

## CHAPTER IV

### Result and Discussions

#### 1.1 The Effect of Flipped Classroom Model in English Speaking Skill.

The research on the effect of Flipped Classroom in English speaking was conducted in one of the high schools in Jambi City. The research sample amounted to 68 students. Class XI A as the experimental class and class XI B as the control class using conventional learning who used conventional learning. In this subchapter will be described general description of the data that has been obtained, row data described is data from pretest and posttest results, experimental class and control class as.

**Table 4.1**

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pre Test Experimental Class	34	60.00	71.50	64.4412	3.21871
Post Test Experimental Class	34	77.00	88.50	82.8824	3.05023
Pre Test Control Class	34	60.00	71.50	65.2500	2.76134
Post Test Control Class	34	67.50	79.50	72.9706	2.52845
Valid N (listwise)	34				

Based on the table above, explain that the number of samples in each class is 34. The minimum value on the experimental pre-test is 60.00 and the minimum value on the post test is 77.00. The minimum value on the control class pre test is 60.00 and the minimum value on the post test is 67.50. For the maximum value on the experimental pre test is 71.50 and the post test is 88.50. While the maximum value on the pre test of control class is 71.50 and the post test is become

79.50. The mean value of experimental pre test is 64.44 and the post test is 82.88. Meanwhile the mean score of control pre test is 65.25 and the post test only 72.97.

#### **4.1.1 Students' Score of Pre Test**

After doing the research, the researcher started to analyze the results of the pre-test from Experimental class and control class. The score classification could be seen on the table below.

**Table 4.1.1**  
**The score of pre-test**

<b>Aspect</b>	<b>Experimental</b>	<b>Control</b>
<b>Pronunciation</b>	64.93	64.12
<b>Fluency</b>	64.1	63.97
<b>Vocabulary</b>	64.93	66.18
<b>Accuracy</b>	62.87	65.51
<b>Comprehension</b>	65.37	66.47

Based on the table 4.1, it showed that the mean score from the experimental class in pronunciation aspect is 64.93, fluency is 64.1, Vocabulary is 64.93, accuracy is 62.87 and comprehension is 65.37. The mean score for all of the aspect is 64.49. Meanwhile in control class for pronunciation aspect is 64.12, Fluency is 63.97, vocabulary is 66.18, accuracy is 65.51, and comprehension is 66.47.

#### **4.1.2 Students' Score of Post test**

**Table 4.1.2**  
**The score of post test**

<b>Aspect</b>	<b>Experimental</b>	<b>Control</b>
<b>Pronunciation</b>	80.29	74.04

<b>Fluency</b>	81.18	69.04
<b>Vocabulary</b>	85.22	80.15
<b>Accuracy</b>	82.21	69.49
<b>Comprehension</b>	85.51	72.13

Based on the table 4.2, it showed that the of mean score from the experimental class in pronunciation aspect is 80.29, fluency is 81.18, vocabulary is 85.22, accuracy is 82.21, and comprehension is 85.51. The mean score for all of the aspect is 83.07. Meanwhile, in control class, the mean score of pronunciation in control class is 74.04, fluency is 69.04, vocabulary 80.15, accuracy 69.49 and comprehension is 72.13.

#### **4.2 Comparison of Experimental and Control Class scores on Five Aspects of English Speaking**

**Table 4.2**  
**Comparison score English speaking**

Paired Samples Test									
		Paired Differences					t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Pre Test Experimental Class - Post Test Experimental Class	-18.38235	3.67023	.62944	-19.66296	-17.10175	-29.204	33	.000
Pair 2	Pre Test Control Class - Post Test Control Class	-7.72059	3.43377	.58889	-8.91869	-6.52249	-13.110	33	.000

Table 4.2 proved that the mean difference of students' pretest and posttest score in experimental class is -18.38. Meanwhile the pre test and post test score in control class is -7.72.

Furthermore, the table shows the significant level of the difference in experimental class is 0.000 which is lower than 0.05. The significant level of the difference in control class is 0.000. Although both have significant values, we can see that the scores in the experimental class are more significant compared to the control class. It shows that students' speaking skill improved after being taught by using flipped classroom model.

#### 4.2.1 Comparison Score Pronunciation of Pre test and Post test in Experimental Class and Control Class

**Table 4.2.1**  
**Comparison pronunciation score**

Paired Samples Test									
		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Pre Test Pronunciation Experimental Class - Post Test Pronunciation Experimental Class	-15.36765	4.40094	.75476	-16.90321	-13.83208	-20.361	33	.000
Pair 2	Pre Test Pronunciation Control Class - Post Test Pronunciation Control Class	-9.92647	6.38076	1.09429	-12.15282	-7.70012	-9.071	33	.000

Table 4.2.1 proved that the mean difference of students' pronunciation pretest and posttest score in experimental class is 15.36. Meanwhile Pronunciation pre test and post test score in control class is only 9.92. Furthermore, the table shows the significant level of the difference in experimental class is 0.000 which is lower than 0.05. The significant level of the difference in control class is also 0.000. Although both have significant values, we can see that the scores in the

experimental class are more significant compared to the control class. The significant value in control class is lower. It shows that students' speaking skill improved after being taught by using flipped classroom model.

#### 4.2.2 Comparison of Pre-test and Post-test Fluency Scores in Experimental Class and Control Class

**Table 4.2.2**  
**Comparison fluency score**

Paired Samples Test									
		Paired Differences					t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Pre Test Fluency Experimental Class - Post Test Fluency Experimental Class	-17.05882	4.41548	.75725	-18.59946	-15.51819	-22.527	33	.000
Pair 2	Pre Test FluencyControl Class - Post Test Fluency Control Class	-5.07353	5.65703	.97017	-7.04736	-3.09970	-5.230	33	.000

Table 4.2.2 proved that the mean difference of students' fluency pretest and posttest score in experimental class is 17.05. Meanwhile pre-test and post-test fluency scores in control class is only 5.07. Furthermore, the table shows the significant level of the difference in experimental class is 0.000 which is lower than 0.05. The significant level of the difference in control class is also 0.000. Although both have significant values, we can see that the scores in the experimental class are more significant compared to the control class. The significant value in control class is lower.

It shows that students' speaking skill improved after being taught by using flipped classroom model.

#### 4.2.3 Comparison of Pre-test and Post-test Vocabulary Scores in Experimental and Control Classes

**Table 4.2.3**

**Comparison vocabulary score**

Paired Samples Test									
		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Pre Test vocabulary Experimental Class - Post Test vocabulary Experimental Class	-20.29412	4.25355	.72948	-21.77825	-18.80998	-27.820	33	.000
Pair 2	Pre Test vocabulary Control Class - Post Test vocabulary Control Class	-13.97059	6.24978	1.07183	-16.15124	-11.78994	-13.034	33	.000

Table 4.2.3 proved that the mean difference of students' vocabulary pretest and posttest score in experimental class is 20.29. Meanwhile vocabulary pre test and post test score in control class is only 13.97. Furthermore, the table shows the significant level of the difference in experimental class is 0.000 which is lower than 0.05 and the significant level of the difference in control class is also 0.000. Although both have significant values, we can see that the scores in the experimental class are more significant rather than to the control class. The significant value in control class is lower. It shows that students' speaking aspect in vocabulary improved after being taught by using flipped classroom model.

#### 4.2.4 Comparison of Pre-test and Post-test Accuracy Scores in Experimental and Control Classes

**Table 4.2.4**  
**Comparison of accuracy scores**

Paired Samples Test									
		Paired Differences					t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Pre Test accuracy Experimental Class - Post Test accuracy Experimental Class	-19.33824	4.49363	.77065	-20.90614	-17.77033	-25.093	33	.000
Pair 2	Pre Test accuracy Control Class - Post Test accuracy Control Class	-3.97059	5.22659	.89635	-5.79423	-2.14694	-4.430	33	.000

Table 4.2.4 proved that the mean difference of students' accuracy pretest and posttest score in experimental class is 19.33. Meanwhile accuracy pre test and post test score in control class is only 3.97. It shows that students' pronunciation improved significantly after being taught by using flipped classroom model. Furthermore, the table shows the significant level of the difference in experimental class is 0.000 which is lower than 0.05 and the significant level of the difference in control class is also 0.000. Although both have significant values, we can see that the scores in the experimental class are more significant rather than to the control class. The significant value in control class is lower. It shows that students' speaking aspect in accuracy improved after being taught by using flipped classroom model.

#### 4.2.5 Comparison of Pre-test and Post-test Comprehension Scores in Experimental and Control Classes

**Table 4.2.5**  
**Comparison score of comprehension**

Paired Samples Test									
		Paired Differences					t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Pre Test comprehension Experimental Class - Post Test comprehension Experimental Class	-20.14706	6.51168	1.11674	-22.41909	-17.87503	-18.041	33	.000
Pair 2	Pre Test comprehension Control Class - Post Test comprehension Control Class	-5.66176	7.36774	1.26356	-8.23249	-3.09104	-4.481	33	.000

Table 4.2.5 proved that the mean difference of students' comprehension pretest and posttest scores in experimental class is 20.14. Meanwhile, the pre test and post-test fluency scores in control class only 5.66. Furthermore, the table shows the significant level of the difference in experimental class is 0.000 which is lower than 0.05 and the significant level of the difference in control class is also 0.000. Although both have significant values, we can see that the scores in the experimental class are more significant rather than to the control class. The significant value in control class is lower.

### 4.3 Hypotheses Testing

H0: There is no statistically significant difference in the speaking abilities of students in the Control class between before and after implementing flipped classroom learning.



H1: There is a statistically significant difference in students' speaking ability in the experimental class between before and after implementing the flipped classroom learning method.

Based on the research question formulated by the researcher, "Is there a statistically significant effect on students' speaking English abilities? Therefore, after researchers conducted research and analyzed the data, it was found that H1 was accepted.

#### **4.4 Discussion**

##### **4.4.1 The Significant Effect of the Flipped Classroom model on students' English Speaking.**

The research results showed that there was a statistically significant difference in students' speaking English abilities between the tests before and after implementing the flipped classroom learning method which answered the research questions. This can be seen from the comparison table between students' pretest scores and posttest in the experimental class. It also can be seen that the difference in the average score of students' speaking ability in the experimental pretest and posttest of the students and the average score of students' speaking ability in the pretest and posttest of the control class in the descriptive table. Both on the experimental class and control class having a rising score, however, the increase in scores observed in the control group is smaller compared to the scores obtained by the experimental group. This proves that the Flipped Classroom model successfully influences students' English speaking abilities, especially in those five speaking aspects. In line with Phoeun, M and Sengsri, S (2021) The students experienced a notable enhancement in their English speaking abilities as they were exposed to genuine and interactive activities both within the classroom and on the online platform.

Apart from that, to measure whether there is a significant difference in students' speaking English abilities after implementing the flipped classroom, researchers have tested its significance, pretest and posttest levels in each speaking aspects. It can be seen in the table 4.2. until 4.2.5 which shows that the significant level of improvement of speaking score in the experimental and control, both were initially low; however, the mean score obtained in the experimental class was higher compared to the control class. Therefore, H1 is accepted that there is a statistically significant difference in the pre-test and post-test after implementing the flipped classroom method. This proves that the flipped classroom learning method helps students improve their speaking skills significantly.

The improvement in students' speaking is shown by the way they respond to each topic discussed in class. Like how students do questions and answers smoothly with their friends and give speaking performances in front of the class. In line with Armier (2021) which find the benefit of flipped classroom that the students more active and interactive. The students made improvements to their speaking which became more precise, clear and close to native speakers. From the pretest recording, most of the students spoke a mixture of languages because by speaking spontaneously and not having the material provided, they were still stuttering and anxious. However, students experienced a significant increase in their speaking skills after being taught using the flipped classroom learning method until the posttest. This is evidenced by students' speaking skills becoming more fluent, increasing vocabulary, and increasing understanding of the material. Students can talk, discuss with friends spontaneously and be responsive when discussing.

Related to the flipped classroom theory which was discussed in chapter II, Baepler, Walker, and Driessen (2014); Davies et al., (2013); and Janotha (2016) the flipped classroom can improve students' speaking skills significantly because students can learn and understand the topics that

will be studied in class, and students have mastered the material, so that in class, students become more active when discussing. Then, when in class students have more time to discuss with the teacher so that there are more opportunities to practice. This is different from the control class where students begin to understand the material in class and practice in class at that time, therefore time is also limited.

Using the flipped classroom learning method in learning English, especially to improve students' speaking, is a fun method for teachers and students because of the flexibility in teaching and learning, students and teachers also understand each other more about the topics discussed, then students' opportunities to practice speaking become more equal as in the Yahya Ashour Alkhoudary (2019) theory. Previous research shows that students can learn more from a variety of sources, including the internet, it means students can learn flexible, it is also in line with the research result from Linur and Mubarak (2022).

#### **4.4.2. The Significant Effects of the Flipped Classroom Model on Five Aspects of Speaking.**

Prior to the treatment, students' speaking scores were below the school standard, but after the treatment was implemented, students' scores increased. In this chapter, the researcher will describe the increase in scores that occurred in each aspect of speaking, namely pronunciation, fluency, vocabulary, accuracy, and comprehension.

In the Experimental class, the pronunciation aspect had the smallest increase in scores compared to the other aspects. Based on the research findings by Zhang, H., Du, X., Yuan, X., & Zhang, L. (2016), the flipped classroom mode of pronunciation teaching is more effective than the traditional teaching mode. Although there was an increase in scores for pronunciation in this study, it was not as significant as the increases observed in the other four aspects. Upon reviewing Zhang's

research, where they conducted a similar study by providing instructional videos, participants in that study focused on the shapes of the mouth and the positions of the tongue in producing sounds before attending class. During the classroom instruction, the teacher first assessed the students' understanding of these shapes and positions, and then evaluated their actual production of sounds, one student after another (Zhang, H., Du, X., Yuan, X., & Zhang, L. (2016). Hence, it is possible that pronunciation would improve further if students were given more treatment specifically focusing on pronunciation during speaking. This limitation arises because the researcher did not solely focus on observing speaking skills in one aspect but rather comprehensively. It might be beneficial for future researchers to investigate this aspect further.

As previously mentioned, both flipped classroom and traditional classroom teaching led to increased vocabulary acquisition. However, according to the results section, flipped classroom instruction seems to be more successful in utilizing long-term vocabulary gains compared to conventional lecture-based teaching methods. Furthermore, the outcomes achieved in the vocabulary domain surpassed those of other areas. In line with the findings of Kirmizi, O., & Komeç, F. (2019), students stated that they enjoyed learning from vocabulary videos, which they found to be quick and easy. In their findings, they appreciated the self-paced learning and preparation provided by the videos. They believed that they participated in activities better than before because they came to class prepared. Additionally, they thought that classroom activities strengthened their learning and resulted in long-lasting vocabulary acquisition.