## CHAPTER IV

## RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

## A. Profil of Study

SMA Wahid Hasyim is one of the institutions of Nahdlatul Ulama. It is located on Jl. Lapangan Gedongsari, Tersono, Batang. It has 2 majors, science and social. It has about 400 students from class X-XII. They usually speak in Javanese or bahasa Indonesia. They are rather unfamiliar with English because it is used in the lesson time only.

The research had been conducted since $30^{\text {th }}$ April 2016 to $30^{\text {th }}$ May 2016 in SMA Wahid Hasyim, Tersono. The researcher gave pre-test for both experimental and control class at $2^{\text {nd }}$ May 2016.

After found that the experimental and control class had same variant, the researcher prepared the lesson plan and material for the learning activity. Experimental class was taught using time token arends while control class taught using lecturing method. It had been conducted on $4^{\text {th }} 2016$.

## B. Research Finding

There were two kinds of test that had been conducted in this research, pre-test and post-test. The data were obtained based on few tests below:

1. Analysis of Pre-Test

The experimental class (XI IPA) and the control class (XI IPS I) were given pre-test on $2^{\text {nd }}$ May 2016. They made a draft of hortatory exposition, and then practice it orally without text. The results of the test were analyzed as follow:
a. Normality Test

The first step in this test is to find the result computation of the Chi-quadrate ( $\chi_{\text {count }}^{2}$ ), then compared with table of Chi-quadrate ( $\chi_{\text {table }}^{2}$ ) by using $5 \%$ alpha of significances. If $\chi_{\text {count }}^{2}<\chi_{\text {table }}^{2}$, it meant that the data spread of the research result distributed normally.

### 4.1. Table of Students' Score of Experimental Class in

Pre-Test

| EXPERIMENTAL |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| NO | CODE | SCORE |
| 1 | E-1 | 44 |
| 2 | E-2 | 48 |
| 3 | E-3 | 56 |
| 4 | E-4 | 52 |
| 5 | E-5 | 48 |
| 6 | E-6 | 52 |
| 7 | E-7 | 52 |
| 8 | E-8 | 48 |
| 9 | E-9 | 52 |
| 10 | E-10 | 60 |
| 11 | E-11 | 52 |
| 12 | E-12 | 52 |
| 13 | E-13 | 48 |
| 14 | E-14 | 48 |


| 15 | E-15 | 48 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 16 | E-16 | 60 |
| 17 | E-17 | 44 |
| 18 | E-18 | 48 |
| 19 | E-19 | 52 |
| 20 | E-20 | 44 |
| 21 | E-21 | 60 |
| 22 | E-22 | 44 |
| 23 | E-23 | 56 |
| 24 | E-24 | 48 |
| 25 | E-25 | 56 |
| 26 | E-26 | 64 |
| 27 | E-27 | 48 |
| 28 | E-28 | 44 |
| 29 | E-29 | 56 |
| 30 | E-30 | 52 |
| 31 | E-31 | 52 |
| 32 | E-32 | 52 |
| 33 | E-33 | 44 |
| 34 | E-34 | 40 |
| 35 | E-35 | 68 |
| SUM |  | 1792 |
| $n$ |  | 35 |
| X Average |  | 51.2 |
| Variance (s2) |  | 38.4 |
| Standard <br> (Sd) |  |  |

### 4.2. Table of Distribution Frequency of Experimental Class in Pre-Test

| Class |  | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $X_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $X_{\mathrm{i}}{ }^{2}$ | $f_{i} \cdot X_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $f_{i} \cdot X_{\mathrm{i}}{ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 40 | - | 44 | 7 | 42 | 1764 | 294 |
| 45 | - | 49 | 9 | 47 | 2209 | 423 |
| 50 | - | 54 | 10 | 52 | 2704 | 520 |
| 55 | - | 59 | 4 | 57 | 3249 | 228 |
| 60 | - | 64 | 4 | 62 | 3844 | 248 |
| 65 | - | 69 | 1 | 67 | 4489 | 67 |
| SUM | 35 |  |  | 178376 |  |  |
|  |  | 92139 |  |  |  |  |

Based on the research result of students in experimental class, before they taught using time token arends strategy, it was found that the maximum score was 68 and minimum score was 40 and the stretches of score the score were 28 . So, there were 6 classes with length of each classes were 5 . From the computation of frequency distribution, it was found the average score $(\bar{X})$ was 50.86 and the standard deviation (Sd) was 6.87. After the researcher counted the average score and standard deviation, table of observation frequency was needed to measure Chi-square
4.3. Table of Observation Frequency of Experimental Class in Pre-Test

|  |  | Bk | $\mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $\mathrm{P}\left(\mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$ | Ld | Ei | Oi | $\frac{\left(O_{i}-E_{i}\right)^{2}}{E_{i}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 39.5 | -1.65 | -0.4509 |  |  |  |  |
| 40 | 44 |  |  |  | 0.1282 | 4.1 | 7 | 2.0446 |
|  |  | 44.5 | -0.93 | -0.3226 |  |  |  |  |
| 45 | 49 |  |  |  | 0.2443 | 7.8 | 9 | 0.1785 |
|  |  | 49.5 | -0.20 | -0.0783 |  |  |  |  |
| 50 | 54 |  |  |  | 0.2804 | 9.0 | 10 | 0.1179 |
|  |  | 54.5 | 0.53 | 0.2021 |  |  |  |  |
| 55 | 59 |  |  |  | 0.1938 | 6.2 | 4 | 0.7813 |
|  |  | 59.5 | 1.26 | 0.3958 |  |  |  |  |
| 60 | 64 |  |  |  | 0.0806 | 2.6 | 4 | 0.7806 |
|  |  | 64.5 | 1.99 | 0.4765 |  |  |  |  |
| 65 | 69 |  |  |  | 0.0202 | 0.6 | 1 | 0.1940 |
|  |  | 69.5 | 2.71 | 0.4967 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\chi^{2}$ | $=$ | 4.10 |

Based on Chi-quadrate table ( $\chi_{\text {table }}^{2}$ ) for 5\% alpha of significance, with $\mathrm{dk} 6-3$, it was found $\left(\chi_{\text {table }}^{2}\right)=7.81$. Based on $\chi_{\text {count }}^{2}=4.10<\chi_{\text {table }}^{2}=7.81$, it meant that the data of control class distributed normally.

The results of students in control class, before they were taught using lecturing learning method, it was found that the maximum score was 64 and minimum score was 36 and the stretches of score were 28 . There were 6 classes with length of each classes were 5 . From the computation of frequency distribution, it was found the average score $(\bar{X})$ was 49.86 and the standard deviation (Sd) was 7.96. After the researcher counted the average score and
standard deviation, table of observation frequency was needed to measure Chi-square.
4.4. Table of Students' Score of Control Class in PreTest

| CONTROL |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NO | CODE | SCORE |
| 1 | C-1 | 52 |
| 2 | C-2 | 52 |
| 3 | C-3 | 36 |
| 4 | C-4 | 64 |
| 5 | C-5 | 48 |
| 6 | C-6 | 36 |
| 7 | C-7 | 44 |
| 8 | C-8 | 48 |
| 9 | C-9 | 52 |
| 10 | C-10 | 52 |
| 11 | C-11 | 48 |
| 12 | C-12 | 64 |
| 13 | C-13 | 64 |
| 14 | C-14 | 44 |
| 15 | C-15 | 52 |
| 16 | C-16 | 36 |
| 17 | C-17 | 52 |
| 18 | C-18 | 48 |
| 19 | C-19 | 48 |
| 20 | C-20 | 44 |
| 21 | C-21 | 64 |
| 22 | C-22 | 44 |
| 23 | C-23 | 40 |
| 24 | C-24 | 44 |
| 25 | C-25 | 56 |
| 26 | C-26 | 56 |
| 27 | C-27 | 48 |


| 28 | $\mathrm{C}-28$ | 44 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 29 | $\mathrm{C}-29$ | 48 |
| 30 | $\mathrm{C}-30$ | 44 |
| 31 | $\mathrm{C}-31$ | 44 |
| 32 | $\mathrm{C}-32$ | 60 |
| 33 | $\mathrm{C}-33$ | 48 |
| 34 | $\mathrm{C}-34$ | 36 |
| 35 | $\mathrm{C}-35$ | 60 |
| SUM |  | 1720 |
| N |  | 35 |
| X Average |  | 49.1429 |
| Variance (s2) |  | 66.420 |
| Standard Deviation <br> (Sd) |  | 8.14986 |

4.5. Table of Distribution Frequency of Control Class in Pre-Test

| Class |  |  | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $X_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $X_{\mathrm{i}}^{2}$ | $f_{i} \cdot X_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $f_{\mathrm{i}} X_{\mathrm{i}}^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 36 | - | 40 | 4 | 38 | 1444 | 152 | 5776 |
| 41 | - | 45 | 8 | 43 | 1849 | 344 | 14792 |
| 46 | - | 50 | 8 | 48 | 2304 | 384 | 18432 |
| 51 | - | 55 | 6 | 53 | 2809 | 318 | 16854 |
| 56 | - | 60 | 4 | 58 | 3364 | 232 | 13456 |
| 61 | - | 65 | 5 | 63 | 3969 | 315 | 19845 |
| SUM |  |  | 35 |  |  | 1745 | 89155 |

4.6. Table of observation frequency of Control Class in

Pre-Test


Based on Chi-quadrate table ( $\chi_{\text {table }}^{2}$ ) for 5\% alpha of significance, with dk 6-3, it was found $\left(\chi_{\text {table }}^{2}\right)=7.81$. Based on $\chi_{\text {count }}^{2}=6.09<\chi_{\text {table }}^{2}=7.81$, it meant that the data of control class distributed normally.
b. Homogeneity Test

Test of homogeneity was done to know if sample of the research came from population that had same variance or not. The hypothesis of homogeneity test in pre- test was:

$$
H_{o}: \sigma_{1}^{2}=\sigma_{2}^{2}
$$

$H_{a}: \sigma_{1}^{2} \neq \mathbf{o}_{2}^{2}$
Description:
$\sigma_{1}^{2}=$ Variance of experiment class
$\sigma_{2}^{2}=$ Variance of control class
Ho was accepted if $F_{\text {count }}<F_{\text {table }}$. It meant that the variance was homogeneous.

### 4.7 Table of Variance in Pre-Test

| Variance Sources | Experimental Class | Control Class |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SUM | 1792 | 1720 |
| n | 35 | 35 |
| $\overline{\mathrm{x}}$ | 51.200 | 49.142 |
| Variance $\left(\mathrm{s}^{2}\right)$ | 38.400 | 66.425 |
| Standard Deviation $(\mathrm{s})$ | 6.197 | 8.149 |

The computation of homogeneity test as follow:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& F=\frac{\text { Biggest Variance }}{\text { Smallest Variance }} \\
& F=\frac{66.42}{38.40} \\
& F=1.73
\end{aligned}
$$

On alpha $5 \%$ with df numerator $=35-1=34$, df denominator $=35-1=34$, it was found $F_{\text {table }}=1.772$. Based on the computation, it is obtain that $F_{\text {count }}=1.730$ < $F_{\text {table }} 1.7772$, so $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{o}}$ was accepted. It could be
concluded that data of pre- test from experiment and control class has the same variance or homogeneous.
c. Hypothesis Test

To test the average of similarity, the researcher used $t$ test. T- test was used to differentiate if the students' result of experiment class and control class were significant or not.

Ho $\quad \mathrm{i}_{1}=\mathrm{i}_{2}$
Ha $\quad: \mathrm{i}_{1} \neq \mathrm{i}_{2}$
Description:
$\grave{\mathrm{l}}_{1} \quad=$ Average data of experimental class
$\grave{\mathrm{l}}_{2}=$ Average data of control class
If $t_{\text {count }}>t_{\text {table }}$ So Ho is rejected and there is difference of average value from both of classes. The formula of $t$-test was:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& t=\frac{\bar{X}_{1}-\bar{X}_{2}}{S \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_{1}}+\frac{1}{n_{2}}}} \\
& S=\sqrt{\frac{\left(n_{1}-1\right) S_{1}^{2}+\left(n_{2}-1\right) S_{2}^{2}}{n_{1}+n_{2}-2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Based on table, the researcher had to find out $S$ with that formula.

$$
\begin{aligned}
S & =\sqrt{\frac{\left(n_{1}-1\right) S_{1}{ }^{2}+\left(n_{2}-1\right) S_{2}{ }^{2}}{n_{1}+n_{2}-2}} \\
& =\sqrt{\frac{(35-1)(38.40)+(35-1)(66.42)}{35+35-2}} \\
& =7.2396
\end{aligned}
$$

After $S$ was found, the next step was to measure $t$-test.

$$
\begin{aligned}
t & =\frac{\bar{X}_{1}-\bar{X}_{2}}{\sqrt[s]{\frac{1}{n_{1}}+\frac{1}{n_{2}}}} \\
& =\frac{51.20-49.14}{\sqrt[7.2396]{\sqrt{\frac{1}{35}+\frac{1}{35}}}} \\
& =1.189
\end{aligned}
$$

With $\alpha=5 \%$ and df $=35+35-2=68$, obtained $t_{\text {table }}=$ 2.00. Based on the result of t-test, it was found that $t_{\text {count }}=1.189$. Because of $t_{\text {count }}<t_{\text {table }}$ so $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{O}}$ was accepted. It could be concluded that there was no significant of difference between experiment and control class. Both of them had same condition before treatments.

## 2. Analysis of Post-test

The experimental class and control class were given a post test on $16^{\text {th }}$ May 2016. Post-test was conducted after doing all treatments. Time token arends strategy was used as a strategy in teaching speaking in the experimental class by the researcher. While in control class, students were taught using lecturing learning method also by the researcher.

Post-test was aimed to measure students' speaking skill. The results of the test were analyzed as follows:
a. Normality Test

When the result computation of Chi-quadrate ( $t_{\text {count }}$ ) found then, compared with table of Chi-quadrate ( $t_{\text {table }}$ ) by using alpha of significances. If $t_{\text {count }}<t_{\text {table }}$,
it meant that the data spread of the research result distributed normally.
4.8. Table of Students' Score of Experimental Class in

Post-Test

| EXPERIMENTAL |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| NO |  | CODE |
| 1 | E-1 | 68 |
| 2 | E-2 | 60 |
| 3 | E-3 | 64 |
| 4 | E-4 | 76 |
| 5 | E-5 | 64 |
| 6 | E-6 | 60 |
| 7 | E-7 | 64 |
| 8 | E-8 | 60 |
| 9 | E-9 | 64 |
| 10 | E-10 | 76 |
| 11 | E-11 | 64 |
| 12 | E-12 | 72 |
| 13 | E-14 | 76 |
| 14 | E-15 | 68 |
| 15 | E-16 | 72 |
| 16 | E-17 | 60 |
| 17 | E-18 | 60 |
| 18 | E-19 | 56 |
| 19 | E-20 | 60 |
| 20 | E-21 | 60 |
| 21 | E-22 | 76 |
| 22 | E-23 | 60 |
| 23 | E-24 | 72 |
| 24 | E-25 | 68 |
| 25 | E-26 | 64 |
| 26 | E-27 | 64 |
| 27 |  | 60 |


| 28 | E-28 | 48 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 29 | E-29 | 72 |
| 30 | E-30 | 64 |
| 31 | E-31 | 64 |
| 32 | E-32 | 68 |
| 33 | E-33 | 60 |
| 34 | E-34 | 60 |
| 35 | E-35 | 76 |
|  |  |  |
| Jumlah |  | 2280 |
| n |  | 35 |
| X rata2 |  | 65.1429 |
| Varians (s2) |  | 43.8319 |
| Standar <br> (Sd) |  | 6.62057 |

### 4.9. Table of Distribution Frequency of Experimental

 Class in Post-Test| Class |  | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $X_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $X_{\mathrm{i}}{ }^{2}$ | $f_{i} \cdot X_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $f_{\mathrm{i}} \cdot X_{\mathrm{i}}{ }^{2}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 48 | - | 52 | 1 | 50 | 2500 | 50 | 2500 |
| 53 | - | 57 | 1 | 55 | 3025 | 55 | 3025 |
| 58 | - | 62 | 11 | 60 | 3600 | 660 | 39600 |
| 63 | - | 67 | 9 | 65 | 4225 | 585 | 38025 |
| 68 | - | 72 | 8 | 70 | 4900 | 560 | 39200 |
| 73 | - | 77 | 5 | 75 | 5625 | 375 | 28125 |
| SUM |  | 35 |  |  | 2285 | 150475 |  |

Based on the research result of students in experiment class, it was found that the maximum score was 76 and minimum score was 48 and the stretches score were 28 . So,
there were 6 classes with length of classes 5 . From the computation of frequency distribution, it was found the average score ( $\bar{X}$ ) was 65.29 and the standard deviation (Sd) was 6.18. After the researcher counted the average score and standard deviation, table of observation frequency was needed to measure Chi-square.
4.10. Table of Observation Frequency of Experimental Class in Post-Test

| Class |  | Bk | $\mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $\mathrm{P}\left(Z_{i}\right)$ | Ld | Ei | 0 i | $\frac{\left(0_{i}-E_{i}\right)}{E}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 475 | - 288 | -04980 |  |  |  |  |
| 48 - | 52 |  |  |  | 0.0172 | 0.6 | 1 | 0.3647 |
|  |  | 52.5 | -2.07 | -0.4808 |  |  |  |  |
| $53-$ | 57 |  |  |  | 0.0845 | 2.7 | 1 | 1.0743 |
|  |  | 57.5 | -1.26 | -0.3963 |  |  |  |  |
| 58 - | 62 |  |  |  | 0.2222 | 7.1 | 11 | 2.1256 |
|  |  | 62.5 | -0.45 | -0.1740 |  |  |  |  |
| 63 - | 67 |  |  |  | 0.3140 | 10.0 | 9 | 0.1094 |
|  |  | 67.5 | 0.36 | 0.1400 |  |  |  |  |
| 68 - | 72 |  |  |  | 0.2386 | 7.6 | 8 | 0.0175 |
|  |  | 72.5 | 1.17 | 0.3786 |  |  |  |  |
| $73-$ | 77 |  |  |  | 0.0974 | 3.1 | 5 | 1.1372 |
|  |  | 77.5 | 1.98 | 0.4760 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\chi^{2}$ | $=$ | 4.83 |

Based on Chi-quadrate table $\left(\div{ }_{\text {table }}^{2}\right)$ for $5 \%$ alpha of significance, with dk 6-3, it was found $\left(\div{ }_{\text {table }}^{2}\right)=7.81$. It
can be concluded that $\div{ }_{\text {count }}^{2}=4.83<\div{ }_{\text {table }}^{2}=7.81$. It meant that the data of control class distributed normally.
4.11. Table of Students' Score of Control Class in PostTest

| CONTROL |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| NO | CODE | SCORE |
| 1 | C-1 | 52 |
| 2 | C-2 | 60 |
| 3 | C-3 | 64 |
| 4 | C-4 | 52 |
| 5 | C-5 | 60 |
| 6 | C-6 | 56 |
| 7 | C-7 | 56 |
| 8 | C-8 | 60 |
| 9 | C-9 | 60 |
| 10 | C-10 | 60 |
| 11 | C-11 | 56 |
| 12 | C-12 | 52 |
| 13 | C-13 | 72 |
| 14 | C-14 | 64 |
| 15 | C-15 | 52 |
| 16 | C-16 | 44 |
| 17 | C-17 | 48 |
| 18 | C-18 | 56 |
| 19 | C-19 | 68 |
| 20 | C-20 | 60 |
| 21 | C-21 | 52 |
| 22 | C-22 | 56 |
| 23 | C-23 | 48 |
| 24 | C-24 | 56 |
| 25 | C-25 | 44 |
| 26 | C-26 | 52 |
| 27 | C-27 | 72 |


| 28 | $\mathrm{C}-28$ | 56 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 29 | $\mathrm{C}-29$ | 52 |
| 30 | $\mathrm{C}-30$ | 56 |
| 31 | $\mathrm{C}-31$ | 60 |
| 32 | $\mathrm{C}-32$ | 48 |
| 33 | $\mathrm{C}-33$ | 60 |
| 34 | $\mathrm{C}-34$ | 64 |
| 35 | $\mathrm{C}-35$ | 48 |
| Jumlah |  | 1976 |
| N |  | 35 |
| X rata2 |  | 56.4571 |
| Varians (s2) |  | 47.785 |
| Standar Deviasi (Sd) |  | 6.91266 |

### 4.12. Table of Distribution Frequency of Control Class in Post-Test

| Class |  | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $X_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $X_{\mathrm{i}}{ }^{2}$ | $f_{i} \cdot X_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $f_{i} \cdot X_{\mathrm{i}}{ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 44 | - | 48 | 6 | 46 | 2116 | 276 |
| 49 | - | 53 | 7 | 51 | 2601 | 357 |
| 54 | - | 58 | 8 | 56 | 3136 | 448 |
| 59 | - | 63 | 8 | 61 | 3721 | 488 |
| 64 | - | 68 | 4 | 66 | 4356 | 264 |
| 69 | - | 73 | 2 | 71 | 5041 | 14424 |
| SUM |  | 35 |  |  | 1975 | 1113265 |

The results of students in control class, after they were taught using conventional learning method, it was found that the maximum score was 72 and minimum score was 44 and the stretches of score were 28 . There were 6 classes with length of each classes were 5 . From the
computation of frequency distribution, it was found the average score $(\bar{X})$ was 56.43 and the standard deviation (Sd) was 7.31. After the researcher counted the average score and standard deviation, table of observation frequency was needed to measure Chi-square.

### 4.13. Table of Observation Frequency of Control Class in Post-Test

| Class |  | Bk | $Z_{i}$ | $\mathrm{P}\left(Z_{i}\right)$ | Ld | Ei | 0 i | $\frac{\left(0_{0}-E_{i}\right)}{E_{i}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 43.5 | -1.77 | -0.4614 |  |  |  |  |
| 44 - | 48 |  |  |  | 0.1006 | 3.2 | 6 | 2.4013 |
|  |  | 48.5 | -1.08 | -0.3608 |  |  |  |  |
| 49 - | 53 |  |  |  | 0.2053 | 6.6 | 7 | 0.0284 |
|  |  | 53.5 | -0.40 | -0.1556 |  |  |  |  |
| 54 - | 58 |  |  |  | 0.2671 | 8.5 | 8 | 0.0350 |
|  |  | 58.5 | 0.28 | 0.1115 |  |  |  |  |
| 59 - | 63 |  |  |  | 0.2217 | 7.1 | 8 | 0.1156 |
|  |  | 63.5 | 0.97 | 0.3332 |  |  |  |  |
| 64 - | 68 |  |  |  | 0.1174 | 3.8 | 4 | 0.0158 |
|  |  | 68.5' | 1.65 | 0.4506 |  |  |  |  |
| 69 - | 73 |  |  |  | 0.0396 | 1.3 | 2 | 0.4227 |
|  |  | 73.5 | 2.33 | 0.4902 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\chi^{2}$ | $=$ | 3.02 |

Based on Chi-quadrate table ( $\div{ }_{\text {table }}^{2}$ ) for $5 \%$ alpha of significance, with dk 6-3, it was found $\left(\div_{\text {table }}^{2}\right)=7.81$. It can be concluded that $\div_{\text {count }}^{2}=3.02<\div_{\text {table }}^{2}=7.81$. It meant that the data of control class distributed normally.
b. Homogeneity Test

Test of homogeneity was done to know if sample of the research came from population that had same variance or not. The hypothesis of homogeneity test in post-test was:
$\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{o}}: \mathrm{o}_{1}^{2}=\mathrm{o}_{2}^{2}$
$\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}: \mathrm{o}_{1}^{2} \neq \mathrm{o}_{2}^{2}$

## Description:

$\delta_{1}^{2}=$ Variance of experimental class
$\mathrm{o}_{2}^{2}=$ Variance of control class
Ho was accepted if $F_{\text {count }}<F_{\text {table }}$. It meant that the variance was homogeneous.

### 4.14. Table of variance in post-test

| Variance Sources | Experimental Class | Control Class |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SUM | 2280 | 1968 |
| n | 35 | 35 |
| x | 65.142 | 56.450 |
| Variance $\left(s^{2}\right)$ | 43.831 | 50.770 |
| Standard Deviation $(s)$ | 6.620 | 7.125 |

The computation of homogeneity test as follow:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& F=\frac{\text { Biggest Variance }}{\text { Smallest Variance }} \\
& F=\frac{50.77}{43.58} \\
& F=1.15
\end{aligned}
$$

On alpha 5\% with df numerator $=35-1=34$, df denominator $=35-1=34$, it was found $F_{\text {table }}=1.7721$. Based on the computation, it is obtain that $F_{\text {count }}=1.158$ $<F_{\text {table }} 1.7721$, so $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{o}}$ was accepted. It could be concluded that data of pre- test from experiment and control class has the same variance or homogeneous.
c. Hypothesis Test

To test the hypothesis, the researcher used t-test. Ttest was used to differentiate if the students' result of experiment class and control class were significant or not.

Ho $\quad: \grave{i}_{1} \leq \grave{l}_{2}$
Ha $\quad: \mathrm{i}_{1}>\mathrm{I}_{2}$

## Description:

$\mathrm{i}_{1} \quad=$ Average data of experimental class
$\grave{\mathrm{l}}_{2}=$ Average data of control class
If $t_{\text {count }}>t_{\text {table }}$ So Ho is rejected and there is difference of average value from both of classes. The formula of t -test was:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& t=\frac{\bar{X}_{1}-\bar{X}_{2}}{\sqrt[S]{\frac{1}{n_{1}}+\frac{1}{n_{2}}}} \text { with } \\
& S=\sqrt{\frac{\left(n^{1}-1\right) S^{12}+\left(n^{2}-1\right) S^{2^{2}}}{n^{1}+n^{2}-2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Based on table, the researcher had to find out $S$ with that formula.

$$
\begin{aligned}
S & =\sqrt{\frac{\left(n_{1}-1\right) S_{1}^{2}+\left(n_{2}-1\right) S_{2}^{2}}{n_{1}+n_{2}-2}} \\
& =\sqrt{\frac{(35-1)(43.88)+(35-1)(50.77)}{35+35-2}} \\
& =6.8775
\end{aligned}
$$

After $S$ was found, the next step was to measure $t$-test.

$$
\begin{aligned}
t & =\frac{\bar{X}_{1}-\bar{X}_{2}}{\sqrt[s]{\frac{1}{n_{1}}+\frac{1}{n_{2}}}} \\
& =\frac{65.14-56.45}{\sqrt[6.8775]{\frac{1}{35}+\frac{1}{35}}}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
=5.365
$$

With $\alpha=5 \%$ and $\mathrm{df}=35+35-2=68$, obtained $t_{\text {table }}=$ 1.67 From the result of $t$-test above, it was found that $t_{\text {count }}=5.422$. Because of $t_{\text {count }}>t_{\text {table }}$, so $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{O}}$ was rejected and $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}$ was accepted. It could be concluded that there is significant difference between experimental and control class. It means that experimental class is better than control class after getting the treatments.

