## CHAPTER IV

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

## A. FINDINGS

The research aims to know the effectiveness of using two theories in teaching English to young learners ( Piaget and Bruner ) in improving students' vocabulary of third grade students in SDN 1 Marabahan before learning through the use of those two theories and after learning through the use of those two theories.

To find out the effectiveness of using two theories in teaching English vocabulary to young learners ( Piaget and Buner), this research had four data, the data of students' vocabulary ability obtained from experiment class and control class there are pre test and post test. Here, the researcher describes about result of the research on the field that collected by techniques of data collection. English learning process at SDN 1 Marabahan at third grade students have been done eight time in four weeks. The test was done for 70 minutes for each class.

The researcher did the research on September, $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ 2017, until September $26^{\text {th }}$ 2017, the researcher gave the research letter from Official of Education in Marabahan City to Headmaster of SDN 1 Marabahan.

## 1. Pre - test Result

## a. Pre - test results in experiment class

The students was given pretest by answering 20 English questions. Pre - test is followed by 24 students. From the result of students'

English score calculation at the time of pretest obtained the lowest score was 40 and the highest score was 80 . Look at the table :

Table 4.1 Pre - test results in experiment class

| No | Name | Scores | Criteria |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Student 1 | 60 | Fair |
| 2 | Student 2 | 50 | Low |
| 3 | Student 3 | 55 | Low |
| 4 | Student 4 | 60 | Fair |
| 5 | Student 5 | 50 | Low |
| 6 | Student 6 | 40 | Very Low |
| 7 | Student 7 | 60 | Fair |
| 8 | Student 8 | 45 | Very Low |
| 9 | Student 9 | 65 | Fair |
| 10 | Student 10 | 60 | Fair |
| 11 | Student 11 | 50 | Low |
| 12 | Student 12 | 50 | Low |
| 13 | Student 13 | 50 | Low |
| 14 | Student 14 | 80 | Very Good |
| 15 | Student 15 | 55 | Low |
| 16 | Student 16 | 40 | Very Low |
| 17 | Student 17 | 50 | Low |
| 18 | Student 18 | 65 | Fair |
| 19 | Student 19 | 60 | Fair |
| 20 | Student 20 | 75 | Good |
| 21 | Student 21 | 45 | Very Low |
| 22 | Student 22 | 65 | Fair |
| 23 | Student 23 | 50 | Low |
| 24 | Student 24 | 55 | Low |

To know the students' vocabulary achievement of using Piaget and Bruner Theories for experiment class before using Piaget and Bruner Theories her research at the third grade students of SDN 1 Marabahan, to calculate the mean score of experiment class vocabulary test for pre test, the writer uses the accounting of mean score as follows:
$\mathrm{M}_{1}=\underline{\sum f \mathrm{x}}$
N
$=\frac{1318}{24}$
$=54,916$

Pre test mean for Experiment Class : 54,916

Based on the calculation above, it can be seen that the students' vocabulary achievement of using Piaget and Bruner Theories for Experiment Calss at the third grade students of SDN 1 Marabahan is conclude in less effective category.

## b. Pre - test results in control class

The students was given pretest by anwearing 20 english questions. Pre - test is followed by 22 students. From the result of students' English score calculation at the time of pretest obtained the lowest score was 35 and the highest score was 75 . Look at the table :

Table 4.2 Pre - test results in control class

| No | Name | Scores | Criteria |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Student 1 | 55 | Fair |
| 2 | Student 2 | 45 | Very Low |
| 3 | Student 3 | 50 | low |
| 4 | Student 4 | 40 | Very Low |
| 5 | Student 5 | 35 | Very Low |
| 6 | Student 6 | 35 | Very Low |
| 7 | Student 7 | 60 | Fair |
| 8 | Student 8 | 60 | Fair |
| 9 | Student 9 | 50 | Low |
| 10 | Student 10 | 55 | Low |
| 11 | Student 11 | 45 | Very Low |
| 12 | Student 12 | 65 | Fair |
| 13 | Student 13 | 45 | Very Low |
| 14 | Student 14 | 55 | Low |
| 15 | Student 15 | 50 | Low |
| 16 | Student 16 | 45 | Very Low |
| 17 | Student 17 | 75 | Good |
| 18 | Student 18 | 45 | Very Low |
| 19 | Student 19 | 55 | Low |
| 20 | Student 20 | 60 | Fair |
| 21 | Student 21 | 40 | Very Low |
| 22 | Student 22 | 60 | Fair |

To know the students' vocabulary achievement of using Vygotsky Theory for control class before trited use Piaget and Bruner Theories her research at the third grade students of SDN 1 Marabahan, to calculate the
mean score of control class vocabulary test for pre test, the writer uses the accounting of mean score as follows:
$\mathrm{M}_{2}=\underline{\sum X}$
N
$=\frac{1108}{22}$
$=50,3636$

Pre test mean for Control Class : 50,3636

Based on the calculation above, it can be seen that the students' vocabulary achievement of using Vygotsky Theory for control Calss at the third grade students of SDN 1 Marabahan is conclude in less effective category.

## 2. Post - test Result

## a. Post - test in Experiment class

Posttest research was held to 22 students from the same when done pretest. This research was carried out after students had been doing treatment by studying through two theories ( Piaget and Brunner ) for 4 weeks respectively. Posttest aimed to find out students' learning achievement after the given treatment by using two theories ( Piaget and Brunner ).

The number of tests as many as 20 and from the result of students'
English score calculation at the time the lowest score obtained was 75, the highest score was 100 and mean 87,625 . Look at the table :

Table 4.3 Post - test results in experiment class

| No | Name | Scores | Criteria |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Student 1 | 100 | Very Good |
| 2 | Student 2 | 85 | Very Good |
| 3 | Student 3 | 80 | Very Good |
| 4 | Student 4 | 95 | Very Good |
| 5 | Student 5 | 85 | Very Good |
| 6 | Student 6 | 75 | Good |
| 7 | Student 7 | 95 | Very Good |
| 8 | Student 8 | 75 | Good |
| 9 | Student 9 | 90 | Very Good |
| 10 | Student 10 | 80 | Very Good |
| 11 | Student 11 | 80 | Very Good |
| 12 | Student 12 | 85 | Very Good |
| 13 | Student 13 | 80 | Very Good |
| 14 | Student 14 | 90 | Very Good |
| 15 | Student 15 | 80 | Very Good |
| 16 | Student 16 | 75 | Good |
| 17 | Student 17 | 95 | Very Good |
| 18 | Student 18 | 100 | Very Good |
| 19 | Student 19 | 85 | Very Good |
| 20 | Student 20 | 100 | Very Good |
| 21 | Student 21 | 75 | Good |
| 22 | Student 22 | 80 | Very Good |
| 23 | Student 23 | 80 | Very Good |
| 24 | Student 24 | 90 | Very Good |

## b. Post - test results in control class

The students was given pretest by anwearing 20 english questions. Post - test is followed by 22 students. From the result of students' English score calculation at the time of pretest obtained the lowest score was 65 , the highest score was 90 and mean was 81,5455 . Look at the table :

Table 4.4 Post - test results in control class

| No | Name | Scores | Criteria |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Student 1 | 80 | Very Good |
| 2 | Student 2 | 80 | Very Good |
| 3 | Student 3 | 80 | Gery Good |
| 4 | Student 4 | 70 | Good |
| 5 | Student 5 | 70 | Fair |
| 6 | Student 6 | 65 | Very Good |
| 7 | Student 7 | 85 | Very Good |
| 8 | Student 8 | 85 | Very Good |
| 9 | Student 9 | 80 | Good Good |
| 10 | Student 10 | 85 | Gery Good |
| 11 | Student 11 | 70 | Very Good |
| 12 | Student 13 | 90 | Very Good |
| 13 | Student 14 | 75 | Good |
| 14 | Student 15 | 80 | Very Good |
| 15 | Student 16 | 80 | Good |
| 16 | Student 17 | 80 | Very Good |
| 17 | Student 18 | 90 |  |
| 18 | Student 19 | 75 | G5 |
| 19 |  | 9 | Gery |


| 20 | Student 20 | 90 | Very Good |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21 | Student 21 | 65 | Fair |
| 22 | Student 22 | 90 | Very Good |

Table 4.5 Normally test of pre test experiment class

| kelas <br> interval | batas <br> kelas | Z batas kelas | Luas Z <br> tabel | $\mathbf{E i}$ | $\mathbf{O i}$ | (Oi-Ei)2/Ei |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 6 |  | 7 |
|  | 38,5 | $-1,667295955$ | 0,4515 |  |  |  |
| $39-45$ |  |  | 0,1226 | 2,9424 | 4 | 0,380137901 |
|  | 45,5 | $-0,95636773$ | 0,3289 |  |  |  |
| $46-52$ |  |  | 0,2341 | 5,6184 | 7 | 0,339744155 |
|  | 52,5 | $-0,245439506$ | 0,0948 |  |  |  |
| $53-59$ |  |  | 0,0824 | 1,9776 | 3 | 0,528570874 |
|  | 59,5 | 0,465488718 | 0,1772 |  |  |  |
| $60-66$ |  |  | 0,2018 | 4,8432 | 8 | 2,0576037 |
|  | 66,5 | 1,176416943 | 0,379 |  |  |  |
| $67-73$ |  |  | 0,0909 | 2,1816 | 1 | 0,639979171 |
|  | 73,5 | 1,887345167 | 0,4699 |  |  |  |
| $74-80$ |  |  | 0,0253 | 0,6072 | 1 | 0,254103821 |
|  | 80,5 | 2,598273391 | 0,4952 |  |  |  |

Table 4.6 Normally Test of pre test control class

| kelas <br> interval | batas <br> kelas | $\mathbf{Z}$ batas kelas | Luas Z tabel | $\mathbf{E i}$ | $\mathbf{O i}$ | $\mathbf{( O i - E i ) 2 / E i}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $\mathbf{2}$ | 3 | 4 | 6 |  | 7 |
|  | 33,5 | $-1,707183729$ | 0,4554 |  |  |  |
| $34-40$ |  |  | 0,1165 | 2,563 | 4 | 0,805684354 |
|  | 40,5 | $-0,998541426$ | 0,3389 |  |  |  |
| $41-47$ |  |  | 0,2286 | 5,0292 | 6 | 0,187396135 |
|  | 47,5 | $-0,289899124$ | 0,1103 |  |  |  |
| $48-54$ |  |  | 0,0488 | 1,0736 | 3 | 3,456610432 |
|  | 54,5 | 0,418743179 | 0,1591 |  |  |  |
| $55-61$ |  |  | 0,2095 | 4,609 | 7 | 1,2403734 |
|  | 61,5 | 1,127385481 | 0,3686 |  |  |  |
| $62-68$ |  |  | 0,0978 | 3,1296 | 1 | 1,449129652 |
|  | 68,5 | 1,836027784 | 0,4664 |  |  |  |
| $69-75$ |  |  | 0,0281 | 0,8992 | 1 | 0,011299644 |



Based on table above, the researcher compered the normally test in pre test from expeiment class and control class which is calculated by Microsoft excel . From table significnt of normally test consist of X2 count and X2 table. The data distributed is normally if X2 count < X2 table. The result of Experiment class was 4,200 with significant 0,05 with the formula (1- $\alpha$ )(n-1) significant 0,05 and $(\mathrm{n}-1)=5$ so X 2 table is 11,07 . It means that the result of pre - test of experiment class was higher than the significant $(4,200<0,05)$. Then, the result of control class was 7,150 with significant 0,05 with the formula $(1-\alpha)(n-1)$ significant 0,05 and $(n-1)=5$ so X 2 table is 11,07 . It means that the result of pre test of control class was higher than the significant $(7,150<0,05)$. So, the data pre-test of experiment class and control class was normal distribution. (See Appendix 7).

Table 4.7 Normally of post tets experiment class

| kelas interval | batas <br> kelas | Z batas kelas | Luas Z tabel | Ei | Oi | (Oi-Ei)2/Ei |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 6 |  | 7 |
|  | 74,5 | 1,566004291 | 0,4525 |  |  |  |
| 75-79 |  |  | 0,121 | 2,904 | 4 | 0,41364187 |
| 79,5 |  | 0,969431228 | 0,3315 |  |  |  |
| 80-84 |  |  | 0,1872 | 4,4928 | 7 | 1,39913903 |
|  | 84,5 | 0,372858164 | 0,1443 |  |  |  |
| 85-89 |  |  | 0,1137 | 2,7288 | 4 | 0,59218317 |


|  89,5 0,705920393 0,258    <br> $90-94$   0,0443 1,0632 3 3,52821129 <br>  94,5 0,850338277 0,3023    <br> $95-99$   0,1184 2,8416 3 0,00882973 <br>  99,5 1,416861025 0,4207    <br> $100-$ <br> 104    0,0571 1,3704 3 |
| :--- |

Table 4.8 Normally test of post test control class

| kelas interval | batas kelas | Z batas kelas | Luas Z tabel | Ei | Oi | (Oi-Ei)2/Ei |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 6 |  | 7 |
|  | 64,5 | 0,501418116 | 0,1844 |  |  |  |
| 65-69 |  |  | 0,0476 | 1,0472 | 2 | 0,8669097 |
|  | 69,5 | 0,354335469 | 0,1368 |  |  |  |
| 70-74 |  |  | 0,0575 | 1,265 | 3 | 2,37962451 |
|  | 74,5 | 0,207252821 | 0,0793 |  |  |  |
| 75-79 |  |  | -0,0554 | -1,2188 | 2 | -8,5007166 |
|  | 79,5 | 0,060170174 | 0,0239 |  |  |  |
| 80-84 |  |  | 0,008 | 0,176 | 7 | 0,56788995 |
|  | 84,5 | 0,086912473 | 0,0319 |  |  |  |
| 85-89 |  |  | 0,0591 | 1,3002 | 4 | 5,60599911 |
|  | 89,5 | 0,233995121 | 0,091 |  |  |  |
| 90-94 |  |  | 0,057 | 1,254 | 4 | 6,01317065 |
|  | 94,5 | 0,381077768 | 0,148 |  |  |  |

jumlah
6,93287728

Based on table 4.7 and 4.8 above the researcher compared the normality test of post - test from experiment class and control class who calculated by

Microsoft Excel. The result of Experiment class was 7,87983066 with significant 0,05 . It means that the result of post - test of experiment class was higher than the significant $(7,879<0,05)$. Then, the result of control class was 6,93287728 with significant 0,05 . It means that the result of post - test of control class was higher than the significant $(6,932<0,05)$. Thus, the data post - test of experiment class and control class was normal distribution.

## 3. Homogeneity from Experiment and Control Class (Pre - Test)

The result of homogeneity in pre - test from experiment class and control class who calculated by Microsoft Excel was 1,009 . Which the significant of homogeneity test is 0,05 with the formula $(1-\alpha)(n-1)$ significant 0,05 and $(n-1)=$ ( $0,05: 23: 21$ ) so X 2 table is 2,035 . So, the result of homogeneit test in pre - test from experiment class and control was higher than the significant $(1,009<2,035)$. It means the data was homogeny. (See Appendix 10).

## 4. Homogeneity from Experiment and Control Class ( post - Test )

The result of homogeneity in post - test from experiment class and control class who calculated by Microsoft Excel was 1,0561 . Which the significant of homogeneity test is 0,05 with the formula $(1-\alpha)(n-1)$ significant 0,05 and $(n-1)=$ ( $0,05: 23: 21$ ) so X 2 table is 2,063. So, the result of homogeneit test in pre - test from experiment class and control was higher than the significant $(1,056<2,063)$. It means the data was homogeny. (See Appendix 11).

The table is 2,015 . To get the critical $t$ value $(t-\operatorname{table})$ at significant 0,05 and db is 44 . Then the researcher count the different between pre and post value and fine Mx 30 and My 18,909. Then fine $\Sigma \mathrm{x}^{\wedge} 2$ is 1400 and $\Sigma \mathrm{y}^{\wedge} 2$ is 10308,82 . So fine $t$ count is 2,303 . Because $t$ count $(2,303)$ is higher than $t$ table $(2,015)$. it means the mean different from experiment class and control class ( post - test) is significant. Then, if $t$ count $>t$ table, it means $H_{0}$ is rejected and $H_{a}$ is accepted. (See Appendix 12).

The last. From the decription above the mean score pre - test of experiment class was 54,916 it changed in post - test after the researcher gave treatment about Piaget and Bruner Theories was 87,625 .The mean score pre - test of control class was 50,363 it changed in post - test was 81,545 .Then, from pre test and post - test score to get a normality and homogeneity.

## 5. Calculation Results of Using Gain Score

To calculate the gain score uses formula as follows:
Gain score $\quad \begin{aligned}:\langle\mathrm{g}\rangle & = \\ & \underline{\text { xpost }- \text { xpre }} \\ & =\quad \underline{87,625-54,916} \\ & =100-54,916 \\ = & \underline{32,708} \\ & =0,75,084 \\ & =0,725\end{aligned}$
The table 4.9. The results of calculatation of Gain Score

| Class | Mean | Gain Score | Category |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pre test | 54,916 | 0,725 | High |
| Post test | 87,625 |  |  |

From the results obtained gain score 0,725 then it can be inferred that the effectiveness of using Piaget and Bruner theories to improve the student's English achievement is in high category.

## B. DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the discusion of the result of data analysis presented in chapter IV. It covers the discussion of the interpretation of the research findings. This research aims to know the effectiveness and the achievemet of using Piaget and Bruner Theories in teaching English vocabulary for young learners. The researchers first did pre - test for experiment class and got mean score 54,916 which of 24 students there were good score. 1 students got score with good category, 1student got score with good category, 8 students get score with fair category, 3 students got score with low category, and 11 students got score with very low category ( look at table 4.1). After a pre - test, then the students were given a treatment where they were taught by using Piaget and Bruner theories in the classroom. Then after given treatment and then held back a post - test. From the result obtained post - tets for experiment class very good with mean score 87,625 where now 20 students got score with very good category, 4 students got score with good category ( look at table 4.3).

The researchers did pre - test for controlclass and got mean score 50,363 which of 22 students there were good score. 1 student got score with good category, 4 students get score with fair category, 7 students got score with low category, and 10 students got score with very low category ( look at table 4.2). After a pre - test, then the students were given a treatment where they were taught by using another theory in the classroom. Then after given treatment and then held back a post - test. From the result obtained post - tets for control class with mean score 81,545 where now 15 students got score with very good category, 5 students got score with good category and 2 students got score with fair category (look at table 4.4).

Based table, it showed the data of pre- test of experiment class and control class was homogeny. Also, table showed homogenity test of post - test of experiment class and contol class was homogeny. Also, table showed homogeneity test of post - test of experiment class and control class was homogeny.

The pre - test of experiment class an control class. The result was homogenous but variances are not significant. Thus, the researcher must apply ttest. Meanwhile the result of $t$ test of pre - test of experiment class and control class. Then, it wsa indicated that the means of experiment class and control class were significantly different in teaching English vocabulary before the researcher doing treatment in experiment class.

Based on table, the result of post - test of experiment class and control class was homogenous. Also, the variance between experiment and control class was different. Thus, $\mathrm{t}-_{\text {test }}$ can be applied. Showed $\mathrm{t}-_{\text {count }}$ was higher than $\mathrm{t}-_{\text {table }}$ it means post -test of experiment class an control class was significant difference in the means. $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ was rejected and $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}$ was accepted. W. S. Gosset (1908). The T- test is used to test differences in the means of two groups. The grouping variable is categorical and data for the dependent variable is interval scaled. The following table showed alternative stastical tehniques that can be used to analyze this type of data when different levels of meansurement are available.

To give accurate data on the students' score improvement and to know the effectiveness using Piaget and Bruner theories in teaching English for young learners, then the results from pretest and posttest were clculated with gain score score formulaand got the score 0,725 which is categoriezed as a high category (look at Table 4.9). it means that using Piaget and Bruner theories in teaching English for young learners in improving students' English achievement is high effective.

As whole, the result of this research idicated that using Piaget an Bruner Theories in teaching English vocabulary by the researcher was effective. There was a difference between experiment class and control class before using Piaget and Bruner Theories. Then, after experiment class used Piaget and Bruner Theories in teaching English vocabulary the mean was increasing and higher than control class without using Piaget and Bruner Theories in teaching English.

