CHAPTER 4
RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 The Result of the Research

This chapter presents the findings and discussion of the research entitled "The Implementation of Drilling Technique for Improving Pronunciation of Culinary Students." This chapter presents three stages of research, namely pre-cycle, cycle I and cycle II. The pre-cycle stage begins with taking care of permits from the school where the research is taking place, namely SMK Negeri 6 Kota Jambi. After obtaining permission from the school, the researcher conducted observations to identify problems by observing learning activities in the classroom, the situation, and conditions of the XI Culinary II class which is the class where the research was conducted. In conducting observations, the researcher also looked at the list of students' daily test scores on the descriptive text material.

This was done as material for implementing research actions. The implementation of this pre-cycle activity was carried out on March 24th, 2025. Then it was continued to ask for permission from the principal to start the research starting on April 11th, 2025 until completion. From the results of data collection through observation of student test scores, it is known that the pronunciation skills of XI Culinary II students in describing food are known. This value is used as the test result value at the pre-cycle stage or pre-action stage in the form of student

skills in describing food. From the results of the pre-cycle test, the average pronunciation skills of students in describing food were 63.72.

Furthermore, the results of the actions of cycle I and cycle II carried out by the researcher were stages in the form of the results of students' pronunciation skills using the drilling technique.

4.1.1 The Learning Process of Cycle I

This section describes the step-by-step implementation of the drilling technique applied throughout Cycle I in improving students' pronunciation skills in describing food. The drilling procedure followed eight instructional stages: (1) introduction of the target language, (2) demonstration, (3) choral repetition, (4) individual practice, (5) pattern drilling, (6) variation and expansion, (7) feedback and correction, and (8) follow-up activities. While the same procedure was maintained in both cycles, the execution and student outcomes might be different.

4.1.1.1 The Process of Drilling Technique Implementation in Describing Food of Cycle I (The First Meeting)

Meeting 1: Introduction of the Target Language, Demonstration, Choral Repetition, and Individual Practice

1. *Planning:* The teacher starts by obtaining the permission from the school headmaster of SMKN 6 Kota Jambi to conduct a research in XI Culinary II class. The researcher prepared the lesson plan for the first meeting.

The researcher also prepared the observation sheet for the teacher collaborator. Then, the teacher prepared a list of target vocabulary related to food description (e.g., crispy, juicy, spicy, grilled, tender), pronunciation guides, and simple sentence models. Visual aids and flashcards were also prepared to assist learning.

Picture 4.1

The teacher drilled the students to pronounce culinary vocabularies

2. *Action:* The teacher introduced the vocabulary orally and wrote them on the board, asking students to listen and repeat. Then, the teacher demonstrated sentence use such as "The chicken is crispy" and asked students to repeat chorally and individually. Students tried to imitate the pronunciation but frequently mispronounced vowel sounds and misplaced stress. During individual practice, students hesitated, lacked confidence, and had trouble articulating full descriptive sentences

accurately. Words like "savory" and "creamy" were often mispronounced as students guessed how to say them based on spelling.

3. *Observation:* Students struggled with accurate pronunciation. Many showed hesitation in choral and especially individual practice. Errors included misplacing stress, unclear vowel sounds, and mispronunciation of consonant clusters. Students lacked confidence.
4. *Reflection:* The teacher and collaborator noted that students needed clearer models and more auditory input. Teacher modeling alone was insufficient for guiding proper pronunciation.

4.1.1.2 The Process of Drilling Technique Implementation in Describing Food of Cycle I (The Second Meeting)

Meeting 2: Pattern Drilling, Variation and Expansion, and Feedback and Correction

A. *Planning:* The researcher prepared the lesson plan for the second meeting. The researcher also prepared the observation sheet for the teacher collaborator. Then, the teacher prepared structured sentence frames and exercises to allow students to apply vocabulary in context. Activities included sentence substitution and guided dialogues. Pronunciation rubrics were used to monitor students' performance.

Picture 4.2

The teacher provided immediate feedback, correcting errors, and reinforcing correct pronunciation

B. *Action:* The teacher drilled pattern sentences like "The [food] is very [adjective]" and guided students to replace elements (e.g., "The soup is very spicy," "The steak is very juicy"). Students practiced in pairs and small groups. However, many continued to mispronounce descriptive adjectives and failed to apply proper intonation and stress. The teacher provided immediate feedback and correction, repeating words slowly and segmenting syllables. Despite guidance, students struggled with rhythm and fluency.

C. *Observation:* While students engaged with the activity, their pronunciation remained weak. Words like "tender" and "buttery" were often mispronounced. Students had difficulty maintaining fluency.

D. *Reflection:* The drilling helped highlight common mistakes, but pronunciation remained a challenge. More engaging and precise pronunciation input was needed.

4.1.1.3 The Process of Drilling Technique Implementation in Describing Food of Cycle I (The Third Meeting)

Meeting 3: Follow-up Activity – (Role - play Preparation)

A. *Planning:* The researcher prepared the lesson plan for the third meeting. The researcher also prepared the observation sheet for the teacher collaborator. Then, the teacher prepared role-play templates and pronunciation checklists. Students were tasked with designing short dialogues involving food description to be performed.

Picture 4.3

The students prepare and practice their dialogue with their group.

B. *Action:* Students worked in pairs or small groups to prepare roleplays that involved describing dishes using the vocabulary and sentence structures learned. The teacher moved between groups, correcting pronunciation and helping students choose suitable words. Despite the teacher's support, students continued to struggle with fluency and articulation, often speaking with unnatural rhythm or mispronouncing multi-syllable words.

C. *Observation:* Students showed effort but continued to mispronounce target words. Fluency and intonation were inconsistent. Peer correction was minimal.

D. *Reflection:* The teacher observed that students needed better examples to internalize pronunciation. Roleplay preparation revealed ongoing difficulties.

4.1.1.4 The Process of Drilling Technique Implementation in Describing Food of Cycle I (The Fourth Meeting)

Meeting 4: Follow-up Activity Continuation – (Role-play Performance)

A. *Planning:* The researcher prepared the lesson plan for the fourth meeting. The researcher also prepared the observation sheet for the teacher collaborator. Then, the teacher prepared assessment tools to evaluate students' pronunciation, fluency, and use of vocabulary during the performance, mostly focus on the pronunciation aspect of the dialogue.

Picture 4.4

The students perform their dialogue in front of the classroom

B. *Action:* Each group performed their dialogues in front of the class. Students were encouraged to speak clearly and apply everything they had practiced. However, many students still demonstrated hesitation, and some mispronounced food-related terms. There was improvement compared to earlier meetings, but overall clarity and rhythm were lacking. The teacher gave verbal feedback after each performance.

C. *Observation:* Most students completed the task but still showed issues with word stress, pronunciation of adjectives, and rhythm. Confidence was low.

D. *Reflection:* The cycle revealed that pronunciation improvements were limited. The teacher and collaborator agreed to incorporate native speaker input in the next cycle.

4.1.1.5 The Interview Data of Cycle I

In Cycle I, interviews were conducted with five students to gather qualitative insights into their experiences during the learning process, particularly focusing on pronunciation difficulties while describing food. The interview questions explored specific areas such as the challenges they encountered, the stages of teaching that presented difficulties, the causes behind their pronunciation issues, and the effectiveness of the drilling technique applied by the teacher.

Most students reported experiencing significant challenges in pronouncing certain words and phrases, particularly adjectives and verbs used to describe food. Many struggled with pronouncing English words that contained unfamiliar sounds or syllables. As S2 reflected, "I often found it difficult to pronounce some words like 'crispy', 'savory', or 'spicy'. I wasn't sure about the stress or the correct sound of the vowels." This highlights a general lack of familiarity with the phonological structure of the target vocabulary, which hindered students from confidently articulating descriptive sentences.

In terms of the teaching stages, students pointed out that certain steps, particularly individual pronunciation practice and sentence drilling, were challenging. While the teacher followed a structured sequence including introduction, demonstration, choral repetition, individual practice, and guided drilling, the execution in Cycle I did not always result in effective mastery of pronunciation. S3 commented, "When the teacher asked me to repeat the sentence alone, I got nervous and still said some words wrong. It felt harder without a clear

model of how it should sound." This sentiment indicates that the teacher-led drilling in Cycle I might not have provided adequate modeling for accurate pronunciation, especially for students with lower proficiency.

When asked about the reasons behind their pronunciation difficulties, many students attributed it to their unfamiliarity with English sounds and the lack of repeated exposure to native pronunciation models. S4 shared, "I think I didn't pronounce some words correctly because I rarely hear how they are spoken by real English speakers. Sometimes I just guessed the pronunciation based on spelling." This response reflects a common issue where learners rely on orthography rather than phonology, which leads to mispronunciation.

The students also discussed the perceived advantages and disadvantages of the drilling technique used in Cycle I. While the structure and repetition were seen as useful, the effectiveness was limited by the students' ability to hear and mimic accurate pronunciation. S5 explained, "The teacher drilling helped a bit, but sometimes I still said the words wrong. I couldn't really hear the difference unless it was said very clearly and slowly." Although the teacher provided corrections and guidance, students seemed to require a more precise auditory model to replicate the pronunciation accurately.

Despite the challenges, some students acknowledged that the drilling technique had potential benefits for their pronunciation development, even though there are limitations in the first cycle. S1, who scored highest in the post-test of Cycle I, observed, "It helped me a little because I got to practice saying the words

many times. But I think I needed to hear how a native speaker would say it so I could copy the sound more correctly." This response implies that while teacher-led drilling offered repetition, it may not have been sufficient for accurate acquisition of English pronunciation, especially in the absence of native-like pronunciation models.

In summary, the interview data from Cycle I revealed that students faced notable pronunciation difficulties due to limited exposure to authentic pronunciation models and lack of confidence in individual practice. The teacher-led drilling, although structured, was not fully effective in addressing these challenges. The findings from these interviews served as an important consideration for refining the instructional approach in Cycle I, especially in terms of incorporating more native speakers input through audiovisual materials. All the transcripts of the research participants' interview can be checked in the appendix.

4.1.1.6 The Learning Outcome of Cycle I

The learning outcomes in cycle I are the results of cycle I actions carried out by researcher in improving the students' pronunciation in describing food using drilling technique. The results of cycle I tests are presented in the form of quantitative data. Meanwhile, the results of cycle I non-tests are obtained from the observation sheet by the teacher collaborator and the interview data with the students regarding to teaching stages, classroom teaching management, and students' engagement which are presented in the form of qualitative data.

4.1.1.6.1 The Pre-Test and Post-Test of Cycle I

The pre-test in Cycle I showed that most students had low pronunciation skills. The average score in the pre-test was 68. After applying the drilling technique in several learning sessions, the post-test was administered. The average post-test score increased slightly to 72. This overall result still had not surpassed the school's minimum criteria of 75.

Summary of Pre-test and Post-test Scores:

- Pre-test (Cycle I): 68

- Post-test (Cycle I): 72

Rubric-Based Assessment Analysis:

Table 4.1

Pre-Test and Post Test Average Score of Cycle I

Aspect	**Pre-Test Average Score of Cycle I**	**Post-Test Average Score of Cycle I**
Vowels & Consonants	18.85 / 25	18.36 / 25
Word & Sentence Stress	19.36 / 25	18.42 / 25
Rhythm & Tempo	18.64 / 25	19.18 / 25
Intonation	13.97 / 25	17.45 / 25
(Average Total Score / 50) × 100	68.00	72.00

While there was an improvement, the overall result of Cycle I indicated that the students still struggled with vowel and consonant sounds, as well as

intonation and sentence stress. This implied that the drilling activities needed to be adjusted and made more intensive in the next cycle.

4.1.1.6.2 The Non-Test of Cycle I

The results of non-test data in cycle I were obtained from data from observation sheet by the teacher collaborator and interviews with the students about the learning process of describing food using the drilling technique guided by the teacher. The results of non-test data in each research instrument are explained in the following description.

4.1.1.6.2.1 The Observation of the Learning Process of Cycle I

The process of observation in Cycle I was conducted during the learning process of describing food using the drilling technique guided by the teacher in XI Culinary II class in SMKN 6 Kota Jambi, namely at the start of the lesson until the end of learning at each meeting. This observation activity was conducted by the researcher and the teacher collaborator who wrote on the observation sheet with the aim of observing positive and negative student behavior during the learning process in cycle I. There are 3 aspects that are the focus in observing the learning process, namely teaching stages, classroom teaching management, and student engagement.

4.1.1.6.2.1.1 The Teaching Stages of Cycle I

In Cycle I, the implementation of the drilling technique followed a structured set of teaching stages that included: introduction of the target language, demonstration, choral repetition, individual practice, pattern drilling, variation and expansion, feedback and correction, and follow-up activities. These stages were designed to help students gradually develop their pronunciation skills, especially in the context of describing food items in English. However, the drilling process in this cycle was primarily guided by the teacher, who provided models and led the repetition activities.

Based on the observations recorded by the teacher collaborator, although the procedures were implemented systematically, many students continued to struggle in pronouncing words correctly. Some students were hesitant and lacked confidence, especially during individual practice. The teacher's modeling, while helpful, seemed insufficient in addressing specific pronunciation issues faced by students. The students often failed to produce the correct sounds despite repeated choral and individual drilling. As a result, the improvement in pronunciation at this stage was still minimal. The teacher's role was active, but the input might have lacked the natural fluency and phonological detail needed to guide students effectively through imitation.

4.1.1.6.2.1.2 The Classroom Teaching Management of Cycle I

During Cycle I, classroom teaching was actively managed by the teacher. The teacher frequently walked around the classroom, listened closely to the students' pronunciation attempts, and corrected errors on the spot. The teacher also gave individual attention to students who faced difficulties, sometimes guiding them word by word slowly to ensure they could grasp the proper articulation. This personalized support demonstrated the teacher’s dedication to improving students' outcomes.

However, despite these efforts, students still made noticeable pronunciation mistakes, particularly with unfamiliar or longer words. When constructing descriptive sentences, many students had difficulty pronouncing verbs and adjectives accurately, even after being guided. The teacher had to repeat corrections several times, suggesting that the students needed more auditory reinforcement or more exposure to native-like pronunciation to build accurate pronunciation habits. In essence, although the teacher created a supportive learning environment, the management strategies did not yet yield significant results.

4.1.1.6.2.1.3 The Student Engagement of Cycle I

Student engagement in Cycle I was moderate. While most students showed interest in the activities and were willing to participate, especially during choral repetitions, their level of active involvement decreased during individual practice.

Some students seemed unsure and reluctant when asked to pronounce words or phrases on their own. The lack of a strong pronunciation model may have affected their confidence.

Students paid attention to the teacher's instructions, but their responses lacked accuracy and fluency, and only a few students demonstrated notable improvement by the end of the cycle. Engagement was present, but it did not always translate into active or confident performance. The learning atmosphere was supportive, but the students appeared to need more dynamic or varied input to become fully engaged and improve their pronunciation skills.

4.1.1.7 The Learning Reflection of Cycle I

The reflection of the learning activities in Cycle I presents valuable insights into the challenges faced by both the teacher and the students, particularly in relation to improving pronunciation through the use of drilling techniques. While the overall structure of the lesson was well-organized and clearly followed the planned teaching stages, several limitations were identified, especially in terms of the effectiveness of pronunciation practice and student engagement.

During Cycle I, the teaching stages followed a logical progression—from the introduction of the target language to follow-up activities. However, the core drilling activities were entirely guided by the teacher without the aid of any audio-visual support. According to the teacher collaborator, this approach did not bring about the desired improvement in pronunciation. The teacher reported, *"I guided*

the students closely, but I noticed many still struggled to produce the right sounds, even after repetition. My modeling alone was not enough for them to really catch the native-like pronunciation." This reflection pointed out a gap between teacher-led instruction and students' ability to absorb and replicate pronunciation accurately.

Students also voiced their challenges during this cycle. One common difficulty was their inability to hear and imitate proper stress, intonation, and pronunciation of descriptive vocabulary related to food. **S3**, for example, mentioned, *"I found it hard to say the words correctly. Sometimes, I didn't know if I was saying them right, because I didn't hear how it should sound first."* This illustrates a key shortcoming of teacher-only drilling—students lacked a consistent and clear pronunciation model that they could imitate with confidence.

Classroom management was supportive, with the teacher making consistent efforts to monitor and assist students. The teacher walked around the classroom, giving individual guidance and repeating words to students who struggled. While this approach showed a strong level of support, it was not sufficient to fully address students' pronunciation issues. The improvement was visible but limited. Students often continued to mispronounce certain sounds, especially in complex adjectives and verbs such as *"crispy," "tender,"* and *"grilled."*

Despite the teacher's efforts, students often relied on guessing the pronunciation or mimicking peers who were equally unsure. As **S5** explained, *"I*

tried to follow what the teacher said, but sometimes I forgot or was unsure how to say the sentence properly. It was a bit confusing, especially with new words." These reflections highlight that auditory exposure to authentic pronunciation models was lacking in Cycle I, and that overreliance on teacher modeling may not effectively build independent pronunciation skills.

In terms of engagement, while students were generally cooperative and motivated, their confidence in producing correct pronunciation remained low. Many showed hesitation during individual drilling sessions, likely due to uncertainty in how the words should sound. The repetitive activities led by the teacher did not offer enough variation or exposure to support deeper learning. As **S2** commented, *"I practiced a lot, but I still made mistakes. I think I needed more help to understand how the words should be said clearly."*

From this reflection, it became evident that the drilling strategy needed improvement. One key area identified for enhancement was the inclusion of native speaker models—either through audio or video media—that could provide students with clearer pronunciation input. Moreover, incorporating a multimodal approach (audio, visual, repetition) was seen as a potential step forward to address the shortcomings of Cycle I.

In conclusion, while Cycle I established a solid foundation for teaching pronunciation through structured stages and direct guidance, it lacked an effective model for accurate pronunciation imitation. The students' feedback and the teacher collaborator's observation both pointed to the need for incorporating

authentic, native speaker input—which could potentially boost students' understanding and accuracy in pronunciation. These reflections served as the guiding force behind the refinements made in Cycle II, particularly in transforming the drilling activity into a more engaging and impactful learning experience.

4.1.2 The Learning Process of Cycle II

This section describes the step-by-step implementation of the drilling technique applied throughout Cycle II in improving students' pronunciation skills in describing food. The drilling procedure followed eight instructional stages: (1) introduction of the target language, (2) demonstration, (3) choral repetition, (4) individual practice, (5) pattern drilling, (6) variation and expansion, (7) feedback and correction, and (8) follow-up activities. While the same procedure was maintained in both cycles, the execution and student outcomes differed significantly, particularly due to the introduction of native speaker input in Cycle II.

4.1.2.1 The Process of Drilling Technique Implementation in Describing Food of Cycle II (The First Meeting)

Meeting 1: Introduction of the Target Language, Demonstration, Choral Repetition, and Individual Practice

A. *Planning:* The researcher prepared the lesson plan for the first meeting. The researcher also prepared the observation sheet for the teacher

collaborator. Then, the teacher selected a YouTube video featuring a native speaker presenting food-related vocabulary and expressions. Worksheets were prepared for vocabulary recording and pronunciation tracking.

Picture 4.5

The teacher plays a Youtube video to display the drilling activity guided with the voice of the native speeaker

B. *Action:* The teacher played the video while students listened to how the native speaker pronounced each word. Students repeated after the video in choral practice and then took turns practicing individually. The teacher paused the video to highlight key pronunciation features, including stress, intonation, and vowel length. Students engaged more actively, mimicking the native speaker’s pronunciation more precisely. They were noticeably more confident and accurate in pronouncing words like "crispy," "grilled," and "mouth-watering."

C. *Observation:* Students were more focused and engaged. Pronunciation improved, especially in words like "crispy," "savory," and "flavorful." Students were able to imitate stress and intonation more accurately.

D. *Reflection:* The native speaker model proved effective. Students had a clear auditory example and showed greater confidence in pronunciation.

4.1.2.2 The Process of Drilling Technique Implementation in Describing Food of Cycle II (The Second Meeting)

Meeting 2: Pattern Drilling, Variation and Expansion, and Feedback and Correction

A. *Planning:* The researcher prepared the lesson plan for the second meeting. The researcher also prepared the observation sheet for the teacher collaborator. Then, the teacher prepared sentence frames, gap-fill drills, and interactive activities using the vocabulary and video content. A pronunciation assessment checklist was prepared.

Picture 4.6

The teacher drills the students to describe food and pronounce culinary vocabulary with the voice of the native speeaker

B. *Action:* Students practiced sentence patterns while listening and repeating after the native speaker in the video. Sentences such as "The fried rice is so delicious" or "The grilled fish is very tender" were modeled. Students then created their own variations and shared with the class. The teacher paused and replayed video clips to support corrections and reinforced proper stress and intonation. Students made noticeable progress, self-corrected, and began supporting one another's pronunciation.

C. *Observation:* Pronunciation accuracy improved significantly. Students used correct stress and rhythm in sentences. Fewer errors were observed, and students showed awareness of mistakes.

D. *Reflection:* Combining the video model with teacher support was highly effective. Students made notable gains in pronunciation and fluency.

4.1.2.3 The Process of Drilling Technique Implementation in Describing Food of Cycle II (The Third Meeting)

Meeting 3: Follow-up Activity – Roleplay Preparation

A. *Planning:* The researcher prepared the lesson plan for the third meeting. The researcher also prepared the observation sheet for the teacher collaborator. Then, the teacher designed a group project where students would prepare a role-play using learned vocabulary. Pronunciation checkpoints and peer-assessment sheets were created.

Picture 4.7

The students prepare their dialogue for the role play activity

B. *Action:* Students worked in groups to write scripts that involved describing dishes or recommending meals. They used the video as a pronunciation model and practiced repeatedly, often replaying clips to fine-tune their speech. The teacher provided individual guidance and corrections.

Students demonstrated stronger self-monitoring and confidence in their delivery.

C. *Observation:* Students demonstrated improved articulation and confidence. Peer support increased, and students self-corrected more often.

D. *Reflection:* Pronunciation practice was now meaningful. Students were better able to apply vocabulary in context.

4.1.2.4 The Process of Drilling Technique Implementation in Describing Food of Cycle II (The Fourth Meeting)

Meeting 4: Follow-up Activity – Roleplay Performance

A. *Planning:* The researcher prepared the lesson plan for the fourth meeting. The researcher also prepared the observation sheet for the teacher collaborator. Then, the teacher prepared a rubric for evaluating pronunciation, fluency, and use of vocabulary during performances.

Picture 4.8

The students perform the dialogue that

they have made which each of them need to describe food.

B. *Action:* Each group performed their roleplays with minimal hesitation. Students spoke clearly and confidently, accurately using descriptive sentences. Words were pronounced with better rhythm and intonation. The teacher provided final feedback and praised improvement in pronunciation.

C. *Observation:* Most students showed strong improvement. Sentences were delivered with good rhythm and articulation.

D. *Reflection:* The teacher and collaborator concluded that the drilling technique, supported by native speaker audio, had a significant positive impact on students' pronunciation and confidence.

4.1.2.5 The Interview Data of Cycle II

The interviews conducted in Cycle II revealed a significant shift in students' experiences and perceptions compared to Cycle I. The incorporation of a native speaker's voice from YouTube videos in the drilling technique proved to be a crucial element in improving students' pronunciation skills when describing food. The responses from the five interviewed students—S1 through S5—highlighted the positive effects of this approach, along with reflections on their pronunciation challenges and learning progress.

Most students reported fewer pronunciation difficulties during Cycle II. The audio-visual support from the native speakers in the video provided them with a clear model of how the words and sentences should sound. For example, S1, the student with the highest post-test score in Cycle II, stated, "In Cycle II, I didn't struggle as much as before. The native speakers in the video helped me hear every sound clearly, especially the stress and intonation in words like 'creamy', 'tender', and 'grilled'. I just followed how they said it." This response reflects a key improvement: students were better able to recognize and imitate pronunciation patterns due to the high clarity and consistency of the model provided by the native speaker.

When discussing the teaching stages, students expressed that the use of the YouTube video during the drilling phase made it easier to follow the lesson and practice effectively. The presence of a native speaker's pronunciation, synchronized with classroom guidance, helps students become more confident. As

S4 shared, "The stage where we repeated after the video was very helpful. I liked listening and then saying the sentence exactly the same. I didn't feel lost like before because the video gave a clear example." The integration of audio-visual materials during the choral and individual practice stages strengthened students' phonological awareness and supported the classroom instruction.

In terms of the causes behind pronunciation difficulties in Cycle II, students indicated that these were minimal and generally linked to complex words rather than misunderstanding or lack of clarity. S3, who had one of the lower post-test scores, admitted, "I still found some hard words like 'succulent' or 'flavorful', but the video really helped. It was not like before where I had to guess the pronunciation. Now I can hear it and copy it." This highlights that while some lexical items remained challenging, the method of delivery in Cycle II provided students with effective tools to tackle those difficulties.

Students also identified strong advantages in the learning process when the drilling activities were supported by the native speaker's voice. The clarity, rhythm, and intonation modeled in the video were consistently cited as helpful. S5 explained, "I think using the video made a big difference. The native speaker said the words so clearly and slowly, and we could replay it. That way, I practiced until I got it right." The ability to hear the correct pronunciation repeatedly and the consistent modeling contributed to deeper learning and better retention.

Finally, all students acknowledged that the modified drilling technique used in Cycle II had a significantly positive impact on their pronunciation. They

expressed that the combination of video modeling and teacher support enhanced their ability to speak more confidently and accurately. S2 reflected, "It really helped my pronunciation. I wasn't sure in Cycle I, but in Cycle II I felt more confident. I learned how to say the words the right way because I heard it many times from a native speaker."

In conclusion, the interview data from Cycle II demonstrated a substantial improvement in students' pronunciation performance. The use of native speaker-guided drilling through YouTube videos not only increased their pronunciation accuracy but also improved their listening skills, confidence, and engagement in speaking activities. These insights validate the effectiveness of incorporating authentic pronunciation models in teaching English pronunciation, especially for descriptive speaking tasks such as describing food. All the transcripts of the research participants' interview can be checked in the appendix.

4.1.2.6 The Learning Outcome of Cycle II

The learning outcomes in cycle II are the results of cycle II actions carried out by researcher in improving the students' pronunciation in describing food using drilling technique. The results of cycle II tests are presented in the form of quantitative data. Meanwhile, the results of cycle II non-tests are obtained from the observation sheet by the teacher collaborator and the interview data with the students regarding to teaching stages, classroom teaching

management, and students' engagement which are presented in the form of qualitative data.

4.1.2.6.1 The Pre-Test and Post-Test of Cycle II

After reflecting on Cycle I, modifications were made in the teaching strategy for Cycle II, such as increasing the repetition frequency, focusing on problematic words, and utilizing audio of native English speakers during the drills.

The pre-test in Cycle II showed an average score of 73. The post-test indicated a big improvement with an average score of 84, both surpassing the school's minimum criteria of 75.

Summary of Pre-test and Post-test Scores:

- Pre-test (Cycle II): 73
- Post-test (Cycle II): 84

Rubric-Based Assessment Analysis:

Table 4.2

Pre-Test and Post Test Average Score of Cycle II

Aspect	Pre-Test Average Score of Cycle II	Post-Test Average Score of Cycle II
Vowels & Consonants	19.58/ 25	18.30/ 25
Word & Sentence	18.48/ 25	19.70/ 25

Stress		
Rhythm & Tempo	18.18/ 25	18.33/ 25
Intonation	16.36/ 25	22.03/ 25
(Average Total Score / 50) × 100	73.00	84.00

4.1.2.6.2 The Non-Test of Cycle II

The results of non-test data in cycle II were obtained from data from observation sheet by the teacher collaborator and interviews with the students about the learning process of describing food using the drilling technique by the teacher utilizing the native speaker voice from the Youtube video. The results of non-test data in each research instrument are explained in the following description.

4.1.2.6.2.1 The Observation of the Learning Process of Cycle II

The process of observation in Cycle II was conducted during the learning process of describing food using the drilling technique guided by the teacher utilizing the native speaker voice from the Youtube video in XI Culinary II class in SMKN 6 Kota Jambi, namely at the start of the lesson until the end of learning at each meeting. This observation activity was conducted by the researcher and the teacher collaborator who wrote on the observation sheet with the aim of observing positive and negative student behavior during the learning process in cycle II.

There are 3 aspects that are the focus in observing the learning process, namely teaching stages, classroom teaching management, and student engagement.

4.1.2.6.2.1.1 The Teaching Stages of Cycle II

The teaching stages in Cycle II remained consistent with those in Cycle I: beginning with introduction of the target language, followed by demonstration, choral repetition, individual practice, pattern drilling, variation and expansion, feedback and correction, and follow-up activities. However, a significant change in this cycle was the introduction of native speaker input through a YouTube video, which served as the main guide for the drilling phase.

This modification markedly improved the quality of the pronunciation model provided to students. The video presented clear articulation, proper intonation, and rhythm, which helped the students better understand how the words and sentences should sound. The teacher still facilitated and paused the video for repetition, but the students were more focused and enthusiastic. They were exposed to more natural speech patterns, and as a result, they began to pronounce descriptive sentences more accurately. The audio-visual input supported a more engaging and effective learning experience, making the drilling stage far more impactful than in Cycle I.

4.1.2.6.2.1.2 The Classroom Teaching Management of Cycle II

Classroom teaching management in Cycle II was enhanced by combining teacher support with multimedia input. The teacher continued to walk around the

classroom, monitoring students' pronunciation closely and giving feedback on stress, intonation, and rhythm. Compared to the previous cycle, the teacher's role became more of a facilitator and coach rather than the main pronunciation model.

The use of native speaker audio helped lighten the teacher's burden in modeling pronunciation while giving students a clearer and more consistent reference. The teacher also continued to guide students in forming descriptive sentences and corrected any remaining pronunciation issues gently and effectively. Students were observed to be more responsive to corrections and able to replicate the native speaker's pronunciation with more accuracy, demonstrating the effectiveness of the classroom management and support strategies employed in this cycle.

4.1.2.6.2.1.3 The Student Engagement of Cycle II

Student engagement in Cycle II improved significantly. The use of multimedia, especially the native speaker video, seemed to spark interest and motivate the students more than in the previous cycle. Students actively listened to the video, mimicked the pronunciation attentively, and participated more confidently in both choral and individual practice.

Their enthusiasm was evident during speaking tasks, especially when describing food. They were able to produce more accurate and fluent sentences with only minor pronunciation errors. Most students appeared more confident and eager to participate, showing greater awareness of pronunciation accuracy and

actively correcting themselves when they noticed mistakes. This heightened engagement played a vital role in the success of the second cycle.

4.1.2.7 The Learning Reflection of Cycle II

The learning reflection of Cycle II shows a significant advancement in students' pronunciation skills compared to Cycle I. The integration of native speaker input via a YouTube video for pronunciation drilling had a noticeable impact on students' ability to pronounce descriptive sentences accurately and confidently. This innovation addressed many of the challenges observed in the previous cycle and was perceived positively by both the teacher collaborator and the students.

The teaching stages remained consistent with Cycle I, following steps such as introduction, demonstration, choral repetition, individual practice, drilling, feedback, and follow-up activities. However, in this cycle, a key change was introduced during the drilling stage: the use of a native speaker's voice from a YouTube video to model correct pronunciation. The teacher continued to guide students during the practice and feedback phases but now with the support of an authentic audio model that students could imitate with clarity and consistency.

The teacher collaborator noted the effectiveness of this approach, stating, *"The use of native speaker audio allowed the students to hear the correct pronunciation clearly. It made a big difference in how they responded. They were more confident, more accurate, and more independent during pronunciation*

practice." The video not only served as a pronunciation guide but also helped maintain student interest and focus during the drilling activities.

The students themselves acknowledged the improvements they experienced. **S1**, the student with the highest post-test score in Cycle II, remarked, *"The voice from the video really helped me understand how to say the sentences clearly. It was easier to follow, and I could repeat the pronunciation until I got it right."* This feedback suggests that having access to consistent and accurate input enabled students to internalize pronunciation patterns more effectively.

Classroom teaching management also improved. The teacher actively monitored students as they practiced with the video, ensuring they paid attention to stress, intonation, and rhythm. Students were given the chance to repeat sentences multiple times along with the native speaker model. When errors occurred, the teacher provided individual support and corrected subtle pronunciation mistakes that may have gone unnoticed in the previous cycle.

Compared to Cycle I, students made fewer errors in pronouncing descriptive vocabulary and sentence structures. They also demonstrated a higher level of engagement. Many showed visible enthusiasm when repeating after the video and became more self-assured in their speech. As **S3** reflected, *"Before, I was unsure. But with the video, I can hear and match the sound. It feels like I am learning from a real speaker."* This indicates an increase not only in pronunciation accuracy but also in learner motivation and self-confidence.

Students with lower scores in Cycle I also showed notable improvement in Cycle II. **S5**, who had previously struggled, mentioned, *"It was easier to pronounce words in Cycle II because I could listen again and again. The voice was clear, and I liked that we practiced together in class."* This feedback highlights the value of multimodal repetition and peer-supported practice under the teacher's guidance.

While the results of Cycle II were significantly improved, there remains room for future enhancement. Some students, especially those with lower confidence, may benefit from more personalized feedback or slower-paced practice segments. The teacher collaborator commented, *"We've seen great progress, but I believe combining the native speaker model with targeted feedback for individuals will bring even better results in the future."*

In conclusion, the reflection of Cycle II underscores the success of integrating native speaker audio in drilling activities to enhance pronunciation. The clear improvement in pronunciation accuracy, fluency, and student confidence confirms the positive impact of this instructional adjustment. The combination of visual-audio support and consistent teacher facilitation created an engaging and effective learning environment, paving the way for sustained development in students' pronunciation skills.

4.2 The Discussion of the Research Result

This section discusses the results of the implementation of the drilling technique in improving the pronunciation skills of XI Culinary II students at SMK Negeri 6 Kota Jambi. The discussion integrates both quantitative and qualitative findings from two action research cycles, highlighting changes in students' pronunciation performance based on four main aspects: Vowels & Consonants, Word & Sentence Stress, Rhythm & Tempo, and Intonation. The improvement is also analyzed in the light of previous research and supported by expert opinions related to pronunciation instruction.

4.2.1 Improvement of Students' Pronunciation through Drilling Technique

The use of drilling technique in Cycle I and Cycle II led to a gradual but noticeable improvement in students' pronunciation. The average score in the Cycle I pre-test was 68, which slightly increased to 72 in the post-test. While this result indicated progress, it was not sufficient to surpass the school's minimum criteria of 75. After refining the strategy in Cycle II by incorporating native speaker audio via YouTube, the students' performance improved more significantly. The average score rose from 73 in the pre-test to 84 in the post-test.

A closer look at the aspect-based data reveals that the largest improvement occurred in the Intonation category, from 13.97 (Cycle I Pre-test) to 22.03 (Cycle II Post-test). This suggests that exposure to natural, native speaker intonation was highly beneficial. Other aspects such as Word & Sentence Stress and Rhythm &

Tempo also showed consistent progress, proving the effectiveness of repeated auditory input paired with guided practice.

These findings align with the results of previous Classroom Action Research (CAR) studies. For instance, a study conducted by Susanti (2019) titled *"Improving Students' Pronunciation through Audio-Lingual Drills at SMP Negeri 4 Palembang"* reported that students' pronunciation improved significantly after applying audio-lingual repetitive drills. Similarly, Hartati (2021), in her CAR titled *"Enhancing Students' Pronunciation through Repetition Drill Technique at MAN 2 Banjarmasin"*, found that students became more confident and accurate in pronouncing English sounds when the repetition drills included both visual and auditory cues.

The theoretical foundation of drilling technique as a behaviorist approach to language learning emphasizes habit formation through repetition and reinforcement. According to Harmer (2007), drilling helps learners to transfer new pronunciation patterns from short-term to long-term memory by repeating them in meaningful contexts. Furthermore, Vygotsky (1978) asserts that with proper scaffolding and models, students can perform better in their zone of proximal development. In this research, the use of native speaker audio provided such scaffolding, bridging the gap between the students' current ability and their pronunciation goals.

Moreover, Gardner's (1983) theory of Multiple Intelligences suggests that auditory learners benefit greatly from hearing and mimicking sounds, which supports the success of the auditory-rich drilling strategy in Cycle II. As the students listened to and imitated native speakers, their phonological awareness improved, particularly in aspects like stress, rhythm, and intonation.

In conclusion, the drilling technique, especially when enhanced with native speaker input, proved to be an effective method for improving the pronunciation of culinary students. This improvement was evident both in quantitative test results and in qualitative observations and student feedback.