**CHAPTER IV**

**RESEARCH RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

* 1. **Research Result** 
     1. **The Students Speaking Ability without Using Two Stay Two Stray (TS-TS) Strategy**

The students speaking ability without using Two Stay Two Stray Srategy called as control group by researcher. In this research, control group consist of 20 students. When the researcher taught the students without using Two Stay Two Stray Strategy some of the students were not have good ability to speak english, and they can not said their sentences clearly or share their opinion and feelings. When they spoke in front of the class, they didnt showed a good performance, their vocabulary, accuracy, fluency and pronounciation were less. The students just spoke a little and some of students afraid to speak english in front of the class, they told about their vacation used simple word. Their motivation to learn speaking also less.

* + 1. **The Data from Control Group**

#### In control group, after the researcher taught the students without Two Stay Two Stray Strategy, the researcher got the data as following.

**TABLE 4.1**

**THE SCORE PRE-TEST OF THE CONTROL GROUP**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Name** | **V** | **A** | **P** | **F** | **Score of**  **Pre-Test** |
| 1 | AS | 20 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 70 |
| 2 | DS | 20 | 16 | 17 | 20 | 73 |
| 3 | DK | 18 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 69 |
| 4 | SRS | 18 | 18 | 17 | 17 | 70 |
| 5 | RPP | 20 | 17 | 18 | 16 | 71 |
| 6 | DRDT | 22 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 70 |
| 7 | SS | 24 | 16 | 15 | 15 | 70 |
| 8 | ISP | 24 | 17 | 16 | 17 | 74 |
| 9 | AB | 23 | 16 | 16 | 17 | 72 |
| 10 | ASS | 20 | 15 | 20 | 15 | 70 |
| 11 | PD | 20 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 74 |
| 12 | APK | 24 | 15 | 14 | 15 | 68 |
| 13 | GEP | 24 | 18 | 15 | 18 | 75 |
| 14 | RRP | 25 | 18 | 20 | 18 | 81 |
| 15 | PS | 22 | 15 | 16 | 15 | 70 |
| 16 | RRSB | 24 | 15 | 16 | 15 | 71 |
| 17 | LW | 27 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 75 |
| 18 | RAP | 24 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 71 |
| 19 | WSP | 27 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 75 |
| 20 | CA | 23 | 16 | 17 | 16 | 75 |
| Total | | | | | | 1444 |

Where: V : Vocabulary A : Accuracy

P : Pronounciation F : Fluency

After applying the pre-test to the control group, the score were gained. It was obtained that in control the highest score in the pre-test is 68 (1 students) and lowest score in the pre-test is 81 (1 students).

**TABLE 4.2**

**THE SCORE OF THE POST-TEST OF CONTROL GROUP**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Name** | **V** | **A** | **P** | **F** | **Score of**  **Post-Test** |
| 1 | AS | 24 | 16 | 18 | 18 | 76 |
| 2 | DS | 20 | 16 | 17 | 20 | 73 |
| 3 | DK | 23 | 22 | 21 | 23 | 89 |
| 4 | SRS | 20 | 18 | 20 | 18 | 76 |
| 5 | RPP | 24 | 15 | 19 | 17 | 75 |
| 6 | DRDT | 25 | 17 | 17 | 16 | 75 |
| 7 | SS | 24 | 17 | 18 | 16 | 75 |
| 8 | ISP | 24 | 18 | 18 | 15 | 75 |
| 9 | AB | 20 | 19 | 19 | 17 | 75 |
| 10 | ASS | 28 | 20 | 18 | 14 | 80 |
| 11 | PD | 20 | 18 | 20 | 17 | 75 |
| 12 | APK | 24 | 16 | 12 | 18 | 70 |
| 13 | GEP | 24 | 19 | 18 | 20 | 81 |
| 14 | RRP | 22 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 76 |
| 15 | PS | 22 | 18 | 17 | 18 | 75 |
| 16 | RRSB | 25 | 17 | 17 | 16 | 75 |
| 17 | LW | 25 | 16 | 17 | 19 | 77 |
| 18 | RAP | 22 | 16 | 18 | 19 | 75 |
| 19 | WSP | 19 | 17 | 19 | 20 | 75 |
| 20 | CA | 19 | 17 | 20 | 22 | 78 |
| TOTAL | | | | | | 1526 |

Where: V : Vocabulary A : Accuracy

P : Pronounciation F : Fluency

After applying the post-test to the control group. The score were gained. It was obtained that in control group the highest score in the post-test is 89 (1 student) and the lowest score in the post-test is 73 (1 student).

* + 1. **The Students Speaking Ability by Using Two Stay Two Stray (TS-TS) Strategy**

The students speaking ability by using Two Stay Two Stray Strategy called experimental group by researcher. In this research, experimental group consist of 20 students. This technique gave good effect in experimental group, where all of student had good spirit to learn about speaking. With their friends, they told about their experience that related to vacation and and they can told it freely. So, when they presented their experince, they were able to show good performance.

Their vocabulary, pronounciation, fluency and accuracy were good. The students also able to delivered what they want to share. They worked together about the topic and share the opinion, though and feeling. Each student in the class had a same opportunity to speak in front of the class and another student listened their friend. So, other students shared opinions, information and though to all of students in the class.

* + 1. **The Data From Experimental Group**

In experimental group, after the researcher taught the students byTwo Stay Two Stray Strategy, the researcher got the data as following :

**TABLE 4.3**

**THE SCORE PRE-TEST OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Name** | **V** | **A** | **P** | **F** | **Score of Pre-Test** |
| 1 | LD | 20 | 18 | 20 | 20 | 78 |
| 2 | FS | 23 | 20 | 18 | 17 | 78 |
| 3 | DS | 25 | 17 | 17 | 16 | 75 |
| 4 | DM | 24 | 17 | 18 | 16 | 75 |
| 5 | LK | 24 | 16 | 19 | 16 | 75 |
| 6 | HS | 22 | 19 | 19 | 15 | 75 |
| 7 | SW | 23 | 18 | 17 | 17 | 75 |
| 8 | MP | 21 | 19 | 21 | 19 | 80 |
| 9 | NW | 25 | 20 | 25 | 19 | 89 |
| 10 | PS | 24 | 19 | 20 | 16 | 79 |
| 11 | AS | 25 | 18 | 17 | 15 | 75 |
| 12 | PS | 23 | 19 | 18 | 15 | 75 |
| 13 | MESS | 22 | 19 | 19 | 15 | 75 |
| 14 | SM | 29 | 15 | 16 | 15 | 75 |
| 15 | RRP | 25 | 18 | 19 | 16 | 78 |
| 16 | MNS | 21 | 20 | 19 | 16 | 76 |
| 17 | ADAD | 23 | 19 | 18 | 15 | 75 |
| 18 | SP | 23 | 21 | 17 | 17 | 78 |
| 19 | ST | 25 | 22 | 22 | 19 | 88 |
| 20 | NAS | 25 | 24 | 22 | 20 | 91 |
| Total | | | | | | 1565 |

Where: V : Vocabulary A : Accuracy

P : Pronounciation F : Fluency

After applying a pre-test to experimental group, the scores were gained. It was obtained that in experimental group highest score in the pre-test is 91 (1 student) and the lowest score in the pre-test is 75.

**TABLE 4.4**

**THE SCORE POST-TEST OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Name** | **V** | **A** | **P** | **F** | **Score of Post-Test** |
| 1 | LD | 25 | 25 | 25 | 20 | 95 |
| 2 | FS | 25 | 25 | 25 | 19 | 94 |
| 3 | DS | 25 | 25 | 25 | 19 | 94 |
| 4 | DM | 25 | 25 | 21 | 20 | 91 |
| 5 | LK | 25 | 25 | 20 | 20 | 90 |
| 6 | HS | 25 | 25 | 24 | 20 | 94 |
| 7 | SW | 23 | 25 | 24 | 21 | 93 |
| 8 | MP | 25 | 25 | 25 | 24 | 99 |
| 9 | NW | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 100 |
| 10 | PS | 25 | 21 | 20 | 21 | 87 |
| 11 | AS | 25 | 25 | 25 | 22 | 97 |
| 12 | PS | 24 | 21 | 25 | 20 | 90 |
| 13 | MESS | 25 | 24 | 22 | 20 | 91 |
| 14 | SM | 24 | 25 | 21 | 21 | 91 |
| 15 | RRP | 23 | 20 | 21 | 20 | 84 |
| 16 | MNS | 29 | 21 | 19 | 20 | 89 |
| 17 | ADAD | 25 | 25 | 25 | 23 | 93 |
| 18 | SP | 25 | 25 | 25 | 21 | 96 |
| 19 | ST | 25 | 25 | 21 | 21 | 92 |
| 20 | NAS | 25 | 25 | 25 | 24 | 94 |
| Total | | | | | | 1854 |

Where: V : Vocabulary A : Accuracy

P : Pronounciation F : Fluency

After applying the post-test to the experimental group, the score were gained. It was obtained that in experimental group the highest score in the post test 100 (1 student) and the lowest score in the post-test is 84 (1 student).

Based on the table score above, we can seen that the experimental group, which is taught by applying Two Stay Two Stray Strategy significantly to the students’ ability in speaking. It can be seen from the score on the pre-test compare with the score on post test. The score on post-test reflected to improve the students’ speaking by applying Two Stay Two Stray Strategy, while the control group, which is taught without TS-TS Strategy did not affect significantly on students’ ability in speaking.

**4.1.5** **The Differences Students’ Speaking Ability Taught without and by Using Two Stay Two Stray (TS-TS) Strategy**

In order to know the effect of Two Stay Two Stray (TS-TS) Strategy, the researcher compared the students’ ability in speaking. After taught the students without and by Two Stay Two Stray (TS-TS) Strategy. The first, in control group their vocabulary, fluency, pronounciation and accuracy were less than experimental group. The second students in control group just a little to speak and use simple word, while students’ in experimental group able to develop their ideas, and their opinions, so they were able to speak more. The last, the students in control group had been less motivation to learn speaking, while students in experimental had a good spirit to learn speaking.

**4.1.6 Data Analysis**

Based on table 4.1 and 4.2 for control group, 4.3 and 4.4 for experimental group above, it showed the different score between pre-test and post test in both of group.

**4.5 THE RESULT OF PRE-TEST AND POST TEST OF**

**THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NO** | **Students’**  **Initial** | **Score of Pre-test** | **Score of Post-test** | **Deviation**  **(d)** | **(dx)=**  **d-** | **Square of Deviation** |
| 1 | AR | 78 | 95 | 17 | 3 | 9 |
| 2 | CMS | 78 | 94 | 16 | 2 | 4 |
| 3 | DS | 75 | 94 | 19 | 5 | 25 |
| 4 | DM | 75 | 91 | 16 | 2 | 4 |
| 5 | IL | 75 | 90 | 15 | 1 | 1 |
| 6 | HS | 75 | 94 | 19 | 5 | 25 |
| 7 | KFS | 75 | 93 | 18 | 4 | 16 |
| 8 | MR | 80 | 99 | 19 | 5 | 25 |
| 9 | NW | 89 | 100 | 11 | -3 | 9 |
| 10 | PS | 79 | 87 | 8 | -6 | 36 |
| 11 | RY | 75 | 97 | 22 | 8 | 64 |
| 12 | RSS | 75 | 90 | 15 | 1 | 1 |
| 13 | VTA | 75 | 91 | 16 | 2 | 4 |
| 14 | WS | 75 | 91 | 16 | 2 | 4 |
| 15 | WA | 78 | 84 | 6 | -12 | 144 |
| 16 | YZA | 76 | 89 | 13 | -1 | 1 |
| 17 | YS | 75 | 93 | 18 | 4 | 16 |
| 18 | DNS | 78 | 96 | 18 | 4 | 16 |
| 19 | ZL | 88 | 92 | 4 | -10 | 100 |
| 20 | JS | 91 | 94 | 3 | -11 | 121 |
|  |  | **1565** | **1854** | **289** | **5** | **625** |

The calculation of the mean (Mx) or the sum of deviation (∑d) of the experimental group is 289 and mean score (Mx) are calculated as follow:

=

= 14,45

= 14

Meanwhile the calculation of Mean (My) or the sum of deviation (∑d ) of control group.

**4.6 THE RESULT OF PRE-TEST AND POST TEST OF**

**THE CONTROL GROUP**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NO** | **Students’**  **Initial** | **Score of Pre-test** | **Score of Post-test** | **Deviation**  **(d)** | **(dy)=**  **d-M** | **Square of Deviation** |
| 1 | AS | 70 | 76 | 6 | 2 | 4 |
| 2 | DS | 73 | 74 | 1 | -3 | 9 |
| 3 | DK | 69 | 81 | 12 | 8 | 64 |
| 4 | SRS | 70 | 76 | 6 | 2 | 4 |
| 5 | RPP | 71 | 75 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | DRDT | 70 | 75 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 7 | SS | 70 | 75 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 8 | ISP | 74 | 75 | 1 | -3 | 9 |
| 9 | AB | 72 | 75 | 3 | -1 | 1 |
| 10 | ASS | 70 | 80 | 10 | 6 | 36 |
| 11 | PD | 74 | 75 | 1 | -3 | 9 |
| 12 | APK | 68 | 70 | 2 | -2 | 4 |
| 13 | GEP | 75 | 81 | 6 | 2 | 4 |
| 14 | RRP | 81 | 82 | 1 | -3 | 9 |
| 15 | PS | 70 | 75 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 16 | RRSB | 71 | 75 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 17 | LW | 75 | 77 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| 18 | RAP | 71 | 75 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 19 | WSP | 75 | 76 | 1 | -3 | 9 |
| 20 | CA | 75 | 78 | 3 | -1 | 1 |
|  |  | **1444** | **1526** | **82** | **6** | **170** |

The following calculation is the mean score of the control group:

=

= 4,1

= 4

The data analysis was taken by the calculation of the result of the test. It is aimed to find sout the significant differences between teaching speaking by applying Two Stay Two Stray Strategy. The researcher analyzed the data by applying the T-test to improve the hypothesis.

From the analyzed data, the following result obtained.

Mx = 14

My = 4

dx2 = 625

dy2 = 170

Nx = 20

Ny = 20

t= 5.882

As stated before, the objective was find out, when the students taught by using Two Stay Two Stray (TS-TS) Strategy have been significant effect to improve students’ ability in speaking.

Based on the calculation of t-test above, t-observed is 5.882. Having the data been computed by using t-test formula it showed that the t-critical value is 5.882 in degree freedom (df) of this research is (Na+Nb-2=20+20-2=38. The Df of 38 was not listed in t-table, so it uses the nearest (df) that was 40.

**CRITICAL VALUE –T**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Critical Value t | | | | | | |
| *Df* | Significant Level One Tail | | | | | |
| 10 | 05 | 025 | 01 | 005 | 0005 |
| Significant Level Two Tails | | | | | |
| 20 | 10 | 05 | 02 | 01 | 001 |
| 1.  2.  3.  4.  5.  6.  7.  8.  9.  10.  11.  12.  13.  14.  15.  16.  17.  18.  19.  20.  21.  22.  23.  24.  25.  26.  27.  28.  29.  30.  40.  60.  120. | 3.078  1.636  1.638  1.533  1.476  1.440  1.415  1.397  1.363  1.372  1.363  1.356  1.350  1.345  1.341  1.337  1.333  1.330  1.328  1.325  1.323  1.321  1.319  1.318  1.316  1.315  1.314  1.313  1.311  1.310  1.303  1.296  1.289  1.282 | 6.314  2.920  2.353  2.132  2.015  1.943  1.895  1.860  1.853  1.812  1.793  1.782  1.771  1.761  1.753  1.746  1.740  1.734  1.729  1.725  1.721  1.717  1.714  1.711  1.708  1.706  1.703  1.701  1.699  1.697  1.684  1.671  1.658  1.645 | 12.706  4.308  3.182  2.773  2.571  2.447  2.365  2.306  2.260  2.228  2.202  2.179  2.160  2.145  2.131  2.120  2.110  2.101  2.903  2.806  2.080  2.074  2.069  2.064  2.060  2.056  2.052  2.048  2.045  2.042  2.021  2.000  1.980  1.960 | 31.821  6.965  4.641  3.374  3.365  3.143  3.993  3.895  3.825  2.764  2.718  2.681  2.650  2.624  2.692  2.583  2.567  2.552  2.539  2.528  2.518  2.508  2.500.  2.492  2.485  2.479  2.473  2.467  2.462  2.547  2.423  2.390  2.358  2.326 | 62.657  9.925  5.841  4.604  4.032  3.707  3.499  3.355  3.250  3.169  3.106  3.055  3.012  2.977  2.947  2.021  2.898  2.876  2.861  2.845  2.831  2.819  2.807  2.797  2.787  2.799  2.771  2.763  2.756  2.750  2.704  2.660  2.617  2.576 | 6.36  31.593  12.941  8.610  6.859  5.959  5.405  5.041  4.781  4.587  4.437  4.316  4.221  4.140  4.073  4.015  3.965  3.922  3.883  3.850  3.819  3.792  3.767  3.745  3.725  3.707  3.600  3.674  3.659  3.646  3.551  3.460  3.373  3.291 |

The value would be used to find out whether the alternative hypothesis was rejected or not. After seeking the table of contribution t-critical as a basis of counting t-critical in certain degree of freedom (*df*), the calculation shows that the *df* was 38 (N1+N2-2= 20+20-2= 38). The *df* of 38 was not listed in t-table, so it uses the nearest (*df*) that was 40. in the line, the t-critical is 2.021 at the level of significance 0.25.

**4.1.7 Testing Hypothesis**

The hypothesis testing is to know whether the hypothesis is rejected or accepted. It was used the basic theory as follow:

1. The hypothesis is accepted if the t-observed > t-table

2. The hypothesis is rejected if the t-observed < t-table

The result of computing the t-test shows that the t-observed is 5.882 and t-table 2.021. It means that t-observed is the higher than t-table (5.882 > 2.021) with df 40. Thus, the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. And it can be concluded that Two Stay Two Stray has a significant effect for students’ speaking ability.

* 1. **Discussion**

This chapter discusses the finding of research that had been doing by the researcher. The test was conducted to collect the data in SMA NEGERI 1 SILINDA. The data required in this study were obtained from the result of the test that had been given to the students as the experimental group and the control group. The data is tabulated to get the mean, standard, deviation and variance of the both of group.

* + 1. **The Use of Two Stay Two Stray (TS-TS) Strategy**

Two Stay Two Stray Strategy is one type of cooperative learning which depeloved from previous methods such as alternative strategy in learning process. TS-TS Strategy is an learning approach in language teaching which have the concept to involved the students in learning process. It is aimed to create the good interaction between students and teacher. The strategy is more functional than other because it how to use the language than structural. It is important for the teacher to involved and interact with them using the language.

After the researcher was done the research on SMA NEGERI 1 SILINDA, researcher want to give a suggestion for teacher. It will be better, when students study about speaking, teacher use Two Stay Two Stray Strategy as learning language approach that use to teach students about speaking.. Two Stay Two Stray Strategy build up their own knowledge, make students enrich their language, develope their opinions and make students brave to speaking.

This research is an experimental research. The sample is taken from two classes of the Tenth Grade of SMA NEGERI 1 SILINDA. The total sample is 40 students. In this research, the researcher found that applying Two Stay Two Stray Strategy give positive effect to the students’ ability in speaking. It means that students who were taught by applying Two Stay Two Stray get higher score that students who were taught without is proved by the result of t-test in which t-score of t-calcualted is higher that t-critic ( t-observed is 5882, t-critic is 2021 with df = 40 at the level significant 0.25), so hypothesis is accepted well.