CHAPTER IV
RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A. Description of Data

Before analyzing the data, the researcher is going to give some explanation. In conducting this research took two group from two classes as the sample in the research. Each class consist of 29 and 30 students. The two classes named as experimental group and control group. Class VIII C is the experimental group and class VIII A is the control group of MTsN 1 Kota Serang – Banten.

The researcher collected some data by giving text, so, it concerned on the test result. The researcher collected the data from experimental group and control group. First, the researcher analyzed the experimental group’ data and then analyzed the control group’ data. The result of the pre-test and posttest in experimental and control group is presented as follows:

1. Experimental Class.

There were 29 students in pre-test and post-test of experimental class.

Below is the table of vocabulary test result of experimental class:
Table 4.1

*The students’ pre test and post test score of students’ class VIII C.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pre test</strong></td>
<td><strong>Post test</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AHN</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ANN</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>DFR</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>HND</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ICE</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>KHA</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>MRO</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>MGH</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>MFH</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>MKA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>MDF</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>MRH</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>NAA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>NN</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>NAG</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>NMJ</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>NMN</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>NNK</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>RNS</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>RFI</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>RR</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>SHS</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>SMN</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table 4.1 above shows the result of the students’ pre test and post test scores in pronunciation before the researcher given them a treatment and after given them a treatment using spelling bee as a teaching media. The average score of experimental class pre test is 24.96 and post test 42.62. While the result of post test of the experimental class are better after the researcher give students the treatment.

Based on the explanation above, the reseacher get the result that there is a significance improvement after given treatment. It can be seen from the average score of pro test that 42.62 > 24.96 of pre test. It means that using spelling bee game as teaching media to improve students pronunciation was success. It can described as follow.

2. Control Class

The writer describes that result of pre test of control class on the table bellows:
Table 4.2

The students’ pre test and post test of students’ class VIII A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Pre test</th>
<th>Post test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ANS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>EPR</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>EDL</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>GMA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>HD</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>KRS</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>KAM</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>KKS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>LRK</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>MDZ</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>MRN</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>RNH</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>RNF</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>RA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>RCI</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>RST</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>SMS</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>SFP</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table 4.2 above shows the result of the students’ pre test and post test scores in pronunciation. The average score of control class pre test is 27,58 and post test is 38,89. While the result of post test of the control class are better after the researcher give students the treatment. It can described as follow.

Based on the explanation above, it shows that the result of control doesn’t have the significance improvement after given treatment given treatment. It can be seen from the average score of post test that is 38,89>27,58 of pre test. This class also experienced improvement but lower than experimental class.
B. Data Analysis

1. Experimental Class

The researcher write show the analysis data by comparing student’s score in pre test and post test. It can be seen on the table bellows:

*Table 4.3*

*The difference score between pre test and post test experiment class*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>TEST</th>
<th>DEVIATION</th>
<th>SQUARRED DEVIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>X2 (Post-test)</td>
<td>(X=X2-X1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AHN</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ANN</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>DFR</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>HND</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ICE</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>KHA</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>MRO</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>MGH</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>MFH</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>MKA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>MDF</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>MRH</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>NAA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>NN</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>NAG</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>NMJ</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>NMN</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>NNK</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>RNS</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>RFI</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>RR</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>SHS</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>SMN</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>ZAP</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>724</td>
<td>1236</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 4.3 above shows that there are the differences between pre test and post test score of the experimental class. The difference score is the result of the post test score is subtracted by pre test score. So that, there are significant differences between pre test and post test score of the experimental class, the highest difference score is 32 and the lowest 0.
2. Control Class

The researcher write show the analysis data by comparing student’s score in pre test and post test. It can be seen on the table bellows:

*Table 4.4*

*The difference score between pre test and post test control class*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>TEST</th>
<th>DEVIATION</th>
<th>SQUARED DEVIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X1 (Pre-test)</td>
<td>X2 (Post-test)</td>
<td>(X=X2-X1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ANS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>EPR</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>EDL</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>GMA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>HD</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>KRS</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>KAM</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>KKS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>LRK</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>MDZ</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>MRN</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>RNH</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>RNF</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>RA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>RCI</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>RST</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table 4.4 above shows that there are differences between pre test and post test score of the control class. The different score is the result of the post test score is subtracted by pre test score. So that, there is no significant different between pre-test and post-test score of control class, highest 32 and lowest 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 experimental class (MX), with formula:

\[
MX = \frac{\Sigma X}{N}
\]

\[
= \frac{515}{29}
\]

\[
= 17.75
\]

The result above showed about the average score (mean) at the experimental class. The researcher got the data from \( \Sigma X_1, \Sigma X_2, \Sigma X \). The researcher calculated the data based on the formula above.

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

\[
MY = \frac{\Sigma Y}{N}
\]

\[
= \frac{328}{29}
\]

\[
= 11.31
\]

The result above showed about the average acore (mean) at the control class. The researcher got the data from \( \Sigma Y_1, \Sigma Y_2, \Sigma Y \). The researcher calculated the data based on the formula above.
3. Determine the total square of error in experimental class (X), with:

\[ \Sigma X^2 = \Sigma X^2 - \frac{(\Sigma X)^2}{N} \]

\[ = 12489 - \frac{(515)^2}{29} \]

\[ = 12489 - \frac{265225}{29} \]

\[ = 12489 - 9145,68 \]

\[ = 3343,32 \]

The result above showed about the quadrates score at the experimental class. The researcher got the data from \( \Sigma X_1, \Sigma X_2, \Sigma X \). The researcher calculated the data based on the formula above.

4. Determine the total square of error in control class (Y), with:

\[ \Sigma Y^2 = \Sigma Y^2 - \frac{(\Sigma Y)^2}{N} \]

\[ = 6664 - \frac{(328)^2}{29} \]

\[ = 6664 - \frac{107584}{29} \]

\[ = 6664 - 3709,79 \]
The result above showed about the quadrates score at the control class. The researcher got the data from $\Sigma Y_1$, $\Sigma Y_2$, $\Sigma Y$. The researcher calculated the data based on the formula above.

5. Calculation T-Test

\[
t = \frac{M_X - M_Y}{\sqrt{\frac{\Sigma X^2 + \Sigma Y^2}{NX + NY - 2}} \left( \frac{1}{29} + \frac{1}{29} \right)}
\]

\[
t = \frac{17,75 - 11,31}{\sqrt{\frac{3343,32 + 2954,21}{29 + 29 - 2}} \left( \frac{1}{29} + \frac{1}{29} \right)}
\]

\[
t = \frac{6,44}{\sqrt{\frac{6297,53}{56}} \left( \frac{1}{29} + \frac{1}{29} \right)}
\]

\[
t = \frac{6,44}{\sqrt{(112,45)(0,068)}}
\]

\[
t = \frac{6,44}{\sqrt{7,646}}
\]

\[
t = \frac{6,44}{2,765}
\]

\[
= 2954,21
\]
\[ t = 2,329 \]

The result above showed about the calculating t-test after the researcher got the data from MX, MY, \( \Sigma X^2 \), and \( \Sigma Y^2 \). The researcher calculated the data based on the formula above.

6. Determine the \( t_{\text{table}} \), with significance 5%:

\[
Df = Nx + Ny - 2
= 29 + 29 - 2
= 56
\]

Based on the calculation above is known that \( t_{\text{table}} \) with significant 5% = 1,68 \( t_{\text{observation}} = 2,329 > t_{\text{table}} = 1,68 \). It is conclude that rejected \( H_0: t_o < t_t \): it means there is no significant of using spelling bee game in teaching pronunciation. and accepted \( H_a: t_t > t_t \): it means there is significant of using spelling bee game in teaching pronunciation.

Comparing “t” has been tested in calculating (\( t= 2,329 \)) and the degree of freedom (df) for 56, the writer used the closest “df” from 58-2= 56. So, the degree of freedom is 56. It can be known that \( t_o > t_t 5\% \). It means 1,68 < 2,329.
D. Interpretation of Data

The data shows that the teaching pronunciation at eighth grade of MTsN 1 Kota Serang before conducted by experiment to apply spelling bee game as teaching media between VIII C as an experimental class and VIII A as an control class is not different significantly. The mean of the pre-test scores obtained by VIII C students as experimental class was 27,58 and pre-test scores obtained by VIII A students as control class was 24,95. The highest score of both classes were same in class VIII C as experimental class got 52 and in the class VIII A as control class got 36. For the lowest score of both classes were same too in class VIII C got 12 and in the class VIII A got 16.

Besides the data also shows that the teaching pronunciation at eighth grade of MTsN 1 Kota Serang before conducted by experiment to apply spelling bee game as teaching media between VIII C as an experimental class and VIII A as a control class is different significantly. The mean of post-test scores obtained by class VIII C as experimental class was 42,62 and post-test scores obtained by VIII A as control class was 38,89. The highest score in class VIII C as experimental class got 80 and in the class VIII A as control class got 64. For the lowest score of both classes were same too in class VIII C got 24 and in the class VIII A got 24. The distribution score of experimental class was $42,62 - 24 = 18,62$. While in the control class was $38,89 - 24 = 14,89$. 
Hypothesis testing is used to know the significance of both variables, and tested as follow:

\[ Ha = t_o > t_t \]

\[ Ho = t_o < t_t \]

To prove the data hypothesis, the data obtained from an experimental class and control class are calculated by using t-test formula with the assumption below :

If \( t_o > t_t \) : the alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means there is a significant effect in using spelling bee game in teaching pronunciation at eighth grade students’ of MtsN 1 Kota Serang.

If \( t_o < t_t \) : the alternative hypothesis is rejected. It means there is no significant effect in using spelling bee game in teaching pronunciation at eighth grade students’ of MTsN 1 Kota Serang.

From the result conclusion above, the value of \( t_o = 2.329 \) the degree of freedom (df) = 56. The researcher use degree of significant 5% = 1.68. It’s mean that Ha (Alternative Hypothesis) of the researcher is accepted and Ho (Null Hypothesis) of the researcher compres both degree of significance 5% \( t_o > t_t \) 2.329 > 1.68 means that the alternative hypothesis of this research is accepted. So, it can be conclude, there is a significant effect in using spelling bee game in teaching pronunciation at eighth grade students’ of MTsN 1 Kota Serang.
This research is said to be successful because researchers used new media and methods in schools. So, students more easily and quickly understand the pronunciation and practice it. The results of the developmental research were seen from the Experimental class compared to the control class.

This study has the same results from the journal Rista Nuralita, with the title "Improving English Vocabulary Pronunciation Skill Using Flash Video. In this study explains that by using flash video there is an increase in pronunciation skills in students, with cycle 1 of 65.15% and cycle 75.86%, from the development of the cycle it is clear that there is an increase in vocabulary pronunciation using flash video media.¹

¹ Nuralita, Rista, “Improving English Vocabulary Pronunciation Using Flash Video “. p 2251