got score 40 , and there are also no students who got that score. Score 60, there are $29 \%$ students in pre-test, and $57 \%$ in post-test. Score 80, there is only $7 \%$
students who got it in pre-test, and $29 \%$ in post-test. For the excellent score, there are no students who got score 100 , and there are $14 \%$ students in posttest.

## 5. Output Data

NPar Tests
/WILCOXON=VAR00001 WITH VAR00002 (PAIRED) /MISSING ANALYSIS.
[DataSet0]
Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test
Ranks

|  |  | N | Mean Rank | Sum of Ranks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| VAR00002 - | Negative Ranks | $0^{\mathrm{a}}$ | .00 | .00 |
| VAR00001 | Positive Ranks | $14^{\mathrm{b}}$ | 7.50 | 105.00 |
|  | Ties | $0^{\mathrm{c}}$ |  |  |
|  | Total | 14 |  |  |

a. VAR00002 < VAR00001
b. VAR00002 > VAR00001
c. VAR00002 $=$ VAR00001

## Table 4.5

Output Ranks above present the comparison of the students' score in pretest and post-test. As seen in the table, there are Negative Ranks, Positive Ranks, and Ties. Negative Ranks show that there are no students' score after treatment lower than before treatment. Positive Ranks show that all of the students' score after treatment higher than before treatment. Ties show that there are no students' score after and before treatment are same.

## Test Statistics ${ }^{\text {b }}$

|  | VAR00002 - |
| :---: | :---: |
| VAR00001 |  |
| Z | $-3.416^{\mathrm{a}}$ |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | .001 |

a. Based on negative ranks.
b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 4.6

Test Statistics show the result of Wilcoxon test, from the test got the significance value $0,001(p<0,05)$. So the conclusion is "There is significant difference of students' score before treatment and after treatment."

## B. DISCUSSIONS

In this part, this research addressed some discussion toward two areas; reflecting on the research problems, interpreting findings, and integrating findings with theoretical framework. For more detail about the discussion, it can be seen in the next explanation.

## 1. Reflecting on the Research Problem

Reflecting on the research problems contained of result to answer research problem have been discussed in Chapter I. The question namely:

Is there any significant improvement of speaking skills after the implementation of role play technique?

From the Table 4.3, seen that all of the students' score are improves. By using Role play activity. They can improve their speaking skill, especially in pronunciation. From the Table 4.4, the rating scales of the students before treatment are start from VERY POOR until GOOD. However, after treatment in post-test their rating scales are improved from AVERAGE until EXCELLENT.

## 2. Interpreting Findings

In comparison students score percentages (Table 4.4), there is any significant improvement. Score 20 in pre-test is $21 \%$ and there are no students that got it in post-test. It's mean that there are no students that in VERY POOR level. Score 40 in pre-test is $43 \%$ and there are no students in POOR level after treatment. Score 60 in pre-test is $29 \%$ and improved become $57 \%$. More half of students are in AVERAGE level after they got treatment. Score 80 (GOOD level), in pre-test only $7 \%$ or a student who can got that score, however in posttest can improve become $29 \%$. The last score is 100 . Before treatment, there are no students that got it. After treatment there is $14 \%$ (two students) can get EXCELLENT score. It can be concluded that before treatment of students' score around 20 until 80 . But the mean of students' score are 40 (POOR) and 60 (AVERAGE). After treatment, their scores are improved become 60 until 100 (AVERAGE until EXCELLENT level). However, the mean of students' score are 60 (AVERAGE) and 80 (GOOD). To more clearly, it can be seen in the chart picture below:
a. Mean of Pre-test Score Chart


Picture 4.1
b. Mean of Post-test Score Chart


Picture 4.2

## 3. Integrating Findings with Theoretical Framework.

In Table 4.5, Positive Rank show that the score of 14 students in posttest are higher than pre-test, it means that $100 \%$ students can improve their score. Exactly they can improve the aspect of speaking assessment as pronunciation (see Appendix 2). However, beside their pronunciations are improved, after the treatment using role play, it can create an active learning environment. It can encourage students to empathize with the position and feelings of others. ${ }^{35}$ Role-play is also fun and motivating for them. It provides the chance for quieter students to express themselves in a more forthright way and the world of the classroom is broadened to include the outside world, thus offering a much wider range of language opportunities. ${ }^{36}$

[^0]
[^0]:    ${ }^{35}$ Lori Jarvis, et.al, "Role-Playing as a Teaching Strategy". Staff Development and Presentation, 2002, pp. 4.
    ${ }^{36}$ M. Aliakbari, - B. Jamalvandi, "The Impact of 'Role Play' on Fostering EFL Learners' Speaking Ability; a Task-Based Approach". Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics, 2010, pp. 20 .

