**CHAPTER I**

**INTRODUCTION**

This chapter presents: (a) background, (b) problems of study, (c) objective of the study, (d) significance of the study, (e) hypotheses and, (f) criteria of testing the hypotheses.

1. **Background**

Language is one of the most important things in communication and it is used a tool of communication among the nations in all over the world. Through language we can connect other people and make sense of our experiences. According to Julie (1995, p. 2), language is foremost a means of communication almost alwaystakes place within some sort of social context. This is why effective communication requires an understanding and recognition of the connections between a language and the people who use it. We use language to let others know how we feel, what we need, and to ask questions. And as human beings, people need language, we can not communicate and understand each other.

Every country has its own language, for example Indonesian use bahasa, Thailand people use tagalog and Malaysian use melayu. To interact with other people in the world, commonly international language are used. English is one of international languages. According to Thirumalai (2002, p. 1), English is an international language, spoken in many countries both as a native and as a second or foreign language. For making the communication easier among people from the different countries, people can use English as an international language. English can help people from different countries whose languages are also different can communicate and understand each other.

Many people think that learning English is difficult. Anwar (2009, p. 1) states that learning English as the foreign language is not as easy as learning the second language, because the process of learning the foreign language is different to the second language where the people may have many chances to practice it in the community. Aryusasra (2011, p. 1) adds that, in Indonesia the people who use English in the society is very limited, English is only used in the school while english subject is being learned.

In English there are four skillsthat should be mastered, they are listening, speaking, reading,and writing. Harmer (2007, p. 265) states that speaking and writing are classified into productive skills. Meanwile, reading and listening are classified into receptive skills. Mari (2010, p. 7) explains that listening is required in understanding, interpreting and evaluating what the listener hears, and reading can be used for sharing knowledge, self development or simply relaxation and escapism into the realms of fiction, are the receptive skills. While, speaking skill make people able to relate what they are thinking in effective, concise and direct manner and allows them to present communicate effectively with others in a variaty of situations, and writing is needed for transmitting information effectively and keeping records of information and experience, are the productive skills. All of skills must be developed in teaching and learning process. Success in speaking is measured in terms of the ability to carry out a conversation in the target language. The right activities are taught in the right way, speaking in class can be lot of fun, raising general learner motivation and making the English language classroom a fun and dynamic place to be. Nunan (2004, P. 9) states that the single most important reason for teaching speaking is to develop oral fluency, that is the ability to express oneself inteligibly, reasonably accurately and without undue hesitation. To meet this objective, learners will have to be brought from the stage where they merely imitate a model or respond to cues to the point where they can use the language to express their own ideas and feelings (processes that must to a large extent be in simultaneous operation.

According to the writer’s preliminary study at MTs N 1 Palembang, the writer found that some of students could understand what people said in English but the students couldn’t speak English well. Moreover, the students were very shy and afraid of making mistakes in speaking English and they don’t have many vocabularies. It was because the students rarely practice speaking English in daily activities and the students were not accustomed to saying anything in English. Moreover observing the school at MTs N 1 palembang. Based on the information from the teacher of English in MTsN 1 Palembang the writer found that most of the students’ ability in speaking was very poor. It was confirmed by the English teacher at that school, ibu Nurhayati, RW, the students achievement in speaking English was very low and the number of the student that joined to the course very small too. Furthemore, the writer also found that the method that the English teachers used in teaching speaking was still traditional method. The teachers just asked the students to act the conversation by reading the text.

To solve the problem, the teacher should be clever in choosing the best method in order to be able to make the students more enthusiastic and interested in learning speaking English. From many kinds of the problem above, improving speaking using drilling method with animated film probably can overcome the problems.

In this research, the writer chooses the topic improving students speaking skill using drilling method animated film. The writer chooses using drilling as method and the animated film as the teaching aids. According to Harmer (2010, p.1), drilling is mechanical ways if getting students to demonstrate and practice their ability to use specific language items in controlled manner. Drilling is technique that has been used in foreign language classrooms which emphasis on repeating structural pattern through oral practice to demonstrate students’ ability in using specific language items in controlled. Drilling can provide for a focus on accuracy.

The writer choose aimated film because there are so many students especially in MTsN 1 Palembang because animated film more interesting than film. So this method can mke the students enjoy and spirit in learning.

Based on the fact above, the writer is interested in conducting a research study entitles.’’ Improving Students’ Speaking Skill Using Drilling Method with Animated Film to eighth grade students MTs N 1 Palembang’’.

1. **Problem of the Study**

Based on the background above, the problem is formulated as follow:

Is there any significant difference on the eighth grade students’ speaking skill taught by using drilling method with animated films and teachers methodat MTs N 1 Palembang?

1. **Objective of the Study**

Based on the problem above, the objective of the study is find out whether or not there is a significant difference on the eighth grade students’ speaking skill taught by using drilling method with animated film and teachers’ method at MTs N 1 Palembang.

1. **Significance of the Study**

The study is expected to give some beneficial inputs for the following:

1. For the teachers of English

The outcome of this study is expected to be useful information for teachers, particularly the English teachers at MTsN 1Palembang to develop their speaking class activity, so their activities become more effectively and functionally;

1. For the Students

This study expected that the students of MTsN 1Palembang would enhance their competence in English especially in speaking skill which is focused on improving speaking. Encourage them to build up their speaking habit and also to cope their difficulties in speaking process. Through animated film, they are expected to have good development in speaking skill. by having animated film, they will feel happy to learn English since they are put in an enjoyable situation.

1. Other researcher

The study would be benefit to the other researchers who want to have further study on speaking activities, and this study is one of the way in improving students’ speaking skill.

1. **Hypotheses of the study**

According to Creswell (2003), research hypotheses are used to show the relationship between two variables and they are never proved or disapproved. The writer proposes two hypotheses in this study; they are null hypothesis (Ho) and alternative hypothesis (Ha). The hypotheses of this study are stated below:

(Ho) : There is no significant difference in teaching speaking skill taught by

using drilling method with animated film and teachers method to the

eighth grade students of MTs N 1 Palembang

(Ha) : There is a significant difference in teaching speaking skill taught by using drilling method with animated film and teachers method to the eighth grade students of MTsN 1 Palembang.

1. **The Criteria for Testing the Hypotheses**

In criteria of testing of hypotheses, measuring a significant difference independent sample t-test is used. Testing criteria of the hypotheses are as follows:

1). The null hypotheses (Ho) is accepted if the p-output is higher 0.05 and alternative hypotheses will be rejected.

2). The alternatives hypotheses (Ha) is accepted if the p-output is lower than 0.05 and the null hypotheses will be rejected.

**CHAPTER II**

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

Inthis chapter the writer presents: (a) theoritical descriptions, (b) previous related study, and (c) research setting.

1. **Theoretical Descriptions**

This chapter is devoted to the discussion of: (1) concept of teaching,(2) concept of speaking, (3) concept of drilling, (4) concept of visual aid,(5) animated film, (6) teaching speaking by using drilling method with animated film, (7)advantages and disadvantages of animated film, (8) teaching procedure by using teachers’ method.

1. **The Concept of Teaching**

Teaching is guiding and facilitating learning, enabling the learner to learn, setting the conditions for learning, ( Brown, 1987, p. 6). In teaching English the teacher should understand of how the learner learns to determine the philosophy of education, the teaching style, the approach, methods, and classroom techniques. It is line with what Islam, the people are suggested to teach in appropriate ways such as dialogue:

بِالْقَلَمِعَلَّمالَّذِي

“ .... that teach human to write and read”. *(Surah Al-Alaq verse : 4).* And additionally

يَعْلَمْلَمْمَاالْإِنْسَانَعَلَّمَ

“....God teaches human what human do not know” *(Surah Al-Alaq verse : 4)*

Based on the verses above, God teaches human to read everything that can increase human’s science. In order, they know about something that they never know before. Then, human write what they have found or known. Furthermore, Tirtarahadja and Sulo (2007, p. 1) said that teaching means as an activities to instruct, give an easy way on how to find (not to give) something based on the ability which is owning by the learners. The statement above the teacher gives such an instruction to the learners how to find their own ability not to give ability to the learners. Besides, Hornby (1975, p. 889) said that teaching means giving somebody knowledge, skill etc. teaching English means that involve four language skills, namely, listening, speaking, reading, writing and the aspect such as grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, etc. on the other hand, teaching English means instruct the learners to find the knowledge that involves four languages skills, they are: listening, speaking, reading, writing and the aspect of language such as grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, etc. Slamet (2005, p. 8) said that teaching and learning are joint enterprises involving both teacher and students or learners in partnership where the participants have complementary roles and similar status.

Tirtarahadja and Sulo (2007, p. 2) said that there are seven aspects in teaching and learning, they are:

1. The learners
2. The teacher or the instructor
3. Interaction between the learner and the teacher
4. The aim of learning
5. The material of learning
6. The method and the teaching aids
7. The place where the process of teaching and learning is held

Furthermore, teaching is process which usually takes place in the classroom situations. It is more of formal processes. In the classroom situations the teacher has something in his/her mind and teacher wants to convey it to the students. A teacher makes all efforts to make his/her students understand. His/her teaching is successful if the students are able to grasp it fully. The teacher aim of teaching process are giving some knowledge to the students, passing some information to the students, making the students acquire some skill changing the attitude of the learners, modifying the behavior of the students, giving some experience of life, etc.

1. **The Concept of Speaking**

According to Manser (2000, p. 414), to “speak is talk to somebody about something, use your voice to say something; be able to use a language; make a speech to know an audience; say or state something.” According to Ramussen (2007, p. 2), speaking is commonly as speech or man’s way of understanding and living with other men, a two side activity a speaker and of the listener, the blending of this element; thought mental processes; language modeling of thought and feelings into word; voice carrying thought and words. Thought vocal sound to someone else; action bodily bearing and responds and listening, to arouse corresponding idea, meanings, and each other.

1. **The Concept of Drilling**

Drilling is a technique that has been used in foreign language classrooms for many years. It was a key feature of audio-lingual method approaches to language teaching, which placed emphasis on repeating structural patterns through oral practice. Drilling is technique that is still used by many teachers when introducing new language items to their students. Harmer ( 2010, p. 1) states that drilling is mechanical ways if getting students to demonstrate and practice their ability to use specific language items in a controlled manner.

1. **Concept of Visual Aid**

According to Manser (2000, p. 481), visual aid are picture, video, so on used in teaching to help people understand something. According to Miarso (2007,p. 4), visual aid is use by teacher to transfer an idea and experience, equipment and material used for communication in instruction. Implies technique based upon practices utilized in education and training.

The writer conclude that visual aid is a media which can be used to show or transfer messages by mechanic and electronic materials or machines that we can both see and hear.

According to Arsyad (2006, p. 75), the use of audio visual aids can be classified based on the learning characteristic and lesson content. The classifications based on learning characteristic consist of:

1. Audio cassette

If the lesson need revise and update information, can be used in medium group (10-50 persons), small group (2-10 persons), and individual test or tutor

1. Film

Can be used in big group (more than 50 persons), medium group, small group and individual test.

1. Computer

Can be used in small group and individual test

1. Video disk

Can be used also in small group and individual test

1. Television

Can be used in big and medium group

There are many kinds of audio visual aids but in this paper, the writer only focus on film. Film or which is famous called motion picture in several years are most valuable tools used by teacher in teaching. It can effectively remove the limitations of time and space placed on the physical classroom learning situation.

1. **Animated Film**

According to Dobson, (1974, p. 72) many teachers like to use animated film as devises to stimulate conversation. The facial expressions of animated film figure may inspire students to interpret the thoughts behind the expressions and inspire students to interpret the thoughts behind the expressions and the story implicit in animated film provides the students with something to describe or narrate. Generally, it is best to show animated film with captions or strips without dialogue, so that the student can supply his own interpretation. You can trace a animated film on a ditto master, eliminating all the words and reproduce it in multiple copies for classroom use only. Have the students examine the animated films; then they can either describe the story or create dialogues that fit the illustrations.

According to Manser (2000, p. 59), animated film is ‘amusing drawing or series of drawing in a newspaper; film made by photographing a series of drawing; person who draws animated films. Chilvers said: “cartoon is a full size drawing made for the purpose of transferring a design to a printing or tapestry or other work.

1. **Teaching Speaking Using Animated Film**

According to the Manser (2000, p. 160), film is “cinema picture movie; role of thin plastic used in photography; thin layer of something”. Collier (1967, p. 186) said that film is one of the teacher’s most powerful teaching tools able the arouse pupil interest, to recreate the past, to show the petals of a flower open in seconds and complex information from many varied sources.

Millifraze of Kentucky Educational Television (KET) 1999 suggest that the teacher of using animated film as three part lesson including pre-viewing, viewing, viewing activities.

1. Pre-viewing

People presenting the film before and then the teacher should engage the learners’ interest in what they will be doing and prepare them to do it successfully. The teacher tells the students or leads them to discover for themselves why they are viewing the film. Presentation may include a previewing activity or a discussion of new vocabulary from the film. It may involve looking at still pictures from the film and predicting language and content to be covered. Finally previewing preparation means ensuring that an operating.

1. Viewing

“ While learners view the film” the teacher should remain in the classroom with the learners to observe the reactions and see what do not understand, what they are intrigued by and what brothers them. The teachers are there also to press the pause, rewind and play button as needed. Something it best to leave the light on. This facilitates the teacher’s observation and enables learners to take notes and to complete worksheets.

1. Post Viewing Activities

“After the viewing” the teacher should and clarify complex points encourage and explain assign follow up activities, whether they are include in the text and the material that accompany the instructional films or they are developed for authentic films.

1. **Advantages and Disadvantages of Animated Film**

The writer observes that teaching speaking through by using animated films has good effect to the students. By showing animated film to give the students a lot of ideas to tell about the film, so it is invite them into a conversation situation. Beside that we could increase their speaking skill. Film also has advantages and disadvantages:

* 1. **Advantages**

Film can be used to complete the experience of students when they read, discussed and practice in the classroom. Film can show which object that we could not see, for example: how is heart worked?

1. Film can be repeated to show the process of something. For example: how is ATM machine used?
2. Film can use to motivated and give positive impact to the students. For example: film about health. Film can show how malaria disease is infected? So the students can be motivated to have healthy life.
3. Film can give more expressions
4. Film can invite us to speak and can make us speak easier.
   1. **Disadvantages**

Film also have disadvantages to the students, they are:

1. Film is expensive to plan and produce
2. Film which is available not always relate to the need lesson purpose so we sometimes need to create our own film.
3. **Teaching Speaking Using Teachers Method**

In control groups, conventional method was used. The conventional method used in teaching foreign languages, refrains from using the learners native language. Characteristic features of the conventional method are:

* + 1. Teaching concepts and speaking through pantomiming, real life objects and other the visual material.
    2. Centrality of spoken language
    3. Focus on question answer patterns

The procedures of conventional method are:

* + - 1. The teacher give the material to the students
      2. The teacher explain the material
      3. The teacher ask to the students to by repeat the conversation by reading text
      4. The teacher give question-answer

1. **Previous Related Study**

There were two thesis related to this study. Firstly, Salsabilatuljannah’s thesis in 2011 entitled “The application of Role Play as a technique in teaching speaking”. The result of her study showed that there is significant difference in speaking achievement between the student who were thought by using role play technique and those who are not.

The second study was written by PrillaLukis, entitled Using 3-D animation movies as Media to Improve the Speaking Ability of the Students at YASPA English Training (YET) Course. In 2009, The result of her study showed that interactive animation program can be used in teaching speaking to young learners. She used experimental method where the population was 15 students in the age of 8 to 10 years old.

There are some similarities and differences between the previous study and the researcher present study. The similarity is it deals with teaching speaking. The differences are the used of interactive animation program and on the objective of the study and the kind of experimental method. the researchers’ present study uses quasi-experimental method.

1. **Research Setting**

The research was done at Islamic Junior High School 1 Palembang, located on Jl. Jendral Sudirman, KM 4 Palembang Kec. Pahlawan Kota Palembang, South Sumatera. The school was established in 1967 with the name of Madinatul Ulum, in November 1967 in order to follow up the decision of Mendikbud RI No. 3751 B.mdr.f.15. in August 4th 1970 about the changing of name and number of school in south Sumatera. MTs N 1 Palembang the decision of Kakanwil Depdiknas south Sumatera, province no 164/1970 on August 4th 1967). In the first year when school built, MTs N 1 Palembang is headed KH. Agus Salim (1961-1968), after that the school is headed by KH. Arsyad (1969-1970), KH. A.Murod (1979-1980) etc. and the head master of the school now is Dra. Hj. Yeni Sufriani. M.Pd.I.

The school has 59 school staffs, in which there are 40 teachers, 8 clerical employees, 23 securities, 1 guardium of the school, and 1 librarian staff. MTs N 1 Palembang consists of 400 students which are divided into 9 classes, in which every class has same number except one class. Those are 39, 39, 39, 39, 39, 39,39, 39, and 38 students. eight grade student consists of students which have one classes that consist of 38 students.

**CHAPTER III**

**METHOD OF RESEARCH**

This chapter presents: (a) method of the study, (b) operational definitions (c) variables of the study, (d) population and sample, (f) techniques for collecting data, (6) research instruments analysis, and (g) techniques for analyzing data.

1. **Method of the Study**

In this study, the writer used experimental design to find out the effectiveness of drilling method with with animated fim in teaching speaking. Experimental design is the blueprint of the procedures that enable the researcherto test hypotheses by reaching valid conclusions about relationasip between independent variables (Best and Kahn, 1993, p. 149). In addition experimental research is the way to find the causal relationshipbetween two factors wich are raised by the researcher. In doing an experimentalresearch usually two groups are involved and compared to find the influence of atreatment.

The writer used*thematching only pretest-postest control group design*. There were two groups in this study. The first group was experimental and the second group was control group; The experimental group was taught by using drilling method with animated film to develop their ability in speaking skills, while the control group was taught by using conventional method. In this design, there weretwo kinds of test would be administered, that is pre-test and post-test to the students of both control and experimental groups. The results of two test compared to know the students’ achievements in speaking before and after they were taught. The formula of design is suggested by Frankel and Wallen (1990: p. 243)as follows:

**01 M X1 02**

**03 M X2 04**

Where:

**01** : The pre-test of the experimental group.

**02** : The post-test of the experimental group.

**03**: The pre-test of the control group.

**04** : The post-test of the control group.

**X1** :Treatmentfor experimental group (by using Drilling method with animated film).

**X2**: Treatment for control group (by using teachers’ method).

**M**  : Matched the subject.

1. **Operatinal Definitions**

The title of the study is ‘’ improving students’ speaking skill using drilling method with animated film to the eight grade students of MTsN 1 Palembang’’. the items that need to explain are improving speaking skills, speaking ability, drilling method and animated film.

1. **Improving speaking skill**

Improving speaking skills is interaction between teacher and students in its Interaction process. Teaching is giving the information, knowledge and skill to helping them to studying something until the learners understand.

1. **Speaking**

Speaking is the process of building and sharing meaning through the use of verbal and non verbal symbols, in a variety contexts. This definition explain that focusing speaking should have partner, thus somebody can share their mind and thought to each other so the communication among of them will occur.

1. **Drilling Method**

Drilling is a technique that has been used in foreign language classrooms for many years. It was a key feature of audio-lingual method approaches to language teaching, which placed emphasis on repeating structural patterns through oral practice.

1. **Animated Film**

Animated film is the teaching strategy that the students can attention together and memorizing what happen in the film. And the students can explain direct orally after watch the film. Therefore, this strategy is an ideal way to promote learning effectiveness.

1. **Variables of the Study**

Best and Kahn (1993, p. 137) states that “variables are the conditions or characteristics that the experimenter manipulates, controls or observes.” There were two types of variable in this study: the independent variable and the dependent variable.

The dependent variable is the condition or characteristics that appear, disappear or change as the experimenter introduced, remove or changes by independent variable. The dependent variable may be a test score, the number of errors, or measured speed changes in pupil perfomance attributable to the influence of the independent variable Best and Kahn (1993, p. 137). In this study, the dependent variable is the ability of students’ speaking skill.

The independent variable is the conditions or characteristics that the experimenter manipulates or controls in his or her attempt to as certain to their relationship to observed phenomena. Therefore the independent variable is drilling method with animated film, drilling is strategy and drilling as a media.

1. **Population and Sample**
2. **Population**

According to Best and Khan (1995, p. 13) “A population is any group of individual that haveone or more characteristics in common that are of interest.” In this study, the population is the eighth grade students of MTs N 1 Palembang. There are fifteen classes on the average, each classes have different and the same number of students with the total population 336. ( 157 male and 179 female students. The population of the study is described in the following table 1:

**Table 1**

**Population of the Study**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Class** | **Gender** | | **Total Number of Students** | **Total Classes** |
| **Male** | **Female** |
| 1 | VIII A | 20 | 19 | 39 | 9 Classes |
| 2 | VIII B | 19 | 20 | 39 |
| 3 | VIII C | 20 | 19 | 39 |
| 4 | VIII D | 19 | 20 | 39 |
| 5 | VIII E | 19 | 20 | 39 |
| 6 | VIII F | 18 | 21 | 39 |
| 7 | VIII G | 20 | 19 | 39 |
| 8 | VIII H | 17 | 22 | 39 |
| 9 | VIII I | 20 | 19 | 38 |
| **Total** | | **157** | **179** | **336** |

Source: *Administration of MTsN 1 Palembang*

1. **Sample**

A sample is a small proportion of population selected for observation or analysis (Best and Kahn, 1993, p. 13). The sample consisted of the students from the population who are chosen to participate in the study. The total amaunted of populations 336 students divided into nine classes, two classes would be selected as the sample.

In this study, the writer used *asystematic non-random sampling* method. According to Sugiyono (2009, p. 66), systematic sampling is taking the sample based on the sequence from the member of population which have been given serial number.

In selecting the sample, the writer used whole number of the population as the sample. The writer start from number 4,8,12,16...., until 336 and finally the writer found 84 students become the sample of this study. Then, the writer devided the sample into two groups. The frist group consist of 42 students and the second group consist of 42 students.

In addition, the writer used matched participants design to get real sample as the subject, so that after got the sample as described above, she would like to find some pairs that have the same scores from pre-test. Students pre-test scores are presented in table 2.

**Table 2**

**Test Result of Students’ Scores in a Group Sample**

**Selected with a Non-Random Sampling Method**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Students’ Name | | Students’ Scores | |
| Group 1 | Group 2 | Group 1 | Group 2 |
| 1 | Abdel hakim ashidiqi | Ahmad Hakim Faradits | 40 | 35 |
| 2 | Agung prasetyo | Aliah Nada | 49 | 60 |
| 3 | Afia nola nema ivany | Ani Melani | 65 | 57.5 |
| 4 | Bayu nery putra | Anisa Aulia Rahma | 50 | 70 |
| 5 | Disqi maulana juliani | Ardila Nur Lestari | 35 | 50 |
| 6 | Enggar aprili p | Ayub Syarifil | 60 | 55 |
| 7 | Fadillah kurniawati | Dimas wahyu Hidayat | 75 | 49 |
| 8 | Faisal anwar dalimunte | Dwi Nur Safitri | 35 | 70 |
| 9 | Fidzah hassyati p | Faris Kuriawan | 50.5 | 70 |
| 10 | Haikal izzaya | Khairunia Rizky Abilah | 70 | 47.5 |
| 11 | Hellen hadetiya | Kms. Muhammad Husni | 50 | 53.5 |
| 12 | Lili nuraulia | M adzmi Nuryansyah | 49 | 75 |
| 13 | M. fadli al kaff | M Arif Rahman | 60.5 | 65 |
| 14 | M. alex ferguson | M Fathur Romadhoni | 45 | 49 |
| 15 | M eggy rafrian pezra | M Jauhar Zalfa Muryadi | 55.5 | 53.5 |
| 16 | M fachrul fahlevi | M Shaxeran Revivales | 55.5 | 38 |
| 17 | M fajri wijaya | M Wahidin | 60 | 60 |
| 18 | M ikhsan ramadan | Mgs Muhammad Hilman | 45 | 46.5 |
| 19 | M nanda | Msy Rana Salsabila | 70 | 60 |
| 20 | Oloan nasution | Noori Fadya Khairunisa | 47.5 | 46.5 |
| 21 | M ridho alhadi | Nova Junita | 55 | 60 |
| 22 | M syarif hidayatullah | Nur Rahmawati | 57.5 | 50 |
| 23 | M Wahyu Adji Paungkas | Nurmeny Putri Ramadani | 49 | 52.5 |
| 24 | Meidini Robeta Indah | Okta Riansyah | 62.5 | 60 |
| 25 | Mursyadi | Puji Tri Salam | 60 | 40 |
| 26 | Nur Anisa | Raziq Hartadinata | 70 | 77.5 |
| 27 | Nurul Muthiah | Rizki Apriliatami | 60 | 50 |
| 28 | Parwati Indah | Rizky Syarif Hidayatullah | 49 | 38 |
| 29 | Rahmat Diman Febriansyah | Rosania | 55.5 | 47.5 |
| 30 | Rhena Mariatul Mahfufa | Ruhil Adila | 47.5 | 67.5 |
| 31 | Rizky Febriyadi | Sari restu widodo | 55 | 49 |
| 32 | Rohmawati Amaliyah | Sifana Amelia eka Yulianti | 55.5 | 53.5 |
| 33 | Sharmila Maharani | Sony Irawan | 57.5 | 49 |
| 34 | Sheren Nabila | Sunita Nabila | 50 | 57.5 |
| 35 | Tarisa Nurrahma | Teuku Muhammad | 45 | 45 |
| 36 | Tri Wulandari | Titin Sumarni | 67.5 | 55 |
| 37 | Tyrell | Vara Dilla Dwi Ananda | 57.5 | 35 |
| 38 | Velia Adriani Fahiya | Wulan Sari | 60 | 57.5 |
| 39 | Yowinda | Y Fikri Nugraha | 65 | 46.5 |
| 40 | Riska Ariyanti | Yunita Aprilia | 55.5 | 75.5 |
| 41 | Selly Hafizah | Ifan Nur Kholid | 55.5 | 45 |
| 42 | Ulya Almurofatu Billah | Indra Irawan | 55.5 | 45.5 |

Based on the results of pre-test to whole sample above, finally the writer got 32 pairs including 64 students from 84 samples who have the same scores between two groups. The highest score was 75 that achieved by one students, three students from group one and three students from group two, while the lowest score was 35 that achieved by two students, 1 student from group one and 1 students from group two. The results of match pairs scores were as follow:

**Table 3**

**Result of Paired Matching Scores**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Students’ Name | | Paired Matching Scores |
| Group 1 | Group 2 |
| 1 | Fadillah Kuriawati | M Adzmi Nuryansyah | 75 |
| 2 | Haikal Izzaya | Anisa Aulia Rahma | 70 |
| 3 | M Nanda | Dwi Nur Safitri | 70 |
| 4 | Nur Anisa | Faris Kurniawan | 70 |
| 5 | Tri Wulandari | Ruhil Adila | 67.5 |
| 6 | Avianola Nema Evani | M Arif Rahman | 65 |
| 7 | Yowinda | Yunita Aprilia | 65 |
| 8 | Mursyadi | Okta Riansyah | 60 |
| 9 | M fajri Wijaya | M Wahidin | 60 |
| 10 | Enggar Aprilli Pratiwi | Aliah Nada | 60 |
| 11 | Velia Andrini Fahia | Msy Rana Salsabila | 60 |
| 12 | Nurul Muthiah | Nova Junita | 60 |
| 13 | Sharmila Maharani | Ani Melani | 57.5 |
| 14 | Tyrell | Wulan Sari | 57.5 |
| 15 | M Syarif Hidayatullah | Sunita Nabila | 57.5 |
| 16 | Rizky Febriyadi | Titin Sumarni | 55 |
| 17 | M Ridho Al Hady | Ayyub Syafril | 55 |
| 18 | Sheren Nabila | Nur Rahmawati | 50 |
| 19 | Bayu Nery Putra | Ardilla Nur Lestari | 50 |
| 20 | Hellen Hadetya | Rizky Apriliatmi | 50 |
| 21 | M Wahyu Adji Paungkas | Dimas Wahyu Hidayat | 49 |
| 22 | Lili Nuraulia | Sony Irawan | 49 |
| 23 | Agung Prasetyo | Sari Restu Widodo | 49 |
| 24 | Parwati Indah | M Fathur Romdhoni | 49 |
| 25 | Rhena Mariatul M | Khairunia Rizky Abillah | 47.5 |
| 26 | M Oloan Nasution | Rosania | 47.5 |
| 27 | M Alex Furguson | Yunita Aprilia | 45 |
| 28 | Tarysa Nur Rahma | Anisa Aulia Rahma | 45 |
| 29 | M Ikhsan Ramadhan | Teuku Muhammad Jg | 45 |
| 30 | Abdel Hakim Ashidiqi | Puji Tri Salam | 40 |
| 31 | Disqi Maulana Juliani | Ahmad Alifin Faradits | 35 |
| 32 | Faisal Anwar Dalimunte | Fara Dilla Dwi Aanda | 35 |

From the results of match pairs scores above, the writer found 32 pairs students who has the same scores from group one and group two, after finding those samples the writer devided the two groups become two calsses, first group as experimental group taught using drilling method with animated Film and the second group as control group taught using conventional straegy for treatment and comparing the result of post-test score at the end of research.

1. **Techniques for Collecting Data**

In collecting the data, the writer did oral test. The test would be given twice: pretest and posttest. The pretest used for starting point of the investigation and to know the students’ competence in speaking before they give the treatment. Then, at the end of treatment, the posttest is given to find out the students’ improvement and siginificance difference between both classes after the treatment were given

1. **Test**

According to Brown (2004: p. 3), “Test is a method of measuring someone’s knowledge, ability or performance in a given domain.” Based on the statement above, test can be used to measure the students’ ability or students’ learning achievement. In this study, the writer used pretest and posttest. The writer used guided dialog in this test. The writer made it by herself. Pretest was given to both control group and experimental group. It was conducted before the treatment and the posttest, the purpose is to know how is the students’ achivement in speaking skill especiallyin performing daily expressions. Meanwhile, post test were conducted after thetreatment. It is also given to both control group and experimental group. It was taken as measurement tool to measure students speaking achievement before and after thetreatment is conducted.

1. **Pre-test**

The pretest is the test that is given before giving some treatments. There would be 84 students joined the pre-test. Both of control and experimental groups were asked to perform an oral test. The role of pre-test was: first of all the writerwould explain to the students that they would have an oral test, then the writer showthe vidio about asking giving opinion, like dislike etc, then shewould divide them int pairs to do a conversation, after that she gavethem a situation to perform their dialogue of asking and giving opinion, like dislike expressions, etc. In the limited time. She recorded the dialogue while the two raters give the scores. While recording, she gave the other students who were waiting for their turn a task, so they would not make a noisy.

1. **Post-test**

Posttest would be given to the control and the experimental group after conductingall the treatments and the pretest. The writer would divide the students into pairs to do a conversation, after that she gave them a situation to perform their dialogue of especially asking and giving opinion, like dislike expressions, etc. In the limited time. The same as pretest two raters would give score for the students while they were performing in pairs. Then, the writer would record and rewrite the data to analysis it.

1. **Research Treatment**

Treatment are done for twelve meeting to get maximal results from the technique that the writer had apllied in the classroom. In the parts, the writer presents the schedule of research including the number, topics, themes and time allocationof the research treatments, the table of teaching materials for research treatments is figured out in the following table 4:

**Table 4**

**Schedule of Teaching Materials for Research Treatment**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Day/Date** | | **Topic/Material** | **Treatment Meeting** | **Theme** | **Time Allocation** |
| **Experimental group and control group** | |
| 1 | Mon/July  4,13 | Mon/July  4,14 | Asking for and Giving Services | 1st | Homework | 40’ |
| 2 | Wed/July  6,13 | Wed/July  6,14 | Asking for and Giving Services | 2nd | Party | 40’ |
| 3 | Frid/ July  8,13 | Frid/July  8,14 | Asking for and Giving Information | 3rd | Family | 40’ |
| 4 | Mon/June  11,14 | Mon/June  11,14 | Asking for and Giving Information | 4th | Address | 40’ |
| 5 | Wed/July  13,14 | Wed/July  13,14 | Borrowing Something | 5th | Restaurant | 40’ |
| 6 | Frid/ July  15,14 | Frid/July  15,14 | Borrowing Something | 6th | School | 40’ |
| 7 | Mon/July  18,14 | Mon/July  18,14 | Asking for and Giving Opinion | 7th | Subject in the School | 40’ |
| 8 | Wed/July  20,14 | Wed/July  20,14 | Asking for and Giving Opinion | 8th | Competition Opinion | 40’ |
| 9 | Frid/ July  22,14 | Frid/July  22,14 | Likes and Dislikes | 9th | Hobby | 40’ |
| 10 | Mon/July  25,14 | Mon/July  25,14 | Likes and Dislikes | 10th | Food | 40’ |
| 11 | Wed/July  27,14 | Wed/July  27,14 | Congratulate Someone | 11th | Getting Scholarship | 40’ |
| 12 | Frid/ July  29,14 | Frid/July  29,14 | Congratulate Someone | 12th | Get New Job | 40’ |

1. **Research Instruments Analysis**
2. **Validity Test**

Validity has been defined as referring to the appropriatness, meaningfulness, and usefulness of the specifie inferences researches make based on the data they collect (Franken & Wallen, 1990, p. 148).

In this study, the writer used *content validity*, According to Hughes in Holandyah (20013, p. 46), a test is said to have content validity if its content constitutes a representative sample of the language skills, structures, etc., with which it is meant to be concerned. In order to judge whether or not a test has content validity, a specification of the skills or structures should be made based on the curriculum and syllabus.

**Table 5**

**Table of Test Specification**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Objective** | **Material** | **Indicator** | **Number of Items** | **Type of Test** |
| 1. | The students are able to:   * Respond and perform a good conversation * Use a conversation in appropriate functions and conditions | Discussion of topic:   * Asking for and Giving Opinion | Indicator of study:   * The students are able to identify the meaning of oral expression. * The students are able to response the expression. * The students are able to apply the conversation in appropriate functions and conditions | 1 | Oral Test |
| * Likes and Dislikes | * The students are able to identify the meaning of oral expression. * The students are able to response the expression. * The students are able to apply the conversation in appropriate functions and conditions | 2 |
| * Asking for and Giving Information | * The students are able to identify the meaning of oral expression. * The students are able to response the expression. * The students are able to apply the conversation in appropriate functions and conditions | 3 |
| * Congratulate Someone | * The students are able to identify the meaning of oral expression. * The students are able to response the expression. * The students are able to apply the conversation in appropriate functions and conditions | 4 |
| * Asking for and Giving Help | * The students are able to identify the meaning of oral expression. * The students are able to response the expression. * The students are able to apply the conversation in appropriate functions and conditions | 5 |
| * Borrowing Something | * The students are able to identify the meaning of oral expression. * The students are able to response the expression. * The students are able to apply the conversation in appropriate functions and conditions | 6 |
|  | **Total** | | | **6** |  |

1. **Reliability Test**

According to Frankeland Wallen (1990, p.154), reliability refers to the consistency of the scores obtained-how consistent they are for each individual from one administration of an instrument to another and from one set of items to another. The concept of reliability is related to the consistency of the measurement when the testing prosedure is related to the consistency of the measurement when the testing procedure is related on a population of individuals or group.

Testing reliability for speaking test is diffferent from the other skills because speaking is subjective. So, The writer used interrater relibility to avoid bias, human error and subjectivity may enter into the scoring proces. According to Brown (2004: p. 20), interrater reliability occurs when two or more scorers yield inconsistent score of the same test, possibly for lack or attention to scoring criteria, inexperience, inattention, or even biases. It is essentially a variation of the equivalent from type of reliability in that scores are usually produced by two raters.

In scoring speaking skills, the writer used *scoring rubric* which is proposed by Hughes (1989, p. 111), there are five criterias in testing studens’ oral permormance such as: comprehension (3-20), fluency (3-20), vocabulary (3-20), grammar (5-25), and pronuncitation (2-15) (see appendix). Each component has specific criterias and score range to make the raters eaiser in giving maximal and appropriate scores. Before the raters gave score for the students the instruments of assesing oral content was given earlier to the raters. Then, the two sets of score are calculated by using the *rank order correlation* formula which suggested by Hatch and Lazaraton (1991, p. 453) finding whether or not the instruments are relaible.

*6 X TOTALd2*

*R*=1

*n (n2* - 1)

Where:

R :Rank-Order Method

d2 :Different Score

n : Number of the Students

The result of speaking test to the 43 students at SMP 26 Palembang was described in the following table 6:

**Table 6**

**The Distribution of Students Speaking Score in Reliability of the Test**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Students’ Name** | **Test 1** | | | **Test 2** | | | **D** | **d2** |
| **Rater 1** | **Rater 2** | **Avg Tot: 2** | **Rater 1** | **Rater 2** | **Avg Tot: 2** |
| 1 | Aisha Belda | 60 | 70 | 65 | 65 | 70 | 67,5 | -2 | 4 |
| 2 | Aldi Pratama | 43 | 65 | 54 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 4 | 16 |
| 3 | Ayu Indra | 65 | 40 | 52,5 | 70 | 60 | 65 | 4 | 16 |
| 4 | Ayu Krismayani | 38 | 43 | 40,5 | 55 | 50 | 52,5 | 5 | 25 |
| 5 | Brian Erlian | 47 | 42 | 44,5 | 55 | 60 | 57,5 | 7 | 49 |
| 6 | Chintia Milenia | 70 | 70 | 70 | 60 | 65 | 62,5 | -5 | 25 |
| 7 | Dandi | 48 | 45 | 46,5 | 48 | 45 | 46,5 | -2 | 4 |
| 8 | Dedi Sulaiman | 80 | 75 | 77,5 | 80 | 95 | 87,5 | 2 | 4 |
| 9 | Devi Anggraini | 31 | 38 | 34,5 | 48 | 35 | 41,5 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | Duta Riyan | 75 | 80 | 77,5 | 75 | 80 | 77,5 | -2 | 4 |
| 11 | Dwi Intan R. | 53 | 45 | 49 | 45 | 48 | 46,5 | -4 | 16 |
| 12 | Elviana Damayanti | 36 | 40 | 38 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 5 | 25 |
| 13 | Ima Fitriyani | 50 | 58 | 54 | 85 | 55 | 70 | 6 | 36 |
| 14 | Inda Agustina P. | 80 | 75 | 77,5 | 85 | 55 | 70 | -4 | 16 |
| 15 | Indah Puspita S. | 31 | 26 | 28,5 | 21 | 40 | 30,5 | -2 | 2 |
| 16 | Indri Safitri | 31 | 28 | 29,5 | 38 | 50 | 44 | 3 | 9 |
| 17 | Latifa Khairunnisa | 50 | 60 | 55 | 55 | 50 | 52,5 | -3 | 9 |
| 18 | Lili Rahmawati | 75 | 65 | 70 | 80 | 55 | 67,5 | -3 | 9 |
| 19 | M. Ale Nurul Q. | 53 | 48 | 50,5 | 55 | 53 | 54 | 1 | 1 |
| 20 | M. Anggi S. | 85 | 85 | 85 | 90 | 80 | 85 | 0 | 0 |
| 21 | M. Arifki H. | 60 | 70 | 65 | 50 | 65 | 57,5 | -5 | 25 |
| 22 | Meishin Intan N. | 70 | 75 | 72,5 | 65 | 60 | 62,5 | -6 | 36 |
| 23 | M. Rizki S. | 53 | 60 | 56,5 | 33 | 60 | 46,5 | -9 | 81 |
| 24 | Nabila Tifana p. | 75 | 65 | 70 | 70 | 65 | 67,5 | -3 | 9 |
| 25 | Nani | 75 | 75 | 75 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 0 | 0 |
| 26 | Nofal Andriansyah | 26 | 28 | 27 | 43 | 38 | 40,5 | 3 | 9 |
| 27 | Oktarina | 50 | 60 | 55 | 55 | 75 | 65 | 2 | 4 |
| 28 | Puteri Natasyah C | 19 | 26 | 22,5 | 55 | 43 | 49 | 11 | 121 |
| 29 | Pebria M. | 40 | 36 | 38 | 35 | 33 | 34 | -5 | 25 |
| 30 | Ranchman E. | 33 | 35 | 34 | 38 | 40 | 39 | -1 | 1 |
| 31 | Rachma Triana. | 50 | 55 | 52,5 | 40 | 38 | 39 | -11 | 121 |
| 32 | Romadi | 52 | 36 | 44,5 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 3 | 9 |
| 33 | Rachmad Prayoga | 55 | 55 | 55 | 65 | 70 | 67,5 | 3 | 9 |
| 34 | Rio Agatha | 75 | 65 | 70 | 85 | 80 | 82,5 | 1 | 1 |
| 35 | Sandi Wahyudi | 28 | 21 | 24,5 | 28 | 43 | 35,5 | 2 | 4 |
| 36 | Siti Nurhaliza | 60 | 55 | 57,7 | 55 | 55 | 55 | -3 | 9 |
| 37 | Sri Depi | 57 | 65 | 61 | 67 | 70 | 68,5 | 0 | 0 |
| 38 | Syarifah U. | 90 | 85 | 87,5 | 85 | 80 | 82,5 | -2 | 4 |
| 39 | Teriyani | 70 | 75 | 72,5 | 70 | 75 | 72,5 | -3 | 9 |
| 40 | Tiara Aurellia | 40 | 40 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 55 | 8 | 64 |
| 41 | Widya P. | 55 | 50 | 52,5 | 55 | 37 | 46 | -7 | 49 |
| 42 | Willi Magala | 55 | 40 | 47,5 | 47 | 50 | 48,5 | -2 | 4 |
| 43 | Yunita Permata S. | 65 | 55 | 60 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 2 | 4 |
|  |  | 2354 | 2325 | 2340,2 | 2503 | 2485 | 2494 |  | 868 |
|  |  | 54,75 | 54,7 | 54,4186 | 58,2 | 57,8 | 58 |  | 20,186 |

The rank order correlation was calculated to find the differencess between the two sets of rankings, the results of calculated is a follows:

*6 xTTALd2*

*R*=1-

*N (n2 - 1)*

*6 x8682*

*R*=1-

*43(432 - 1)*

*5208*

*R*=1-

*43(1848)*

*5208*

*R*=1-

*79464*

*5208*

*R*=1-

*79464*

*R*= 0.93

The test would be reliable if the result of the data measurement was higher than 0.70. According to Frankel snd Wallen (1990, p.137), for the purpose a rule of thumb is that reliability should be at least 0.70 and preferably higher. Since the result of rank order correlation calculation above, the writer found (0.93) it can be stated that the score of the try out test was reliable.

1. **Techniques for Analyzing Data**

For anlyzing the data, the writer used SPSS (Statistic Package for the Social Science). Version 16.0. the writer got the data from pre-test and post-test between two groups experimental and control groups. Then the writer presented the data by using some steps and techniques as follows:

1. **Data Description**

In anlyzing the data distributions, there are two analyses to be done, they are distribution of ferquency data and descriptive statistics.

1. **Distribution of Frequency Data**

Distribution of frequency data, the students’ score are described by presenting a number of student who can got a certain score, and its score’s percentage. The distributions of frequency data are got from students’ pretest score in control group, students’ postted score in control group, the students pretest score in experimental group and the students posttest score in experimental group. Then, the distribution of data was displayed in the table of analysis.

1. **Descriptive Statistics**

In this part, the data is obtained to get the lowest score (minimun), the highest score (maximum), mean score and the score of standard deviation. Descriptive statistics weregot from students’ pretest score in control group, students’ posttest score in control group, the students pretest score in experimental group, andstudents’ posttest score in experimental group.

1. **Prerequisite Analysis**

Prerequisite analysis is an analysis done before testing the research hyphothesis. It measures wether or not the obtained data from students’ pretest and posttest scores in both groups (experiment and control) is normal and homogen.

1. **Normality Test**

Normality test is used to measure the obtained data whether it is normal or not. The data is obtained from students’ pretest and postest in control and experimental groups. The test is consindered normal when p-output was higher then mean significant difference at 0.05 level. In analyzing the normality test, *one-samplekolmogronov smrinovtest* is used.

1. **Homogenity Test**

Homogenity test is used to measure the obtained data whether it is homogen or not. The data can be categorized homogen whenever it is higher than 0.05. the obtained data are achieved from students’ pretest and postest in control and experimental groups. In analyzing the homogenity test*, levena statistics* in SPSS is used.

1. **Hypothesis Testing**

In this study, the hypothesis of research tested by using independent sample T-test evaluated the difference between the means of two independent. The independent sample t-test was used in measuring the significant difference on studnts speaking skill by using drilling method with animated it used to compare between the mean score of two independent groups on given variable. It means that to evaluate wheater the means for two independents groups were significant different from each other. Significant difference was found whenever the p-output 0,05 is lower than mean significant difference at levels.

**CHAPTER IV**

**FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION**

This chapter presents: (a) findings and (b) the interpretations.

1. **Findings**

This study deals with the title “Improving Students’ Speaking Skill using Drilling Method to the Eight Grade Students of MTS N 1 Palembang. The findings of the study to analyze: (1) data descriptions, (2) prerequisite analysis, and (3) results of hypothesis testing.

1. **Data Descriptions**

In data descriptions, there are two analyses to be done, they are (1) distributions of frequency data, and (2) descriptive statistics. The scores are obtained from students’ pre-test and post-test in both group (control and experiment).

* 1. **Distribution of Frequency Data**

In distributions of frequency data, the students’ scores are got from students’ pre-test and post-test scores in control group and students’ pre-test and post-test scores in experimental group.

1. **Students’ Pre-test Score in Control Group**

The analysis of distribution frequency in pre-test score of control group was showed that there were two student got score 35 (6.20%), one student got the score 40 (3.10%), three student got the score 45 (9.40%), two students got 47.5 (6.20%), four students got the score 49 (12.50%), three students got the score 50(9.40%), two students got the score 55 (6.20%), three students got the score 57.5 (9.40%), five students got the score 60 (15.60%), two students got the score 65 (6.20%), one student got the score 67.5 (3.10%), three students got the score 70 (9.40%), one student got the score 75 (3.10%),. Further description of distribution frequency can be seen in the following table:

**Table 9**

**Distribution Frequency Data of Students’ Pre-Test**

**Score in Control Group**

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Valid | 35 | 2 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 6.2 |
| 40 | 1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 9.4 |
| 45 | 3 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 18.8 |
| 47.5 | 2 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 25.0 |
| 49 | 4 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 37.5 |
| 50 | 3 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 46.9 |
| 55 | 2 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 53.1 |
| 57.5 | 3 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 62.5 |
| 60 | 5 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 78.1 |
| 65 | 2 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 84.4 |
| 67.5 | 1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 87.5 |
| 70 | 3 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 96.9 |
| 75 | 1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 100.0 |
| Total | 32 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

1. **Students’ Pre-test Score in Experimental Group**

Similarly, the result of distribution of frequency in experimental group, there were two student got 35 score (6.20%), three student got the score 40 (9.40%), five student got the score 45 (15.60%), two students got 47.5 (6.20%), four students got the score 50 (12.50%), one students got the score 55 (3.10%), three students got the score 57.5 (9.40%), three students got the score 60 (9.40%), four students got the score 65 (12.50%), two students got the score 67 (6.20%),treee student got the score 70 (9.40%). The illustration of the result analysis was described in Table 10.

**Table 10**

**Distribution Frequency Data of Students Pre-test**

**Score in Experiment Group**

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Valid | 35 | 2 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 6.2 |
| 40 | 3 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 15.6 |
| 45 | 5 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 31.2 |
| 47.5 | 2 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 37.5 |
| 50 | 4 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 50.0 |
| 55 | 1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 53.1 |
| 57.5 | 3 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 62.5 |
| 60 | 3 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 71.9 |
| 65 | 4 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 84.4 |
| 67 | 2 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 90.6 |
| 70 | 3 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 100.0 |
| Total | 32 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

After analyzing the distribution of frequency data pre-test scores of control and experiment group above, the writer also analyze the score results of post-test in control and experimental group.

1. **Students’ Post-test Score in Control Group**

From the result analysis of frequency data of post-test control goup, it was found that one student got score 40 (3.10%), one students got the score 38 (3.10%), one students got the score 41 (3.10%), tthree students got 45 (9.40%), two students got the score 47.5 (6.20%), three students got the score 49 (9.40%), two students got the score 50 (6.20%), two students got the score 53.5 (6.20%), three students got the score 57.5 (9.40), three students got the score 60 (9.40%), one students got the score 62.5 (3.10%), three students got the score 65 (9.40%) and one student got the score 67.5 (3.10%), three students got score 70 (9.40%), three students got score 77.5 (9.40%). The illustration of the result analyss was described in the following table.

**Table 11**

**Distribution Frequency Data of Students’ Post-test**

**Score in Control Group**

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Valid | 35 | 1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 |
| 38 | 1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 6.2 |
| 41 | 1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 9.4 |
| 45 | 3 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 18.8 |
| 47.5 | 2 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 25.0 |
| 49 | 3 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 34.4 |
| 50 | 2 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 40.6 |
| 53.5 | 2 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 46.9 |
| 57.5 | 3 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 56.2 |
| 60 | 3 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 65.6 |
| 62.5 | 1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 68.8 |
| 65 | 3 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 78.1 |
| 67.5 | 1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 81.2 |
| 70 | 3 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 90.6 |
| 77.5 | 3 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 100.0 |
| Total | 32 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

1. **Students’ Post-test Score in Experimental Group**

The distribution frequncy analysis of post-test experimental group, it was found that there were three student got 50 score (9.40%), three student got the score 55 (9.40%), six student got the score 58 (318.80%), three students got 60 (9.40%), three students got the score 65 (9.40%), two students got the score 68 (6.20%), four students got the score 70(12.50%), two students got the score 70.5 (6.20%), two students got the score 78 (6.20), two students got the score 80 (6.20%), two students got the score 85.5(6.20%). Further description it can be seen in the following table:

**Table 12**

**Distribution frequency data of Students’ Post-test**

**Score in Experimental Group**

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Valid | 50 | 3 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 9.4 |
| 55 | 3 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 18.8 |
| 58 | 6 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 37.5 |
| 60 | 3 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 46.9 |
| 65 | 3 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 56.2 |
| 68 | 2 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 62.5 |
| 70 | 4 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 75.0 |
| 70.5 | 2 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 81.2 |
| 78 | 2 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 87.5 |
| 80 | 2 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 93.8 |
| 85.5 | 2 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 100.0 |
| Total | 32 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**1.2 Desriptive Statistics**

In descriptive statistics, number of sample, the score of minimal, maximal, mean, standard deviation, and standard error of mean are obtained. Descriptive statistics are got from students’ pretest score in control group, students’ posttest score in control group, the students’ pretest score in experimental group and students’ posttest score in experimental group.

1. **Students’ Pre-test Score in Control Group**

Based on analyzing data got from pre-test control group, it was found that the minimum score was 35, the maximum score was 75 the mean score was 54.7187 and the standard deviation was 10.20589, for detailed description it is described in the table 3.

**Table 13**

**Descriptive Statistics of Students’ Pre-test Score in Control Group**

|  | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Students’ pretest scores | 32 | 35.00 | 75.00 | 54.7187 | 10.20589 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 32 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Students’ Pre-test Score in Experimental Group**

Equally, based on analyzing data got from pre-test experimental group, it was also found that the minimum core was 35, the maximum score was 70 the mean score was 53.7969 and the standard deviation was 10.77322,for detailed description it is described in Table 14.

**Table 14**

**Descriptive Statistics of Students’ Pre-test Score in Experimental Group**

|  | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students’ pretest scores | 32 | 35.00 | 70.00 | 53.7969 | 10.77322 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 32 |  |  |  |  |

1. **Students’ Post-test Score in Control Group**

The result analysis of descriptive statistics post-test in control group found that there were 32 students. The lowest score was 53, the highest score was 77.5, mean score was 56.8125, and the standard deviation was 11.57706. further description is described in Table 15.

**Table 15**

**Descriptive Statistics of Students’ Post-test Score in Control Group**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Students’  Post-test Scores | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| 32 | 53.00 | 77.50 | 56.8125 | 11.57706 |

1. **Students’ Post-test Score in Experimental Group**

The results analysis of descriptive statistics post-test experimental group, it was found that there were 32 students. The lowest score was 50, the highest score was 85.5, mean score was 65.0625, and the standard deviation was 10.08172 further description is described in Table 16.

**Table 16**

**Descriptive Statistics of Students’ Post-test Score in Experimental Group**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Students’  Post-test Scores | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| 32 | 50.00 | 85.50 | 65.0625 | 10.08172 |

1. **Prerequisite Analysis**

Before analyzing the data, prerequisite analysis was done to see whether the obtained data was normal and homogen.

* 1. **Normality Test**

Normality test is used to measure whether the obtained data normal or not. The data can be classified into normal when the p-output is higher than mean significant difference at 0.025 level Basrowi and Soenyono (2007:85). In measuring normality test, One sample Kolmogronov Smrinov was used.

In this study, the writeranalyzed the normality test of students pretest and posttest scores in experimental and control groups.

1. **Students’ Pre-test Score in Control and Experimental Groups**

From the statistical analysis using normality test of Kolmogrove Smirnove, it was found that the significant value of the pre-test in control and experimental group 0.670, it can be stated that the data of both groups were categorized normal since the p-output was higher than mean significant different at 0.025 level. Further description is shown in Table 17.

**Table 17**

**Result Analysis in Measuring Normality Test of students’ Pre-test in Control and Experimental Groups Using 1-Sample Kolmogronov Smirnov**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Students’ Pre-test | N | Kolmogronov  Smirnov | Sig. | Result |
| 1 | Control Group | 32 | 0.831 | 0.495 | Normal |
| 2 | Experimental Group | 32 | 0.779 | 0.578 | Normal |

1. **Students’ Post-test Score in Control and Experimental Groups**

Additionally, the analysis of Normality testwas also done to students’ post-test score in control and experimental groups. Based on the analysis, it was found that the significant value of control group was 0.670 and experimental group was 0.378, it can be assumed that the scores in the data of post-test control and experimental group were categorized normal since p-output was higher than mean significant different al 0.025 level. The results analysis is figured out in the Table 18.

**Table 18**

**Result Analysis in Measuring Normality Test of students’ Post-test Score in Control and Experimental Groups Using 1-Sample Kolmogronov Smirnov**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Students’ Post-test | N | Kolmogronov  Smirnov | Sig. | Result |
| 1 | Control Group | 32 | 0.725 | 0.670 | Normal |
| 2 | Experimental Group | 32 | 0.911 | 0.378 | Normal |

* 1. **Homogenity Test**

Homogeneity test is used to measure the scores obtained whether it is homogeny or not. Basrowi (2007:106) states that the score is categorized homogeny when the p-output was higher than mean significant difference at 0.05 levels. In measuring homogeneity test, Levene Statistics found in SPSS is used. The homogeneity test is used to measure students’ pretest score in control and experimental groups, and students’ posttest score in control and experimental groups.

1. **Students’ Pre-test Score in Control and Experimental Group**

Firstly, based on the result of analyzing the data of pre-test of control and experimental groups, it was found that the p-output was 0.451, it means that the sample in control group was categorized homogeneous because p-output was higher than mean significant difference at the level 0.05. the results of homogenety test is illustrated in the Table 19.

**Table 19**

**Result Analysis in Measuring Homogenity Test of Students’ Pre-test Score in Control and Experimental Groups Using Levena Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Students’ Pre-test | N | Levena Statistics | Sig. | Result |
| 1 | Control Group | 32 | 0.576 | 0.451 | Homogen |
| 2 | Experimental Group | 32 |

1. **Students’ Post-test Score Control and Experimental Groups**

Secondly, the result analysis of homegenity test of post-test control and experimental groups to get verification the sample data is homogeneous or not. Based on the result, it was found that the p-output was 0.240, it can be assumed that the students’ post-test scores in control and experimental group is homogen, since p-output was higher than 0.05. The analysis is described in the following table:

**Table 20**

**Result Analysis in Measuring Homogenity Test of students’ Post-test Score in Control and Experimental Groups Using Levena Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Students’ Post-test | N | Levena Statistics | Sig. | Result |
| 1 | Control Group | 32 | 1.410 | 0.240 | Homogen |
| 2 | Experimental Group | 32 |

1. **Results of Hypothesis Testing**
2. In measuring Means a significant different on students’ speaking skill taught using drilling method with animated film and teacher’s method.

From the analysis, it was found p-output 0.04 and it was considered that there was a means significant different on students speaking skill taught using drilling method with animated film since the p-output was lower than 0.05. the result analysis in measuring means significant improvement was figured out in Table 21.

**Table 21**

**Result Analysis of Significant Different on Student’s Speaking Skill Taught Using Drilling Method with Animated Film and Teacher’s Method.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Levene test for equality of variance | | t-test for equality of means | | | | | |
|  | f | Sig | T | Df | Sig (2-tailed | Mean difference | Std error difference | 95% confidence |
| Equal variance assumed | 1.410 | .240 | .3016 | 62 | .004 | 6.93750 | 2.33978 | 11.53522 |
| Equal variances not assumed |  |  | 3016 | 59.597 | 004 | 6.93750 | 2.33609 | 11.53891 |

1. **Interpretation**

Based on the findings above, some interpretations were made as follows:

Based on the statistical analysis of normality and homogeneity test. It was found that the p-output of normality test from students’ pretest scores between two goups 0.495 was higher than 0.05, while the results of normality test from students’ posttest scores between two groups it was found 0.670 was higher than 0.05 too. so it can be interpreted that all variable or value were distributed normally. B of homogeneity test it beside that the results of homogeneity test from students post-test scores between two groups it can be found 0.240, so it can be concluded all variables were homogeny.

From. the result analysis of measuring a significant difference on speaking skill taught using drilling method with animated film and teacher’s method, it was found that p-output 0.004, it can be interpreted that there was a means significant difference on students speaking skill taught using drilling method with animated film and teachers method since the p-output was lower than 0.05.

In experimental group, the writer gave treatments after giving pretest. It’s the same as the control group but the writer used different treatments for each group. The drilling method with animated film was used as the treatment in the experimental group. The writer found that there were positive progress from the students’ result of pretest and posttest. It can be seen from the total scores and also from the students average of pretest and posttest. It means that there was a significance different between pretest and posttest in experimental group.

Moreover the result of t-test in posttest of control and experimental group shows that the value of t-obtained was 3016 at the significance level p<0.05 in two tailed testing with df = 62, the critical value of t-table = 2.021 (3016>2.021). since the value of t-obtained was higher than the critical value of t-table, it means hat there was a significant difference between the students who were taught by using drillng method with animated film and teachers method. Thus the null hypotheses (Ho) was rejected and the alternative hypotheses (Ha) was accepted.

Based on the following above, we could know that there were many advantages of drilling method with animated film. First, animated film as device to stimulate conversation. Second animated film can inspire students to interpret the toughts behind the expression, third animated film serves anytime and anywhere mobile learning.

On the other hand, on teaching speaking using drilling method with animated film the students found new way that made them easier to speak English well. It is because teaching speaing using drilling method with animated film was more interested.

From the explanation above it can be cnclude that teaching speaking using drilling method with animated film was effective to improve students’ speaking ability for teaching speaking to the eighth grade students of MTsN 1 Palembang.

**CHAPTER V**

**CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS**

In this chapter, the writer concludes the results based on the findings and the analyses that were presented in the previous chapter. The writer also offers some suggestion which are hopefully useful and helpful for teachers and the students in teaching and learning speaking.

1. **Conclusions**

At the end of this study, based on the findings and interpretation in previous chapter, the writer concludes that there a significant difference between students who are taught by using drilling method with animated film and those who were not. The writer got result p-output 0,004< 0,05 this means that significace difference on students speaking skill taught using drilling method with animated film and teachers method sice the p-output was lower than 0.05. This means that the teaching English by applying drilling method with animated film in teaching speaking to the eight grade students at MTs N 1 Palembang is effective to improve students’ speaking ability.

1. **Suggestions**

Based on the conclusions above the writer would like to give some suggestion to teachers of English, on the application of drilling method with animated film. There are two suggestions offered; first, the teacher can use drilling method with animated film to teach other forms of speaking, such as conversation, vocabulary, and story telling. Second, this method is also can be used in formal or informal situation. For the formal situation it can be applied at school and for the informal situation it can be applied at English course. Hopefully, this study can be useful for the other researchers as their theoretical reference and they can apply drilling method with animated film in as their method in teaching speaking skill.

**Table 2**

**Test Result of Students’ Scores in a Group Sample**

**Selected with a Non-Random Sampling Method**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Students’ Name** | | **Students’ Scores** | |
| **Group 1** | **Group 2** | **Group 1** | **Group 2** |
| 1 | Aisi Jumarni | Ardela Handika Sari Utami | 49 | 35 |
| 2 | Delta Apriana | Anisa Yusnita Ningsih | 62,5 | 70 |
| 3 | Desva Adinda | Aprianingsih | 50 | 49 |
| 4 | Eliza | Dewi Ainur Rahmah | 38,5 | 57,5 |
| 5 | Fera Astuti | Deliana | 42,5 | 70 |
| 6 | Fernanda Rizkianti | Dira Marisa | 49 | 35 |
| 7 | Gia Tradifa | Eli Sukma Yanti | 60 | 67,5 |
| 8 | Humayroh Askia | Febrianti | 35 | 36 |
| 9 | Izzah Zulfiana Luthfia | Ida Nuraini | 47,5 | 46,5 |
| 10 | Jumaini Eka Putri | Innayatul Faiqoh | 41 | 41 |
| 11 | Leni Marlina | Juli Yanti | 50 | 50 |
| 12 | Marsela Rizki Dwi | Lena Sulistia | 60 | 57,5 |
| 13 | Novia Sari | Maysaroh | 77,5 | 77,5 |
| 14 | Nurbagiyo Mastuti | Mariska Putri Sari | 45 | 45 |
| 15 | Pika Fitriyanti | Merna Sari | 72,5 | 65 |
| 16 | Ratu Lestari | Nabilatun Nurhana | 31 | 65 |
| 17 | Resti | Nurul Adila | 45 | 45 |
| 18 | Riskha Ariyanti | Regita | 46,5 | 49 |
| 19 | Selly Hafizah | Rezki Amelia | 65 | 70 |
| 20 | Sisi Afrilia | Reza Yanselsi | 45 | 45 |
| 21 | Siti Fatimah | Riski Ananda | 53,5 | 53 |
| 22 | Siti Srimodika | Rohana | 65 | 47,5 |
| 23 | Ulya Almuarofatu Billah | Sari Piyanti | 70 | 62,5 |
| 24 | Wulan Sari Sariah | Sintia | 65 | 47,5 |
| 25 | Windi Anggraini | Tri Aprianti | 70 | 62,5 |
| 26 | Wiwin Lestari | Umi Kalsum | 60 | 50 |
| 27 | Yesi Krisdayanti | Viora Natasya | 57,5 | 42,5 |
| 28 | Yurika Muhirah | Zainab Haryanti | 70 | 45 |
| 29 | Pebria Maharani | Hendri Dunan | 67,5 | 65 |
| 30 | Sultan Effendi | Riduansyah | 50 | 60 |
| 31 | Rachma Triana | Wawansyah | 65 | 52,5 |
| 32 | Romadian | Acep Gunawan | 57,5 | 40,5 |
| 33 | Pratama Prayogan | Hanif Al-afghoni | 57,5 | 60 |
| 34 | Roi Agatha | Putry Tyas | 62,5 | 70 |
| 35 | Sandi Wahyudi | Cahya Ningsih | 46,5 | 47,5 |
| 36 | Siti Nurhaliza | Amirul Mukminin | 77,5 | 77,5 |
| 37 | Sri Maharani | Faturrahman | 38 | 34,5 |
| 38 | Wina Rumanita | Welly Putra | 77,5 | 77,5 |
| 39 | Teriyani | Robby Maulana | 47,5 | 49 |
| 40 | Ira Purnama Sari | Teresia Naomi | 50 | 38 |
| 41 | Indra Irawan | Lisa Zulaiha | 70 | 60 |
| 42 | Ifan Nur Kholid | Heydi Fayyaz | 70 | 77,5 |

**Table 4**

**Schedule of Teaching Materials for Research Treatment**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Day/Date** | | **Topic/Material** | **Treatment Meeting** | **Theme** | **Time Allocation** |
| **Experimental group and control group** | |
| 1 | Mon/July  4,13 | Mon/July  4,14 | Asking for and Giving Services | 1st | Homework | 40’ |
| 2 | Wed/July  6,13 | Wed/July  6,14 | Asking for and Giving Services | 2nd | Party | 40’ |
| 3 | Frid/ July  8,13 | Frid/July  8,14 | Asking for and Giving Information | 3rd | Family | 40’ |
| 4 | Mon/June  11,14 | Mon/June  11,14 | Asking for and Giving Information | 4th | Address | 40’ |
| 5 | Wed/July  13,14 | Wed/July  13,14 | Borrowing Something | 5th | Restaurant | 40’ |
| 6 | Frid/ July  15,14 | Frid/July  15,14 | Borrowing Something | 6th | School | 40’ |
| 7 | Mon/July  18,14 | Mon/July  18,14 | Asking for and Giving Opinion | 7th | Subject in the School | 40’ |
| 8 | Wed/July  20,14 | Wed/July  20,14 | Asking for and Giving Opinion | 8th | Competition Opinion | 40’ |
| 9 | Frid/ July  22,14 | Frid/July  22,14 | Likes and Dislikes | 9th | Hobby | 40’ |
| 10 | Mon/July  25,14 | Mon/July  25,14 | Likes and Dislikes | 10th | Food | 40’ |
| 11 | Wed/July  27,14 | Wed/July  27,14 | Congratulate Someone | 11th | Getting Scholarship | 40’ |
| 12 | Frid/ July  29,14 | Frid/July  29,14 | Congratulate Someone | 12th | Get New Job | 40’ |

**Table 5**

**Table of Test Specification**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Objective** | **Material** | **Indicator** | **Number of Items** | **Type of Test** |
| 1. | The students are able to:   * Respond and perform a good conversation * Use a conversation in appropriate functions and conditions | Discussion of topic:   * Asking for and Giving Opinion | Indicator of study:   * The students are able to identify the meaning of oral expression. * The students are able to response the expression. * The students are able to apply the conversation in appropriate functions and conditions | 1 | Oral Test |
| * Likes and Dislikes | * The students are able to identify the meaning of oral expression. * The students are able to response the expression. * The students are able to apply the conversation in appropriate functions and conditions | 2 |
| * Asking for and Giving Information | * The students are able to identify the meaning of oral expression. * The students are able to response the expression. * The students are able to apply the conversation in appropriate functions and conditions | 3 |
| * Congratulate Someone | * The students are able to identify the meaning of oral expression. * The students are able to response the expression. * The students are able to apply the conversation in appropriate functions and conditions | 4 |
| * Asking for and Giving Help | * The students are able to identify the meaning of oral expression. * The students are able to response the expression. * The students are able to apply the conversation in appropriate functions and conditions | 5 |
| * Borrowing Something | * The students are able to identify the meaning of oral expression. * The students are able to response the expression. * The students are able to apply the conversation in appropriate functions and conditions | 6 |
|  | **Total** | | | **6** |  |

**Table 6**

**The Distribution of Students Speaking Score in Reliability of the Test**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Students’ Name** | **Test 1** | | | **Test 2** | | | **d** | **d2** |
| **Rater 1** | **Rater 2** | **Avg Tot: 2** | **Rater 1** | **Rater 2** | **Avg Tot: 2** |
| 1 | Aisha Belda | 60 | 70 | 65 | 65 | 70 | 67,5 | -2 | 4 |
| 2 | Aldi Pratama | 43 | 65 | 54 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 4 | 16 |
| 3 | Ayu Indra | 65 | 40 | 52,5 | 70 | 60 | 65 | 4 | 16 |
| 4 | Ayu Krismayani | 38 | 43 | 40,5 | 55 | 50 | 52,5 | 5 | 25 |
| 5 | Brian Erlian | 47 | 42 | 44,5 | 55 | 60 | 57,5 | 7 | 49 |
| 6 | Chintia Milenia | 70 | 70 | 70 | 60 | 65 | 62,5 | -5 | 25 |
| 7 | Dandi | 48 | 45 | 46,5 | 48 | 45 | 46,5 | -2 | 4 |
| 8 | Dedi Sulaiman | 80 | 75 | 77,5 | 80 | 95 | 87,5 | 2 | 4 |
| 9 | Devi Anggraini | 31 | 38 | 34,5 | 48 | 35 | 41,5 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | Duta Riyan | 75 | 80 | 77,5 | 75 | 80 | 77,5 | -2 | 4 |
| 11 | Dwi Intan R. | 53 | 45 | 49 | 45 | 48 | 46,5 | -4 | 16 |
| 12 | Elviana Damayanti | 36 | 40 | 38 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 5 | 25 |
| 13 | Ima Fitriyani | 50 | 58 | 54 | 85 | 55 | 70 | 6 | 36 |
| 14 | Inda Agustina P. | 80 | 75 | 77,5 | 85 | 55 | 70 | -4 | 16 |
| 15 | Indah Puspita S. | 31 | 26 | 28,5 | 21 | 40 | 30,5 | -2 | 2 |
| 16 | Indri Safitri | 31 | 28 | 29,5 | 38 | 50 | 44 | 3 | 9 |
| 17 | Latifa Khairunnisa | 50 | 60 | 55 | 55 | 50 | 52,5 | -3 | 9 |
| 18 | Lili Rahmawati | 75 | 65 | 70 | 80 | 55 | 67,5 | -3 | 9 |
| 19 | M. Ale Nurul Q. | 53 | 48 | 50,5 | 55 | 53 | 54 | 1 | 1 |
| 20 | M. Anggi S. | 85 | 85 | 85 | 90 | 80 | 85 | 0 | 0 |
| 21 | M. Arifki H. | 60 | 70 | 65 | 50 | 65 | 57,5 | -5 | 25 |
| 22 | Meishin Intan N. | 70 | 75 | 72,5 | 65 | 60 | 62,5 | -6 | 36 |
| 23 | M. Rizki S. | 53 | 60 | 56,5 | 33 | 60 | 46,5 | -9 | 81 |
| 24 | Nabila Tifana p. | 75 | 65 | 70 | 70 | 65 | 67,5 | -3 | 9 |
| 25 | Nani | 75 | 75 | 75 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 0 | 0 |
| 26 | Nofal Andriansyah | 26 | 28 | 27 | 43 | 38 | 40,5 | 3 | 9 |
| 27 | Oktarina | 50 | 60 | 55 | 55 | 75 | 65 | 2 | 4 |
| 28 | Puteri Natasyah C | 19 | 26 | 22,5 | 55 | 43 | 49 | 11 | 121 |
| 29 | Pebria M. | 40 | 36 | 38 | 35 | 33 | 34 | -5 | 25 |
| 30 | Ranchman E. | 33 | 35 | 34 | 38 | 40 | 39 | -1 | 1 |
| 31 | Rachma Triana. | 50 | 55 | 52,5 | 40 | 38 | 39 | -11 | 121 |
| 32 | Romadi | 52 | 36 | 44,5 | 52 | 52 | 52 | 3 | 9 |
| 33 | Rachmad Prayoga | 55 | 55 | 55 | 65 | 70 | 67,5 | 3 | 9 |
| 34 | Rio Agatha | 75 | 65 | 70 | 85 | 80 | 82,5 | 1 | 1 |
| 35 | Sandi Wahyudi | 28 | 21 | 24,5 | 28 | 43 | 35,5 | 2 | 4 |
| 36 | Siti Nurhaliza | 60 | 55 | 57,7 | 55 | 55 | 55 | -3 | 9 |
| 37 | Sri Depi | 57 | 65 | 61 | 67 | 70 | 68,5 | 0 | 0 |
| 38 | Syarifah U. | 90 | 85 | 87,5 | 85 | 80 | 82,5 | -2 | 4 |
| 39 | Teriyani | 70 | 75 | 72,5 | 70 | 75 | 72,5 | -3 | 9 |
| 40 | Tiara Aurellia | 40 | 40 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 55 | 8 | 64 |
| 41 | Widya P. | 55 | 50 | 52,5 | 55 | 37 | 46 | -7 | 49 |
| 42 | Willi Magala | 55 | 40 | 47,5 | 47 | 50 | 48,5 | -2 | 4 |
| 43 | Yunita Permata S. | 65 | 55 | 60 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 2 | 4 |
|  |  | 2354 | 2325 | 2340,2 | 2503 | 2485 | 2494 |  | 868 |
|  |  | 54,75 | 54,7 | 54,4186 | 58,2 | 57,8 | 58 |  | 20,186 |