

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the research finding and discussion. The research findings were obtained from pre-test and post-test scores indicating The Effect of “Dictotell” at 11th Science Grade Students’ Speaking Skill at MA YASMU Senior High School. The research finding was included in the explanation of pre-experiment of quasi experimental design and post-experiment of quasi experimental design analysis, while the discussion was in the last part of this chapter.

4.1 Pre-Experiment of quasi-experimental design

In this research, the researcher has two classes as the sample of the research. There are 11 IPA and 11 IPS1. The researcher used pre-test as the instrument of the study. Before the researcher do the pre-test, she analyzed the syllabus to see the standard competence at 11th grade to design the pre-test and to check the validity of the test. The topic has been checked by the researcher through content validity to convince the validity of the test. Then, about the question of pre-test can be seen at *appendix 2*. Beside the topic, the researcher also decided to give the treatment in six times meeting as in the syllabus. It is because the time duration in the syllabus is 12x45’ in which one meeting consist of 2x45’ so to fulfill into 12x45’ the researcher should did six treatment.

After the researcher did an analysis, she did the pre-test to know the homogeneity of those samples to decide which one is the control group and which

one is the experimental group. Moreover, this pre-test is aimed to know the first student's proficiency level in speaking skill. To know about the first student's proficiency level is important for researcher to design the treatment.

4.1.1 Homogeneity testing

The researcher did the pre-test on Thursday 8th January 2015. The pre-test did on the same day for those classes. The pre-test was given for 11 IPA first and then for 11 IPS1 . In 11 IPA there are twenty eight (28) students and all the students followed the pre-test. In 11 IPS1 there are thirty (30) students but only twenty eight (28) who followed the pre-test. The pre-test included seven question which the contain is about the material in the first semester. The researcher give the student about two or three question from those seven question which represent the standard competence. The student answered the question orally and the researcher took the score immidiately together with other two expert. There are three person who gived the score. They are the researcher, the english teacher and one another expert. The researcher also took some recorder of the student's answer.

The researcher gave the score based on Harris's rating scale and immediately write down the score on the scoring paper and the score of pre-test can be seen at *appendix 12* and the script of the pre-test can be seen at *appendix 10*. After the researcher got the score, she analyzed the data by using SPSS 15.0 program. The researcher used Univariate analyses of variance and Levene's test was used to analyze the variance of homogeneity of both two classes.

The result of homogeneity test in univariate analyses of variance is presented as follows :

Between-Subjects Factors

	Value Label	N
group 1	Ipa	28
2	Ips	28

Table 1.2 statistic between subject factors

Group Statistics

Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
nilai Ipa	28	6,21	1,500	,283
Ips	28	6,21	1,500	,283

Table 1.3 group statistics

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances(a)

F	df1	df2	Sig.
,000	1	54	1,000

Table 1.4 Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances(a)

Ho: sample data is come from homogeneous population.

H₁: sample data is come not from homogeneous population.

Criteria :

Ho can not be rejected if the significant's level is higher than alpha (0,05)

Ho can be rejected if the significant's level is lower than alpha (0,05)

From the table above, we can see that the mean of both group are the same which is 6,21 and the number of the data or N is the same which is twenty eight (28). The number of the data or N is the same because in the 11 IPS1 there are two

students who did not follow the pre-test. The result of significant showed at level 1,000. It means that the significant is higher than alpha which is 0,05.

The result showed that the number of significant is 1,000 which is higher than alpha (0,05). So, it means that H_0 can not be rejected because the sig is higher than alpha ($1,000 > 0,05$). We can concluded that the 11 IPA and 11 IPS1 are homogenous.

So that, the researcher decide where the 11 IPA is the experimental group and 11 IPS1 is the control group because the result said that those sample variance are homogenous or equal.

4.2 Experiment

The researcher did the treatment by using “dictotell” for 11 IPA as the experimental group. The treatment was done six times and the schedule can be seen at *appendix 1*.

4.2.1 The first treatment of “Dictotell” (Saturday, 10th January 2015)

Before do the treatment, the researcher explained the purpose of the method, the steps of the method, the rules of the method and the activities in teaching learning process.

At the beggining, the researcher introduced her self and greeting the students by using English. Then, she told the students about the material which is asking and giving opinion. As the first step in dictotell, the researcher did a warming up by activating the student background knowledge about asking and giving opinion. She gave the students some question about their favourite movie

to attract the students to give their opinion about the film. Next, the researcher explained some expression of asking and giving opinion then the students could understand well the explanation.

The next step is that the researcher explain the next activity where they would hear a text which is dictated by the teacher as the second step in dictotell that is dictation. The researcher dictated the text three times. In the first dictation they only hear the text. The second dictation they start to take some words from the text which showed the idea of the text. In the third dictation they took all the words that they catch from the text.

Because the students proficiency level of speaking skill is low, so the researcher decided to make them reconstructed the text by rearrange the paragraph from the patch of word that made by the researcher. The researcher thought that, although they only reconstructed the text but through that activity they will catch the meaning of the text. So, they would be able to retell the text even if they only could say some words or one sentence.

After rearrange the paragraph, they were asked to tell the text one more in front of the class. All of them should tell the part of the text though they told only a little and not in complete paragraph. So, this activities made them practice their speaking skill. Another group gived their comment and opinion about the group performance. After all the group was finished retell the paragraph, every group which contains about four students made a partner to practice the dialog in the text dictation.

In this first meeting, all the students had a chance to speak though they speak only a little. Then, this meeting run well just like in the lesson plan.

Although the meeting run well just like in the lesson plan but the researcher still found some problems. The students were too shy to present their task in front of the class. It made the researcher confused how to make them to speak but finally all of them present and speak in front of the class. The researcher also found that most of the students have a poor vocabulary. So, the researcher help them in retelling and memorizing the paragraph.

4.2.2. The second treatment of “Dictotell” (Friday 16th January 2015)

The second meeting the researcher did a same activity just like in the first meeting. The researcher did a warming up about the second material which is expressing satisfactory and dissatisfactory. In the warming up step, the researcher also review the last material about giving and asking opinion. The researcher explained the relationship between asking and giving opinion and expression of satisfactory and dissatisfactory. Then the students could understand the explanation well.

In the second step, the researcher dictated the text. The same with the first meeting, the researcher read the text three times. In the first, they only hear. In the second, they write down some key word. In the third, they check again their words with the text.

In the third step, they rearrange the text by using patch of word. After the students rearrange the text, they should present their work in front of the class. Then, the other students should give their comment about the performance. After

all the group was finished to retell the text, every group which contains about four students made a partner to practice the dialog in the text dictation.

In this second meeting, the students still feel shy to speak in front of their friends but this second meeting is better than the first meeting. the student's feeling of shy decreased in the second meeting. so they performed a little more confidently than before.

4.2.3 The third treatment of "Dictotell" (Saturday 17th January 2015)

In the third treatment the researcher still did the same as usual by using "Dictotell's steps". The researcher open the class by saying greeting and asking the some question. After that the researcher tried to attract the student's attention to the materials which talk about suggestion. The researcher also tried to explain the relation between giving opinion, suggestion and expressing satisfactory and dissatisfactory. It's because in this meeting the researcher wanted to review all the material in the first and the second meeting.

The researcher still asked the student about how to give their opinion. How to express the satisfactory. The students could answer the researcher question but they always felt shy to say their opinion or answer the researcher question.

After the warming up, the researcher dictated the students three times just like usual. After the dictation, the students reconstructed the text. The next activities was that every group should retell their reconstructed text in front of the class. Then, another group should give a comment and opinion about the group performance. After all the group was finished to retell the text, every group which

contains about four students should made a partner. After making a partner, the researcher gived every partner a little paper which contains about a situation. For example, i come late when i go to school. So what should i do?. Every partner should practice a dialog how to ask and give a suggestions based on the situation.

In this meeting, the researcher focused in how to guide them to present because in the firts and second meeting they were very poor in how to present a task. They feld very shy to speak in front of the class. They did not want to present the task so the researcher should motivate them slowly by any way to present their task in front of the class. They did not pay an attention when their friend perform in front of the class. So, the researcher still face the same problems with the first and the second meeting but over all they were better than before.

4.2.4 The fourth treatment of “Dictotell” (Friday 23rd January 2015)

In this fourth meeting, the researcher opened the class by saying greeting and asked their condition. The researcher opened the class just like usuall. After that the researcher tried to activate their knowledge about relief, pain and pleasure by asking some questions and giving an examples. In this meeting, the researcher explained to students about relief, pain and pleasure.

After the explanation in warming up step, the researcher dictated the students as usuall. The text consist of expressing pain, relief and pleasure. The researcher dictated the students three times. After dictation, the students move on their group to rearrange the text. The following is that the students discussed the sequences of the text with their group. in this meeting the student’s dictation was taken by the researcher so they arrange the paragraph by discussing it with their

group and they tried to memorize with their group. Before the student's dictation was taken by the researcher, they were given a time by researcher to discuss it first and memorize it. So that they could discuss with the group.

The next step, the students was asked by the researcher to present their task in front of the class. After that the researcher choose another students from another group to give the opinion about the performance. Another group also checked the mistake of the performance. After all the group was finished to retell the text, every group which contains about four students made a partner. The researcher gived the partner with a little paper which contaion about a word which stated some one. For example, about mother, so with a partner, the students should practice the expression of pain, relief and pleasure by asking and gving statement based about mother.

In this meeting, the researcher found that the students are more confident to perform and present their task in front of the class. Their vocabulary and pronuciation also better then before. They did not feel afraid anymore to ask the teacher if they had any difficulties. They also better in dictation. Their dictation was near complete because they only missed some word and it does not a big problem.

4.2.5 The fifth treatment of "Dictotel" (Saturday 24th January 2015)

In this treatment the researcher tried to review all the materiaal which was given by the researcher from the first into the fifth meeting. the researcher opened the class just like usuall by greeting and asking their condition. The researcher

explained the material about how to ask a permission to other. The researcher did not ask too much in warming up because we only reviewed again all the material before. The material which are reviewed by the researcher about giving opinion, giving advice or suggestion, pain, relief and pleasure.

In dictation step, the researcher dictated the text three times. Every sentences was read by the researcher three times. The text is longer than before. The text is a poem which the content consist of the material that have been taught by the researcher. In this meeting The student's dictation is better than before. It seems in the result of their dictation. Their missing word decreased and they were able to memorize the word and every single sentence well although there is a little mistake.

After the dictation, the students was asked to work in group to rearrange the text. Before they rearranged the text, their text dictation was taken by the researcher. So that they should understand the poem to rearrange the text. The arranging of the text is not the main point of the researcher but the meaning of the text. All the kind of rearranging is allowed as long as the meaning is delivered well. After all the group was finished retell the text, every group made a partner. With the partner the students should practice the expression of asking a permission by using their own things like a book, bag or etc, as the media.

In this meeting the students was better motivated. They anthusiam better than before. They also begin to be confident to perform in front of the class by their selves and without choosen by the researcher. It happened after the long time

during fourth treatment. So that, it gave a good signal for the researcher to increase the difficulty level of the activity.

4.2.6 The sixth treatment of “Dictotell” (Monday 26th January 2015)

This meeting is the last meeting as the design which is made by the researcher based on the syllabus. In this meeting the researcher still gave the treatment about “Dictotell”. In warming up, the researcher explained about giving warning to others. The researcher also tried to review some material in order to prepare the students to the post-test. Therefore, the text consist of giving and asking opinion, giving and asking advice, pain, relief and pleasure, and asking someone permission. Something different in this meeting is that the students should play the characters in the dialogue then telling the feeling of the characters.

The researcher opened the class as usual by saying greeting. The researcher then did a warming up by asking a question which attract them to remember the material in the meeting before. The researcher also asked the student if there is any difficult word that they still did not understood yet from the first into the last meeting. in warming up also, the researcher explained the activities which is different with some meeting before. The students seemed to be afraid and worry if they can not perform well and feeling shy but the researcher tried to convince them if they will be able to do the task well.

After the warming up step, the researcher dictated the text to the students. They paid full attention than some meeting before. They heard the text three times just like as usual. While dictated the text, the researcher walked around the

class to convince if the students fully focused or not. To check also their dictation's text whether they missed too much word or not.

The next activitie is that the students was asked to found their partner to discuss the text. After that to reconsstructing the text and to memorizing the text in order to retelling the text in the form of dialogue. In this step, there are something which were unpredictable by the researcher in which the students became more active and confident to ask the difficult word or ask about something which is not understood by them. The students also made some improvement in the text as the researcher wished in this methodology. Some of the students did an improvement in the dialogue. Some of them also did some changes in the text of dialogue. For the researcher, It showed a good development of the student' attitude and student' thinking after some treatment.

The changes or the improvement which made by the student is not a matter because actually they were wished to be able in paraphrasing a text, a poem, a song, a dialogue or etc. It will make the student's vocabulary better than before and the improvement of the vocabulary was very important to the student' speaking skill.

In the retelling step, the student should perform their dialogue by playing the character of the dialogue. They performed with their partner. They also did not seem to look shy rather than the some meeting before. After playing the characters, the student told about the feeling of the characters, what did happend with the characters and mentioned which one is the kind of warning expression. They performed better. So that, the problem which happened in the first into the

fifth meeting can be solved well by the researcher in the last meeting. So that, the teaching and learning process run well just like in the lesson plan.

In this sixth meeting also the researcher asked the students to give their peer assessment to their friend performance. It aimed to make the students to be more responsible with their task. It also aimed to give them more activity while watching their friend performance. So that the students paid more attention when their friend was performing their task not to be busy with their own activity like chatting with friend, opened handphone, or sleeping in the class.

4.3 Post-Experiment of quasi experimental design

In the post experiment there are an explanation about the post test and the hypothesis testing.

4.3.1 Post-test

After the researcher did the treatment of “Dictotell” into six meeting, the researcher conducted the post-test. This test was conducted by the researcher on Tuesday 27th January 2015 for the experimental group (11 IPA) and 26th January 2015 for the control group (11 IPS1). This differences of conducting the post-test is because the researcher should follow the schedule which is permitted by the headmaster of the school. This test was aimed to find out whether there is significant different between experimental group and control group in the use of “Dictotell”.

In the post test, the students were asked by the researcher some question based on the syllabus. The students should answer the questions orally. Every

student was asked by the researcher minimally three question which seems to represent the standard competence. Then, about the post-test question can be seen at *appendix 9*. The students voices was recorded by the researcher to convince that the post-test was run well just like the post-test design. Then, about the script of post-test can be seen at *appendix 11*. The expert gived the score immidiately in the class. The expert came from the researcher, the English teacher of the 11 IPA and 11 IPS1, and one more expert from the researcher college who has a good score in the speaking skill subject her name was Ratna juwita. The reason of taking three expert validation is to keep the reliability of the test and subjectivities of the scoring. Then, the score of post-test can be seen in the *appendix 13*.

4.3.2 Hypothesis testing

Before analyzing the data, the researcher stated the hypothesys which has stated in chapter III. The hypothesys are stated as follow:

H_0 : there is no significant influence on the use of “Dictotell” between experimental group and control group.

H_1 : there is significant influence on the use of “Dictotell” between experimental group and control group.

Criteria :

H_0 can not be rejected if the significant is higher than alpha (0,05)

H_0 can be rejected if the significant is lower than alpha (0,05)

The result of independent sample T-test is as follows :

Group Statistics

Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
nilai Ipa	28	12,64	2,792	,528
Ips	25	6,16	1,313	,263

Table 1.5 group statistics

The table above showed the statistics of the group. The group of 11 IPA has twenty eight students who followed the post-test. The group of 11 IPS1 has twenty five students who followed the post-test. The average of both groups are 12,64 for 11 IPA as the experimental group and 6,16 for 11 IPS1 as the control group.

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig. Upper	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
nilai	Equal variances assumed	11,777	,001	10,603	51	,000	6,483	,611	5,255	7,710
	Equal variances not assumed			11,001	39,317	,000	6,483	,589	5,291	7,675

Table 1.6 Independent Samples Test

In details of the table showed that probability value in sig. (2-tailed) of both groups was 0,000. It showed the significance less than α (0,05) level or (0,000 < 0,05). It means that the null hypothesis can be rejected. So that, there was significant influence on the use of "Dictotell" on student's speaking skill between experimental and control group. Therefore, there was a significant different between experimental and control group after the treatment of "Dictotell".

4.4 Discussion

In conducting this research, the research found that the use of “Dictotell” was effective to improve the student’s speaking skill. It can be approved with the significant which at 0,000 level. It means that there is significant influence on the use of “Dictotell” towards student’s speaking skill at 11th grade of MA YASMU senior high school because the significant is lower than alpha or $(0,000) < (0,05)$.

The finding above is supported by other statement which noted that the dictogloss method and cooperative learning can be combined to promote the development of listening and speaking skills of second language learners (Vasiljevic:2010). In addition,(wulandari:2011) in her study about improving student’s listening ability by using spot the dictogloss (a combination between spot the different and dictogloss) also noted that the use of spot the dictogloss can also increased the student’s communicative competence because the student’s speaking time is significantly longer than in a traditional teacher-centered classroom as the strength of spot the dictogloss technique.

Moreover, as the combination retelling technique also showed benefits which can support the student’s speaking skill. There are by retelling, students produces an oral report and storytelling also allows students to give their opinion or thought about the story (O’Malley&Pierce:1996). This finding is also supported by (Herminda:2013) who said that Story telling techniques is effective in improving the students’ speaking ability.

It can be one alternative method in teaching the EFL learner which might be have no chance to practice or expose their English skill outside the class. By using this method, the students not only practiced their speaking but also another skill which are listening, grammar and writing. It is supported by several definitions which have reported that the use of dictogloss involves students' attention to those four language skills (i.e. listening, speaking, reading and writing), and encourages learner's autonomy (Jacobs:2003).

When the teacher dictated the text, the students practiced their listening. When the teacher gave the task to reconstruct the text, the students practiced their grammar and writing skill and when the teacher asked them to present their task or retell the reconstruction of the text it means that they practiced their speaking skill. If the student have an activity so they will not feel bored and sleepy in the class during the teaching and learning process. As stated by (Kayi:2006) who said that the students should have a real-life communication to promote oral language. This can occur when students collaborate in groups to achieve a goal or to complete a task.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

In thi chapter, the researcher would like to present the conclusion of this research finding in relation to some previous chapter. Besides, this chapter also provide suggestions for the teachers, and the next researcher which are expected to bring some benefits.

5.1 conclusion

The use of “Dictotell” in teaching English speaking skill was effective to improve the student’ speaking skill. The student’s score of post-test showed a significant influence toward student’s speaking skill at the level 0,000. This level of significant is lower than the significant value which is 0,05 or $0,000 < 0,05$. So, the use of “Dictotell” was significantly nfluence the student’s speaking skill at 11th grade senior high school of MA YASMU Manyar Gresik.

In the previous study, dictogloss was implemented in the focus on listening and writing skill while in this study dictogloss was considered to be implemented in the focus on speaking skill. This method combined conventional teaching procedures such as topical warm-up and explisit vocabulary instruction with a meaning based activity such as retelling technique. It becomes “Dictotell”.

This method or “Dictotell” could help the students to understand the use of language, pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar and student’s comprehension. This method could help the students to improve their English speaking skill

because this method requires the student to be more active in the teaching learning process.

The score of the student's speaking skill which showed that the use of "Dictotell" was effective to improve the student's speaking skill at grade 11th of MA YASMU senior high school also supported by (Vasijevic:2010) who stated that dictogloss method and cooperative learning can be combined to promote the development of listening and speaking skills of second language learners. It also supported by (Rachmawaty&Hermagustiana:2010) who noted that retelling technique improves the student's fluency by the improvement on their vocabulary and comprehensibility. So that, the researcher can also concluded that if dictogloss and retelling technique is implemented correctly, this method can also improve student's speaking skill.

5.2 Suggestion

From those finding above, the researcher provide some suggestions to the English teacher and the next resercher toward the use of "Dictotell" as a method to teach student's speaking skill.

5.2.1 Suggestion for the English teacher

The finding of this study can support the English teacher to consider thi method as an alternative method to be implemented to teach the student's speaking skill. it because this method make the student become more active and creative. So that the student will be bored and busy with their task. It will make the class easier to be controled by the teacher.

5.2.2 Suggestion for the students

The students are expected to be more pay attention, active and more confidence during teaching and learning process in the class. They should practice their English speaking not only in the class but also outside the class. It is aimed to improve their speaking skill and to accustom themselves to speak English. The researcher hoped that “Dictotell” can be an alternative method to improve the students speaking skill.

5.2.3 Suggestion for the next researcher

It necessary for another researcher to conduct a further research in order to deepen the treatment and improve student’s speaking skill. Beside that, the next researcher is expected to do the research more intensively. So that, the result can be valid and aaccountble. Then, the next researcher who wants to conduct a research using “Dictotell” is expected to conduct this research with different media, areas, level of proficiency, and skills with different student’s condition like student’s interest, habits or motivation

REFERENCES

- Ary, D.(1990). Introduction to Research in Education.United State of America.
- Chaney & Burk.(1998). Teaching Oral Communication in Grades K-8. Boston:Allyn&Bacon.
- Creswell, J W.(2010). Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative and MixedMethod Approaches. California:Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J W.(2008). Educational Research Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research. Colombus:Pearson.
- Daura, R J.(2013). Using Dictogloss As An Interactive Method Of Teaching Listening Comprehension . Australia:Australian International Academic Centre.
- David, P H.(1969). Testing English as a Second Language. New York:McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Djiwandono, M S.(2008). Tes Bahasa: Pegangan Bagi Pengajar Bahasa. Jakarta:PT. INDEKS.
- Gambrell, L.B., Koskinen, P.S., & Kapinus, B.A.(1991). Retelling and the reading comprehension of profi- cient and less-proficient readers. Journal of Educational Research, 84(6), 356–362.
- Herminda.(2013).The effectiveness of using story telling technique to iprove speaking ability of second year students at SMPN 1 Boyolangu, Tulungagung. Islamic University of Malang
- Jacobs, G.(2003). Combining Dictogloss and Cooperative Learning To Promote Language Learning. The Reading Matrix Vol.3. No.1.
- Kayi, H.(2006). Teaching Speaking: Activities to Promote Speaking in a Second Language. The Internet TESL Journal, Vol. XII, No. 11
- Knight, Ben.(1992). Assessing speaking skills:a workshop for teacher development. Oxford:Oxford University Press.
- Nunan, D.(2003). Practical English Language Teaching.New York:McGraw-Hill
- O'Malley, J. Michael & Lorraine V, Pierce.(1996). Authentic Assessment for English Language Learners. USA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

- Oradee, T.(2012). *Developing Speaking Skills Using Three Communicative Activities (Discussion, Problem-Solving, and Role- Playing)*. International Journal of Social Science and Humanity, Vol. 2, No. 6.
- Rachmawaty , N & Hermagustiana , I.(2010). *Does Retelling Technique Improve Speaking Fluency?*. TEFLIN Journal, Vol. 21.
- Richards, Jack C.(2008). *Teaching Listening and Speaking From Theory to Practice*.Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.
- Šolcová, Bc. Petra.(2011). *English Language and Literature and Teaching English Language and Literature for Secondary Schools*. Teaching Speaking Skills Master"s Diploma Thesis
- Sugiyono.(2009). *Metode Penelitian Qualitative, Quantitative, and R&D*. Bandung:Alfabeta.
- Tarigan, Henry G.(1986).*Berbicara Sebagai Sesuatu Ketrampilan Berbahasa*.Bandung:Angkasa.
- Teaching Excellence in Adult Literacy (TEAL).(2010). *Student-Centered Learning*. American Intitutes for Research.
- Urdan, Timothy C.(2010). *Statistics in Plain English Third Edition*. New York: Taylor and Francis Group, LLC.
- Vasiljevic, Z.(2010). *Dictogloss as an Interactive Method of Teaching Listening Comprehension to L2 Learners*. English Language Teaching Vol.3 No.1.
- Wajnryb, R.(1990). *Grammar dictation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wulandari, F.(2011). *Improving student's listening ability using spot the dictogloss technique*. Universitas Sebelas Maret:Surakarta.