CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the finding of the research. It presents some discussions deal with the collected data of students' pre-test and post-test score from experimental and control group. This chapter covers the description of data, hypothesis testing, and discussion.

A. The Description of Data

In this section, the data presentation was done to show the result of research that has been carried out to the subjects of the research. The sample of the research was 64 students of VIII A and VIII B classes at MTsN 4 Tulungagung, in which class A consist of 30 students and class B consist of 34 students. To obtain the data, the test was administered to that class. The researcher presented and analyzed the pretest scores and posttest scores of control group and experimental group in speaking. The data for the students' which taught speaking was taught by using conventional strategy and taught by using video blog (vlog) as teaching media.

1. The students' speaking ability in descriptive text taught by using a conventional strategy (control group)

a. Pretest of Control Class

Control class is a class which was taught speaking by using a conventional strategy. The learning activity in control class was conducted by using conventional strategy. Before the control class was

taught speaking by using conventional strategy, the researcher administered a pretest for this group in the form of speaking. The test takes of the pretest in control group consisted of 34 students. Based on the result in pretest the highest score was 76 and the lowest was 56. For the details, the students' pretest score in control class could be seen in Appendix 9.

By using SPSS program 16.0 versions it was known that the mean of the students score in pretest was 67.65, the mode was 63, and the median was 68.00. The standard deviation was 5.026. The result of computation could be seen in Table 4.1 follows:

Table 4.1 The Output of statistic Data of Control Class's Score in Pretest

Statistics

PRETEST

N	Valid	34
	Missing	0
Mean		67.65
Median		68.00
Mode		63[a]
Std. Deviation		5.026
Variance		25.266
Range		20
Minimum		56
Maximum		76

After getting the statically data, the researcher presented a group frequency distribution by using SPSS program 16.0 version. The

frequency distribution of control class students' score in pretest could be seen in Table 4.2 below:

Table 4.2 The Frequency Distribution of Control Class's Score in Pretest

Pretest Control

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	56	1	2.9	2.9	2.9
	58	1	2.9	2.9	5.9
	61	1	2.9	2.9	8.8
	62	2	5.9	5.9	14.7
	63	4	11.8	11.8	26.5
	65	4	11.8	11.8	38.2
	66	2	5.9	5.9	44.1
	68	3	8.8	8.8	52.9
	69	1	2.9	2.9	55.9
	70	3	8.8	8.8	64.7
	71	3	8.8	8.8	73.5
	72	4	11.8	11.8	85.3
	73	1	2.9	2.9	88.2
	74	2	5.9	5.9	94.1
	76	2	5.9	5.9	100.0
	Total	34	100.0	100.0	

The Table 4.2 above showed that there was 1 student who got score 56. There was 1 student who got score 58. There was 1 student who got score 61. There were 2 students who got score 62. There were 4 students who got score 63. There were 4 students who got score 65. There were 2 students who got score 66. There were 3 students who got score 68.

There was 1 students who got score 69. There were 3 students who got score 70. There were 3 students who got score 71. There were 4 students who got score 72. There was 1 students who got score 73. There were 2 students who got score 74. The last, there were 2 student who got score 76.

Based on the control class students' score in pretest, the researcher categorized their speaking ability into 4 categories; excellent, very good, good, need improvement. The categorization could be seen in Table 4.3 below:

Table 4.3 The Control Group Students' Qualification in Pretest

No	Grade	Qualification	Range of scores	Frequency
1	A	Excellent	80-100	0
2	B	Very Good	70-79	15
3	C	Good	60-69	17
4	D	Need Improvement	1-59	2

Based on the Table 4.3 above, the result of the categorization shown that 2 students were in need improvement, 17 students were in good ability and 14 students were in very good ability. The result shown that the students had good ability in speaking. It could be concluded that the students had to improve their ability in speaking.

b. Posttest of Control Class

The researcher administered a posttest in the form of speaking for control class. It was conducted to know the improvement of the students' ability in speaking taught by using conventional method. The test takes of

the posttest in control group consisted of 34 students. Based on the result of posttest, the highest obtained score was 84 and the lowest score was 64. For details, the students' posttest score in control class could be seen in Appendix 10.

By using SPSS 16.0 version, it was known that the mean of the students score in pretest was 76.76, the mode was 70, and the median was 78.00. The standard deviation was 5.483. The result of computation could be seen in Table 4.4 follows:

Table 4.4 The Output of Statistic Data of Control Class

Statistics

POSTTEST

N	Valid	34
	Missing	0
Mean		76.76
Median		78.00
Mode		70[a]
Std. Deviation		5.483
Variance		30.064
Range		20
Minimum		64
Maximum		84

After getting the statistical data, the researcher presented a group frequency distribution by using SPSS program 16.0 version. The frequency distribution of control class students' score in posttest could be seen in the Table 4.5 below:

Table 4.5 The Frequency Distribution of Control Class's Score in Posttest

Post-test Control

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	64	1	2.9	2.9	2.9
	69	2	5.9	5.9	8.8
	70	3	8.8	8.8	17.6
	71	2	5.9	5.9	23.5
	73	3	8.8	8.8	32.4
	74	3	8.8	8.8	41.2
	76	2	5.9	5.9	47.1
	77	1	2.9	2.9	50.0
	79	3	8.8	8.8	58.8
	80	3	8.8	8.8	67.6
	81	2	5.9	5.9	73.5
	82	3	8.8	8.8	82.4
	83	3	8.8	8.8	91.2
	84	3	8.8	8.8	100.0
	Total	34	100.0	100.0	

The Table 4.5 above showed that there was 1 student who got score 64. There were 2 students who got score 69. There were 3 students who got score 70. There were 2 students who got score 71. There were 3 students who got score 73. There were 3 students who got score 74. There

were 2 students who got score 76. There was 1 student who got score 77. There were 3 students who got score 79. There were 3 students who got score 80. There were 2 student who got score 81. There were 3 student who got score 82. There were 3 students who got score 83. The last, there were 3 students who got score 84.

Based on the control class students' score in posttest, the researcher qualified their speaking ability into 4 categories; excellent, very good, good, need improvement. The categorization could be seen in Table 4.6 as below:

Table 4.6 The Control Group Students' Qualification in Posttest

No	Grade	Qualification	Range of scores	Frequency
1	A	Excellent	80-100	14
2	B	Very Good	70-79	17
3	C	Good	60-69	3
4	D	Need Improvement	1-59	0

Based on the Table 4.6 above, the result of categorization shown that 14 students in excellent ability, 17 students in very good ability, and 3 students in good ability. It could be concluded that there was no improvement ability in good qualification for the posttest score in control class.

2. The students' speaking ability in descriptive text taught by using video blog (vlog) (experimental group)

a. Pretest of Experimental Class

Experimental class is a class which was taught speaking by using Video blog (vlog). The learning activity in experimental class was conducted by using Video blog (vlog). Before the experimental class was given a treatment by using video blog (vlog), the researcher administered a pretest for the group in the form of speaking. The pretest that administered for experimental class was same with the pretest for control class. The test takes of pretest in experimental group consisted of 30 students. Based on the result in pretest, the highest score was 80 and the lowest score was 63. For the details, the students' pretest score in experimental class could be seen in Appendix 7.

By using SPSS program 16.0 version, it was known that the mean of students score in pretest was 71.63, the mode was 70, and the median was 72.00. The standard deviation was 4.888. The result of computation could be seen in Table 4.7 follows:

Table 4.7 The Output of Statistic Data of Experimental Class's Score in Pretest

Statistics

PRETEST

N	Valid	30
	Missing	0
Mean		71.63
Median		72.00

Mode	70[a]
Std. Deviation	4.888
Variance	23.895
Range	17
Minimum	63
Maximum	80

After getting the statistical data, the researcher presented a group frequency distribution by using SPSS program 16.0 version. The frequency distribution of experimental class students' score in pretest could be seen in the Table 4.8 as below:

Table 4.8 The Frequency Distribution of Experimental Class Score in Pretest

Pretest Experimental

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	63	2	6.7	6.7	6.7
	64	1	3.3	3.3	10.0
	65	1	3.3	3.3	13.3
	66	2	6.7	6.7	20.0
	67	1	3.3	3.3	23.3
	68	1	3.3	3.3	26.7
	69	1	3.3	3.3	30.0
	70	3	10.0	10.0	40.0
	71	2	6.7	6.7	46.7
	72	3	10.0	10.0	56.7

	73	2	6.7	6.7	63.3
	74	2	6.7	6.7	70.0
	75	1	3.3	3.3	73.3
	76	2	6.7	6.7	80.0
	77	2	6.7	6.7	86.7
	78	2	6.7	6.7	93.3
	79	1	3.3	3.3	96.7
	80	1	3.3	3.3	100.0
	Total	30	100.0	100.0	

The Table 4.8 above showed that there were 2 students who got score 63. There was 1 student who got score 64. There was 1 student who got score 65. There were 2 students who got score 66. There was 1 student who got score 67. There was 1 student who got score 68. There was 1 student who got score 69. There were 3 students who got score 70. There were 2 students who got score 71. There were 3 students who got score 72. There were 2 students who got score 73. There were 2 students who got score 74. There was 1 student who got score 75. There were 2 students who got score 76. There were 2 students who got score 77. There were 2 students who got score 78. There was 1 student who got score 79. The last, there was 1 student who got score 80.

Based on the experimental class students' score in pretest, the researcher categorized their speaking ability into 4 categories; excellent,

very good, good, need improvement. The categorization could be seen in Table 4.9 below:

Table 4.9 The Experimental Group Students' Qualification in Pretest

No	Grade	Qualification	Range of scores	Frequency
1	A	Excellent	80-100	1
2	B	Very Good	70-79	20
3	C	Good	60-69	9
4	D	Need Improvement	1-59	0

Based on the Table 4.9 above, the result of the categorization shown that 9 students were in good ability, 20 students were in very good ability and 1 student was in excellent ability. The result above shown that the students had enough ability in speaking. It could be concluded that the students' ability in speaking from both experimental and control class was almost same in pretest.

b. Posttest of Experimental Class

The researcher administered a posttest in the form of speaking for experimental class. It was conducted to know the improvement of the students' ability in speaking taught by using Video blog (vlog). The test takes of the posttest in the experimental class consist of 30 students. Based on the result of posttest, the highest obtained score was 91 and the lowest score was 73. For the details, the students' posttest score in experimental class could be seen in Appendix 8.

By using SPSS program 16.0 version, it was known that the mean of students score in posttest was 82.03, the mode was 79, and the median

was 81.00. The standard deviation was 4.846. The result of computation could be seen in Table 4.10 follows:

Table 4.10 The Output of Statistic Data of Experimental Class's Score in Posttest

Statistics

POSTTEST

N	Valid	30
	Missing	0
Mean		82.03
Median		81.00
Mode		79[a]
Std. Deviation		4.846
Range		18
Minimum		73
Maximum		91

After getting the statistical data, the researcher presented a group of frequency distribution by using SPSS program 16.0 version. The frequency distribution of experimental class students' score in posttest could be seen in the Table 4.11 below:

Table 4.11 The Frequency Distribution of Experimental Class's Score in Posttest

Posttest

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	73	1	3.3	3.3	3.3
	74	1	3.3	3.3	6.7
	75	1	3.3	3.3	10.0
	77	2	6.7	6.7	16.7
	78	2	6.7	6.7	23.3
	79	4	13.3	13.3	36.7
	80	2	6.7	6.7	43.3
	81	3	10.0	10.0	53.3
	83	2	6.7	6.7	60.0
	84	2	6.7	6.7	66.7
	85	2	6.7	6.7	73.3
	87	4	13.3	13.3	86.7
	88	1	3.3	3.3	90.0
	89	1	3.3	3.3	93.3
	90	1	3.3	3.3	96.7
	91	1	3.3	3.3	100.0
	Total	30	100.0	100.0	

The Table 4.11 above showed that there was 1 student who got score 73. There was 1 student who got score 74. There was 1 student who

got score 75. There were 2 students who got score 77. There were 2 students who got score 68. There were 4 students who got score 79. There were 2 students who got score 80. There were 3 students who got score 81. There were 2 students who got score 83. There were 2 students who got score 84. There were 2 students who got score 85. There were 4 students who got score 87. There was 1 student who got score 88. There was 1 student who got score 89. There was 1 student who got score 90. The last, there was 1 student who got score 91. From those data it was known that the score frequently appear was scoring 79 and 87, each score occurred 4 times.

Based on the experimental class students' score in posttest, the researcher qualified their speaking ability into 4 categories; excellent, very good, good, need improvement. The categorization could be seen in Table 4.12 as below:

Table 4.12 The Experimental Group Students' Qualification in Posttest

No	Grade	Qualification	Range of scores	Frequency
1	A	Excellent	80-100	19
2	B	Very Good	70-79	11
3	C	Good	60-69	0
4	D	Need Improvement	1-59	0

Based on the Table 4.12, the result of categorization shown that 11 students in very good ability and 19 students in excellent ability. The result above showed that there was a significant difference of experimental

group students' ability between pretest and posttest. There was the improvement of the need improvement ability to good ability to very good ability to excellent ability. Moreover, the excellent ability was increase.

B. Data Analysis

As stated in the previous part, data analysis was done to analyze the data from the two groups to determine whether or not there was significant different score. The students' score of post-test of both groups (control and experimental) were analyzed using independent T-test at SPSS 16.0.The test results as follows in table 4.13:

Table 4.13 Group statistics of two groups

Group Statistics

	KELAS	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
POSTTEST	EXPERIMENTAL	30	82.03	4.846	.885
	CONTROL	34	76.76	5.483	.940

The result of computation above showed the performance scores of the members of the one group given treatment by using video blog (vlog). The mean score of post-test in experimental class was 82.03; meanwhile the mean score of post-test in control class was 76.76. Based on those results, it could be seen that the mean scores between experimental class

and control class was different. The mean score of experimental class was higher than the mean score of control class.

After doing the treatment, the researcher recorded the scores from experimental class and control class, conducted some statistical calculation for the data analysis and made interpretation and conclusion. The result of experimental class and control class were presented in table 4.14 below

Table 4.14 The result of analyzing 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
POSTTEST	Equal variances assumed	1.153	.287	4.049	62	.000	5.269	1.301	2.668	7.870
	Equal variances not assumed			4.081	61.999	.000	5.269	1.291	2.688	7.850

Referring the Table 4.14, it showed that in Levene's Test for Equality of Variances, it seen that F= 1.153 (p=0.287) because of p higher than 0,05, it indicated that there is no difference in variance data or in the

other words data was equal or homogeneous. If the data was homogeneous, see on the result of *Equal Variances Assumed.* As can be seen in table 4.14, it showed that Df (Degree of freedom) was 62. Therefore, the way to test whether the null hypothesis can be rejected was by comparing p-value with the standard level of significance (0.05). According to Balvanes & Calputi (2001), the convention to reject the null hypothesis was when the p-value of the obtained statistics was less than or equal to 0.05. As table 4.14 showed, the gained of significance value (p-value) was 0.000, and it has to be divided into two since we have one-tailed test (0.000 : 2 = 0.000). The result of SPSS the significance value <0.05 (0.000 < 0.05), it was less than 0.05 (α = 5 %). Thus, there was significant different score in speaking descriptive text of the students between taught by using and without using video blog (vlog) strategy. In short, the null hypothesis was rejected or it means that the alternative hypothesis was accepted.

C. Hypothesis Testing

According to Cresswell (2012: 188), hypothesis testing is a procedure for making decisions about results by comparing an observed value of a sample with a population value to determine if no difference or relationship exists between the values. The hypotheses testing of this research were as follows:

1. If the p-value (significance value) is less than or equal to 0.05 (α = 5%), then the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected and the alternative

hypothesis (H_a) is accepted. It means there is significant difference score in speaking descriptive text of the students being taught by using video blog (vlog) and taught by using conventional strategy.

2. If the p-value (significance value) is greater than to 0.05 ($\alpha = 5\%$), then the null hypothesis (H_0) is accepted and the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is rejected. It means there is no any significant difference score in speaking descriptive text of the students being taught by using video blog (vlog) and taught by using conventional strategy.

From the result of computation in table 4.15, it could be seen that difference of the mean between experimental class and control class was 5.269. the value of t-count had been found, and then the degrees of freedom or d.f = N-1 is (62). Meanwhile the t-count was 4.049.

The result of t-test above shown that P-value (Sig) was 0.000, and it was lower than 0.05 or 5% (0.000 < 0.05) it could be concluded that the null hypothesis saying that there was no significant difference score in speaking toward eight grade at MTsN 4 Tulungagung between the students speaking skill taught by using video blog (vlog) and those taught by using conventional strategy was rejected. In the other hand, the alternative hypothesis saying that there was significant difference score in speaking toward eight grade of MTsN 4 Tulungagung between the students speaking skill taught by using video blog (vlog) and those taught by using conventional strategy was accepted. In addition, the

finding verified that video blog (vlog) was effective to be used for eight grade students in teaching speaking at MTsN 4 Tulungagung.

D. Discussion

In this research, a researcher conducted the research in two classes during the teaching and learning process. The subjects of the research consisted of 74 students. The sample was gotten by using purposive sampling technique where the researcher did not consider the strata when choose the subject. The researcher decided VIII-A class as experimental class which was given the treatment by using video blog (vlog) as teaching media and VIII-B class as control class which was not given the treatment by using video blog (vlog) as the teaching media. In this research, the researcher administered two kinds of test; those were pretest and posttest.

After the data were collected, the data were analyzed by using of SPSS program 16.0 version. The students' who were taught by using conventional strategy did not reveal significant improvement. It could be seen from the mean score of pretest was 67.65 and the mean score of posttest was 76.76. In addition, there was a few of students who were need improvement based on the table of control group students' qualification. In the other hand, the students who were taught by using video blog (vlog) reveal significant improvement. It was proved by the mean score in posttest was higher than the mean score in pretest. The mean score of pretest was 71.63 and the mean score of posttest was 82.03. It can be

conclude that the gained score of experimental class was higher than control group.

Related to the statistic calculation of Independent Samples T Test by using SPSS 16.0, the result of Sig. (2-tailed) showed that the significant value of the group was 0.000, and it has to be divided into two since we have one-tailed test (0.000 : 2 = 0.000). the significance level was 0.05. since 0.000 was smaller than significance level (α) 5% or 0.05, so the null hypothesis was rejected. Thus, there were significant different score in speaking descriptive text between the students who were taught using video blog (vlog) and those who were not taught by using conventional strategy. It could be said that audiovisual media was affective to be used in teaching speaking ability and suggested to be used.

From the data analysis above, it could be concluded that the use of video blog (vlog) is effective in increasing students' speaking score. The previous researcher has been proved that video blog (vlog) was effective in improving students speaking skill. A study conducted by Shih (2010) stated that blogging helped 82% of students improve their professional public speaking skill, such as enunciation, articulation, expressions, posture, and gestures.

Another study conducted by Bujan & Suppasetseree (2017) stated that the use of video blog (vlog) was efficient and could help the students in enhance their English oral communication skill effectively. The tools of video blog (vlog) are considered effective in improving the students

speaking skill because the use of video would rather show effective than written text. By using video blog (vlog), the students not only study about pronunciation but also the facial expression. Video blog (vlog) also brought the positive effects on teaching and learning process.

The use of teaching media in teaching learning process was very important, so the teacher should chose the media for teaching learning, especially for teaching speaking. A teaching media could help the teacher to teach more easily and helped the students more enjoyed and the learning environment interesting, fun, and interactive. One of teaching media that were easy and interesting to apply in teaching speaking was video blog (vlog). Video blog (vlog) could be supported by interactive activities in an attempt to stimulate teaching speaking. Instructional video blog (vlog) could be used as an interactive learning in the classroom and for students themselves through online presentation or offline.

Based on the explanation above, it can be said that video blog (vlog) gave contribution to the teaching speaking in descriptive text at MTsN 4 Tulungagung. The effectiveness of using video blog (vlog) also proved by result of the previous study which conducted by Robith and Fahri (2018) conducted a study entitled "Vlogging as a Medium for Eight Graders of SMP Negeri 1 Gresik in Speaking Recount Text". In her conclusion she stated that video blog (vlog) is effective to improve students' speaking ability. In conclusion the use of video blog (vlog) is

effective on teaching speaking in descriptive text of second grade students at MTsN 4 Tulungagung.