CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presented the result of data analysis. It means that how was the result after the data being analysed. In this chapter there were three main points that would be discussed. It included the description of data, hypothesis testing and discussion.

A. Data Presentation

In this part, researcher described the result of analyzing data. The data was students' score of teaching vocabulary which was integrated in teaching reading. The score was gotten by administering test where the researcher conducted two kinds of test. These tests were pre-test and post-test. The tests were in the form of multiple choice and completion. These tests were administered in the different time. The pre-test and post-test were administered to VII D class of MTs Al-MA'arif Tulungagung which was consists of 43 students.

In this research, researcher wanted to know the effectiveness of treatment which was used for teaching vocabulary. In this case, the treatment was Make a Match technique. For the first, the researcher administered the pre-test for the students. After the pre-test being done, the researcher implemented the treatment for four times. When the treatment was done, the researcher administered the post-test to the students. Hence, the effectiveness of Make a Match technique for teaching vocabulary could be seen in the table of pre-test and post-test score in the single group below:

Table 4.1 The Students' Score of Pre-test and Post-test

No	Name	Pre-test	Post-test
1	NAP	87	97
2	PSNS	88	96
3	NLVS	97	97
4	MRAM	16	80

5	FF	86	97
6	IAM	85	97
7	MFA	100	94
8	MIR	88	90
9	REPK	97	100
10	NF	100	97
11	RFN	91	95
12	US	90	88
13	ATP	91	97
14	SMF	65	80
15	RA	88	94
16	ISNA	94	91
17	MY	94	88
18	MHS	100	100
19	ASSS	87	94
20	SD	100	97
21	MBU	65	91
22	KN	87	96
23	MRH	91	94
24	YS	100	96
25	MS	87	90
26	ARU	91	94
27	MZ	90	87
28	AZ	94	88
29	WDS	88	91
30	SPS	94	100
31	RGM	91	90
32	RFS	82	88
33	ANA	87	91
34	TDS	51	80
35	MRF	91	84
36	ZAZ	54	87
37	SV	42	77
38	EG	70	76
39	NARP	100	97
40	TAS	77	84
41	VA	97	96
42	AD	73	86
43	FKA	90	94
		$\sum X = 3636$	$\sum Y = 3926$
	Mean Score	84.56	91.30

The data of pre-test and post-test above were analyzed using SPSS 16. After analyzing, the result was follow:

Table 4.2 Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pretest	84.56	43	17.193	2.622
	posttest	91.30	43	6.315	.963

The table above represented the students' score before and after being taught by using Make a Match technique in teaching vocabulary which was integrated in teaching reading. It could be concluded that mean score between pre-test and post-test were different. The table showed that the mean score of pre-test was 84.56 while the mean score of post-test was 91.30. It means that mean score of post-test higher than pre-test. So, there was significance different between mean score of pre-test and post-test.

Table 4.3 Paired Samples T-Test

		Paired Differences						Sig. (2-tailed)
					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference			
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper	t	Df	
Pair 1	pretest – posttest	-6.744	13.340	2.034	-10.850	-2.639	-3.315	42	.002

The table above showed that the difference of mean score between pre-test and post-test were -6.744, standard deviation was 13.340, and standard error was 2.034. The lower difference was -10.850 while the upper difference was -2.639. The result of T-test was -3.315 with degree of freedom (df) was 42 and significance (sign. 2 tailed) was 0.002. Meanwhile, the degree of freedom (df) was 42 and could be seen in T-table with significant level 5%. It could be found the result was 2.021.

B. Hypothesis Testing

In this research there are two kinds of hypothesis which was used. These were alternative hypothesis (H_1) and null hypothesis (H_0). According to Sukardi (2003:44-45) null

hypothesis explained that there was no difference or connection between variables which were used by researcher. Alternative hypothesis was positioned as limitation of knowledge after being gotten from the result of theoretical research. Hypothesis was temporary answer toward the research problem.

The null (H_0) hypothesis of this research said that there was no significant difference between teach vocabulary using Make a Match and not using Make a Match. The alternative hypothesis (H_1) said that there was significant difference between teach vocabulary using Make a Match and not using Make a Match. The hypothesis of this research concerned both the value of T-score and significance (sig) were comparing with T-table. The hypothesis testing was stated as follow:

1. If the value of T-score was higher than T-table with df=42 and significant level 0.05 and significant value <0.05, it can be concluded that the null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected.

2. If the value of T-score was lower than T-table with df=42 and significant level 0.05 and significant value >0.05, it can be concluded that the alternative hypothesis (H_1) was rejected.

After calculating by using SPSS 16 program, it was found that the T-score was 3.315 with the significant value was 0.002. When it was checked, the T-table with df=42 and significant level 0.005, it was gotten T-table value was 2.021. As stated before, if the T-score > T-table and significant value <0.05, the null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected. If the T-score < T-table and significant value >0.05, the alternative hypothesis (H_1) was rejected. Based on the table of T-test above, the result showed that T-score > T-table and significant value < 0.05 (3.315>2.021 and 0.002<0.05). So, the null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected and automatically the alternative hypothesis (H_1) was accepted. It means that there was significant difference of

the students' mean score before being taught using Make a Match technique and after being taught using Make a Match technique. In other words, using Make a Match technique was effective in teaching vocabulary.

C. Discussion

The objective of this research was to know the effectiveness of Make a Match technique toward students' vocabulary mastery of first grade of MTs Al-Ma'arif Tulungagung in academic year 2015/2016. The result of administering test showed that mean score from pre-test was 84.56 and mean score of post-test was 91.30. It means that there is significant difference between teaching vocabulary before and after using make a match technique. After analyzing data using SPSS program shows that T-score is 3.315 with the significant value 0.002. Whereas in the T-table with df=42 and significant level 0.05, the score is 2.021. It means that the score of T-score is higher than T-table. So, the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (H_1) is accepted. It can be concluded that make a match technique is effective to increase students' score of vocabulary.

Lie (2002:29) states that cooperative learning is effective to implement in classroom activities because there are five elements which can differentiate cooperative learning with ordinary group working. These elements are positive interdependence, personal responsibility, face to face, interpersonal skill, group processing. These elements encourage learners to learn actively. In the theory of Vygotsky in Suprijono (2009:49) which states that cooperative learning emphasize learning as the process of interactive dialogue (social interaction) because cooperative learning is based on philosophy homo homini socius. It means that learners are emphasized to construct their knowledge through social interaction with other people.

In other hand, Make a Match technique can be said effective because there are two special purposes. According to Suprijono (2009:50) there are intrinsic purpose and extrinsic purpose. Intrinsic purpose is a purpose which is based on the reason that in group working, learners feel happy. Extrinsic purpose is purpose which is based on the reason that in reaching learning goal can't be reached by own self. Cooperative learning is also effective because make learners are easier to learn useful things such as fact, skill, value, concept, and how to life harmonious with other people.

Empirically, there are some previous studies which support this research. These previous research have the same design with this research, that is used quantitative research. Research which is conducted by Arisa Setianingsih (2010) shows that the average score of control group's before treatment is (64.70), after treatment is (70.30). The experimental group's average score before treatment is (63.90) and after treatment is (76.60). There is a difference of the mean score between students taught by using matching game and taught by using non-matching game. Research which is conducted by Sulistiani (2012) shows that pre-test achieved there are 10 students get insufficient score, 5 students get sufficient score, 8 students get good score, 2 students get very good score and now body and excellent score. It means that there are 40% students get insufficient score, 20% students get sufficient score, 32% students get good score, 8% students get very good score and 0% who students get excellent score in achievement vocabulary before using Make a Match Method. After teaching by using make a match, the result of post-test are 2 students get insufficient score, 1 students get sufficient score, 9 students get good score, 9 students get very good score, 4 students get excellent. It means that there were 8% students get fair score, 4% students get sufficient score, and 36% students get good score, 36% students get very good score, and 16%

students get excellent score in vocabulary achievement after using make a match method. It means that there is significant difference between score of pre-test and post-test. Research which is conducted by Asri Pratiwiningsih (2013). The result shows that pretest the average pre-test score of experimental group is 70.17 and the average score of control group is 74.00. Then, the result of the posttest shows that the average scores for experimental group is higher than the average score of control group. The average score of experimental group is 78.5 and the average score of control group is 73.67. This indicates that the gain of reading comprehension means scores of experimental group is significantly higher than the gain of reading comprehension means scores of control group.

Based on the theory, the result of supporting previous studies and also the result of this research, it can be concluded that Make a Match technique is surely effective to be used in teaching and learning activities especially in teaching and learning vocabulary. Beside can be used in teaching vocabulary, make a match can be used as alternative technique in teaching reading, speaking or other subject. The result of this research and the result of previous research show that students' score absolutely increased because of implementing Make a Match technique. Make a Match technique can help students easier and pleasantly in learning and memorizing many vocabularies. It also can change the atmosphere in teaching and learning activity where a passive class change into an active class. It means that in the teaching and learning process the students is active and the teacher guide the activity.

Make a Match has many advantages which are used as consideration in applying for teaching and learning process. According to Huda (2011), these are: giving motivation students to help each other in teaching and learning process, growing responsibility toward group of study in doing the best, increasing social skill which needed in effectively working,

giving opportunity to students for using their asking skill and discussing a problem and developing leadership talent and teaching discussion skill. Besides Huda, Lie (2002:55) said that the advantages of make a match are, excitement condition will grow in teaching and learning process in the classroom, cooperation between students dynamically, there is dynamic mutual cooperation inter students and students look for their partner while study about concept or topic in pleasing condition. Chianda (2013) states the advantages of make a match are students directly involve in answering questions from teacher through card, increasing students learning creativity, avoiding students feel bored in teaching and learning process, learning more pleasing because of involving teaching media made by teacher and making cooperation between students dynamically.