## CHAPTER IV

## RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the researcher will describe the findings and present the research discussion which consists of descriptive data, normality and homogeneity testing, hypothesis testing and discussion.

## A. Research Findings

## 1. Descriptive Data

In this study, the researcher discusses the result of the research. The researcher presented the data of students' score in pronunciation achievement between students who taught by using U-Dictionary and students who taught conventionally. The aim of this research is to find out the effectiveness of U Dictionary application as learning media in teaching students' pronunciation of the eleventh grade students at SMK Islam 1 Durenan.

The researcher conducted pretest and posttest before and after doing treatment which chooses one class as the sample. The instrument was given to the eleventh grade students. The scores of pretest and posttest are devided by five criteria which could be seen in the table 3.6 below:

Table 4.1 The Score's Criteria

| Interval Class | Criteria |
| :--- | :--- |
| $85-100$ | Excellent |
| $71-84$ | Very Good |
| $60-70$ | Good |
| $40-59$ | Poor |
| $0-39$ | Very Poor |

Based on the table 4.1 above, the scores criteria was divided into 5, they are excellent, very good, good, poor, and fail. The one that categorized as being excellent were the students who got 85 to 100 as their scores. The category of being very good was that the students have to get score between 71 and 84 . The students who got $60-70$ as their score would be categorized as good. And the one who would be categorized as poor were the students whose score was between 40 and 59. Lastly, students whose score was 39 or below would be categorized as failed.

## a. The Data of Experimental Class

The data of experimental class which were obtained after the researcher conducting pretest and posttest were as follows:

Table 4.2 Students' Pronunciation Achievement Taught with U-
Dictionary

| NO | Name | Class | Pretest | Posttest |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | ARS | XI OTKP 1 | 50 | 68 |
| 2 | DNA | XI OTKP 1 | 40 | 59 |
| 3 | DRA | XI OTKP 1 | 68 | 81 |
| 4 | ED | XI OTKP 1 | 30 | 45 |
| 5 | EAN | XI OTKP 1 | 55 | 69 |
| 6 | EA | XI OTKP 1 | 60 | 73 |
| 7 | FADS | XI OTKP 1 | 82 | 87 |
| 8 | HZ | XI OTKP 1 | 31 | 53 |


| 9 | HF | XI OTKP 1 | 58 | 67 |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | HH | XI OTKP 1 | 62 | 74 |
| 11 | HN | XI OTKP 1 | 80 | 88 |
| 12 | NBDS | XI OTKP 1 | 69 | 83 |
| 13 | NTN | XI OTKP 1 | 59 | 75 |
| 14 | NSRN | XI OTKP 1 | 66 | 78 |
| 15 | NR | XI OTKP 1 | 52 | 68 |
| 16 | RF | XI OTKP 1 | 78 | 88 |
| 17 | RLM | XI OTKP 1 | 66 | 78 |
| 18 | SQA | XI OTKP 1 | 75 | 88 |
| 19 | SIO | XI OTKP 1 | 65 | 82 |
| 20 | SMS | XI OTKP 1 | 70 | 78 |
| 21 | SNH | XI OTKP 1 | 66 | 75 |
| 22 | SUN | XI OTKP 1 | 80 | 88 |
| 23 | UFN | YN |  | 75 |
| 24 | YN |  |  |  |

Based on the table 4.2, the sample of this research in experimental class were 24 students. The descriptive statistics of experimental class as follows:
a. Pretest of Experimental Class

SPSS 16.0 version was used by the researcher to obtain the descriptive statistics pretest of experimental class, the frequency and the percentage of
students' pronunciation achievement in experimental class before taught by using U-Dictionary. The percentage is divided by five criteria: excellent, very good, good, poor and fail (Table 4.1). The result of the data as follows:

Table 4.3 Descriptive Statistics Pretest of Experimental Class

Descriptive Statistics Pretest

|  | N | Minimum | Maximum | Sum | Mean | Std. <br> Deviatio <br> n |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Valid <br> Valid N <br> (listwise) | 24 | 30 | 82 | 1464 | 61.00 | 15.036 |

Based on Table 4.3 above, the table informed that the lowest and the highest score of pretest of experimental class was 30 and 82 , the mean of the score was 61.00 , the deviations' standard was 15.036 , and the sum of data was 1464 . And then, pretest frequency of 24 students in experimental class as follows:

Table 4.4 Frequency of Students' Pronunciation Achievement before Taught by Using U-Dictionary

## Statistics

Valid

| N | Valid | 24 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  | Missing | 0 |

Pretest

|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid <br> Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid 30 | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 |


| 31 | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 8.3 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 35 | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 12.5 |
| 40 | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 16.7 |
| 50 | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 20.8 |
| 52 | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 25.0 |
| 55 | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 29.2 |
| 58 | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 33.3 |
| 59 | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 37.5 |
| 60 | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 41.7 |
| 62 | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 45.8 |
| 65 | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 50.0 |
| 66 | 3 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 62.5 |
| 67 | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 66.7 |
| 68 | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 70.8 |
| 69 | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 75.0 |
| 70 | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 79.2 |
| 75 | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 83.3 |
| 78 | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 87.5 |
| 80 | 2 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 95.8 |
| 82 | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 100.0 |
| Total | 24 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

According to table 4.4 above, it showed that 3 students' pretest frequency score from experimental class were between 0 and 39 which mean that their pronunciation achievement was failed. There were also 6 students whose score were between 40 and 59 which showed that their pronunciation was poorly achieved. Meanwhile, there were 8 students whose score between 60 and 70 which was such a good pronunciation achievement. Lastly, there were 4 students whose pronunciation was very good where their scores were between 85 and 100 .
b. Posttest of Experimental Class

SPSS 16.0 version was used by the researcher to acquire the descriptive statistics posttest of experimental class, the frequency as well as the percentage of students' pronunciation achievement in experimental class after taught by using U-Dictionary. The percentage is divided by five criteria, which are excellent, very good, good, poor and fail (Table 4.1). The outcome of the data showed in the table follows:

Table 4.5 Descriptive Statistics Posttest of Experimental Class

Descriptive Statistics Posttest

|  | N | Minimum | Maximum | Sum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Valid | 24 | 45 | 88 | 1769 | 73.71 |  |
| Valid N <br> (listwise) | 24 |  |  |  |  | 12.292 |

Based on Table 4.5 above, it showed that the lowest and the highest score of posttest of experimental class was 45 and 88 , the data mean score was 73.71, the standard deviation was 12.292 , and the sum of data was 1769 . And then, the pretest frequency of 24 students in experimental class as follows:

## Table 4.6 Frequency of Students' Pronunciation Achievement after Taught by Using U-Dictionary

## Statistics

Valid

| N | Valid | 26 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  | Missing | 0 |

Posttest

|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid 45 | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 |
| 49 | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 8.3 |
| 53 | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 12.5 |
| 59 | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 16.7 |
| 67 | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 20.8 |
| 68 | 2 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 29.2 |
| 69 | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 33.3 |
| 73 | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 37.5 |
| 74 | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 41.7 |
| 75 | 3 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 54.2 |
| 78 | 3 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 66.7 |
| 81 | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 70.8 |
| 82 | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 75.0 |
| 83 | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 79.2 |
| 87 | 1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 83.3 |
| 88 | 4 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 24 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

According to table 4.6 above, it showed that the pretest frequency score in experimental class was no failure since there was no student whose score was between 0-39. Then, there were 4 students whose score was between 40 and 59 which mean that that the students' pronunciation achievement was poorly achieved. And then, there were 3 students whose score were around 60 to 70 which mean that the pronunciation achievement for students were good. Also, there were 6 students whose
score between 71 and 84 and that means that the pronunciation achievement was very good. And the last showed that there were 3 students who got an excellent achievement for their pronunciation with the score start from 85 to 100 .
b. The Data of Control Class

After conducting pretest and posttest for the control class, the researcher got the following data as listed below:

Table 4.7 Students' Pronunciation Achievement Taught with

## U-Dictionary

| NO | Name | Class | Pretest | Posttest |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | ANMN | XI OTKP 2 | 63 | 67 |
| 2 | ARU | XI OTKP 2 | 70 | 64 |
| 3 | BST | XI OTKP 2 | 63 | 63 |
| 4 | DW | XI OTKP 2 | 45 | 50 |
| 5 | DFW | XI OTKP 2 | 70 | 67 |
| 6 | EWR | XI OTKP 2 | 53 | 58 |
| 7 | EDS | XI OTKP 2 | 80 | 67 |
| 8 | FNP | XI OTKP 2 | 35 | 44 |
| 9 | HAS | XI OTKP 2 | 60 | 63 |
| 10 | IF | XI OTKP 2 | 70 | 67 |
| 11 | ISA | XI OTKP 2 | 61 | 64 |
| 12 | LKW | XI OTKP 2 | 63 | 66 |


| 13 | MDS | XI OTKP 2 | 54 | 58 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 | MAK | XI OTKP 2 | 80 | 67 |
| 15 | MM | XI OTKP 2 | 47 | 47 |
| 16 | NRM | XI OTKP 2 | 35 | 44 |
| 17 | NFS | XI OTKP 2 | 55 | 53 |
| 18 | NAPM | XI OTKP 2 | 40 | 48 |
| 19 | NDA | XI OTKP 2 | 61 | 66 |
| 20 | NSIS | XI OTKP 2 | 40 | 46 |
| 21 | NW | XI OTKP 2 | 60 | 65 |
| 22 | PMA | XI OTKP 2 | 40 | 47 |
| 23 | SRS | XI OTKP 2 | 61 | 61 |
| 24 | SAW | XI OTKP 2 | 30 | 44 |
| 25 | TAS | XI OTKP 2 | 50 | 51 |
| 26 | TF | XI OTKP 2 | 72 | 63 |

According to table 4.7, this research sample was 26 students which were categorized as control class. The descriptive statistics of control class as follows:
a. Pretest of Control Class

SPSS 16.0 version were used by the researcher for the descriptive statistics pretest, the frequency, and the percentage of control class to know the students' pronunciation ability before being taught by using U Dictionary. The percentage was divided by five criteria they were
excellent, very good, good, poor and fail (Table 4.1). The result of the data as follows:

Table 4.8 Descriptive Statistics Pretest of Control Class

Descriptive Statistics Pretest

|  | N | Minimum | Maximum | Sum | Mean | Std. <br> Deviation |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid <br> Valid N <br> (listwise) | 26 | 30 | 80 | 1458 | 56.08 | 13.897 |

Based on Table 4.8 above, the table showed that the lowest and highest score of pretest of control class was 30 and 80 , the mean of data was 56.08 , the standard deviation was 13.897 , and the sum of data was 1458. And then, the pretest frequency of 26 students in control class as follows:

Table 4.9 Frequency of Students' Pronunciation Achievement

## before Taught by Using U-Dictionary

| Statistics |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid |  |  |  |  |  |
| N | Valid Missing | \|r|r| 26 |  |  |  |
| Pretest |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 30 | 1 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 |
|  | 35 | 2 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 11.5 |
|  | 40 | 3 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 23.1 |


|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 45 | 1 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 26.9 |
| 47 | 1 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 30.8 |
| 50 | 1 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 34.6 |
| 53 | 1 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 38.5 |
| 54 | 1 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 42.3 |
| 55 | 1 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 46.2 |
| 60 | 2 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 53.8 |
| 61 | 3 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 65.4 |
| 63 | 3 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 76.9 |
| 70 | 3 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 88.5 |
| 72 | 1 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 92.3 |
| 80 | 2 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 26 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

According to table 4.9 above, it showed that the pretest frequency in control class were 2 students whose score were between $0-39$ was failing the students' pronunciation achievement Then, there were 7 students whose score were between 40 and 59 which mean that that the students' pronunciation achievement was poorly achieved. And then, there were 4 students whose score were between 60 and 70 which mean that those students' pronunciation achievement was good. Meanwhile, there were only 2 students who got very good scores in achieving the students' pronunciation goal between 71 and 84 .
b. Posttest of Control Class

SPSS 16.0 version was used by the researcher for the descriptive statistics posttest, the frequency, and the percentage of control class
students' pronunciation ability after being taught by using U-Dictionary. The percentage was divided by five categories they were excellent, very good, good, poor and fail (Table 4.1). The result of the data as follows:

Table 4.10 Descriptive Statistics Posttest of Control Class

## Descriptive Statistics Posttest

|  | N | Minimum | Maximum | Sum | Mean | Std. <br> Deviation |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid <br> alid N <br> (listwise) | 26 | 44 | 67 | 1500 | 57.69 | 8.826 |

According to Table 4.10 above, the table as can be seen showed the data of control class posttest such as the lowest score was 44 , the highest score of was 67 , the mean of data was 57.69 , the standard deviation was 8.826, and the sum of data was 1500 . And then, the posttest frequency of 26 students in control class as follows:

Table 4.11 Frequency of Students' Pronunciation Achievement after Taught by Using U-Dictionary

## Statistics

Valid

| N | Valid | 26 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  | Missing | 0 |

Posttest

$\left.$|  |  |  |  | Valid <br> Percent |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | | Cumulative |
| :---: |
| Percent | \right\rvert\, | Falid | 44 | 3 | 11.5 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Percent | 11.5 | 11.5 |  |
|  | 46 | 1 | 3.8 |
| 3.8 | 15.4 |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 47 | 2 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 23.1 |
| 48 | 1 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 26.9 |
| 50 | 1 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 30.8 |
| 51 | 1 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 34.6 |
| 53 | 1 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 38.5 |
| 58 | 2 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 46.2 |
| 61 | 1 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 50.0 |
| 63 | 3 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 61.5 |
| 64 | 2 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 69.2 |
| 65 | 1 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 73.1 |
| 66 | 2 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 80.8 |
| 67 | 5 | 19.2 | 19.2 | 100.0 |
| Total | 26 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

According to the table above which was named as table 4.11, showed that the posttest frequency in control class was achieved poorly. The student whose score was between 0-39 was clearly failing in accomplishing the students' pronunciation goal. The 8 students whose scores were between 40 and 59 accomplished the students' pronunciation goal even though it was barely passed. Meanwhile, the 6 students whose scores were 60 or above has been greatly accomplished the students' pronunciation goal.

## 2. Normality and Homogeneity Testing

a. Normality Test

To know whether a research data is normally distributed or not, researcher conducted a normality test. According to Rohmah (2016),

Data would be considered as the representative of population if the data were normally distributed that is why, normality of data is important. In this research, the researcher used SPSS 16.0 One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. The result can be seen in table below:

Table 4.12 Normality Testing
One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

|  |  | Experimental | Control | Unstandardized Residual |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N |  | 24 | 26 | 24 |
| Normal | Mean | 61.00 | 56.08 | . 0000000 |
| Parameters ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Std. Deviation | 15.036 | 13.897 | 13.69606916 |
| Most | Absolute | . 147 | . 150 | . 105 |
| Extreme | Positive | . 085 | . 107 | . 105 |
| Differences | Negative | -. 147 | -. 150 | -. 101 |
| Kolmogorov- | Smirnov Z | . 718 | . 763 | . 516 |
| Asymp. Sig. | (2-tailed) | . 681 | . 606 | . 953 |
| a. Test distrib | ution is Normal |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

The normality testing should fulfill some criteria as follows:
a. If the significance value is $>0.050$ then the data would have normal distribution.
b. If the significance value is $<0.050$ then the data would not have normal distribution.

According to table 4.12 above, the value of significance of the pretest in experimental class was 0.681 which means bigger than 0.05 . It means that the distribution of the test was normal. Meanwhile, the value of
significance of the posttest in control class was 0.606 which was bigger than 0.05 and so it means that the test distribution was normal.
b. Homogeneity Testing

To know if a data has homogeneity or not, the researcher was conducting a homogeneity testing. In this research, the homogeneity test was done by the researcher by using SPSS 16.0 with the significance value $(\alpha)=0.050$. The result of the test can be seen in table below:

Table 4.13 Homogeneity Testing

## Test of Homogeneity of Variances



The homogeneity testing should fulfill some criteria as follows:
a. The significance value would be homogenous if the data was $>0.050$
b. The significance would not be homogenous if the data was $<0.050$.

Based on the data on table 4.13, the Levene statistic number was 2.066 and the significance value was 0.141 that is bigger than 0.05 . So, the pretest data in experimental and control class had shown that they had the homogeneity of variances.

## B. Hypothesis Testing

This research hypothesis testing as follows:

1. Ho : Null hypothesis

The pronunciation score between students that have been taught by using U-Dictionary and those who does not use it or using a conventional method at SMK Islam 1 Durenan is not significant.
2. $\mathrm{H} \alpha$ : Alternative hypothesis

The pronunciation score between students that have been taught by using U-Dictionary and those who does not use it or using a conventional method at SMK Islam 1 Durenan is significant.

Table 4.14 The Output of Group Statistics

## Group Statistics

|  | Group | N | Mean | Std. <br> Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Students' | Treatment | 24 | 73.71 | 12.292 | 2.509 |
| Scores | Control | 26 | 57.69 | 8.826 | 1.731 |

From the table number 4.14 above, the subject in experimental class and control class were 24 and 26 subjects. It also showed that the mean score for experimental class and control class were 73.71 and 57.69. Meanwhile, the standard deviation of experimental and control class were 12.292 and 8.826 . According to the average score between experimental and control class, it can
be seen that the experimental class was higher than control class so that the student's score in pronunciation was increase from being taught by UDictionary. And then, the T-test result can be seen in the table below:

Table 4.15 The Output T-test

Independent Samples Test

|  | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances |  | t-test for Equality of Means |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | F | Sig. | t | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. <br> Error <br> Diffe <br> rence | $95 \%$ConfidenceInterval of theDifference |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lower | Upper |
| Students Equal <br> 'Scores variances assumed | . 743 | . 393 | 5.323 | 48 | . 000 | 16.016 | 3.009 | 9.967 | 22.065 |
| Equal variances not assumed |  |  | $5.254$ | $41.463$ | $.000$ | $16.016$ | 3.048 | 9.862 | 22.170 |

For deciding to rejected or not rejected the Null Hypothesis were:
a. The probability value is accepted if the null hypothesis is $(\mathrm{sig})>0.050$
b. The null hypothesis not accepted if the probability value (sig) $<0.050$.

Table 4.15 showed that the significant value (Sig-2 tailed) was 0.000 which smaller than 0.050 . It means that H 0 was rejected and Ha was accepted so, there was significant different in students pronunciation taught by U Dictionary. It could be concluded that using U-Dictionary was effective as
learning media in teaching students' pronunciation of the eleventh student at SMK Islam 1 Durenan.

From the data analysis, the purpose of this study was to determine whether there was an effect of the application of the U-Dictionary in learning pronunciation for the eleventh grade students at SMK Islam 1 Durenan. Based on the research method, researchers conducted the study consisting of two classes during the teaching and learning process. The research subjects were i50 istudents iwhose isamples iwere itaken iby iusing ipurposive isampling technique. The researcher determined class XI OTKP 1 as the Experiment class which was treated using U-Dictionary as a learning medium and XI OTKP 2 as a control class that was not treated using U-Dictionary as a learning medium. The researcher gave two kinds of tests, namely pretest and posttest. After that the researchers collected data and analyzed using SPSS version 16.0.

Based on the results of statistical calculations using the $t$-test, it was found that students without the U-Dictionary did not show a significant increase. This can be seen from the average pretest score of 56.08 and the average post-test score of 57.69 . The average score was 1.61 . It is proven that there are still a few students who get scores that are categorized as failures. While the average pretest score is 61.00 and the average post-test score is 73.71. The average score was 12.71 . It is proven that there are still a few students who get scores that are categorized as very good after using the U Dictionary.

In addition, the $t$-test calculation shows a P value (Sig.) of 0,000 and less than 0.050 , which means that the null hypothesis is rejected while the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Admittedly, this learning media is accepted by researchers in the learning process and teaching pronunciation in Vocational High Schools, especially in management classes. This can be proven by the eleventh grade students there is a significant difference in ability between those who were taught without using the U-Dictionary and those who were taught using the U-Dictionary.

After researchers conducted research in teaching pronunciation to eleventh grade students at SMK Islam 1 Durenan, the U Dictionary application not only helps teachers in the pronunciation learning process but also motivates students to easily learn pronunciation achievement. So, it can be said that the U Dictionary application is effective as a learning medium in learning pronunciation for eleventh grade students at SMK Islam 1 Durenan.

## C. Discussion

Based on the data findings, can be concluded that U-Dictionary application is effective as a learning media in learning pronunciation for the eleventh grade students at SMK Islam 1 Durenan. It has a corresponding with the research that done by Dewi Wulandari and Cici Handayani by the title "The Use U-Dictionary as a learning media to Increase the Students' Vocabulary in Teaching Speaking". Based on the research result and discussion, it is concluded that U-Dictionary has positive or good effect as learning media in teaching speaking particularly increasing the vocabulary, the
students' vocabulary has increased significantly. During the research, the students got many vocabularies at least one hundred new words based on the category; noun, adjective, verb and adverb.

U- Dictionary can be used as an effective learning media to increase the students' vocabulary. U-Dictionary is one of English offline dictionary that can be downloaded by every student in every grade. It can be found at playstore, one of application in android phone. It is easy to use either to increase the vocabulary or to improve the ability in pronouncing English word because U-Dictionary not only provides the meaning of a word but also giving the spell of a word.

Rahayuningtyas also said that she used an Online Dictionaries by general at all in the middle school level students. The effectiveness of Online Dictionaries can be shown in the following points: 1) the mean score of students on pre-test taught by using Online Dictionaries was 58.40, and the mean score of post-test was 70.93 . The gain of the mean score was 12.53 . 2) the mean score of students on pre-test taught without Online Dictionaries was 56.42 , and the mean score of post-test was 58.23 . The gain of the mean score was 1.81 . 3) the result of $t$-test at significance level of 0.05 showed that the significant values (sig-2 tailed) was 0.00 smaller than $0.05(0.00<0.05)$. The result means that there is significant different in pronunciation of the students taught by using Online Dictionaries and those taught by usingconventional method. It can be said that Online Dictionaries gives significance effect to the language users especially in learning pronunciation.

