CHAPTER IV

THE RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A. Data Description

To describe the effectiveness of using English Youtube Video as a media on students' listening skill, the researcher gave the data pre-test before teaching, as post-test that would be used as data in the research.

Both of the test, pre-test, and post-test the researcher gave a listening test (using English Youtube Video and without it), having finished the field research, the researcher got the score as follow:

1. The score of pre-test and post-test of experiment class.

Table 4.1

The Result of Experiment Class

Student's Name	Pre test	Post test
Student 1	90	100
Student 2	100	100
Student 3	100	100
Student 4	100	100
Student 5	100	100
Student 6	100	100
Student 7	90	100

Student 8	100	100
Student 9	50	20
Student 10	100	100
Student 11	60	100
Student 12	100	100
Student 13	100	100
Student 14	70	100
Student 15	70	100
Student 16	100	90
Student 17	30	90
Student 18	70	100
Student 19	80	100
Student 20	80	100
Student 21	90	100
Student 22	80	100
Student 23	90	100
Student 24	100	80
Student 25	100	90
Student 26	80	100
Student 27	70	100
Student 28	100	100
Student 29	30	60

Student 30	100	100
N = 30	Total Score = 2530	Total Score = 2830
	Average 84,33	Average 94,33

The Table 4.1 above showed that the result of the students' pre-test scores on the criteria in the listening narrative text at the experimental class. The data showed that the maximum score was 100 and the minimum score was 30. The average score of the pre-test was 84,33.

The Table 4.1 above showed that the result of the students' post-test scores on the criteria in the listening narrative text at the experimental class. The data showed that the maximum score was 100 and the minimum score was 20. The average score of the post-test was 94,33.

Based on the explanation above, it is showing the result of post-test at the experimental class got the significant improvement after giving treatment, it is seen from the average of the post-test was better than the average of the pre-test, that 84,33<94,33.

2. The score of pre-test and post-test of control class.

Table 4.2

The Result of Control Class

Student's Name	Pre test	Post test
Student 1	50	50
Student 2	70	30
Student 3	90	50
Student 4	80	80
Student 5	70	60
Student 6	80	90
Student 7	80	50
Student 8	60	40
Student 9	70	80
Student 10	80	100
Student 11	30	60
Student 12	100	100
Student 13	70	50
Student 14	60	90
Student 15	80	40
Student 16	80	100
Student 17	40	60
Student 18	80	100

Student 19	80	80
Student 20	70	60
Student 21	50	60
Student 22	70	80
Student 23	40	60
Student 24	30	70
Student 25	50	90
Student 26	70	90
Student 27	40	60
Student 28	60	90
Student 29	80	70
Student 30	50	50
N = 30	Total Score = 1960	Total Score = 2090
	Average 65,33	Average 69,66

The Table 4.2 showed that the results of the students' pre-test scores on the criteria in listening narrative text at the control class. That the data showed the maximum score was 100, and the minimum score was 30. One student who got the maximum and one student who got the minimum score. The average score of the pre-test was 65,33.

The Table 4.2 showed that the results of the students' post-test scores on the criteria in listening narrative text at the control class. That the data showed the maximum score was 100, and the minimum score was 40. Four student who got the maximum and two student who got the minimum score. The average score of the post-test was 69,66.

Based on the explanation above, it showed that the result of post-test at the control class got a significant improvement after giving treatment without using Youtube Video. It is seen from the average of the post-test got better than the pre-test, that 65,33<69,66

B. Data Analysis

1. Experimental Class

The Writer analysis the data by comparing students score in pre-test and post-test in experimental class. It is explained by the table as follow:

Table 4.3

The different score between pre-test and post-test at experiment class

No	**Respondents**	TEST		Deviation (X=X2-X1)	Squared Deviation (X^2)
		Pre-Test	Post-Test		

		(X1)	(X2)		
1	Student 1	90	100	10	100
2	Student 2	100	100	0	0
3	Student 3	100	100	0	0
4	Student 4	100	100	0	0
5	Student 5	100	100	0	0
6	Student 6	100	100	0	0
7	Student 7	90	100	10	100
8	Student 8	100	100	0	0
9	Student 9	20	50	30	900
10	Student 10	100	100	0	0
11	Student 11	60	100	40	1600
12	Student 12	100	100	0	0
13	Student 13	100	100	0	0
14	Student 14	70	100	30	900
15	Student 15	70	100	30	900
16	Student 16	90	100	10	100
17	Student 17	30	90	60	3600
18	Student 18	70	100	30	900

19	Student 19	80	100	20	400
20	Student 20	80	100	20	400
21	Student 21	90	100	10	100
22	Student 22	80	100	20	400
23	Student 23	90	100	10	100
24	Student 24	80	100	20	400
25	Student 25	90	100	10	100
26	Student 26	80	100	20	400
27	Student 27	70	100	30	900
28	Student 28	100	100	0	0
29	Student 29	30	60	30	900
30	Student 30	100	100	0	0
Total		ΣX1= 2460	ΣX2= 2900	ΣX= 440	ΣX^2= 12900

Table 4.3 above showed that the score difference between pre-test and post-test at the experimental class. The difference score was the results from the post-test scores subtract with pre-test score. There was significant difference score between pre-test and post-

test at the experimental class, the biggest difference score was 60 and the lowest difference score was 0.

2. Control Class

The Writer analysis the data by comparing students score in pre-test and post-test in control class. It is explained by the table as follow:

Table 4.4

The different score between pre-test and post-test at control class

No	**Respondents**	TEST		Deviation (Y=Y2-Y1)	Squared Deviation (Y^2)
		Pre-Test (Y1)	Post-Test (Y2)		
1	Student 1	50	50	0	0
2	Student 2	30	70	40	1600
3	Student 3	50	90	40	1600
4	Student 4	80	80	0	0
5	Student 5	60	70	10	100
6	Student 6	80	90	10	100
7	Student 7	50	80	30	900
8	Student 8	40	60	20	400

9	Student 9	70	80	10	100
10	Student 10	80	100	20	400
11	Student 11	30	60	30	900
12	Student 12	100	100	0	0
13	Student 13	50	70	20	400
14	Student 14	60	90	30	900
15	Student 15	40	80	40	1600
16	Student 16	80	100	20	400
17	Student 17	40	60	20	400
18	Student 18	80	100	20	400
19	Student 19	80	80	0	0
20	Student 20	60	70	10	100
21	Student 21	50	60	10	100
22	Student 22	70	80	10	100
23	Student 23	40	60	20	400
24	Student 24	30	70	40	1600
25	Student 25	50	90	40	1600
26	Student 26	70	90	20	400
27	Student 27	40	60	20	400

28	Student 28	60	90	30	900
29	Student 29	70	80	10	100
30	Student 30	50	50	0	0
Total		ΣY1= 1960	ΣY2= 2090	ΣY= 590	ΣY^2= 15900

Table 4.4 above showed that the score difference between pre-test and post-test at the control class. The difference score was the results from the post-test score subtract pre-test score. There was significant difference scores between pre-test and post-test at the control class, the biggest difference score was 40, and the lowest different was 0.

C. Statistical Hypothesis Testing

To test the hypothesis the data obtained from both pre-test and post-test are analyzed and calculated by using formula. From the above data is gotten, the writer t-test calculated using steps as follow:

1. Determine mean of score experiment class (MX), with formula :

$$Mx = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$

$$= \frac{440}{30}$$

= 14,67

The result above showed about the average score (mean) of the experimental class. The writer got the data from Σx_1, Σx_2, and $\Sigma x_.$. Afterwards the researcher calculated the data based on the formula above.

2. Determine mean of score control class (MY), with formula:

$$Mx = \frac{\sum Y}{N}$$

$$= \frac{590}{30}$$

= 19,67

The result above showed about the average score (mean) of the experimental class. The writer got the data from ΣY_1, ΣY_2, and $\Sigma Y_.$. Afterwards the researcher calculated the data based on the formula above.

3. Determine the total square of error in experimental class, with formula:

$$\sum x^2 = \sum x^2 - \frac{(\sum x)^2}{N}$$

$$= 12900 - \frac{(440)^2}{30}$$

$$= 12900 - \frac{193600}{30}$$

= 12900-6453

= 6,447

The result above showed about the score quadrates at the experimental class. The writer got the data from Σx_1, Σx_2, Σx and Σx^2. Afterwards she calculated the data based on the formula above.

4. Determine the total square of error in control class, with formula:

$$\sum y^2 = \sum y^2 - \frac{(\sum y)^2}{N}$$

$$= 15900 - \frac{(15900)^2}{30}$$

$$= 15900 - \frac{252{,}810}{30}$$

=15900-8427

=7473

The result above showed about the score quadrates at the control class. The writer got the data from ΣY_1, ΣY_2, ΣY and ΣY^2. Afterwards she calculated the data based on the formula above.

5. Calculate the T-test

$$t = \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\Sigma x^2 + \Sigma y^2}{Nx + Ny - 2}\right)\left(\frac{Nx + Ny}{Nx.Ny}\right)}}$$

$$= \frac{14{,}67 - 19{,}67}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{2900 + 19{,}67}{30 + 30 - 2}\right)\left(\frac{30 + 30}{30.30}\right)}}$$

$$= \frac{-5}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{4990}{58}\right)\left(\frac{60}{900}\right)}}$$

$$= \frac{-5}{\sqrt{(86{,}09)(0{,}067)}}$$

$$= \frac{-5}{\sqrt{5{,}73}}$$

$$= \mathbf{-2{,}11}$$

6. Determine the t_{table} with significance 5%

Df = $N_X + N_Y - 2$

= $30 + 30 - 2$

= 58

= 1,67

Based on the calculation above is known that t_{table} with significant 5% = 1,67 $t_{observation}$ = - 2,11 > t_{table} =1,67 . it is concluded that rejected Ho: to< tt: it means there are no significant Youtube Video

students Listening Skill. And accepted Ha: to> tt: it means there is a significant effectivness of using Youtube Video students Listening skill.

From the result of the calculation is obtained the value of the test to -2,11. The writer uses a degree of significance of the t_{table} of 5%. it can be seen that on the df= 58 and on the degree of significance of 5% the value of the degree significance is 1,67, comparing the t_o with the value of degree significance, the result t_{caunt} = - 2,11 > t_{table}= 1,67. Since t_o from score obtained from the result of calculating, the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is rejected and the null hypothesis (H_o) is accepted.

D. Interpretation of Data

The analysis is aimed to know the influence of using poster Youtube Video students listening skill we have already known that the mean score of experimental class is 84,33, in pre-test and 94,33 in post-test. But the mean score of the control class is 65,33 in pre-test and 69,66 in post-test. Based on the calculation above the experimental class gets better than the control class.

Before deciding the result of the hypothesis, the writer purposes the interpretation toward procedure as follow:

a. If tobservation> ttable: it means there is significant effectiveness between students' listening skill using Youtube Video.

b. If tobservation<ttable: it means there is no effectivness between students' listening skill using Youtube Video.

According to the data, the value of $t_{observation}$ is small than t_{table} . $t_{observation}$ = - 2,11 < t_{table} = 1,67 (5%) or $t_{observation}$ - 2,11 < t_{table} = 2,39 (1%), so H_o is accepted and H_a is rejected. It means that Youtube Video had significant no effect in students' listening skill.

From the explanation above, the writers give a conclusion that means there is no significant effectivness using Youtube Video students listening skill in narrative text.

Reasons for effective listening skills using YouTube videos according to the previous research:

1. According to previous research, the result shows that there is a significant difference between the score before treatment and the score after treatments. It can be concluded that the use of songs improved the eleven graders students' listening skills at SMAN 4 Cimahi.[1]
2. The researcher found that this research could improve students' listening and situation of the classroom. It is expected that the

[1] Intan Gusviani, "The Use of English Song in Teaching Listening Skill, (Tesis, Program Sarjana (S1), Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia Januari, 2014).

teachers will not consider the students as something to be increased in quantity or score only but also in quality.[2]

From the explanation above, the writers give a conclusion reality which means in this research there is no significant effectiveness using Youtube Video student's listening skills in narrative text.

[2] Apriliana Sri Rahayuningsih, "Improving Students' Listening Comprehension On Narrative Text Through Youtube Video, (Tesis, Program Sarjana (S1), Sebelas Maret University Surakarta, 2010)