# CHAPTER IV

# RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This chapter covers about research findings and discussion that include data of research findings, hypothesis testing, the result of normality and homogeneity testing, and discussion.

## A. Research Findings

In this chapter, the researcher presented the data on the students' speaking mastery between students' that taught using Kebs Media and those taught without using Krebs Media. The subjects of the research consisted of two classes, they were 8.7 as Experimental Class and 8.9 as Control Class. The purposed of the researcher was to know the effectiveness of using Krebs Media on second grade students' vocabulary mastery at MTsN Tulungagung 1. The data were collected from students' score in pre-test and post-test of both classes. Then, to determine the significance different whether using Krebs Media was effective or not, the researcher did not use individual scores for comparison. But, it used the results of class scores or mean to determined it. The data were described as follow:

### 1. Data of Experimental Class

The table bellow showed the students' score of pre-test and post-test of Experimental class that was consist of 39 students' on second grade of MTsN Tulungagung 1. The test was speaking practice which consist 4 items about greeting. Students' score of pre-test and post-test can be seen on table 4.1 as follow:

**Table 4.1 Students' Scores of Experimental Class (Using Kebs Media)**

| No. | Students' Name | Pre-test | Post-test |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | ADP | 80 | 80 |
| 2. | AFI | 80 | 80 |
| 3. | AOR | 75 | 75 |
| 4. | APF | 75 | 85 |
| 5. | AYD | 80 | 85 |
| 6. | ASK | 80 | 90 |
| 7. | BAN | 80 | 90 |
| 8. | BTR | 75 | 90 |
| 9. | CEA | 75 | 80 |
| 10. | CAM | 75 | 80 |
| 11. | DZN | 75 | 80 |
| 12. | EJA | 90 | 90 |
| 13. | EAP | 75 | 90 |
| 14. | ENU | 90 | 90 |
| 15. | FMA | 75 | 75 |
| 16. | HDK | 85 | 90 |
| 17. | LFI | 75 | 80 |
| 18. | LNH | 75 | 75 |
| 19. | LHA | 75 | 85 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 20. | MPM | 80 | 90 |
| 21. | MZM | 80 | 85 |
| 22. | MLS | 80 | 85 |
| 23. | MDN | 80 | 90 |
| 24. | MAS | 80 | 90 |
| 25. | MFA | 80 | 95 |
| 26. | MSN | 80 | 80 |
| 27. | NRH | 75 | 80 |
| 28. | NRZ | 80 | 85 |
| 29. | NAN | 80 | 90 |
| 30. | NAF | 80 | 80 |
| 31. | PUH | 80 | 85 |
| 32. | RAA | 80 | 85 |
| 33. | RFN | 90 | 90 |
| 34. | RNW | 90 | 90 |
| 35. | SZM | 75 | 75 |
| 36. | WPT | 80 | 85 |
| 37. | WWA | 80 | 80 |
| 38. | YAR | 75 | 85 |
| 39. | ZNA | 75 | 80 |

The researcher used SPSS 23.0 *for windows* to know the students' speaking achievement at Expeimental class. First, the resercher gave the

students' pre-test to know their basic speaking mastery. The result can be seen on the table 4.2 below:

**Table 4.2 Descriptive Statistic Pre-test of Experimental Class**

**Statistics**

Pretest

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| N | Valid | 39 |
| | Missing | 0 |
| Mean | | 79.23 |
| Median | | |
| Mode | | |
| Std. Deviation | | 4.522 |
| Minimum | | 75 |
| Maximum | | 90 |
| Sum | | 3090 |

According to te result of pre-test from the table above, it shown that the sum of data was 3090. The lowest score of pre-test was 75 and the highest score was 90. The mean of data was 79.23. And after the researcher gave the treatmentt by using Krebs Media in teaching vocabulary for a week, the researcher gave the students post-test scores. The data in the post-test showed on the table 4.3 below:

**Table 4.3 Descriptive Statistic Post-test of Experimental Class**

**Statistic**

Posttest

| | |
|---|---|
| N Valid | 39 |
| Missing | 0 |
| Mean | 84.49 |
| Median | |
| Mode | |
| Std. Deviation | 5.355 |
| Minimum | 75 |
| Maximum | 95 |
| Sum | 3295 |

According to the result of post-test from the table above, it shown that the sum of data was 3295. The lowest score of post-test was 75 and the highest score was 95. The mean of data was 84.49.

Based on descriptive statistic pre-test and post-test of Experimental class, it shown the *Sum* of data pre-tet was 3090 and the *Sum* of data post-test was 3295. *Mean* of pre-test score was 79.23 and the *Mean* of post-test score was 84.49.

Acording to the descriptive statistic of pre-test and post-test of experiment class, it can be concluded that there were significance different score between pre-test and post-test.

**2. Data of Control Class**

The table below showed the students' score of pre-test and post-test of Control class that was consist of 39 students' on second grade of MTsN 1 Tulungagung. The test was speaking practice which consist of 4 items about greeting. Students' score of pre-test and post-test can be seen on table 4.4 as follow:

**Table 4.4 Students' Scores of Control Class (Without Using Krebs Media)**

| No. | Students' Name | Pre-test | Post-test |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | AJF | 80 | 85 |
| 2. | AAL | 85 | 85 |
| 3. | AND | 80 | 85 |
| 4. | AAS | 75 | 75 |
| 5. | AAA | 80 | 80 |
| 6. | ASW | 80 | 80 |
| 7. | AMA | 85 | 85 |
| 8. | DDK | 80 | 80 |
| 9. | DQO | 75 | 75 |
| 10. | DOK | 75 | 75 |
| 11. | FDA | 75 | 80 |
| 12. | IAF | 80 | 80 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 13. | IKH | 75 | 75 |
| 14. | KRA | 80 | 90 |
| 15. | KAA | 75 | 75 |
| 16. | LFL | 75 | 80 |
| 17. | MAF | 80 | 80 |
| 18. | MDB | 75 | 80 |
| 19. | MHF | 85 | 95 |
| 20. | MRA | 80 | 80 |
| 21. | NDA | 90 | 90 |
| 22. | NDN | 75 | 80 |
| 23. | OLN | 75 | 85 |
| 24. | PRW | 80 | 80 |
| 25. | PLN | 75 | 80 |
| 26. | RAM | 75 | 75 |
| 27. | RAH | 85 | 85 |
| 28. | SKK | 85 | 85 |
| 29. | SHJ | 80 | 80 |
| 30. | TDK | 80 | 85 |
| 31. | TRF | 80 | 80 |
| 32. | VDR | 85 | 75 |
| 33. | YDF | 75 | 80 |
| 34. | YAF | 75 | 85 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 35. | ZCK | 75 | 80 |
| 36. | ZIA | 75 | 75 |
| 37. | ZAN | 80 | 75 |
| 38. | RDW | 75 | 75 |
| 39. | JAF | 75 | 75 |

The researcher used SPSS 23.0 *for windows* to know the students' speaing achievement at Control class. First, the resercher gave the students' pre-test, to know their basic vocabulary mastery. The result can be seen on the table 4.5 below:

**Table 4.5 Descriptive Statistic Pre-test of Control Class**

**Statistics**

Pretest

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| N | Valid | 39 |
| | Missing | 0 |
| Mean | | 79.49 |
| Median | | |
| Mode | | |
| Std. Deviation | | 4.412 |
| Minimum | | 75 |
| Maximum | | 90 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Sum | 3100 |

According to te result of pre-test from the table above, it shown that the sum of data was 3100. The lowest score of pre-test was 75 and the highest score was 90. The mean of data was 79.49. And after the researcher teaching speaking using conventional method, the researcher gave the students post-test scores. The data in the post-test showed on the table 4.6 below.

**Table 4.6 Descriptive Statistic Post-test of Control Class**

**Statistics**

Posttest

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| N | Valid | 39 |
| | Missing | 0 |
| Mean | | 82.44 |
| Median | | |
| Mode | | |
| Std. Deviation | | 48.49 |
| Minimum | | 75 |
| Maximum | | 95 |
| Sum | | 3215 |

According to the result of post-test from the table above, it shown that the sum of data was 3215. The lowest score of post-test was 75 and the highest score was 95. The mean of data was 82.44.

Based on descriptive statistic pre-test and post-test of Control class, it shown the *Sum* of data pre-tet was 3100 and the *Sum* of data post-test was 3215. *Mean* of pre-test score was 79.49 and the *Mean* of post-test score was 82.44.

Acording to the descriptive statistic of pre-test and post-test of experiment class, it can be concluded that there were significance different score between pre-test and post-test.

**B. Hypothesis Testing**

The hypothesis testing of this study as follow:

1. $H_0$ (null hypothesis): There is no significant difference score between the students' taught by using Krebs Media and those taught by using conventional method.
2. Ha (alternative hypothesis): There is significant difference score between the students' taught by using Krebs Media and those taught by using conventional method.

The hypothesis testing of this study followed the rule as follows:

1. If the significant value is less than 0,05, the null hypothesis ($H_0$) is rejected and alternative hypothesis (Ha) accepted.
2. If the significant value is more than 0.05, the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is rejected and null hypothesis ($H_0$) is accepted.

To know whether there were any significant different students' speaking achievement between the students' who are taught by using Krebs Media and those taught by using conventional method, the calculating result should show whether $H_0$ is rejected meanwhile Ha is accepted. To analyzed data the researcher used SPSS *23.0 for windows*, the result can be seen on table 4.7 below:

**Table 4.7 Descriptive Statistic of Post-test (Experimental and Control Class)**

**Descriptive Statistics**

| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Experimental_class | 39 | 75 | 95 | 84.49 | 5.355 |
| Control_class | 39 | 75 | 95 | 82.44 | 4.849 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 39 | | | | |

Based on the table above, it showed there were two classes, experimental class and control class. Experimental class showed there were 39 students', *Mean* of score experimental class was 84.49, *Standard Deviation* for experimental classs was 5.355. Meanwhile, in the control class, showed there were 39 students', *Mean* of score control class was 82.44, *Standard Deviation* for control class was 4.849.

From the result above it can be concluded, that there is a significant difference score of the students' taught by using Krebs Media and those taught by using conventional Method.

In addition, the result of t-test testing with the helped of SPSS *23.0 for windows* can be seen on table 4.8 as follow:

**Table 4.8 Independent Sample T-test**

**Independent Samples Test**

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | Lower | Upper |
| The Result of Students' Score | Equal variances assumed | 1,288 | ,260 | 3,312 | 76 | ,001 | 3,846 | 1,161 | 1,533 | 6,159 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 3,312 | 75,383 | ,001 | 3,846 | 1,161 | 1,533 | 6,159 |

Based on the table above, the result of t-test can be concluded that significant value (sig-2 tailed) was 0.001, and it was smaller than 0.05 (0.001<0.05). It means that $H_0$ was rejected and Ha was accepted. Thus, it can be interpreted that there was significant difference of students' score between

students' taught by using Krebs Media and those taught by using conventional method. It means that teaching speaking using Krebs Media was effective.

## C. Normality and Homogeneity Testing

### 1. Normality Testing

Normality testing is conducted to determine whether the gained data was normal distribution or not. The researcher used SPSS *23.0 Kolmogorov-Smirnove and Shapiro-Wilk test* by the value of significance (α) = 0.050. The result can be seen in table below:

**Table 4.9 Normality Testing**

**One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test**

| | | Unstandardized Residual |
|---|---|---|
| N | | 156 |
| Normal Parameters[a,b] | Mean | ,0000000 |
| | Std. Deviation | 1,11612668 |
| Most Extreme Differences | Absolute | ,139 |
| | Positive | ,139 |
| | Negative | -,135 |
| Test Statistic | | ,139 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | | ,000[c] |

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.

a. $H_0$: Data is in normal distribution

b. $H_1$: Data is not in normal distribution

The standard significant of education is 0.05 (α = 5%). To determine data was normal distribution or not it can be seen from the

result of data normality testing. Based on the output from SPSS above is known that the significance value is .000. It means that the residual value were bigger than 0.05 (0.000>0.05). And it can be concluded that $H_0$ is rejected and $H_1$ accepted, so the data is not in normal distribution

**2. Homogeneity Testing**

Homogeneity testing is conducted to know whether the gained data has a homogeneous variance or not. To know the homogeneity, the researcher used *Test of Homogeneity of Variances* with SPSS 16.0 by the value of significance (α) = 0.050. The result can be seen below:

**Table 4.10 Homogeneity Testing**

**Test of Homogeneity of Variance**

| | | Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Student Learning Result | Based on Mean | ,508 | 1 | 76 | ,478 |
| | Based on Median | ,253 | 1 | 76 | ,617 |
| | Based on Median and with adjusted df | ,253 | 1 | 73,796 | ,617 |
| | Based on trimmed mean | ,469 | 1 | 76 | ,496 |

a. $H_0$: Data is homogeny

b. $H_1$: Data is not homogeny

The standard significant of education is 0.05 (α =5%). Based on the output from SPSS above is known that the test called homogeny if the significant score more than 0.05. According to the table above, the test is homogen because the significance value based on mean is 0.478 that is

bigger than 0.05 and it means that $H_0$ is accepted and $H_1$ is rejected. So, it can be conclude that students' of 8.7 has homogeny of variances.

## D. Discussion

`From the research finding above, the data were analyzed with SPSS *23.0 for windows*. The students' who were taught by using Krebs Media made significant improvement, as seen from the mean score of pre-test was 79.23 and the mean score of post-test was 84.49. The gained of the mean score of experimental class between pre-test and post-test was 5.26. Meanwhile, the students' who were taught without using Krebs Media did not make significant improvement, as seen from the mean score of pre-test was 79.49, and the mean score of post-test was 82.44. The gained of the mean score of control class between pre-test and post-test was 2.95. Based on the gained score between experimental class and control class, there are significance difference. The gained score of experimental class was 5.26 and the gained score of control class was2.95. We can conclude that the gained score of experimental class was higher than control class.

From the explanation above, experimental class has better speaking achievement than control class on post-test. Since the research used homogeneous selection to control extraneous variable and the result of homogeneity testing on students' pre-test on previous chapter showed that the students' have homogenous ability on vocabulary mastery. It can be conclude that Krebs Media was effective and not affected by extraneous variable.

Based on the research at MTsN 1 Tulungagung, it can be inferenced that teaching speaking by using Krebs Media was better than without using Krebs Media. Furthermore, the students' who learned speaking mastery through Krebs Media and who taught without Krebs Media having such a significant difference that the students' speaking scores who were taught by using Krebs Media was higher than those who were not. It can also be concluded that using Krebs Media was effective to teaching speaking.

Here Krebs Media helped the students in speaking skill in interesting way. Students got the opportunity to listen and imitate the phrases and words after they were listen to Krebs Media. The learning process in Krebs Media is based on imerson – immersion in language, someone must go through it. Listening and repeating certain sentences at cerain time intervals wll give extraordinary results. Krebs Media uses tricks of short-term memory and thanks to certain time intervals, you can quickly memorize all phrases or words. (id.krebsmethod.com).

Briefly, the speaking achievement in the experimental class has proven that Krebs Media is effective on students' speaking mastery. The findings of the present research confirm the findings of preceding studies. The previous study was written by Rizka (2016), which found that watching YouTube video can improve students' speaking and not only on their academic score, but also on their behavior to the lesson. It also relevant to the finding in the study conducted by Erwin (2018), that using short movie for improving students' speaking ability. There were improvement in the students'

participation in introduction, discussion and practice. Then, they interested in communicative and active since used Krebs as media in teaching vocabulary.

In inference to the findings and previous study, the use of Krebs Media successfully improved the students' speaking mastery. Krebs Media provide the different way of learning speaking that is student listen and copy what they have listen to. The activities also increased the students' motivation and create a simple way of learning speaking, so the students' did not get bored. Therefore, as Krebs Media is useful to be used in vocabulary mastery, the English teacher is suggested to implement this media in teaching learning process of speaking mastery.