CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter the researcher presents research finding, hypothesis testing and discussion. The research finding discuss about the result of data analysis. The discussion section consists of discussion about the research finding.

A. The Description of Data

The objective of this research is to know the effectiveness of word wall media in improving students' vocabulary mastery and to know the significance different between students who taught by using word wall and students who taught without word wall media of seventh grade students at MTsN Tunggangri in academic year 2016/2017. The data of this research consisted of pretest and posttest of control group and experimental group. The result of the research will be explained as follows.

1. The Students' Mastery in Vocabulary Who Are Taught Without Using Word Wall Media.

To know the students' vocabulary mastery who taught without using word wall media, the researcher analyze the pretest and posttest as follows.

a. Pretest of Control Group

Control group is a class which was taught without using word wall media. The learning process was done as usual that is listen to the teacher, taking note and did the exercises. There are 42 students in control group. The data of students' score of pretest and posttest can be seen in Table 4.1 appendix III .

To know the students' score that is good or not, the researcher give criteria as the standard score given by the English of MTsN Tunggangri as follows:

Table 4.2 Students' Criteria Score

Grade	Interval Class	Criteria
A^+	90 – 100	Excellent
A	80 – 89	Very Good
B	70 – 79	Good
C	50 – 69	Fair
D	0 – 49	Poor

Table 4.3 Descriptive Statistic of Pretest

PRETEST CONTROL GROUP

N	Valid	42
	Missing	0
Mean		49.92
Median		50.00
Mode		40[a]
Minimum		25
Maximum		83

Based on the table 4.3 above, it consist of 42 students. It showed that the mean score is 49.92, it mean that the average score of 42 students were got 50. Thus, the mean score of the students showed that most of students got fair/ enough score. The median score was 50 and the mode score was 40. It mean that many students got poor score because it was the most frequent score.

Table 4.4 Percentage of Control Group Pretest

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0-49	18	42.9	42.9	42.9
	50-69	21	50.0	50.0	92.9
	70-79	2	4.8	4.8	97.6
	80-89	1	2.4	2.4	100.0
	Total	42	100.0	100.0	

Based on the Table 4.4 and, there were 18 students (42.9%) who got score < 49. They were two students (4.8%) who got score 25, two students (4.8%) who got 28, one student (2.4%) got 30, one student (2.4%) got 37, three students (7.1%) who got 38, four students (14.3%) got 40, two students (4.8%) got 44, one student (2.4%) who got 48. It means that they just can answer several question from the test. That's way they are categorized as poor score. Then, there were 21 students (50%) who got fair score. It was students who got score around 50-69, they are six students (14.3%) got 50 two students (4.8%) who got 53, three students (7.1%) got 55, also three students (7.1%) got 58, five students (11.9%) who got 65, two students (4.8%) got 68, It means the students are only able to answer some of the questions that have been tested. Next, there were two students (4.8%) who got 75. It means that the vocabulary mastery of the students were good. The last, there was one students (2.4%) who got 83. It means that the students could answer almost all of the question and got very good score in vocabulary mastery. (More detail frequency pretest of control group can be seen in Table 4.5 appendix IV).

b. Posttest of Control Group

Administering a posttest for control group was done to know the improvement of students' vocabulary mastery after the learning activities without using word wall media. The subject of control group consists of 42 students.

Table 4.6 Descriptive Statistic of Posttest

POSTTEST CONTROL CLASS

N	Valid	42
	Missing	0
Mean		64.29
Median		65.00
Mode		65
Minimum		35
Maximum		90

Based on the table 4.6 above, it consists of 42 students. It shows that the mean score is 64.29, it means that the average score of 42 students are got 64. Thus, the mean score of the students shows that most of students got fair score. The median score is 65. In this case the mode score is 65. Mode is simply that value which has the highest frequency. It means that the most frequent score is 65 which indicated that many students got fair score.

Table 4.7 Percentage of Control Group Posttest

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent

	0-49	4	9.5	9.5	9.5
	50-69	23	54.8	54.8	64.3
	70-79	12	28.6	28.6	92.9
Valid	80-89	2	4.8	4.8	97.6
	90-100	1	2.4	2.4	100.0
	Total	42	100.0	100.0	

Based on the Table 4.7 above, there were for students (9.5%) who got score < 49. There was one student (2.4%) who got score 35, one student (2.4%) got 38, two students (4.8%) who got 40. It means that these students are only able to answer several of the questions that have been tested. Thus, their vocabulary mastery is categories as poor. Next, there were 23 students (54.8%) who got score around 50-69, they were one student (2.4%) got 50, one student (2.4%) who got 53, three students (7.1%) got 55, also three students (7.1%) got 58, three students (7.1%) who got 60, also three students (7.1%) got 63, five students (11.9%) got 65, four students (9.6%) who got 68. It means that the vocabulary mastery of these students are fair because they can answer some of the questions correctly. Next, there were 12 students (28.6%) who got score around 70-79, they were three students (7.1%) who got 70, three students (7.1%) got 73, again three students (7.1%) got 75, and again three students (7.1%) got 78. They can answer many questions correctly, so that they were qualified as good score. The last, there were two students who qualified as very good and one students qualified as excellent in vocabulary mastery because they can answer almost all of the questions. They were two students (4.8%) got 85, and one students (2.4%) got highest score that

was 90. From these data, we can take conclusion that there is improvement in student's vocabulary mastery of control group. There are just four students who got poor categories, even most of them got good categories in vocabulary mastery. (More detail frequency pretest of control group can be seen in Table 4.8 appendix V)

2. The Students' Vocabulary Mastery Who Are Taught by Using Word Wall Media.

To know the students' vocabulary mastery who taught by using word wall media, the researcher analyze the pretest and posttest as follows.

a. Pretest of Experimental Group

Experimental group is a class which was taught by using word wall media. The learning process was done by using word wall media and all of activities in the class was being made based on this media. There are 40 students in experimental group. The data of students' score of pretest and posttest can be seen in Table 4.9 appendix VI.

Table 4.10 Descriptive Statistic of Pretest

PRETEST EXPERIMENTAL CLASS

N	Valid	40
	Missing	0
Mean		51.96
Median		51.25
Mode		48[a]
Minimum		23
Maximum		78

Based on the table 4.10 above, it consists of 40 students. It shows that the mean score is 51.96, it means that the average score of 40 students are got 52. Thus, the mean score of the students shows that most of students got fair score. The median score is 51.25. In this case the mode score is 48, it means that many students got poor score because it is the most frequent score.

Table 4.11 Percentage of Experimental Group Pretest

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	0-49	17	42.5	42.5	42.5
	50-69	19	47.5	47.5	90.0
Valid					
	70-79	4	10.0	10.0	100.0
	Total	40	100.0	100.0	

Based on the Table 4.11, there were seventeen students (42.5%) who got score < 49. There were one students (2.5%) who got score 23, one students (2.5%) who got 30, two students (5%) got 38, three students (7.5%) got 40, again three students (7.5%) who got 43, one student (2.5%) got 45, one student (2.5%) who got 46, and five students (12.5%) got 48. It means that the vocabulary mastery of these students are poor. Then, there were nineteen students (47.5%) who got score around 50-69 which was categorized as fair score. They were three students (7.5%) got 50, one student (2.5%) who got 53, five students (12.5%) got 55, four students (10%) got 58, two students (5%) who got 60, two students (5%) got 63, two students (5%) got 65. It means the students are only able to answer some of the questions that have been tested. Thus, their vocabulary mastery was qualified

as fair/ enough. Next, there were four students (10%) who got score around 70-79, they were two students (5%) got 70, one students (2.5%) got 75, and one students (2.5%) who got 78. These students can answer most of the question correctly, so that they qualified as good in vocabulary mastery. (More detail frequency pretest of experimental group can be seen in Table 4.12 appendix VII)

b. Posttest of Experimental Group

Administering a posttest for experimental group was done to know the improvement of students' vocabulary mastery after the learning activities by using word wall media. The subject of experimental group consists of 40 students

Table 4.13 Descriptive Statistics of Posttest

POSTTEST EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

N	Valid	40
	Missing	0
Mean		70.13
Median		70.00
Mode		70
Minimum		48
Maximum		93

Based on the table 4.13 above, it consists of 40 students. It shows that the mean score is 70, it means that the average score of 40 students are got 70. Thus, the mean score of the students shows that most of students got good score. The median score is also 70. In this case the mode score is also 70. Mode is simply that value which has the highest frequency. It means that the most frequent score is 70 which indicated that many students got good score.

Table 4.14 Percentage of Experimental Group Posttest

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0-49	1	2.5	2.5	2.5
	50-69	14	35.0	35.0	37.5
	70-79	18	45.0	45.0	82.5
	80-89	5	12.5	12.5	95.0
	90-100	2	5.0	5.0	100.0
	Total	40	100.0	100.0	

Based on the Table 4.14 above, there was one student (2.5%) who got score 48 which was still categorized as poor score. Then, there were fourteen students (35%) who got score around 50-69, they were one student (2.5%) got 50, there were two students (5%) who got 55, two students (5%) got 58, one student (2.5%) got 60, three students (7.5%) who got 63, four students (10%) got 65, again four students (10%) got 68. It means that these students are only able to answer some of the questions that have been given. Thus, their vocabulary mastery is categories as fair. Next, there were eighteen students (45%) who got score around 70-79. These students were ten students (25%) who got 70, five students (12.5%) who got 73, and there were three students (7.5%) who got 75. It means that the vocabulary mastery of these students are good. They can answer many of the questions correctly. More, there were five students (12.5%) who got score around 80-89, they were two students (5%) who got 80, one student (2.5%) got 83, two students (5%) got 85. It means they can answer most of the questions

correctly; that's way they were categorized as very good score. The last, there were two students who got excellent categorize, they were one students (2.5%) got 90 and the other one got 93. These two students were qualified as excellent in vocabulary mastery because they can answer almost all of the questions. From these data, we can take conclusion that there is improvement in student's vocabulary mastery of experimental group. There are no students who got poor categories, even most of them got good score which qualified in good vocabulary mastery. So, it can be concluded that there is significance improvement in students' vocabulary mastery. (More detail frequency pretest of experimental group can be seen in Table 4.15 appendix VIII). For t-test of students' pretest and posttest to know the significance difference can be seen in appendix IX.

B. Hypothesis Testing

The hypothesis testing of this study as follows:

1. If $t_0 > t_{table}$, the Null Hypothesis (H_0) is rejected and alternative hypothesis (H_1) is accepted. It means there is a significant difference of students' vocabulary mastery between students who are taught through ward wall media and students who are taught without using word wall media.

2. If $t_0 < t_{table}$, the Null hypothesis (H_0) is accepted and alternative hypothesis (H_0) is rejected. It means there is no a significant difference of students' vocabulary mastery between students who are taught through word wall media and students who are taught without using word wall media.

To know the different score of the students' vocabulary mastery who were taught trough word wall media and students' vocabulary mastery who were not,

the researcher analyzed the data by using Independent Sample Test in SPSS statistics 20.0.

Table 4.18 Group Statistics

CLASS		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
SCORE	EXPERIMENT CLASS	40	70.1250	9.33614	1.47617
	CONTROL CLASS	42	64.2857	12.38712	1.91137

Table 4.19 Independent Samples Test of Control Group and Experimental Group

		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	
Score	Equal variances assumed	3.123	.081	-2.401	80	.019	-5.839	2.432	-10.678	-1.000	
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.418	76.052	.018	-5.839	2.415	-10.649	-1.029	

Based on Table 4.19, the Sig. (2-tailed) is 0.019. If Sig. (2-tailed) < 0.05, it means that there is significance different between students' vocabulary mastery who are taught through ward wall media and students who are taught without using word wall media. Besides, from the result of the independent samples test

we can see that the t_0 is 2.401, and the t_{table} of df 80 and in significant level 5% is 1.990. Thus, 2.401 > 1.990 or t_0 > t_{table}. Therefore, the Null Hypothesis (H_0) is rejected and alternative hypothesis (H_1) is accepted. So that, it means there is a significant difference of students' vocabulary mastery between students who are taught through ward wall media and students who are taught without using word wall media.

C. Normality and Homogenity Testing

1. Normality Testing

Normality test is intended to show that the sample data come from a normally distributed population. The normality testing in this research To know the normality, the researcher used statistic computation SPSS Statistics 20.0 One-Sample Kolmogrov-Smirnov test by the value of significance (α) = 0.05. *Kolmogorov-smirnove test* is a test of normality for large samples. The result of normality testing can be seen in the table below:

Table 4.20 One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Pretest Control	Posttest control	Pretest experimen tal	Posttest experimen tal
N		42	42	40	40
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	49.92	64.29	51.96	70.13
	Std. Deviation	10.202	12.387	11.719	9.336
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.115	.094	.077	.150
	Positive	.115	.072	.073	.150

Negative	-.094	-.094	-.077	-.120
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	.743	.612	.489	.946
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.639	.848	.971	.332

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

Based on the result of the test above, can be seen that the significance value of pretest of control group is 0.639, posttest of control group is 0.848, pretest of experimental group is 0.971, and posttest of experimental group is 0.332, so all of them are more than 0.05. It means that all of the data are normal distributed.

2. Homogeneity Testing

Homogeneity testing is conducted to know whether the gotten data has a homogeneous variance or not. The homogeneity testing in this research using statistic computation SPSS Statistics 20.0 that is Levene Statistic test by the value of significance (α) = 0.05. The samples can be categorized as homogeneity if value of significance > 0.05, so it means that the data of sample has same variance. The result can be seen below:

Table 4.21 Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Pretest

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
1.356	1	80	.248

Based on the output from SPSS above is known that the test called homogeny if the significant score more than 0.05. Based on the table above, the

test is homogeneity because 0.248 > 0.05 and it means that both of the samples have same variance. So, it can be concluded that students of control group and experimental group have homogeny of variances.

D. Discussion

Based on the research finding, it showed that the mean scores between pretest and posttest of control group and experimental group is different. The objectives of the study is to know the effectiveness of word wall media in improving students' vocabulary mastery and to know the significance different between students who taught by using word wall and students who taught without word wall media of seventh grade students at MTsN Tunggangri in academic year 2016/2017. Based on the result of the statistical computation, showed that the result of experimental group after taught vocabulary by using word wall media is 2.401, and to know what the different was significant or not, the researcher used t distribution. If tcount> ttable, it means there is significant level between both group. Because it has known that the ttable is 1.990, so null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected or alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted, it means there is a significance different between students who taught by using word wall and students who taught without using word wall media.

In the pretest of control group, the average score is 49.92, and the average score in posttest is 64.25. While the pretest of experimental group is 51.96 and the average score of posttest is 70.13. From the mean score of both groups look difference value, the result shows that the posttest of experimental group was better than posttest of control group. From the result above, the conclusion is the

students get good achievement in mastering vocabulary after taught by using word wall. The students' vocabulary mastery improves significantly. So word wall media is proved effective to improve students' vocabulary mastery.

By using word wall media, the students felt enthusiastic, enjoy, and motivated in participating the teaching and learning process. It was known from the implementation of teaching by using word wall media. The first is giving pretest for all of the subjects (control group and experimental group), it means to know the students' vocabulary mastery before treatment. Second, giving treatment to the students, the treatment here was teaching vocabulary by using word wall media for experimental class, and teaching as usual for control class. The last step was giving posttest, the posttest was also given for both experimental group and control group to administering their vocabulary mastery after they were got treatment whether a treatment by word wall media or just teaching learning process as usual.

Here word wall media helps the students in mastering vocabulary in interesting and communicative way. The use of a word wall in a classroom can be a highly effective teaching strategy to improve literacy skills. Word wall activities engage students while they learn key vocabulary, whether it be learning to explain a word, to compare it to other key concepts, or to spell it. These words are referred to continually throughout a unit or term by the teacher and students during a variety of activities (Cronsberry: 2004: 3). It can be considered to give practice in all skills such as: reading, writing, and speaking. Word Wall is

concerned primarily with developing skill, but some of them are more actively oral and give better situation where the teacher wants to provide the relief.

It is relevant to Brabham and Villaume (2001), the use of interactive word walls holds instructional potential for enhancing vocabulary learning as students engage in activities centered on the word wall activities in which students explore, evaluate, reflect, and apply word meanings in meaningful contexts. Interactive word walls showcase well-selected words; they help teachers build a foundation for student content vocabulary comprehension.

From the explanation above, it can conclude that word wall media is an effective media in improving students' vocabulary mastery. Such as the previous research which conducted in pre-experimental design by Nadhiroh (2010) at the fifth year students' mastery on vocabulary at SDN 04 Sumberbendo Puncanglaban. Her research was successes and shows a better result. The teacher can use this media as alternative way in teaching English. Hence, the class will more live because the students active to participate in the study so that they will not feel bored. So the teachers can use this media for Islamic Junior High School level.