

CHAPTER IV

RESULT OF RESEARCH AND DISCUSSION

This chapter discuss about research finding and discussion, research finding present the data that is gotten from spreading the instrument of research that is questionnaire and documentation. There are some points which is presented in this research, that are presentation of data, hypothesis testing and discussion of finding.

A. Presentation of Data

As stated in the previous chapter that there is only one research problem of this study, it is whether there is a difference in speaking skill between students who have integrative and students who have instrumental motivations at the third semester of TBI IAIN Madura. Therefore, the researcher will present the data obtained from distributing questionnaires which will be compared to another data.

The data will be described is gotten from respondents during the research process related with variable X (integrative and instrumental motivations) and variable Y (speaking skill).

1. Result of Questionnaire

The population of this research is the third semester of TBI IAIN Madura, but the researcher only took 64 students as a sample from 179 population). These results are obtained from the use of simple random sampling based on Slovin formula.

To obtain questionnaires data, the researcher distributed to 64 samples from various classes in the third semester. In the questionnaire,

there are 20 statements which have been divided into 10 statements leading to integrative and 10 more to instrumental. So, the researcher will present two data of independent variables. While the questionnaire has five alternative choices (Likert-scale) those are strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree and strongly agree. These alternatives are used to change the data into numerical data. Each alternative choice has its own score, as follows:

- a. If respondent select “strongly agree” will get 5 score.
- b. If respondent select “agree” will get 4 score.
- c. If respondent select “neutral” will get 3 score.
- d. If respondent select “disagree” will get 2 score.
- e. If respondent select “strongly disagree” will get 1 score.

So the answer from the respondents will be scored by scale likert and the data must be valid and reliable, to know the validity of the data the researcher uses construct validity.

- a. The Presentation of Integrative Questionnaire

The researcher got the data by distributing the questionnaire into the third semester students of TBI IAIN Madura. The researcher distributed through Whatsapp group by link, and it was held on 24th October 2020 at 10:00 up to 28th October 2020.

Before determining who the students have integrative and instrumental motivations, the researcher compared their two scores of the questionnaire. As the researcher stated above that the questionnaire

lead to integrative are ten statements, those are odd number (1,3,5,7,9,11,13,15,17,19). The students' questionnaire score is displayed in the table below:

Table 4.1

Result of Integrative Questionnaire

No	Name	Score
1.	Ach. Baihaqi	41
2.	Achmat Nur Rifqi F	46
3.	Ahlul Maghfiroh	27
4.	Amar Ariantino	41
5.	Aqiella Nur S	50
6.	Cut Widi L A	37
7.	Deri Afrian	38
8.	Hanif Irwansyah	43
9.	Hauro' Huwaida	40
10.	Hidayatul I	42
11.	Lailatul Jannah	41
12.	Lailatul Q	47
13.	Lidya Risqi	43
14.	Lu'lual Jannah	45
15.	Moh. Muhsin A	42
16.	Moh. Nurus Z	41
17.	Muwaffiqotul F	27
18.	Novianti Eka P	42
19.	Nuzulul I	40
20.	Rofiyatul M	38

21.	Safira Widya	32
22.	Samsuri Yadi	46
23.	Shafira Chairun	38
24.	Silahtur R	38
25.	Sulfiana S	44
26.	Sunarti	50
27.	Suryadi	37
28.	Syamsul A	39
29.	Tiara Hidayati	36
30.	Wilda Alya	43
31.	Mohammad Chusnul Yaqin	44
Total of Score		1258

Based on the table above, it is known that the students who have integrative motivation are thirty one and the total score are 1258. In the questionnaire, the highest score of the items are 50 and the lowest score is 27.

b. The Presentation of Instrumental Questionnaire

In the questionnaire, the number of statements which lead to instrumental motivation are 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20. The students' questionnaire score is displayed in the table below:

Table 4.2

Result of Instrumental Questionnaire

No	Name	Score
1.	Ach. Syarifuddin	47
2.	Aisyah Al-Munawwaroh	42
3.	Ayu Dia S	46
4.	Dheya Ulfaq FAW	45
5.	Dinda Fitriya	47
6.	Elsa Dwi A	42
7.	Fatimatus S	41
8.	Fikriyatul Kamilah	42
9.	Ianatul Millah	43
10.	Imalatur Raihah	38
11.	Indawati	48
12.	Lailatul B	33
13.	Maftuhatul J	40
14.	Maghfiroh A	47
15.	Mahbubah	47
16.	Mahmudatul M	36
17.	Maimunah	38
18.	Mardiyatin H	46
19.	Moh. Farhan	40
20.	Muhammad Naufal	18
21.	Nafa Nur	44
22.	Najwa Muqoddas	46
23.	Nur Aida	35
24.	Raden Samba	41
25.	Rifyal Kalam M	38
26.	Rina Munawwaroh	49
27.	Robiatul Andaniyah	29

28.	Siti Amelia Martin	42
29.	Vika Anjani	43
30.	Wildan Rosyadi	44
31.	Yulia R	44
32.	Yuliati Ningsih	43
33.	Zailana Zahroh	30
Total of Score		1362

Based on the table above, it is known that the students who have instrumental motivation are thirty three and the total score are 1362. In the questionnaire, the highest score of the items are 49 while the lowest score is 18.

From the result above, the researcher found that students who have instrumental motivation more than students who have integrative motivation.

c. Validity of questionnaire

The validity use to measure how far the instrument especially questionnaire instrument is valid or not. Because the variable or the data that going to research is about integrative and instrumental motivations. So to know the questionnaire is valid or not the researcher uses construct validity. Because construct validity focuses on test scores as a measure of psychological construct such as intelligence, motivation, anxiety, or

critical thinking are hypothetical qualities or characteristic that have been constructed to account for observed behavior.¹

The result of questionnaire is not numerical score, so the researcher use scale likert to give score to each item of questionnaire. Before testing the validity of questionnaire, the researcher will present the table coefficient value of correlation “r” product moment, that is:

Table 4.3

Table of Coefficient Value of Correlation “R” Product Moment²

	The distribution value r_{table}
Significance	5%
N	64
r_{table}	0.250

To test the validity of questionnaire, the researcher uses SPSS 20 that is:

Table 4.4

Testing of Validity Integrative Questionnaire

Correlations											
	item 1	item3	item5	item 7	item 9	item 11	item 13	item 15	item 17	item 19	Sum item

¹Donald Ary, *Introduction to Research in Education, 8th Ed.* (Canada: Wadsworth, 2010), P. 231.

²Anas Sudjiono, *Pengantar Statistik Pendidikan* (Jakarta: Rajawali Pers, 2014), P. 402.

item1	Pearson Correlation	1	.629**	.328**	.482*	.516*	.392*	.507*	.600*	.423*	.593*	.826**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.008	.000	.000	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64
item3	Pearson Correlation	.629*	1	.335**	.360*	.429*	.340*	.462*	.639*	.303*	.591*	.759**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.007	.003	.000	.006	.000	.000	.015	.000	.000
	N	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64
item5	Pearson Correlation	.328*	.335**	1	.206	.267*	.519*	.365*	.375*	.182	.383*	.560**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.008	.007		.103	.033	.000	.003	.002	.150	.002	.000
	N	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64
item7	Pearson Correlation	.482*	.360**	.206	1	.457*	.243	.384*	.524*	.282*	.369*	.651**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.003	.103		.000	.053	.002	.000	.024	.003	.000
	N	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64
item9	Pearson Correlation	.516*	.429**	.267*	.457*	1	.235	.292*	.448*	.255*	.534*	.648**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.033	.000		.062	.019	.000	.042	.000	.000
	N	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64
item11	Pearson Correlation	.392*	.340**	.519**	.243	.235	1	.407*	.391*	.292*	.419*	.611**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.006	.000	.053	.062		.001	.001	.019	.001	.000
	N	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64
item13	Pearson Correlation	.507*	.462**	.365**	.384*	.292*	.407*	1	.430*	.267*	.268*	.652**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.003	.002	.019	.001		.000	.033	.032	.000
	N	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64
item15	Pearson Correlation	.600*	.639**	.375**	.524*	.448*	.391*	.430*	1	.256*	.559*	.780**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.002	.000	.000	.001	.000		.041	.000	.000
	N	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64
item17	Pearson Correlation	.423*	.303*	.182	.282*	.255*	.292*	.267*	.256*	1	.278*	.532**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.015	.150	.024	.042	.019	.033	.041		.026	.000
	N	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64
item19	Pearson Correlation	.593*	.591**	.383**	.369*	.534*	.419*	.268*	.559*	.278*	1	.729**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.003	.000	.000	.001	.000	.000	.000		.000

item12	Pearson Correlation	.423*	.347*	.087	.538*	.409*	1	.472*	.225	.487*	.096	.630**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.005	.494	.000	.001		.000	.074	.000	.450	.000
	N	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64
item14	Pearson Correlation	.215	.388*	.231	.498*	.395*	.472*	1	.331*	.552*	.337*	.670**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.087	.002	.066	.000	.001	.000		.008	.000	.006	.000
	N	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64
item16	Pearson Correlation	.419*	.355*	.317*	.419*	.608*	.225	.331*	1	.535*	.276*	.680**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.004	.011	.001	.000	.074	.008		.000	.027	.000
	N	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64
item18	Pearson Correlation	.390*	.542*	.421*	.565*	.506*	.487*	.552*	.535*	1	.265*	.809**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.034	.000
	N	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64
item20	Pearson Correlation	-.009	.267*	.159	.237	.302*	.096	.337*	.276*	.265*	1	.417**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.944	.033	.211	.060	.015	.450	.006	.027	.034		.001
	N	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64
Sum item	Pearson Correlation	.606*	.706*	.513*	.757*	.770*	.630*	.670*	.680*	.809*	.417*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001	
	N	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

(2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

To know which item of questionnaire is valid or not, we must see the r_{table} . In this research the total of students are 64 students. The researcher uses significance 5%, and the r_{table} is 0,250. Based on the data above, all item of questionnaire are valid because the value pearson correlation is higher than r_{table} .

d. Reliability of questionnaire

To know reliability of questionnaire, the researcher uses internal consistency reliability and calculates the integrative and instrumental motivation score using coefficient alpha, also called Cronbach alpha. To measure the questionnaire is reliable or not, we must know the level of significance and r_{table} , that is:

Table 4.6

Table of Coefficient Value of Correlation “R” Product Moment

	The distribution value r_{table}
Significance	5%
N	64
r_{table}	0.250

To measure the reliability of questionnaire, the researcher uses SPSS 20 to make the researcher easier and decimate misinterpretation, are as follows:

Table 4.7

Reliability of Integrative Questionnaire

Case Processing Summary		
	N	%
Valid	64	100.0
Cases Excluded ^a	0	.0
Total	64	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Table 4.8

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.868	10

Table 4.9**Item-Total Statistics**

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
item1	36.13	25.571	.752	.840
item3	35.95	27.601	.681	.847
item5	35.75	30.667	.468	.864
item7	36.27	28.452	.542	.859
item9	35.59	29.642	.563	.857
item11	35.80	29.783	.516	.860
item13	36.05	28.934	.554	.858
item15	35.69	27.139	.705	.845
item17	35.92	30.010	.408	.870
item19	35.59	28.912	.659	.850

Table 4.10**Reliability of Instrumental Questionnaire****Case Processing Summary**

		N	%
Cases	Valid	64	100.0
	Excluded ^a	0	.0
	Total	64	100.0

- a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Table 4.11

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.857	10

Table 4.12

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
item2	36.17	32.018	.491	.849
item4	35.50	30.603	.609	.839
item6	36.25	33.397	.391	.857
item8	35.31	30.060	.675	.833
item10	35.58	30.565	.699	.831
item12	35.39	31.924	.524	.846
item14	35.81	31.615	.575	.842
item16	35.59	31.515	.587	.841
item18	35.56	29.139	.738	.826
item20	35.59	35.102	.311	.861

Based on two data above the result of Alpha is 0.857. It shows that the level of reliability is high. It is based on Dr. Amir Hamzah stated:

- a. If the result of alpha > 0.90 so the level of reliability is perfect.
- b. If the result of alpha between 0.70 – 0.90 so the level of reliability is high.

- c. If the result of alpha between 0.50 – 0.70 so the level of reliability is moderate.
- d. If the result of alpha < 0.50 so the level of reliability is low.³

2. Result of Documentation

The data were obtained from documentation is students' speaking score. There are two lecturers of speaking, Mrs. Afifah Raihany and Mrs. Fitriyah Rahmawati. They have a different application in teaching speaking since this pandemic. Mrs. Afifah teaches speaking through WhatsApp group while Mrs. Fitri do it through Telegram, but overall they have a same ways in the class of speaking. They asked students in pair to practice or speak up through video.

The researcher asked the speaking score to the two lectures of speaking and it was on 30th December and 07th January 2021. The speaking score are as follow:

Table 4.13

Table of Speaking Score

No	Name	Score
1.	Ach. Baihaqi	85
2.	Achmat Nur Rifqi F	46
3.	Ahlul Maghfiroh	83
4.	Amar Ariantino	85

³Amir Hamzah, *Penelitian Berbasis Proyek Metode Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D Kajian Teoritik & Contoh-contoh Penerapannya*, (Malang: Liteerasi Nusantara, 2019), P.104.

5.	Aqiella Nur S	96
6.	Cut Widi L A	85
7.	Deri Afrian	75
8.	Hanif Irwansyah	86
9.	Hauro' Huwaida	90
10.	Hidayatul I	85
11.	Lailatul Jannah	87
12.	Lailatul Q	85
13.	Lidya Risqi	92
14.	Lu'lual Jannah	80
15.	Moh. Muhsin A	79
16.	Moh. Nurus Z	80
17.	Muwaffiqotul F	68
18.	Novianti Eka P	88
19.	Nuzulul I	85
20.	Rofiyatul M	88
21.	Safira Widya	84
22.	Samsuri Yadi	88
23.	Shafira Chairun	88
24.	Silahtur R	87
25.	Sulfiana S	76
26.	Sunarti	90

27.	Suryadi	85
28.	Syamsul A	90
29.	Tiara Hidayati	86
30.	Wilda Alya	85
31.	Mohammad Chusnul Yaqin	92
32.	Ach. Syarifuddin	85
33.	Aisyah Al Munawwaroh	80
34.	Ayu Dia S	78
35.	Dheya Ulhaq FAW	98
36.	Dinda Fitriya	94
37.	Elsa Dwi A	86
38.	Fatimatus S	70
39.	Fikriyatul kamilah	83
40.	Ianatul Millah	85
41.	Imalatur Raihah	78
42.	Indawati	95
43.	Lailatul B	90
44.	Maftuhatul J	85
45.	Maghfiroh A	75
46.	Mahbubah	78

47.	Mahmudatul M	84
48.	Maimunah	75
49.	Mardiyatin H	90
50.	Moh. Farhan	78
51.	Muhammad Naufal	70
52.	Nafa Nur	90
53.	Najwa Muqoddas	90
54.	Nur Aida	75
55.	Raden Samba	80
56.	Rifyal Kalam M	98
57.	Rina Munawwaroh	90
58.	Robiatul Andaniyah	69
59.	Siti Amelia Martin	86
60.	Vika Anjani	84
61.	Wildan Rosyadi	88
62.	Yulia R	90
63.	Yuliati Ningsih	90
64.	Zailana Zahroh	69

The lecture gave all students speaking score, but the researcher only took 64 names who have already fill the questionnaire as the instrument of the research. The score are surely valid because it took from the expert who have measure what they want to measure based on the content of speaking.

3. Data Analysis

After measuring the validity and reliability of the instrument, the researcher needs to analyze the scores to statistical form. To analyze the data, the researcher used independent t-test which included score of students who are integratively motivated and instrumentally motivated on speaking skill.

Before analyze by using independent t-test, there are two requirements those are normality test and homogeneity test.

a. Normality Test

The normality test is used to ensure that the data for each variable analyzed is normally distributed. This is based on the assumption that parametric statistics work based on the normality data which will be analyzed from each variable.

The researcher used One Sample Kolmogorov Smirnov to measure the normality of the data through SPSS 20 by using a significance level of 5%.

If the significance value is more than 0.05, the residual value is normally distributed. On the contrary, if the significance value is less

than 0.05, the value is not normally distributed. The calculation of normality test as follow:

Table 4.14
Normality Test

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test					
		X1	X2	Y1	Y2
N		31	33	31	33
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	40.58	41.03	83.84	83.52
	Std. Deviation	5.365	6.469	8.907	8.190
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.123	.166	.262	.119
	Positive	.068	.117	.148	.093
	Negative	-.123	-.166	-.262	-.119
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.686	.952	1.456	.684
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.734	.326	.029	.737

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

Based on the table 4.14 above, it is known that the significant value of two kinds of motivations are 0.734 and 0.326 while the significant value of speaking is 0.29 and 0.737. The two data have a significant value > 0.05 , so the data is normally distributed.

b. Homogeneity Test

Homogeneity test is a test to determine whether two sample data groups of the sample come from the same variance of population. The criteria of homogeneity is when the sig value > 0.05 , it means that the

data is homogenous. While if the sig value < 0.05 , it shows that the data is not homogenous. The result of homogeneity test as follows:

Table 4.15

Table of Homogeneity Test

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Speaking			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.838	1	62	.364

Based on the result of homogeneity test, the significant value is 0.364. It shows that $0.364 > 0.05$. So it can be concluded that both of data have the same variant or homogenous.

B. Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis are statements in quantitative research in which the investigator makes a prediction about the outcome of relationship among attributes or characteristics.⁴ It presents as a researcher's expectations about the variables within the question. There are two types of hypothesis: Null hypothesis (Ho) and Alternative hypothesis (Ha).

Based on the requirements of statistical analysis, it is known that the speaking score of students who have integrative and instrumental motivation are normally distributed and homogeneous. Therefore, hypothesis testing can be tested by using independent sample t- test. Independent sample t- test is

⁴John W. Creswell, *Educational Research Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research Educational Research*, 4th Ed. (Boston: Pearson, 2012), P. 111.

designed to determine whether there is a significant difference in speaking skill between students who have integrative and instrumental motivations. The statistical hypothesis as follows:

Ho : There are not significant differences in speaking skill between students who have integrative and instrumental motivation at the third semester of TBI IAIN madura.

Ha : There are significant differences in speaking skill between students who have integrative and instrumental motivation at the third semester of TBI IAIN madura.

The research hypothesis will be tested with the following criteria: if $t_0 > t_t$, H_0 is rejected. While if $t_0 < t_t$, H_0 is accepted. The result hypothesis testing is:

Table 4.16

Group Statistics					
	Category	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Speaking	Integrative	31	83.84	8.907	1.600
	Instrumental	33	83.52	8.190	1.426

Table 4.17

Independent Samples Test	
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	t-test for Equality of Means

	F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	.838	.364	.151	62	.880	.324	2.137	-3.949	4.596
Speaking Equal variances not assumed			.151	60.687	.880	.324	2.143	-3.962	4.609

The table 4.15 shows about the descriptive statistic of research which shows that the total of integrative students are 31 while instrumental students are 33. It also shows the mean of integrative is 83.84 while instrumental is 83.52. So, from this result the mean of integrative is higher than instrumental.

Based on the result of independent sample t- test on Levene's test for equality of variances the sig value is $0.364 > 0.05$ and t_0 is 0.151, df (Degree of Freedom) = 62 and sig. (2- tailed) 0.880.

After $t_0 = 0.151$, then compare with t-value in t-table of 2.00 in the level significance 5%. The researcher stated that the null hypothesis is accepted because $t_0 < t_t$ ($0.151 < 2.00$) and alternative hypothesis is rejected.

Finally the researcher infers that null hypothesis is accepted. So, this research conclude that there are not significant differences in speaking skill between students who have integrative and instrumental motivation at the third semester of TBI IAIN madura.

C. Discussion of Finding

In this study, the researcher composes a problem of study which need to be answered. It is:

“Is there any differences in speaking skill between students who have integrative and instrumental motivations at the third semester of TBI IAIN Madura?”

Based on the data above, the result of this research which analyzed by statistical analysis of independent t-test showed that there are not significant differences in speaking skill between students who have integrative and instrumental motivation. It is proved by comparing the result of t_0 with t_t . The result t_0 is 0.151 and the value of t_{table} is 2.00. So the result of t_0 is lower than t_{table} ($0.151 < 2.00$). So, based on the hypothesis testing the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternative hypothesis is rejected.

While one of researchs that is conducted by Ghufron Khoironi stated that students who have integrative motivation have better speaking like native speaker. It based on the stage of each students. Students who have low integrative motivation is also low in speaking. The mean point of his research has different point with this research. He focused on speaking like native. While this research focus on the different speaking between students with integrative and instrumental motivations.

Although motivation is a crucial factor that can affects learners' success or failure toward the educational process especially in learning English as

foreign language.⁵It is only can support students to achieve their each goal without making significant difference on their speaking skill.

⁵Patsy M. Lightbown& Nina Spada, *How Languages are Learned*, 2nd Ed (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), P. 56