CHAPTER IV

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the data of the research result will be presented and analyzing. The data are pre-test and post-test result. The writer describes and analyzing the result the data. There was analyzing the result of pre-test, treatment activities, post-test, t-test statistical, and discussion of the research findings. The writer also gave pre-test and post-test to know whether it is effective or not use Round Robin teaching method to enhance student's vocabulary mastery. The writer wanted to know whether any significant difference between before and after the students was taught by using Round Robin as technique in teaching.

The writer took two classes, class X MIA 1 has 22 students and X MIA 2 has 22 students. There were fourty four students of MA Walisongo Pecangaan Jepara, who were given pre-test and post-test.

4.1 Pre-test Score

In this part, the data of the pre-test score of experimental class and control class is provided. Therewere descriptions:

Table 4.3
Pre-test Score of Experimental Class and Control Class

Experimental Class			Control Class		
No.	Students	Score	No.	Students	Score
1.	E-01	48	1.	E-1	40
2.	E-02	44	2.	E-2	40
3.	E-03	38	3.	E-3	50
4.	E-04	30	4.	E-4	40
5.	E-05	32	5.	E-5	48

6.	E-06	48	6.	E-6	52
7.	E-07	46	7.	E-7	42
8.	E-08	32	8.	E-8	48
9.	E-09	36	9.	E-9	40
10.	E-10	52	10.	E-10	48
11.	E-11	40	11.	E-11	52
12.	E-12	22	12.	E-12	42
13.	E-13	28	13.	E-13	46
14.	E-14	48	14.	E-14	44
15.	E-15	52	15.	E-15	54
16.	E-16	32	16.	E-16	52
17.	E-17	30	17.	E-17	42
18.	E-18	50	18.	E-18	40
19.	E-19	42	19.	E-19	40
20.	E-20	46	20.	E-20	52
21.	E-21	52	21.	E-21	40
22.	E-22	46	22.	E-22	54
	∑	894		∑	1006
	Mean	40,63636		Mean	45,72727

Based on the table 4.3 we can see that in experimental class, the highest is 52 while the lowest pre-test score is 30. On the other hand, in the control class the highest score was 54 and the lowest pre-test score was 40. Moreover, the experimental class, the average score or means was 40, 63636. On the other hand, in the control class the average score or means was 45,472727.

From the students' pre-test score mean it can be assumed that students from the control class performed better than students' from experimental class in the pre-test. This assumption was tested using T-test in next section.

Table 4.4

The T-test of Pre-test Score in the Experimental Group and Control Group

Group Statistics

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
experimental	1,00	22	40,6364	9,05825	1,93123
control	2,00	22	41,7273	5,35574	1,14185

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
experimental	Equal variances assumed	9,268	,004	3,869	42	,028	-5,09091	2,24354	-9,61855	-,56327
	Equal variances not assumed			3,869	34,084	,030	-5,09091	2,24354	-9,64991	-,53191

T-table showed that was 0, 4269. It means that the result from this calculation 0,3869 < 0,4044. It means that there was no significant difference between experimental group and control group. The average score of them almost same, so both of them and 40 and 41, it was good score to compare them because both of them has a different quality.

In the calculation of pre-test score using SPSS above, the T_{count} was 0,4044. It indicated that there was no significant between experimental group and control group. In conclusion both experimental and control group had the different level of achievement.

4.2 Post-test Score

In this part, the data of the post-test score of experimental class and control class was provided. Therewere descriptions:

Table 4.5
Post-test Score of Experimental Class and Control Class

Experimental Class			Contrl Class		
No.	Students	Score	No.	Students	Scoce
1.	E-01	80	1.	E-01	64
2.	E-02	84	2.	E-02	64
3.	E-03	92	3.	E-03	62
4.	E-04	90	4.	E-04	60
5.	E-05	88	5.	E-05	58
6.	E-06	94	6.	E-06	58
7.	E-07	88	7.	E-07	56
8.	E-08	92	8.	E-8	56
9.	E-09	88	9.	E-9	60
10.	E-10	96	10.	E-10	60
11.	E-11	94	11.	E-11	56
12.	E-12	92	12.	E-12	60
13.	E-13	80	13.	E-13	60
14.	E-14	90	14.	E-14	64
15.	E-15	86	15.	E-15	66
16.	E-16	88	16.	E-16	62

17.	E-17	84	17.	E-17	56
18.	E-18	86	18.	E-18	66
19.	E-19	90	19.	E-19	62
20.	E-20	88	20.	E-20	56
21.	E-21	80	21.	E-21	60
22.	E-22	86	22.	E-22	68
	∑	1936		∑	1334
	Mean	88		Mean	60,63636

Based on the table 4.5 we can see that in experimental class, the highest is 96 while the lowest post-test score is 80. On the other hand, in the control class the highest score was 68 and the lowest post-test score was 56. Moreover, the experimental class, the average score or means was 88. On the other hand, in the control class the average score or means was 60,6363. The result showed that there was an improvement in post-test result than pre-test.This assumption was tested using T-test in next section.

Table 4.6

The T-test of Post-test Score in the Experimental Group and Control Group

Group Statistics

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Experimental	1,00	22	88,0000	4,53557	,96699
control	2,00	22	60,6364	3,61933	,77164

Independent Samples 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
experimental	Equal variances assumed	,491	,487	62,119	42	,000	27,36364	1,23713	24,86700	29,86027
	Equal variances not assumed			62,119	40,029	,000	27,36364	1,23713	24,86335	29,86392

The result of the research show that the experimental class (the students who were taught using Round Robin teaching method) has the mean value 88. Meanwhile, the control class (the students who were taught without using Round Robin teaching method) has the mean 60. It can be said that the instrument of vocabulary achievement of experimental class is higher than control class.

T-table showed that was 0,62119. It means that the result from this calculation 0,62119> 0,4044. It means that there was significant difference of the vocabulary achivement between students taught using Round Robin teaching method and those taught without Round Robin teaching method. In this case, the use of Round Robin teaching method is necessary needed in teaching vocabulary.

4.3 Hypothesis

In this section, the researcher described the interpretation of research finding by using statistical calculation and summerized the hypothesis. The research was held to answer the question whether the use of Round Robin teaching method to enhance student's vocabulary mastery of MA Walisongo Pecangaan Jepara or not. The researcher wrote the Alternative Hypothesis (H_a) and the Null Hypothesis (H_o) as follows:

a. The Null hypothesis (H_o): there was no significant difference of student's vocabulary mastery who were taught by using Round Robin teaching method.

b. The Alternative Hypothesis (H_a): there was significant difference of student's vocabulary mastery who were thaught by using Round Robin teaching method in listening class.

To prove the hypothesis, the data obtained in pre-test and post-test were calculated by usingt_{test}formula with assumption as follows:

a. If the probability $> 0,05$ the Null hypothesis (H_o) was accepted and the alternative hypothesis (H_a) was rejected. It was proved that Round Robin teaching method was not effective to enhance students' vocabulary mastery.

b. If the probability $< 0,05$ the Null hypothesis (H_o) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis (H_a) was accepted. It was proven that Round Robin teaching method was effective to enhance students' vocabulary mastery.

According to the analysis of result above, there was significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores.

2.1 Discussion

The writer conducts the research in experimental group for two meetings. The first meeting for pre-test, experimental and second meeting for posttest. After giving treatment for experimental class using Round robin teaching method technique, the writer found the highest is 96 while the lowest post-test score is 80. On the other hand, in the control class the highest score was 68 and the lowest post-test score was 56. Moreover, the experimental class, the average score or means was 88. On the other hand, in the control class the average score or means was 60,6363.

When the student taught by using Round Robin teaching method, they felt exciting in teaching learning process, because there were many interactions between the other students that make them interested in Round Robin teaching method. They said that Round Robin teaching method can make the students speak out. So, it made them felt easy to understand the vocabulary mastery. The writer did not give technique in control class, but the writer only give some material about vocabulary mastery. After the writer giving treatments without Round Robin teaching method the writer found that the pre-test experimental class, the highest is 52 while the lowest pre-test score is 30. On the other hand, in the control class the highest score was 54 and the lowest pre-test score was 40. Moreover, the experimental class, the average score or means was 40, 63636. On the other hand, in the control class the average score or means was 45,472727. So, it mean that the lowest and the highest score in pre-test were also higher than post-test.

Teaching vocabulary mastery at control class without using Round Robin teaching method feel bored with the material that was being presented by the writer, because the method was to monotonous. So, the material could not transfer well to the student optimally. According to (Harianda, Fakhri, 2012: 65) after analyzing the result of students' pre-test, it could be concluded that the students' vocabulary mastery was still far from good. In addition to this, the students' vocabulary mastery needed to be improvement by applying Round Robin teaching method to the students. The writer believed that the use Round Robin teaching method is an effective way to solve the students' problems.