

BAB IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the writer discusses data analysis and data interpretation. The data are try-out, pre-test and post-test.

The writer took two classes, they are class VIII B and VIII C. Class VIII B has 28 students and VIII C has 29 students. All of them are given pre-test and post-test.

1.1 Try-out Analysis

The try-out analysis aimed to find out the validity and reliability of the instrument before it was given to the students as the pre-test and post test. This test was given on March 07 2018. It was conducted for VIII B class which consists of 28 students. The try-out test item is available in Appendix 1.

4.1.1. Validity

The speaking test consists of 30 item numbers. From the try-out test was conducted, it was got that item numbers were valid. As mentioned at the chapter 3, the test was valid if the result of r_{xy} higher than r-table. The data was counted by the formula and calculated with Product Moment. Meanwhile, the result showed that the index of validity of item number 5 was 0,605. The writer consulted the r-table with N=28 and the significance of level 5% in which the r-table is 0,374. It meant that the item number 3 was valid.

The following is the example of counting the validity of item number 5.

$$r_{xy} = \frac{(N \cdot \Sigma XY) - (\Sigma X \cdot \Sigma Y)}{\sqrt{\{N \cdot \Sigma X^2 - (\Sigma X)^2\} \{N \cdot \Sigma Y^2 - (\Sigma Y)^2\}}}$$
$$r_{xy} = \frac{(28 \cdot 363) - (20 \cdot 479)}{\sqrt{\{28 \cdot 20 - (20)^2\} \{28 \cdot 8527 - (479)^2\}}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{10.164 - 9580}{\sqrt{\{500 - 400\}\{238.756 - 229.441\}}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{584}{\sqrt{\{100\}\{9315\}}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{584}{\sqrt{931500}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{584}{965,143}$$

$$r_{xy} = 0,605$$

The item number 5 of the try-out test was valid. The $r_{xy} = 0,605$ was higher than critical value (0, 374).

Table 4.1.1

The analysis of all item numbers was mentioned bellow:

Criteria	Number of item	The total number
Valid	,5,6,7,8,11,15,16,17,18,22, 27,29.	12 numbers
Invalid	1,2,3,4,9,10,12,13,14,19,20,21 23,24,25,26,28,30.	18 numbers

From the table above, it could be concluded that there were 12 numbers had valid and 18 numbers invalid items. The complex result could be seen at the Appendix 2.

4.1.2. Reliability

An instrument is said good if the item numbers of instruments were valid and reliable. After the validity of item numbers had been counted, the next step was to test the reliability of instrument. The test was reliable if the result of r_{11} is greater than r-table. In this computation, the writer used Arikunto formula and the result showed that the r_{11} was for $\alpha = 5\%$, $N = 28$ and the r table was 0, 374.

Following is the computation:

Formula:

$$r_{11} = \frac{2 \cdot r_{1/21/2}}{1 + r_{1/21/2}}$$

Based on the instruments, the calculation can be shown as below:

$$r_{xy} = \frac{(N \cdot \Sigma XY) - (\Sigma X \cdot \Sigma Y)}{\sqrt{\{N \cdot \Sigma X^2 - (\Sigma X)^2\} \{N \cdot \Sigma Y^2 - (\Sigma Y)^2\}}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{(28 \cdot 2091) - (242 \cdot 237)}{\sqrt{\{28 \cdot 2238 - (242)^2\} \{2 \cdot 2107 - (237)^2\}}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{(58548) - (57354)}{\sqrt{\{62664 - 58564\} \{58996 - 56169\}}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{1194}{\sqrt{\{4100\} \{2827\}}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{1194}{\sqrt{11590700}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{1194}{3404,5}$$

$$r_{xy} = 0,350$$

$$r_{11} = \frac{2 \cdot r_{1/21/2}}{1 + r_{1/21/2}}$$

$$r_{11} = \frac{2 \cdot 0,350}{1 + 0,350}$$

$$r_{11} = \frac{0,7}{1,35}$$

$$r_{11} = 0,518$$

For $\alpha = 5\%$ with $N = 28$, and r -table = 0,374. From the calculation above, the result of r_{11} was higher than r -table. It meant that the try-out of instrument was reliable.

1.2 Pre-test

The pre-test was conducted on March 08, 2018 for control group and experimental group. It was done in the same day but different time. The pre-test was held in the first meeting of experimental research that aimed to know the basic skill / the real

condition of students especially in speaking skill. The students had oral test with the dialogue. The instruments of the dialogue can be seen at the Appendix

1.2.1 The Data Pre-test of Students Who Taught by Using Audio-lingual Method and Who Taught Without Using Audio-lingual Method

Table 4.2.1.1

Pre-test Score of Experimental and Control Group

No	Code	Pre-Test Result	Mark	No	Code	Pre-test Result	Mark
1	E-01	40	E	1	C-01	40	E
2	E-02	36	E	2	C-02	36	E
3	E-03	56	E	3	C-03	52	E
4	E-04	44	E	4	C-04	68	D
5	E-05	56	E	5	C-05	40	E
6	E-06	64	D	6	C-06	40	E
7	E-07	56	E	7	C-07	36	E
8	E-08	52	E	8	C-08	40	E
9	E-09	44	E	9	C-09	40	E
10	E-10	40	E	10	C-10	72	C
11	E-11	36	E	11	C-11	40	E
12	E-12	52	E	12	C-12	40	E
13	E-13	44	E	13	C-13	48	E
14	E-14	56	E	14	C-14	40	E

15	E-15	40	E	15	C-15	36	E
16	E-16	52	E	16	C-16	48	E
17	E-17	44	E	17	C-17	44	E
18	E-18	44	E	18	C-18	44	E
19	E-19	48	E	19	C-19	52	E
20	E-20	44	E	20	C-20	56	E
21	E-21	44	E	21	C-21	48	E
22	E-22	48	E	22	C-22	60	D
23	E-23	52	E	23	C-23	36	E
24	E-24	48	E	24	C-24	36	E
25	E-25	48	E	25	C-25	60	D
26	E-26	36	E	26	C-26	64	D
27	E-27	68	D	27	C-27	48	E
28	E-28	44	E	28	C-28	64	D
SUM		1336		29	C-29	48	E
					SUM	1376	

The score above, the mean of pre-test of experimental and control group were got by using the formula below:

a. Pre-test Experimental Group

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

$$X = \frac{1336}{28}$$

$$X = 47,714$$

b. Pre-test Control Group

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

$$X = \frac{1376}{29}$$

$$X = 47,448$$

From the calculation above, it could be said that the mean of pre-test in experimental research was 47,714 and mean of pre-test in control group was 47,448.

Table 4.2.1.2

Table of Level Achievement

Mark	Score	Level Achievement
A	90-100	Excellent
B	80-89	Very Good
C	70-79	Adequate
D	60-69	Inadequate
E	BELOW 60	Fail

(Brown, 2004:287)

Based on the table, it can be seen that the mean of pre-test in experimental group is 47,714 and the mean of pre-test in control group is 47,44. It can said that the result of the mean in the range below 60. Thus, it can be concluded that the basic skill of speaking at the eighth grader is low.

1.3 Treatment Activities

The treatment activity was conducted three times after the pre-test was given to students (experimental and control group). For the experimental group was treated by Audio-lingual method in teaching speaking and for the control group was treated by discussion in teaching speaking. Each group was treated with the same duration but different days.

Table 4.3.1

Below is the schedule of the research:

Date	Experimental Group (VIIB)	Date	Control Group (VIIC)
March 08, 2018	Pre-test for experimental group	March 08, 2018	Pre-test for control group
March 10, 2018	First treatment, by using Audio-lingual method	March 10, 2018	First treatment, using discussion method.
March 14, 2018	Second treatment, teaching speaking by using Audio-lingual method.	March 14, 2018	Second treatment, teaching speaking by using discussion method.
March 15, 2018	Third treatment, teaching speaking by using Audio-lingual method.		Third treatment, teaching speaking by using discussion method.
March 19, 2018	Post-test for experimental group.	March 17, 2018	Post-test for control group.

During two meetings, every group was given the same topic. In this activities, the writer functions as the teacher. The first meeting, the topic was the expression of asking help by the dialogue form with the certain theme. The second meeting, the writer gave same topic as the first meeting but with the other

dialogue. For the third meeting, the writer gave the topic about asking permission for experimental group and giving opinion for control group.

Here is the activity of the research:

Table 6.6
The Activity of the research

Activity	Experimental Group	Control Group
Pre-test	Teacher gave the speaking test items.	Teacher gave the speaking test items.
First treatment (expression of asking help)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher explained about the method. • The teacher showed the material in the projector and explained it shortly (as the introduction). • The teacher gave the dialogue which showed in the projector with the expressing of asking help theme. • The teacher read the dialogue per line and then breakdown them to each word. After that the students followed the teacher, as the teacher's instruction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher explained about the method. • The teacher showed the material in the projector and explained it shortly (as the introduction). • The teacher divided students in a several group. • The teacher gave the dialogue in the paper with the expressing of asking help theme. • The teacher read the dialogue per line. • The teacher asked them to discuss dialogue was given with their group. • The students practiced with representation of

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The students practiced by themselves together. 	each group.
Second treatment (expression of asking help)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher gave the dialogue which showed in the projector with the expressing of asking help themes with different topic by the first meeting. • The teacher read the dialogue per line and then breakdown them to each word. After that the students followed the teacher, as the teacher's instruction. • The students practiced by themselves together. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher divided students in a several group. • The teacher gave the dialogue in the paper with the expressing of asking help themes with different topic by the first meeting. • The teacher read the dialogue per line. • The teacher asked them to discuss dialogue was given with their group. • The students practiced with representation of each group.
Third treatment (asking permission for experimental group and giving opinion for control group)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher gave the dialogue which showed in the projector with the asking permission themes. • The teacher read the dialogue per line and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher divided students in a several group. • The teacher gave the dialogue in the paper with the giving opinion themes. • The teacher read the

	<p>then breakdown them to each word. After that the students followed the teacher, as the teacher's instruction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The students practiced by themselves together. 	<p>dialogue per line.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher asked them to discuss dialogue was given with their group. The students practiced with representation of each group.
Post-test	Teacher gave the speaking test items as like the pre-test items.	Teacher gave the speaking test items as like the pre-test items.

1.4 Post-test Activities

Post-test was given after giving treatment by the teacher (writer). Both of them were in the same day, it was held on March 19, 2018. The writer used the same instrument like the pre-test items. The instrument can be seen in Appendix.

1.4.1 The Data Pre-test of Students Who Taught by Using Audio-lingual Method and Who Taught Without Using Audio-lingual Method

Table 4.4.1.1

Post-test Score of Experimental and Control Group

No	Code	Post-Test Result	Mark	No	Code	Post -test Result	Mark
1	E-01	72	C	1	C-01	64	D
2	E-02	76	C	2	C-02	68	D
3	E-03	82	B	3	C-03	72	C

4	E-04	68	D	4	C-04	72	C
5	E-05	88	B	5	C-05	56	E
6	E-06	88	B	6	C-06	68	D
7	E-07	76	C	7	C-07	68	D
8	E-08	88	B	8	C-08	76	C
9	E-09	80	B	9	C-09	68	D
10	E-10	64	D	10	C-10	80	B
11	E-11	68	D	11	C-11	69	D
12	E-12	64	D	12	C-12	68	D
13	E-13	68	D	13	C-13	60	D
14	E-14	84	B	14	C-14	64	D
15	E-15	80	B	15	C-15	64	D
16	E-16	80	B	16	C-16	72	C
17	E-17	84	B	17	C-17	72	C
18	E-18	64	D	18	C-18	68	D
19	E-19	76	C	19	C-19	64	D
20	E-20	72	C	20	C-20	68	D
21	E-21	68	D	21	C-21	64	D
22	E-22	80	B	22	C-22	64	D
23	E-23	68	D	23	C-23	68	D

24	E-24	72	C	24	C-24	56	E
25	E-25	72	C	25	C-25	72	C
26	E-26	64	D	26	C-26	68	D
27	E-27	76	C	27	C-27	64	D
28	E-28	72	C	28	C-28	80	B
				29	C-29	64	D
SUM		2094			SUM	1961	

The score above, the mean of post-test of experimental and control group were got by using the formula below:

- a. Mean of Post-test in Experimental Group:

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

$$X = \frac{2094}{28}$$

$$X = 74,785$$

- b. Mean of Post-test in Control Group

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

$$X = \frac{1961}{29}$$

$$X = 67,620$$

From the calculation above, it can be said that the mean of post-test in experimental research was 74,78 and mean of post-test in control group was 67,62.

Table 4.4.1.2

Table of Level Achievement:

Mark	Score	Level Achievement
A	90-100	Excellent
B	80-89	Very Good
C	70-79	Adequate
D	60-69	Inadequate
E	BELOW 60	Fail

(Brown, 2004:287)

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the mean of post-test in experimental group is 74,78 in the range (70-79) with the mark C and the mean of post-test in control group is 67,62 in the range (60-69) with the mark D. It can be concluded that there are any significant improvement teaching by using Audio-lingual method at the grader eight. Meanwhile there is student's improvement by the other method but it is lower than experimental group.

1.5 Description of Data

The writer finished the research with the title teaching speaking by using Audio-lingual method at the eighth grader of SMP Walisongo Peacangaan. The writer took the scores from the students both experimental group and control group.

Here, the report of the scores concerning the data description of students' score in the pre-test and post-test:

Table 4.5.1

The Students' Score of Experimental Group
(Using Audio-lingual method)

Students	Pre-test Score	Post-test Score	Gained (d) Score (Post-test-Pre-test)

1	40	72	32
2	36	76	40
3	56	82	26
4	44	68	24
5	56	88	32
6	64	88	24
7	56	76	20
8	52	88	36
9	44	80	36
10	40	64	24
11	36	68	32
12	52	64	12
13	44	68	24
14	56	84	28
15	40	80	40
16	52	80	28
17	44	84	40
18	44	64	20
19	48	76	31
20	44	72	28

21	44	68	24
22	48	80	32
23	52	68	16
24	48	72	24
25	48	72	24
26	36	64	28
27	68	76	12
28	44	72	28
SUM	1336	2094	765
MEAN	47.71	74.78	27.32

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

$$X = \frac{765}{28} = 27,32$$

Table 4.5.2
The Students' Score of Control Group
(Using Discussion method)

Students	Pre-test Score	Post-test Score	Gained (d) Score (Post-test-Pre-test)
1	40	64	24
2	36	68	32

3	52	72	20
4	68	72	4
5	40	56	16
6	40	68	28
7	36	68	32
8	40	76	36
9	40	68	28
10	72	80	8
11	40	69	29
12	40	68	28
13	48	60	28
14	40	64	24
15	36	64	28
16	48	72	24
17	44	72	28
18	44	68	24
19	52	64	12
20	56	68	12
21	48	64	16
22	60	64	4

23	36	68	32
24	36	56	20
25	60	72	12
26	64	68	4
27	48	64	16
28	64	80	16
29	48	64	16
SUM	1376	1961	601
MEAN	47.44	67.62	20.72

$$X = \frac{601}{29} = 20,72$$

1.6 Analysis of Data

For analyzing the data, the writer compares both experimental group and control group. It aims to prove whether any significant improvement between two variables, students who taught by using Audio-lingual method and who taught by the other method. To know the result, the writer uses t-test by calculating mean of each group, find the standard deviation of each group and find the standard error of the mean of each group first. After that, the writer calculated standard error of difference between the means. Below is the table to analyze the t-test formula:

Table 4.6.1

The Comparison of Students' Result in Pre-test of Experimental Group and Control Group.

Students X	Students Y	X	Y	X	y	x.x	y.y
1	1	32	24	4,68	3,28	21,90	10,75
2	2	40	32	20,68	11,28	427,66	127,23
3	3	26	20	-1,32	-0,72	1,74	0,51
4	4	24	4	-3,32	-16,72	11,02	279,55
5	5	32	16	4,68	-4,72	21,90	22,27
6	6	24	28	-3,32	7,28	11,02	52,99
7	7	20	32	-7,32	11,22	53,58	125,88
8	8	36	36	8,86	15,28	78,49	233,47
9	9	36	28	8,86	7,28	78,49	52,99
10	10	24	8	-3,32	-12,72	11,02	161,79
11	11	32	29	4,68	8,68	21,90	75,34
12	12	12	28	-15,32	7,28	234,70	52,99
13	13	24	28	-3,32	7,28	11,02	52,99
14	14	28	24	0,68	3,28	0,46	10,75
15	15	40	28	12,68	7,28	153,02	52,99
16	16	28	24	0,68	3,28	0,46	10,75
17	17	40	28	20,68	7,28	153,02	52,99
18	18	20	24	-7,32	3,28	53,58	10,75

19	19	31	12	3,68	-8,72	13,54	76,03
20	20	28	12	0,68	-8,72	13,54	76,03
21	21	24	16	-3,32	-4,72	11,02	22,27
22	22	32	4	4,68	-16,72	21,90	279,55
23	23	16	32	-11,23	11,22	128,14	125,88
24	24	24	20	-3,32	-0,72	11,02	0,51
25	25	24	12	-3,32	-8,72	21,90	76,03
26	26	28	4	0,68	-16,72	0,46	279,55
27	27	12	16	-15,32	-4,72	234,70	22,27
28	28	28	16	0,68	-4,72	0,46	22,27
	29		16		-4,72		22,27
	Mean	27.32	20.72				
N=28	N=29	765	601			1.850,2	2.389,64

Based on the table above, it was known the differences result between pre-test and post-test each group. Meanwhile, the writer calculated the t-test as the steps below:

1. Process to determine Mean of Variable X:

$$\begin{aligned}
 M1 &= \frac{\sum x}{N1} \\
 &= \frac{765}{28} \\
 &= 27,32
 \end{aligned}$$

2. Process to determine Mean of Variable Y:

$$\begin{aligned} M_2 &= \frac{\sum y}{N_2} \\ &= \frac{601}{29} \\ &= 20,72 \end{aligned}$$

3. Process to determine Standards of Deviation Score of Variable X:

$$\begin{aligned} SD_1 &= \sqrt{\frac{\sum X^2}{N_1}} \\ SD_1 &= \sqrt{\frac{1.850,2}{28}} \\ SD_1 &= \sqrt{66,0785} \\ SD_1 &= 8,12 \end{aligned}$$

4. Process to determine Standards of Deviation Score of Variable Y:

$$\begin{aligned} SD_2 &= \sqrt{\frac{\sum Y^2}{N_2}} \\ SD_2 &= \sqrt{\frac{2.389,64}{29}} \\ SD_2 &= \sqrt{82,4013} \\ SD_2 &= 9,077 \end{aligned}$$

Process to determine Standard Error Mean of Variable X:

$$SE_{M1} = 1,564$$

5. Process to determine Standard Error Mean of Variable Y:

$$\begin{aligned} SE_{M2} &= \frac{SD_2}{\sqrt{N_2-1}} \\ SE_{M2} &= \frac{9,077}{\sqrt{28}} \\ SE_{M2} &= \frac{9,077}{5,29} \\ SE_{M2} &= 1,715 \end{aligned}$$

6. Determining Standard Error of Different Mean of Variable X and Mean of Variable Y:

$$\begin{aligned} SE_{M1-M2} &= \sqrt{SE_{M1}^2 + SE_{M2}^2} \\ SE_{M1-M2} &= \sqrt{1,564^2 + 1,715^2} \end{aligned}$$

$$SE_{M1-M2} = \sqrt{2446 + 2941}$$

$$SE_{M1-M2} = \sqrt{2446 + 2941}$$

$$SE_{M1-M2} = \sqrt{5.882}$$

$$SE_{M1-M2} = 2,42$$

7. Process to determine t_0 with formula:

$$8. t_0 = \frac{M1-M2}{SE_{M1-M2}}$$

$$t_0 = \frac{27,32-20,72}{2,42}$$

$$t_0 = \frac{6,6}{2,42}$$

$$t_0 = 2,27$$

9. Process to determine Degrees of Freedom (df):

$$df = (N1+N2)-2$$

$$= (28+29)-2$$

$$= 55$$

1.7 T-test Statistical Analysis

After getting the t-value from the formula, the writer consulted the critical value on the table to check whether the difference was significant or not.

The computation is as follow:

$$t_0 = \frac{M1-M2}{SE_{M1-M2}}$$

$$t_0 = \frac{27,32-20,72}{2,42}$$

$$t_0 = \frac{6,6}{2,42}$$

$$t_0 = 2,27$$

Based on the t_0 above, the writer could conclude the result of the research. For this experiment, the writer used the 5% (0.05) alpha level of significance as usually used in psychological and educational research. The number of subjects in this experiment was 28. The degree of freedom (df) was $N-1 = (28+29)-2 = 55$. For five percents alpha level and 56 degree of freedom was found 2. From the table for 55 was 2 meanwhile t-value was 2,27. So, the t-value was higher than the

critical value on the table ($2,27 > 2$), it was proven that there was significant difference between experimental group and control group. In this case, there was significant difference the speaking class that taught by using Audio-lingual method and with the other method.

Table 4.7.1

The t-test of Pre-test in the Experimental Group and Controlled Group

Group Statistics					
	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Score	Exp	28	47.71	7.995	1.511
	Cont	29	47.45	10.568	1.962

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Score	Equal variances assumed	2.419	.126	.107	55	.915	.266	2.489	-4.722	5.254
	Equal variances not assumed			.107	52.062	.915	.266	2.477	-4.704	5.236

Table above describes the t-test analysis of pre-test for both experimental and control group. The analysis showed that the difference was significant at .915. It means that there is no significant difference the pre-test score of experimental and control class which is the significance level of 0.915 is higher than 0,05. It indicates that the pre-test of experimental and control group are equal. The group statistic table shows the mean of experimental is 47,71 and the mean of control class is 47,45. Furthermore, the mean difference both the experimental and controlled class is 0,266. Moreover the interval of the differences is between - 4.722 and 5.236.

Table 4.7.2

The t-test of Post-test in the Experimental Group and Controlled Group

Group Statistics					
	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Score	Exp	28	74.79	7.685	1.452
	Cont	29	67.62	5.697	1.058

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Score	Equal variances assumed	5.340	.025	4.008	55	.000	7.165	1.788	3.583	10.747

Equal variances not assumed			3.988	49.748	.000	7.165	1.797	3.555	10.775
-----------------------------------	--	--	-------	--------	------	-------	-------	-------	--------

The table above shows the result of t-test analysis of post-test both the experimental and controlled class. The significant difference is 0.000. This result means that the significant level of 0.000 is lower than 0,05. Thus, it can be concluded that there was significance of the treatment. The statistic table shows that mean score of post-test in experimental research is 74,79 and the controlled is 67,62. Meanwhile the interval of the difference is between 3.583 and 10.775.

In order to see the comparison of scores between the experimental and controlled class, the writer also took the measurement of gained score. The gained scores are calculated by computing the difference between the pre-test and post-test of each score. This step is to know whether there is significant difference and to answer the hypothesis (Ha) is accepted or rejected.

The calculation can be shown below:

Table 4.7.3

The t-test of Gained Scores in the Experimental Group and Controlled Group

Group Statistics					
	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Score	Exp	28	27.32	7.503	1.418
	Cont	29	20.72	9.231	1.714

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Score	Equal variances assumed	2.884	.095	2.955	55	.005	6.597	2.233	2.123	11.072
	Equal variances not assumed			2.955	53.468	.005	6.597	2.225	2.136	11.058

The table above describes that there is significant difference of the experimental and controlled group from the measurement score. From the statistically result, the score of t-test is 2.955, by using the degree of freedom 5% the value of 55 in the t-table is 2.

1.8 Discussion and Research Finding

This study is aimed at answering the problem statement of the research, the research was find out the effectiveness of Audio-lingual method in teaching speaking (An Experimental Research at the Eighth Graders of SMP Walisongo Pecangaan Jepara in Academic Year 2017/2018). In this research, the writer took two classes as the sample of experimental research and control group. Class VIII B was in experimental research that consist of 28 students and VIII C was in control group, it consist of 29 students. The writer gave the treatment for experimental group by using Audio-lingual method. Moreover, for control group, the writer taught by using discussion method. The average of experimental group was 47,714 (pre-test) and 74,78 (post-test) and the average for control group was 47,488 (pre-test) and 67,62 (post-test).

The table of pre-test and post-test students' average score as the follow:

Table 4.8.1

Experimental and Control group:

No.	Group	The average Percentage of pre-test	The average Percentage of post-test
1	Experimental	47,714	74,78
2	Control	47,488	67,62

From the result of experimental and control groups above, the writer found that the average students' score of pre-test almost had same score, there is no significant difference in speaking skill of each group.

After giving the treatment, the mean score of experimental group was 74, 78 and the mean score of control group was 67,62. It meant that the mean score of experimental group was higher than control group which could be concluded teaching speaking by using Audio-lingual method at the eighth grader was effective than using the discussion method.

Another computation shows that the result of t-test is 2,27 and the writer uses the degree significance of 5% and 1%. It can be seen that on df 55 in significant 5% and 1%, the value of degree are 2 and 1,67. It can be concluded that the $t\text{-test} > t\text{-table}$. Based on the computation before, the conclusion is that there is significant difference between students who were taught by Audio-lingual method and discussion method in speaking skill. Moreover, the stating that "Audio-lingual method is effective in improving speaking skill at the eighth grader of SMP Walisongo Pecangaan" is accepted.

10.

$$SE_{M1} = \frac{SD1}{N1-1}$$

$$SE_{M1} = \frac{8,12}{\sqrt{27}}$$

$$SE_{M1} = \frac{8,12}{5,19}$$