

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter covers about research findings and discussion that include the description of data, hypothesis testing, and discussion.

A. The Description of Data

In this chapter, the researcher presented the data on the students' vocabulary acquisition between students who were taught by using Semantic Feature Analysis and who were taught without using Semantic Feature Analysis. The subject of this research consisted of two classes, they were VIII B as experimental class and VIII A as control class. The purpose of this research was to know the effectiveness of Semantic Feature Analysis on students' vocabulary acquisition of second grade at MTs Darul Huda. The data were collected from students' score in pre-test and post-test of both classes.

The scores are divided into five criteria. They are excellent, very good, good, low, and failed. First, the students will be categorized into *excellent* score if they got 85-100 score. Second, the students will be categorized into *very good* score if they got 71-84 score. Third, the students will be categorized into *good* score if they got 60-70 score. Fourth, the students will be categorized into *poor* score if they got 40-59

score. Last, the students will be categorized into *failed* score if they got 0-39 score.

Table 4.1: The Score's Criteria

No.	Interval Class	Criteria
1.	85-100	Excellent
2.	71-84	Very good
3.	60-70	Good
4.	40-59	Poor
5.	0-39	Failed

1. The Students' Score in Experimental Class

a. Pre-test of Experimental Class

The pre-test was done on February, 27th 2019. Experimental class is class which got treatment by using Semantic Feature Analysis. The subject of this study consisted of 30 students at eight B class. According to the result of pre-test in table 4.2, it showed that the sum of data was 2040. The lowest score was 45, the highest score was 90, the mean of students' score in pre-test was 68, the mode was 65, and the median was 67.50.

Table 4.2: Descriptive Statistic Pre-Test of Experimental Class**Statistics**

Pretest

N	Valid	30
	Missing	0
Mean		68.00
Median		67.50
Mode		65
Std. Deviation		9.879
Minimum		45
Maximum		90
Sum		2040

Table 4.3: The Frequency of Students' Vocabulary Acquisition before being taught by using Semantic Feature Analysis**Pretest**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	45	1	3.3	3.3	3.3
	55	3	10.0	10.0	13.3
	60	4	13.3	13.3	26.7
	65	7	23.3	23.3	50.0
	70	6	20.0	20.0	70.0
	75	5	16.7	16.7	86.7
	80	1	3.3	3.3	90.0
	85	2	6.7	6.7	96.7
	90	1	3.3	3.3	100.0
Total		30	100.0	100.0	

From the table 4.3, the frequency of pre-test after being distributed, there were not students who got failed score. There were 4 students who got score between 40-59 means that students' vocabulary acquisition is poor, there were 17 students who got score between 60-70 means that students' vocabulary acquisition is good, there were 6 students who got score between 71-84 means that students' vocabulary acquisition is very good, and there were 3 students who got score between 85-100 means that students' vocabulary acquisition is excellent.

b. The Students' Score in Post-test

The post-test was done on March, 22nd 2019. The subject of post-test consisted of 30 students at eight B class. According to the result of post-test in table 4.4, it showed that the sum of data was 2330. The lowest score of post-test was 55, the highest score was 95, the mean was 77.67, the mode was 80, and the median was 80.

Table 4.4: Descriptive Statistic Post-Test of Experimental Class**Statistics**

Posttest

N	Valid	30
	Missing	0
Mean		77.67
Median		80.00
Mode		80
Std. Deviation		10.965
Minimum		55
Maximum		95
Sum		2330

Table 4.5: The Frequency of Students' Vocabulary Acquisition after being taught by using Semantic Feature Analysis

Posttest

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	55	1	3.3	3.3	3.3
	60	3	10.0	10.0	13.3
	65	3	10.0	10.0	23.3
	70	1	3.3	3.3	26.7
	75	4	13.3	13.3	40.0
	80	7	23.3	23.3	63.3
	85	7	23.3	23.3	86.7
	90	1	3.3	3.3	90.0
	95	3	10.0	10.0	100.0
	Total	30	100.0	100.0	

From the table 4.5, the frequency of post-test after being distributed, there were not students who got failed score. There was 1 student who got score between 40-59 means that students' vocabulary acquisition is poor, there were 7 students who got score between 60-70 means that students' vocabulary acquisition is good, there were 11 students who got score between 71-84 means that students' vocabulary acquisition is very good, and there were 11 students who got score between 85-100 means that students' vocabulary acquisition is excellent.

2. The Students' Score in Control Class

a. Pre-test of Control Class

Pre-test in control class was done on February, 25th 2019. Pre-test class is a class which was taught by using conventional method in learning process. The subject was eight A class which consisted of 33 students. According to the result of pre-test in table 4.6, it showed that the sum of data was 1790. The lowest score of pre-test was 35, the highest score was 75, the mean was 54.24, the median was 55, and the mode was 45.

Table 4.6: Descriptive Statistic Pre-Test of Control Class**Statistics**

Pretest

N	Valid	33
	Missing	0
Mean		54.24
Median		55.00
Mode		45
Std. Deviation		11.734
Minimum		35
Maximum		75
Sum		1790

Table 4.7: The Frequency of Students' Pre-test in Control Class**Pretest**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 35	2	6.1	6.1	6.1
40	4	12.1	12.1	18.2
45	6	18.2	18.2	36.4
50	3	9.1	9.1	45.5
55	5	15.2	15.2	60.6
60	3	9.1	9.1	69.7
65	5	15.2	15.2	84.8
70	3	9.1	9.1	93.9
75	2	6.1	6.1	100.0
Total	33	100.0	100.0	

From the table 4.7, the frequency of pre-test after being distributed, there were 2 students who got score between 0-39 means that students'

vocabulary acquisition is failed. There were 18 students who got score between 40-59 means that students' vocabulary acquisition is poor, there were 11 students who got score between 60-70 means that students' vocabulary acquisition is good, there were 2 students who got score between 71-84 means that students' vocabulary acquisition is very good, and there were not students who got excellent score.

b. Post-test in Control Class

Post-test was done on March, 18th 2019. The subject was eight A class which consisted of 33 students. According to the result of post-test in table 4.8, it showed that the sum of data was 2020. The lowest score of post-test was 40, the highest score was 85, the mean was 61.21, the mode was 65, and the median was 60.

Table 4.8: Descriptive Statistic Post-Test of Control Class

Statistics

Posttest

N	Valid	33
	Missing	0
Mean		61.21
Median		60.00
Mode		65
Std. Deviation		12.502
Minimum		40
Maximum		85
Sum		2020

Table 4.9: The Frequency of Students' Post-test in Control Class

		Posttest			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	40	3	9.1	9.1	9.1
	45	3	9.1	9.1	18.2
	50	2	6.1	6.1	24.2
	55	4	12.1	12.1	36.4
	60	5	15.2	15.2	51.5
	65	7	21.2	21.2	72.7
	70	2	6.1	6.1	78.8
	75	3	9.1	9.1	87.9
	80	3	9.1	9.1	97.0
	85	1	3.0	3.0	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

From the table 4.9, the frequency of post-test after being distributed, there were not students who got failed score. There were 12 students who got score between 40-59 means that students' vocabulary acquisition is poor, there were 14 students who got score between 60-70 means that students' vocabulary acquisition is good, there were 6 students who got score between 71-84 means that students' vocabulary acquisition is very good, and there was 1 student who got score between 85-100 means that students' vocabulary acquisition is excellent.

3. The difference of statistical data in post-test of control and experimental class

Here, the researcher compared the students' score of post-test.

The result of statistical calculation will be shown as follows:

Table 4.10: Descriptive Statistic of Control and Experimental Class

		Statistics	
		Experimental	Control
N	Valid	30	33
	Missing	0	0
Mean		77.67	61.21
Median		80	60
Mode		80	65
Minimum		55	40
Maximum		95	85

Based on the table above, it can be seen the differences students' score of control class and experimental class. In control class, the mean score was 61.21, the median was 60, the mode was 65, the lowest score was 40, and the highest score was 85. While in experimental class, the mean score was 77.67, the median was 80, the mode was 80, the lowest score was 55, and the highest score was 95.

The result showed that the experimental class or the class who got treatment by using Semantic Feature Analysis was higher than the class without treatment. Thus, there were significance difference of the students' score in the test between group who got treatment and the other one without treatment. In other words, the use of Semantic Feature

Analysis is effective on students' vocabulary acquisition at second grade students of MTs Darul Huda.

In this research, the researcher used SPSS 16.0 to know the effectiveness of Semantic Feature Analysis on students' vocabulary acquisition at second grade of MTs Darul Huda. The result would be shown as follows:

Table 4.11: Descriptive Statistic of Post-Test (Experimental Class and Control Class)

Group Statistics				
Class	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Value experimental	30	77.667	10.9649	2.0019
control	33	61.212	12.5019	2.1763

Based on the table above, it showed that there were two classes, experimental and control class. Experimental class showed that there were 30 students, mean score of experimental was 77.67, and Standard Deviation for experimental class was 10.9649. Meanwhile, in control class showed that there were 33 students, mean score of control class was 61.21, and Standard Deviation for control class was 12.5019.

B. Hypothesis Testing

The hypothesis testing of this study as follows:

1. If $P\text{-value} < \alpha$, H_0 is rejected

It means that there is significant difference score between experimental class and control class or Semantic Feature Analysis is effective on students' vocabulary acquisition.

2. If $P\text{-value} \geq \alpha$, H_0 is not rejected

It means that there is no significant difference score between experimental class and control class or Semantic Feature Analysis is not effective on students' vocabulary acquisition.

To know whether the P-value was bigger or smaller than α (0.05), the researcher analyzed the data by using SPSS 16.0.

Table 4.12: The Result of Analyzing Independent Sample T-test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Value Equal variances assumed	.516	.475	5.530	61	.000	16.4545	2.9757	10.5042	22.4049
Value Equal variances not assumed			5.565	60.929	.000	16.4545	2.9570	10.5415	22.3676

Based on the table above, the result of t-test can be concluded that significant value (sig-2 tailed) was 0.000, and it was smaller than 0.05 ($0.000 < 0.05$). It means that null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected. Thus, it can be interpreted that there was significant difference on students' score between students who were taught by using Semantic Feature Analysis and conventional method. It means that Semantic Feature Analysis is effective on students' vocabulary acquisition.

C. Discussion

In this part, the researcher presents the discussion of analyzed data that has been presented in previous sub chapter. Based on the analysis, the post-test mean of control group was 61.21. While the post-test mean of experimental group was 77.67. The result also showed that P value or sig is smaller than α (0.05). It indicated that after the researcher gave treatment to the experimental group, their score was really increase than before. In this case, teaching vocabulary by using Semantic Feature Analysis was better than without using Semantic Feature Analysis. Thus, it can be concluded that Semantic Feature Analysis strategy was effective on students' vocabulary acquisition.

Based on the research method in chapter III, the researcher conducted quasi experimental with two groups pretest-posttest design. The first step is the researcher conducted pre-test to the both control group and experimental group. The test is vocabulary test which consisted of 20 question in form of multiple choices. It is used to know the students' earlier knowledge before they got treatment. The second step is given treatment to the students. The researcher used Semantic Feature Analysis for the treatment in experimental class. While in control class, the researcher used conventional method or white board as the media of teaching and learning. Although some of students felt difficulty and confused in applying this strategy, it was really clear that the students who got treatment feel very enjoying and they are more enthusiastic in teaching

learning process. While the students in control class looked very bored when the researcher delivered the material. In this case, the researcher did some steps on the treatment. First, the teacher gave students Semantic Feature Analysis grid or matrix based on category that has been selected. Then, the teacher guided students through the matrix, having them determine if the words on the left side possess the features listed. Finally, the students complete the matrix by adding plus sign or minus sign to indicate feature possession. After the students got treatment, the researcher gave them post-test. The test is also vocabulary test which consisted of 20 questions in form of multiple choices. The post-test was conducted to know students' score after they got treatment.

Anders (1983) conducted Semantic Feature Analysis on the reading comprehension, the result showed that Semantic Feature Analysis is significantly improve the reading comprehension of adolescent learning disabled students. In addition, Zahra, Nahid, Amin, and Leila (2017) also conducted a research to compare the effectiveness of Semantic Feature Analysis (SFA) and Phonological Components Analysis (PCA) for anomia treatment in Persian speaking patients with aphasia. The result showed that both SFA and PCA treatments have the potential to improve naming ability in participants

Semantic Feature Analysis is not only a good strategy to enhance students' vocabulary skill, but the students can build their prior knowledge, master important concepts, and make connections. Fenton

(2006:1) stated that Semantic Feature Analysis is a good way to build prior knowledge and reinforce vocabulary. This strategy also help students understand the meaning of new vocabulary words (Ditkson, 2007:1). Besides, Semantic Feature Analysis is easily implemented and simple to use in the classroom because the teacher just provided Semantic Feature Analysis grid to apply this strategy. In addition, this strategy can be implemented with the whole group or small group so that it can promote students' interaction and discussion.

Based on the result, it can be concluded that using Semantic Feature Analysis is effective on students' vocabulary acquisition at Junior High School, especially at second grade students of MTs Darul Huda. Furthermore, Semantic Feature Analysis provides many opportunities for students to enhance their vocabulary acquisition. The activity also increased the students' motivation and create a relax atmosphere, so the students did not get bored. Therefore, Semantic Feature Analysis is a useful strategy that can be used in teaching learning process on students' vocabulary acquisition.