CHAPTER IV
THE RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter I explained about the entire data and fact I found during the research held. In the first section I described about pre test on experiment and control class, and following explanation was post test in both experiment and control class. This chapter focused on the data which have been collected and analyzed. I gave the description of the facts, proves, examples, and statistic analysis include the explanation of the application the method, how it can influence students’ speaking ability. There were some analysis that have been held such as homogeneity analysis of pre test and the post test, Normality analysis, and hypothesis verification. In the next discussion I will describe the facts above that relates with this study.

4.1 Research Finding

4.1.1 The Data Description of the Pre Test

Pre test has been conducted on 21st of April 2012 and the test was given to find out the students’ ability in speaking skill (see appendix result of pre test). The test was simple, where the students made into several group and discussed the topic given (see appendix topics) and I used camcorder to gain their speaking skill. Post test was given before the treatment process, the student talked in group and after that they would present their idea, opinion, suggestion, or even critics about the topic. There were 4 groups had been formed in the pre test, and all of
them discussed same topic “why would I be in this college, especially English department?” and the result pre test of will be presented as follows:

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>The Data</th>
<th>Experiment Class</th>
<th>Control Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The lowest score</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The highest score</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The mean of score</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Standard deviation of score</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>6.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The range of score (r)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The amount of class (k)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The wide of class interval (p)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The description of the result of students' score above will be clear by looking at the table of relative frequency of students speaking ability on the next page.

**Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Class Interval</th>
<th>Frequency Absolute</th>
<th>Frequency Relative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experiment Class</td>
<td>Control Class</td>
<td>Experiment Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>63 – 65</td>
<td>57– 60</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>66 – 68</td>
<td>61– 64</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>69 – 71</td>
<td>65– 68</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>72 – 74</td>
<td>69– 72</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>75– 77</td>
<td>73– 76</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table shows us that in experiment class, students who get score in the range of 63 – 65 were 3 students, 66 – 68 was 3 students, 69 – 71 were 5 students, 72 – 74 were 3 students, and 75– 77 were 3 students. So based on the data above, I conclude that most of the students’ score of pre test in experiment class is in the range of 69 – 71, it is 29.41%.

In control class, there were 4 students who got score in the range of 57 – 60; 2 students in the range of 61 – 64; 2 students in the range of 65 – 68; 6 students in the range of 69 – 72; and in the range of 73– 76 I got 4 students. I found that most of the students’ score of pre test in control class was in the range of 69 – 72, it is 33.33%

Furthermore, I present the score of students’ ability in pre test base on speaking components as described below:

**Table 3**

*The pre test score of speaking components on experiment and control class*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Speaking Components</th>
<th>Score Maximum</th>
<th>Total Score of</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Difference = 2.92**

*Note:*

EC = experiment Class  
CC = control class

Based on the result of previous, I can conclude that, in experiment class
the total score of pronunciation was 239 (70.21%), Grammar was 225 (66.96%),
Vocabulary was 224 (65.88%), Fluency was 237 (69.70%) and comprehension
was 260 (76.47%).

In control class shows that the total score of pronunciation was 242
(67.22%), Grammar was 239 (66.38%), Vocabulary was 234 (65.00%), Fluency
was 230 (63.88%) and comprehension was 257 (71.38%).

It will be clearer by looking at the polygon graphic on the next page.

**Figure 1**

*Polygon graphic of speaking component of pre test of experiment and control*

be in this college?” Both class could answer and response with varies way, but
there are some standards which have been defined in scoring and grading as have
been mentioned in chapter III collecting data. So the students’ answer must be
appropriate with the standard; 2) the result of pre test for both experiment and control class was close or quite similar, because the highest score was same 75, but for the entire score, experiment class little bit better than control class, for example on mean score experiment class was 70, while control class 67.3, for speaking competence the different between both if class was 2.92 where experiment class higher than control class, (69.70: 66.77). Next following description will be about post test.

4.1.2 The Data Description of the Post Test

The aim of Post test conducted is to find out the result of the method which has been implemented on experiment class, and it was the most important result of this study. Post test conducted two times first was on twenty three of Mei 2012 for Experiment Class and second was first of June 2012 for control class and it was given after eight times treatment of two stay two stray method. For more details see appendix video of post test. In this test I gave both of the class experiment and control class several questions which divided into several section (see appendix of post test) all the questions have been studied and discussed in treatment process. All the materials given were all about the components of speaking such as grammar, vocabulary, expression, (see appendix). Post test was conducted using two stay two stray method, in other word they worked in group section and the score was in group grade. For the details here I present the result of post test in graphic and percentage form on the next page.
Table 4

The comparison of post test data of control class and experiment class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>The Data</th>
<th>Experiment Class</th>
<th>Control Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The lowest score</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The highest score</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The mean of score</td>
<td>89.05</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Standard deviation of score</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The range of score (r)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The amount of class (k)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The wide of class interval (p)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To make the data clearly, here I present the table of relative frequency and polygon graphic of students' speaking skills as follows:

Table 5

The interval relative frequency of post test of control class and experiment class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Class Interval</th>
<th>Frequency Absolute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experiment Class</td>
<td>Control Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>86–87</td>
<td>75–76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88-89</td>
<td>77–78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90–91</td>
<td>79–80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92–93</td>
<td>81–82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>93-94</td>
<td>83–84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows us that in experiment class, students who get score in the range 86 – 87 was 6 students, in the range 88-89 was 4 students, in the range of 90 – 91 was 3 students, and in the range of 93 – 94 was 1 student. I find that most of the students’ score of post test in experiment class was in the range of 86 – 87, it was 35.29%

In control class, there is 1 student who got score in the range of 75 – 76; 3
students in the range of 77–78; 7 student in the range of 79–80; 4 students in the range of 81–82; and 3 students in the range of 83–84. So I found that most of the students' score of post test in control class was in the range of 77–78, it was 38.88%.

Furthermore, I wrote the score of students' ability in post test base on speaking components as showed below:

**Table 6**

*The students of control and experiment class post test score in speaking component*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Speaking Components</th>
<th>Score Maximum</th>
<th>Total of Score</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>313</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The different between the both class was 9. The polygon score of speaking component on experiment and control class will be provided on the next page.

**Figure 2**

*Polygon graphic of speaking component in post test of experiment and control class*
I make comparison of the score between pre test and post test, on experiment and control class based on speaking components, and it is described at the table 7 on the next page

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Speaking Components</th>
<th>Presentation score of pre test</th>
<th>Presentation score of post test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>70.21</td>
<td>67.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7
The component of students’ average scores in speaking based on the speaking component pre test and post test.
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>66.96</td>
<td>66.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>65.88</td>
<td>65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>69.70</td>
<td>63.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>76.47</td>
<td>71.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>69.70</strong></td>
<td><strong>66.77</strong></td>
<td><strong>89.05</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.92</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the pre test the difference score between experiment and control class was only 2.92% and control class was higher than experiment class, but in post test the difference between them is 9% and experiment class was higher than control class. The increasing of experiment class is 20.75 and control class is 14.72. Those data and charts above have clearly shows that two stay two stray method has influenced on students’ speaking ability. The table above seems clearer by providing the polygon as shown on the next page.

*Figure 3*

*Polygon graphic of comparison students’ average score in speaking after applying paired storytelling method in teaching speaking*
experiment and control class. In pre test the highest score in experiment class was 76.47% and control class was 71.38%. Based on the polygon graphic above, the score in post test was change, on experiment class the score was 92.05% and control class was 83.05%. The importance point in post test section was the deference score between experiment and control class, whereas the score of experiment class was higher than control class. It means that the applying of two stay two stray method can influence toward students’ speaking ability.

To complete the data of the comparison score between experiment and control class easy to be understood, I present another graphic that show the result of pre test and post test. The following polygon graphic describes about the result of pre and post test on experiment and control class. It shows on the next page.

**Figure 4**

*Polygon of the students’ ability in speaking from pre test to post test both of experiment and control class*

![Polygon graphic](image)

Next explanation is about the analyses that have been held to support this research such as normality, homogeneity, and statically hypothesis of research.

**4.2 The Data Analysis**
4.2.1 Normality Analysis

The normality test held to find out what is the statistical kind used in hypothesis examination. If the data will be distributed as normal, parametric statically system is used, and if it does not we use non parametric statically system. In this study I used Liliefort test with realistic level on $\alpha = 0.05$. The test was based into two kinds of groups:

1. The examination of data on Experiment Class
2. Students’ Speaking Ability.

Here I present the result of the Normality Analysis of pre- test both on Experiment and Control Class

1. Data pre-test both of experiment and control class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Result of normality analysis</th>
<th>Experiment class</th>
<th>Control class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$\sum \gamma$</td>
<td>1185</td>
<td>1196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$\sum F(Zi)$</td>
<td>8.6177</td>
<td>8.1415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$\sum S(Zi)$</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$L_0$</td>
<td>0.0395</td>
<td>0.0517</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By the table normality analysis above, I found that $L_0$ of experiment class and control class were 0.0395 and 0.0517 (it shown in appendix 9 and 10). It was also found that $L_{list}$ of both experiment class and control class were 0.072 (it shown in appendix…), in level significance $\alpha=0.05$ and the criteria analysis were receiving $H_0$ if $L_0 < L_{list}$. Based on the criteria above, the result of analysis was $L_0 < L_{list}$ that was 0.0395 and 0.0517<0.072. Furthermore it could be concluded that the pre test data were normally distributed.

2. Post test both of experiment class and control class
The normality analysis data of post test of experiment and control class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Result of normality analysis</th>
<th>Experiment class</th>
<th>Control class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$\Sigma x$</td>
<td>1514</td>
<td>1441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$\Sigma f(Z_i)$</td>
<td>8.2870</td>
<td>8.2647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$\Sigma S(Z_i)$</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$L_0$</td>
<td>0.0575</td>
<td>0.0549</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By the table normality analysis above, I found that $L_0$ of experiment class and control class were 0.0575 and 0.0549 (it shown in appendix 11 and 12). It was also found that $L_{list}$ of both experiment class and control class were 0.072 (it shown in appendix), in level significance $\alpha=0.05$ and the criteria analysis was receiving $H_0$ if $L_0 < L_{list}$.

Based on the criteria above, we could show that $L_0 < L_{list}$ that was 0.0575 and 0.0549<0.072 furthermore it could be concluded that the post test data were normal distribution.

4.2.2 Homogeneity Analysis Sample

In homogeneity analysis I used Barlet testing. It used for knowing whether both of sample experiment and control class are homogeneity or not. The criteria as follows:

- Receive $H_0$ if $\hat{X}_{lis} < \hat{X}_{con}$ = both of sample homogeneity
- Refused $H_0$ if $\hat{X}_{lis} > \hat{X}_{con}$ = both of sample is not homogeneity

The steps of the homogeneity analysis (look appendix 11) and the result is showing by table bellows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Result of homogeneity analysis</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Variant of experiment class</td>
<td>6.183824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Variant of control class</td>
<td>4.526144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the table above shows that $\chi^2\text{count} = 1.3662$ from distribution list of chi quadrat for $\alpha = 0.05$ and $k = 2$, it got $t_l$.

So it could be compared that $r_{\text{count}} = 1.3662$ and $r_{\text{list}} = 1.730$, so $\chi_{\text{list}} > \chi_{\text{count}}$. It means that $H_0$ is received and both of sample experiment and control class was homogeneity. The hypothesis above only used to find out whether samples that I used were the same or variants. (see appendix)

4.3 Hypothesis verification

The hypothesis in this research is “the application of two stay two stray method can increase the students’ ability in speaking skill”. I found the value of the mean score, standard deviation, and numbers of samples of both experiment class and control class in post test or after applying treatment (two stay two stray method) as follows:

$\bar{X}_1 = 89.05$, $\bar{X}_2 = 80.05$, $n_1 = 17$, $n_2 = 18$, $S = 2.30$

These value were applied on t test formula in appendix and found that the standard deviation of both experiment class and control class in post test was $11.604909$ (appendix ).

The result would be presented in the following table on the next page.

---

Table 10

*The result of t-testing counting*
\[ t_{\text{list}} = t_{(1-\alpha/2)}(n_1+n_2-2) \rightarrow t_{(0.975)}(33) = 2.034515 \] so it means that \( t_{\text{count}} > t_{\text{list}} \)

so \( H_0 \) refused and \( H_1 \) is received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>t-count</th>
<th>t-list (( \alpha=0.05 ))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 + 18 - 2 = 33</td>
<td>35.11</td>
<td>2.034515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

\( N \) = the numbers of sample

\( df \) = degree of freedom = \((n_1 + n_2 - 2) = \)

\( t_{\text{count}} \) = the value obtained from the computation result of \( t \) -testing analysis

\( t_{\text{list}} \) = the value obtained from of statistic table of \( t \)-distribution at the level significance (\( \alpha = 0.05 \))

It could be concluded that the hypothesis of this research was accepted, because based on criteria that \( t_{\text{count}} \) is larger than \( t_{\text{list}} \) that is 35.11 > 2.03. Thus it could be concluded that the application of two stay two stray method could increase students’ speaking ability.

4.4 Discussion

In this section I explained about the treatment process, the procedures and the implementation of two stay two stray method. The data, facts, and findings will be discussed more in this section. Moreover, in this section i describe the
component of speaking which become my main instrument in getting the data such as pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension. Those components will be analyzed one by one, and also the increasing and percentage will be presented in this section. Therefore, it would be easy to be understood about the improving of student both experiment and control class. First discussion will be about the goal, sample, and the explanation of pre and post test of this research.

The objective of this study focuses on the implementation of two stay two stray method on increasing students' speaking ability in forth semester of English Department Gorontalo State University. I have managed the research into several steps that have been mentioned on the previous chapter, and it has been conducted for more than 1 month started from 21st of April-15th of June 2012. This research has been done in Forth Semester of English Department Gorontalo State University. There were two kinds of sample that I used in this research; they were Experiment and Control class because I used queasy experimental form of quantitative method of research. Experiment class is 17 students, they are in class A forth semester of English Department, and Control Class is 18 they are in class C. I implemented the two stay two stray method on Experiment Class and conventional method on control class.

This research was done into three phases; they were pre test, treatment and post test. It was done in both of control class and experiment class. In pre test I provide one same topic that they should discuss, and the topic was "why would
you be in this University especially English department?” I divided the students into 4 group and they share their idea, opinion, critics, by providing the facts, examples, and general things which support their idea about the topic. I used camcorder to gain the data of speaking ability. In treatment, I applied two stay two stray method, In this session, students formed in a group discussion use two stay two stay method, in the other words this stage was the main activity in learning process. The students worked together in a group two students of each group left their group to meet the other group two other students who left have a duty to their result of discussion for their guest Students come back and report their finding and discuss it with their own group. I gave treatment for eight times, so there are tens meetings include pre test and post test in both of experiment class and control class. For the control class I organized them into convensional class.

Post test given both to experiment and control class, and for the experiment class it was given after they got treatment 8 times. Post test instrument was the question which has relation with speaking components which divided several parts. For experiment class I managed them, to work in group as well as they did before using two stay two stray method, and control class only using conventional learning process.

I will describe those steps in the following section. So it will be clearly understood.
4.4.1 The Implementation of Two Stay Two Stray Method

In experiment class the learning process worked so fine, because the student learnt confidently without afraid for making any mistake. They feel so free to talk and to make opinion about the topic given. At the first of treatment the students were still worry, and lack of courage so it really influenced to their pronunciation production, but step by step it had decreased, and they all become so enthusiastic to learn every topic that I gave to them. In this process the experiment class became so colorful and full of new things in every learning process, because I always change the group and split them into different and vary students and the topic as well. As like mentioned in previous chapter that the method is really fun, and challenge it has proved in this research. I found that they are support each other, and investigated all the possibility that they can say or put into their opinion.

During the implementation process especially in treatment section, I gave them opportunity to solve the real problems that they faced in real life. Two students who walked to the other group brought and shared their problem that they faced and the two left students gave solution to the problems. It was amazing because most of them do not feel embarrass to share their problem. It shows that they have been trusted each other, and for sure it’s good in learning process.

Facts that I found were; 1) all the students were happy work in group 2); they got excited to discuss about the topics that I gave to them (see appendix topics); 3) they learnt fast especially to memorize the vocabulary of today 4); they
showed cooperative ways in learning process.

The more importance things in experiment class, I noticed the students situation in learning. They were really active in speaking practice, they were happy and learning with joyfull sometimes they gave corection each others if their friend were wrong, and also they were serious speaking in pairs. So it was easy for them to practice their english speaking.

In control class, I just organized them in conventional class. The students practiced speaking individually, so the class seemed not alive. I let them practice by their own selves, and I gave the corection if the students asking.

4.4.2 Students’ Speaking Ability

This section described about the speaking component and competence I have found during treatment process. In describing he students’ error I used initials instead of real name of the students. I used initials because privasi reason, to protect their privasi and to keep their confidencial exist. I described some mistakes and findings which indicates the progress in students’ speaking ability. The corrections found in treatment process which was eight times. The components that I am about to explain were: 1 pronunciation, 2, grammar, 3, vocabulary, 4, fluency, and 5, comprehension.

In finding the students competence in speaking skill, I gave them test namely pre test. The test was used to find out the basic students’ speaking ability, after that I gave treatment by applying two stay two stray method. I found some problems on speaking components, such as pronunciation, grammar vocabulary,
fluency, and comprehension. Therefore, on the further section I describe each components of speaking that was my main instrument in defying the students score both pre test and post test. First explanation is about the experiment class.

4.4.2.1 Experiment class

1. Pronunciation

In pronunciation there are some student’s errors because it was influenced by their mother tongue, such as:

1. In this case Sample fifteen was trying to say the word of girl which is the stress of this sound was ə (gal). However in his pronunciation he made ii sound, and it become “The giirl” instead. And second word that he said was bother with pronounce “bathr” while it should be “bathr”

2. “Prepestiv” (perspective) It was said by Sample twelve and some others samples, while the correct one is, “par’spestiv”

3. In this situation, Sample six was trying to give suggestion to her friend when I asked her to present her suggestion, and she said “try
and try” with the pronounce “tie..an tie..”, while it should be “tri and try”. Another mistake of pronunciation she made was the word actually. She pronounced it with “akcelly” while it should be “akchooooly”.

4. Sample eight and some others sample made same pronunciation on word suggestion. They pronounced it with “sujeson...” instead, while the correct is “so(g)jesCH on”. Another word was exactly, they said with “esacli...”. Whereas it should be “ig’zak(t)la”.

5. This situation Sample seven and her friends in same group, meant to say the words attend and favorite with the pronounce “atand” and “fafoeid” instead, while those words should be pronounced with “otend” and “fav(ə) rot”.

6. Sample eleven in his explanation pronounced words go and recycling with “gu” and “resikling”, where as the correct sound of those words should be “go” and “ra’sikeling”.

7. In stead of say “ di’vjd”, for divide word, she said it with “devided “.

In the post test I found that the students’ pronunciation increased because they could produce the correct sounds, even they also still having a little error. I realized that to be good in pronunciation we need much time and practice. The
data show that the average of students’ pronunciation in pre test was 70.21%, while in post test was 90.05 %. So it can conclude that students’ pronunciation increased 19%.

2. Grammar

I found some students’ errors on using grammar and most of the problems were the using of tenses, word order, and noun phrase, as describe follow:

1. In formalization stage of this method, Sample twelve presented the result of his discussion to the other group, and he said “we know that, the way is we have to find”. In this case, the better sentence that he should used was “the way is finding” because on grammar rule, the use of *is*, should be followed by noun, adjective, V plus *ing*, gerund or noun phrase which function as noun. He already said pronoun we, so it is not necessary to say it again.

2. In this situation, Sample nine wanted to give suggestion to Sample twelve’s question, she said “has to asked about the material”. In this case the grammar point was wrong, after to can not followed by second or third verb unless it’s a passive voice. What she meant was she wanted to explain that Sample twelve had asked to her about the material. Therefore the correct sentence was “has asked us the material, another mistake was ” they are too difficult”, while what she wanted to
said was "it is too difficult for them"

3. Sample twelve was trying to say that he and his friends have gone, but he made mistake by saying "I and my friend has gone", so the correct was "me and my friend have gone". As the subject is plural form, me and my friend so, have is appropriate word instead of has. Another mistake he mad was verb es.s form he mentioned "we should changes", while it should be "we should change" without s.

4. In discussion acidity I asked to Sample three about her response to previous group that have come to them, and she said "one of the suggestion is to make the girl love the man". The sentence above is not correct, because the subject was the girl so the verb should be added with s. Therefore, the correct sentence is "one of the suggestion is to make the girl loves the man"

5. Sample six said a sentence "he is get the solution", this sentence is wrong because its a simple present form, as the subject is he then the verbs must be added by s, otherwise she changes the sentence into present continues "he is getting the solution" instead. There fore the correct sentence was "he gets the solution" or "he is getting the solution". Another mistake was tenses problem, she said and "I always came". This is not appropriate verb, because after always should be followed by first verb come. So, the correct one was "I always come"
6. Another mistake I found on Sample thirteen, she said “you must be speak” this is wrong sentence because after be it should be followed by third verb for, or an adjective. Instead of saying must be speak, she better said it “you must speak”

7. Sample seventeen said “she have to prepare “, her mistake was on the verb have, because she used she as the verb then it should be followed by has. Therefore the sentence supposed to be” she has to prepare”

8. Sample four wanted to say that she has asked but she said “I Am ask to him yesterday”, the form of the sentence should be in past form not in present. Therefore the correct sentence “I was asking to him yesterday ” or “I asked to him yesterday”

9. “She do not know” said by Sample thirteen it should be “ she does not know “, because the subject is she, so the verb must be added by s. Next mistake that she made was saying “my suggestion that she have to”, while the correct one is “my suggestion was she has to”, because she was telling the past event, so the verb must in pas was. Another mistake she mad was saying the sentence “she was told me”, while it should be “she told me”, because there were two past form was and told. She can choose one of the verbs. “She have not much money”, it should be “she does not have much money”, “you must to open, while
it should be “you must open”, and “to chatting” while it should be “to chat”.

Students’ grammar in post test is better than in pre test. Based on the calculation of the data, in pre test was 67%, while in post test was 86%. So it can assume that student’s grammar increased 21 %

3. Vocabulary

There are some students’ problems in vocabulary described on the next page:

1. Most of students were lack of vocabulary variants because they only speak average one to three sentences, it is around eight second. And the students who speak better than all use forty-five second

2. Students use inaccurate vocabulary, such as love trouble, it should be love diseases

3. There are some students who could not speak even just one word or the simple words.

While in the post test, all the students could speak and use around one minutes in speaking. For the students who better than all spoke one minute and thirty seven second in her speaking. In pre test the average of students’ vocabulary was 66% and in post test was 89%. So it can assume that students’ vocabulary
increased 23%.

4. **Fluency**

There are some points in this past, they are: many of students did not speak fluently; it was difficult for them to spell out a sentences. They spoke slow and hesitant; some students look shy, no self confidence when they were speaking, for example:

1. “the... the... information... theeeeeey a.........”, “aaa assignment .... “ this piece of script was said by Sample twelve, when he explained the things he got from discussion activity

2. “e... good sumary” it is... is. Consist ..... “ it was said by Sample nine. She was trying to say it's a good summary and it's consist

3. “Has.. e.. e... “ was said by Sample fifteen. He was trying to say that his friend has good point of the discussion activity.

4. “I think e... he is e.... “ said by Sample six and “e I a.. aқ a......”. This script was taken from discussion activity when she wanted to give the response of her friend question.

5. “A.. she has ,, a,,, “ said by Sample seven and “she try to...... e... blow.. when she a....” She said the sentence in hesitate situation, because it was the first treatment, and some of the students also had the same situation
like her.

6. “She can... she have. To...... she have to try “ said by Sample seventeen. What she meant was, she wanted to say that she can and she has to try to do her best. Those sentences were one of her suggestion to her friend about what should i do to be more confidence with my speaking?

7. “It’s a problem.. that she a..... a... “said by Sample two and “.. haven’t a.. haven’t a.. much money.... “. In this situation she wants to say that her friend problem was about money, and she doesn’t have to worry about it.

8. “ found the a.... answer.. a... a..” said by Sample eleven. “Much a.. e.... a..”. this situation influenced by his dialog or local language, so in his speaking it was still not fluency.

In post test students spoke more fluently than in pre test. The average of students’ fluency in pre test was 70% and in post test 89%. So the students’ fluency increased 19 %.

5. Comprehension

In this section based on the data that I found in pre test, showed that their comprehension about the topic was average and too broad. They responded the question from their friend with the general idea, not really specific. Here some expression relate with their comprehension:

1. “ you should believe to yourself try and try “ said by sample seven
2. "go shopping and open the facebook account" said by sample two

3. "find lot of check your diseases to the doctor" said by sample eight.

During the treatment process, the students become so creative beyond that I expected before. The students can improve the topic I provided. The answer or opinions about the topic were varied and all of them were so brilliant, especially when they give the examples and some facts about it. They composed their idea and mixed it with the real life facts and situations. Honestly, they taught me new things about life.

Here are their comments about the topic (big is small, small is big) and I think it was amazing thought:

1. "If we look small people it does not mean she has little though about life, but sometimes people who have a small body they get many talent and gift". Said by Sample fifteen

2. "if we have a problem and we think it's just a small problem and we just underestimate it, and by the time it becomes bigger, and when we have big problem in fact we the one who make it big" said by Sample three

3. "in my opinion small is big and big is small is, a small things can do big things, such as our brain it has small shape but huge function" said
by Sample twelve

4. “in my opinion small is , big is small is a motivation words in Indonesia (berdiri sama tegak, duduk sama rendah) so when we are small don’t be afraid to do huge things in fact we are still the same human being, same creator and same position, so just be brave to do anything” said by Sample nine.

In the post test, students comprehension increased, base on the data, the students’ the average score in pre test was 76% but in post test is increased to 89%. So it can calculate that the student’s comprehension increased 13%.

Based on the explanation above, I can conclude some points, and they are as follow: 1) in pre test the lowest components that the student of experiment class got, is vocabulary aspect it was 66%, followed by grammar 67%, and fluency 70%, then pronunciation 7,21% and last is comprehension it was 76%. In post test the lowest score that the experiment class got is grammar aspect it was 86% it increased 21%, and followed by vocabulary and fluency both aspect were 89% it increased 23%, then pronunciation 91% it increased 19% and last is comprehension it was 92% increased 13%.

The further explanation is about control class based on speaking components analysis, as described on the next page

4.4.2.2 Control class

1. Pronunciation

In pronunciation, there are some students’ errors, such as:
1. In formalization activity Sample seven and Sample ten were in the same group four, they made same mistake about pronounced the word *Realize* with” relis” . Based on Longman dictionary the pronunciation should be (re_ə liz). Another word was a live and they said with ” lif”, while it should be (ə liv)

2. The word Chapter pronounced as “capter “by sample 3 and some other students in discussion activity. Whereas the correct pronunciation is (CH opt ər)

3. Sample twelve and some other samples said word actually with “ectuali” in their speaking. Based on Longman dictionary it supposed to be (akCHoo əle)

4. (I agree)“I agree” said by Sample thirteen and others, it should be (ə’gre)

5. (take Chance) “Take chang”, said by Sample seventeen, it should be (CHans)

6. (Opinion) “opinion” said by Sample fifteen and some other samples, it supposed (ə’piny ən)

7. (I think) “I ching” said by Sample fifteen and some other students it should be (THInGk)

8. (our) “awer” said by most of samples, it should be (ou(ə)r), (ər)

In the post test I found that the students’ pronunciation increased, although it was not better than in experiment class. The data show that students’
pronunciation in pre test is 67 %, while in post test was 81 %. So it can conclude that students’ pronunciation increased 15%.

2. Grammar

In grammar, there are some students’ errors such as:

1. “We should forgotten Said by Sample five, it’s ungrammatically form, because when we use modal it should be followed simple form of verb not in third form, unless there is a be before the third verb. Therefore the correct sentence “we should forget” as simple present form.

2. “Every single person have” said by Sample seven, the sentence is wrong because the verb supposed to be ” has”, and the sentence should be “every single person has” or he can replace it with the phrase “every people have”

3. “it make our sad”, this piece of script was said by Sample twelve. The sentence is wrong because the subject was it, so the verb make should be added of s and it become makes. Next mistake was about the possessive adjective our should be changed by us. Therefore the correct one is “it makes us sad”. And the second sentence “ it must forget”, while the correct the sentence should be “it must be forgotten” passive sentence form.

4. “It is so sad in the past”, said by Sample seventeen, this sentence was wrong, because he was trying to say the word in past form, so the
sentence should be “it was so sad in the past” simple past form.

5. “There are a lot of something bad that i have done “ it was said by Sample eighteen. He was wrong on the using of tenses. As he telling his past therefore he must used past form instead. Therefore, it should be “the were lot of things “ because he was telling his past, so the sentence must use simple past

6. “I make something bad in past time” said by Sample sixteen, this is the same case with the sentence above, the sentence should be in simple past, so it is going to be “I made something bad in past”

7. “We have to finishing” said by Sample six, he sentence should be “we have to finish” simple present

Students’ grammar in post test was better than in pre test. Base on the calculation of the data, in pre test was 66%, while in post test was 77%. So it can be assumed that students’ grammar increased 11 %. Experiment class still getting higher increasing than control class.

3. Vocabulary

   In vocabulary, there are some student’s problems, such as:

1. “When we feel happiness” this sentence was said by Sample seven, he is better to use the word happy as an adjective than word happiness as a noun instead.

2. “Our face” said by Sample ten, in this situation she was trying to say an expression, but she did not know what the appropriate word is for
it. Instead of saying “our face” she would rather use word “expression”.

3. Hesitate said by Sample eighteen while it would be better if he uses word “concern” or “doubt” instead

4. Most of the students could not define the topic which was chosen

5. Also in this skill of vocabulary they have limit vocabulary to be spoken.

In the post test, all the students could speak and they use around one minute in speaking. In pre test the average of students’ vocabulary was 65% and in post test was 77%. So it can assume that students’ vocabulary increased 12%. In experiment class was higher than control class.

4. Fluency

I found that most of students did not speak fluently; it was difficult for them to spell out the words or sentences. They speak slowly, stagnantly, and hesitant; some students look shy and have no self confidence when they were speaking, for example:

1. Sample five who makes us e.... e.... She was trying to say the person who makes us be more confidence

2. Our life e.. e.... said by Sample ten. In this situation she was trying to explain that our life is depending on what we doing.
3. Because e...e.. said by Sample nine. The students intended to make a response on her friend question, what she wanted to say were because life is so beautiful to be wasted.

4. “I e... e.. have” said by Sample one. She wanted to say I but in the situation which was the first time for them to have this situation.

5. Because I, I, I, do not, said by Sample three to... they wanted to say a reason, but she lack of vocabulary so the speaking was not really good.

6. When..when.. sorry.. this scripts was said by Sample fifteen. He said that not really clear. Another sentence was “Sometimes we have to e.. e... have,, e....” said by sample fifteen.

The facts were the students in control class spoke with the long interval, for each idea that they want to say, there must be an “a, e, the the, etc” which means they did not construct their idea and vocabulary well.

In pre test students speak more fluently than in pre test. The average of students’ fluency in pre test was 65 % and in post test was 81%. So the students’ fluency increased about 16 %.

5. Comprehension
In control class students could speak English but they could not organize the ideas just like in experiment class. They could not extend the topics; most of them speak only one sentence to three sentences but it is good for the beginner to learn English. We can look some example below:

1. The topic was sometimes we have to feel sorrow to realize that we are still alive, one students only could speak one sentence “because e... e... in this life we have to feel sorrow thank you” said Sample nine

2. No comment thank you, heheh said by Sample eleven.

3. And some samples only say “thank you” when I was asking their opinion about the topic given.

Most of students only can speak one sentence. In addition, another example is there some students could not speak; they could not define their topics.

In the post test, student’s comprehension is increased, base on the data (see appendix) the students’ the average score in pre test is 71 % but in post test is increased to 83%. So it can calculate that the student’s comprehension is increased 12%, it is still low from the increasing of experiment class.

Based on the explanation above, I can conclude some points, and they are as follow : 1) in pre test the lowest components that the student of experiment class got, is vocabulary aspect it was 66%, followed by grammar 67%, and fluency 70%, then pronunciation 7,21% and last is comprehension it was 76%. In
control class is fluency aspect 64%, and followed by vocabulary 65%, grammar 66% and last is comprehension aspect it was 72%. 2) in post test the lowest score that the experiment class got is grammar aspect it was 86%, and followed by vocabulary and fluency both aspect were 89%, then pronunciation 91% and last is comprehension it was 92%. In control class the lowest score is vocabulary and grammar aspect it was 77% and followed by fluency and pronunciation it was 82%, and last comprehension it was 83%. 3) the increasing of experiment class was higher than control class.

The next chapter is the chapter V conclusion and suggestion. This chapter is a conclusion of my study, and summary the details, facts, during the research process. More over, this chapter describes some suggestion that relates to this study.