

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

A. Findings

1. Description of Data

The data of vocabulary mastery and listening ability of the eleventh grade students at the eleventh grade students at Integrated Islamic Senior High School Qardhan Hasana Banjarbaru School Year 2017/2016 was directly gotten from the research location. Data X (students' vocabulary mastery) was acquired from vocabulary written test that had been performed once for about 25 minutes. Furthermore, data Y (students' listening ability) was acquired from listening test that had been performed once for about 25 minutes as well.

Based on the result of vocabulary mastery test of the eleventh grade students at Integrated Islamic Senior High School Qardhan Hasana Banjarbaru School Year 2016/2017, it was found that the highest score is 100 and the lowest score is 30. The accumulated score is 5490. The result can be seen in the table below:

Table 4.1 Students' Vocabulary Mastery Scores

Number	Students' Names	Vocabulary mastery (X)
1	A	70
2	B	90
3	C	70
4	D	70
5	E	50

Continuing Table 4.1. Students' Vocabulary Mastery scores

6	F	90
7	G	60
8	H	70
9	I	70
10	J	70
11	K	90
12	L	60
13	M	90
14	N	100
15	O	70
16	P	60
17	Q	70
18	R	70
19	S	90
20	T	80
21	U	70
22	V	50
23	W	70
24	X	70
25	Y	90
26	Z	90
27	AA	70
28	AB	90
29	AC	60
30	AD	70
31	AE	60
32	AF	70
33	AG	80
34	AH	60
35	AI	70
36	AJ	80
37	AK	90
38	AL	100
39	AM	70
40	AN	70
41	AO	100
42	AP	60
43	AQ	40
44	AR	30
45	AS	70

Continuing Table 4.1. Students' Vocabulary Mastery scores

46	AT	70
47	AU	50
48	AV	80
49	AW	90
50	AX	100
51	AY	50
52	AZ	40
53	BA	100
54	BB	100
55	BC	90
56	BD	80
57	BE	60
58	BF	60
59	BG	70
60	BH	60
61	BI	40
62	BJ	70
63	BK	70
64	BL	80
65	BM	60
66	BN	100
67	BO	100
68	BP	70
69	BQ	80
70	BR	70
71	BS	50
72	BT	80
73	BU	90
74	BV	100
75	BW	60
	Total	$\Sigma X = 5490$

While, from the result of listening test of the eleventh grade students at Integrated Islamic Senior High School Qardhan Hasana Banjarbaru School Year 2017/2016, it is found that the highest score is 100 and the lowest score is 40. The accumulated score is 5720.

Table 4.2 Students' Listening Scores

Number	Students' Names	Listening ability (Y)
1	A	90
2	B	80
3	C	70
4	D	90
5	E	60
6	F	100
7	G	50
8	H	80
9	I	70
10	J	60
11	K	70
12	L	50
13	M	70
14	N	100
15	O	70
16	P	70
17	Q	90
18	R	60
19	S	70
20	T	90
21	U	60
22	V	60
23	W	80
24	X	70
25	Y	100
26	Z	70
27	AA	80
28	AB	70

Continuing Table 4.2. Students' Listening Ability scores

29	AC	50
30	AD	70
31	AE	50
32	AF	60
33	AG	60
34	AH	90
35	AI	40
36	AJ	100
37	AK	60
38	AL	100
39	AM	80
40	AN	90
41	AO	70
42	AP	70
43	AQ	50
44	AR	50
45	AS	100
46	AT	60
47	AU	70
48	AV	100
49	AW	90
50	AX	90
51	AY	60
52	AZ	60
53	BA	80
54	BB	100
55	BC	80
56	BD	90
57	BE	70
58	BF	60
59	BG	100
60	BH	80
61	BI	60
62	BJ	70
63	BK	100
64	BL	100
65	BM	80
66	BN	100
67	BO	90
68	BP	90

Continuing Table 4.2. Students' Listening Ability scores

69	BQ	100
70	BR	80
71	BS	60
72	BT	90
73	BU	80
74	BV	90
75	BW	70
	Total	$\sum Y = 5720$

2. Data Presentation about Students' Vocabulary Mastery

To know the students' level at the test, the writer classifies the data into 6 categories, namely excellent, good, sufficient, low, very low and poor as the standard score of the test. The clarification of students' ability can be seen in the table as below:

Table 4.3 Classification of students' in Vocabulary Mastery

Score	Frequency	Percentage	Category
80 – 100	29	38.66%	Excellent
70 - < 80	25	33.33%	Good
60 - < 70	12	16%	Sufficient
50 - < 60	5	6.66%	Low
40 - < 50	3	4%	Very low
0 - < 40	1	1.33%	Poor
Total	N = 75	100%	

The table above shows students' ability of vocabulary mastery. 38.66% students' are in excellent level, 33.33% students are in good level, 16% students are in sufficient level. But there are 6.66% students' who are in low level, 4% students are in very low level, and 1.33% students get poor level.

3. Data Presentation about Students' Listening ability

To know the students' level at the test, the writer classifies the data into 6 categories, namely excellent, good, sufficient, low, very low and poor as the standard score of the test. The clarification of students' ability can be seen in the table as below:

Table 4.4 Classification of students' in Listening Ability

Score	Frequency	Percentage	Category
80 – 100	37	49.33%	Excellent
70 - < 80	17	22.66%	Good
60 - < 70	14	18.66%	Sufficient
50 - < 60	6	8%	Low
40 - < 50	1	1.33%	Very low
0 - < 40	0%	0%	Poor
Total	N = 75	100%	

The table above shows students' achievement in listening ability. 49.33% students' are in excellent level, 22.66% in good level, 18.66% in sufficient level. But there are 8% students' who are in low level, 1.33% in very low level

4. Data Analysis

To define the degree of students vocabulary mastery and listening ability. The degree of correlation between students' vocabulary mastery and listening ability.

$$\overline{M_x} = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$

$$\overline{M_y} = \frac{\sum Y}{N}$$

Thus, based on the table score it can be know that:

$$\sum X = 5490$$

$$\sum Y = 5720$$

$$N = 75$$

$$\overline{M_x} = \frac{5490}{75} = 73.2$$

$$\overline{M_y} = \frac{5720}{75} = 76.26$$

After the mean of data X and Y are defined. The writer makes working table of the final score as in this table below:

Table 4.5. Working Table of Analyzing the Correlation

No.	X	Y	X	Y	XY	X ²	Y ²
1	70	90	-3.2	13.74	-43.968	10.24	188.7876
2	90	80	16.8	3.74	62.832	282.24	13.9876
3	70	70	-3.2	-6.26	20.032	10.24	39.1876
4	70	90	-3.2	13.74	-43.968	10.24	188.7876
5	50	60	-23.2	-16.26	377.232	538.24	264.3876
6	90	100	16.8	23.74	398.832	282.24	563.5876
7	60	50	-13.2	-26.26	346.632	174.24	689.5876
8	70	80	-3.2	3.74	-11.968	10.24	13.9876
9	70	70	-3.2	-6.26	20.032	10.24	39.1876
10	70	60	-3.2	-16.26	52.032	10.24	264.3876
11	90	70	16.8	-6.26	-105.168	282.24	39.1876
12	60	50	-13.2	-26.26	346.632	174.24	689.5876
13	90	70	16.8	-6.26	-105.168	282.24	39.1876
14	100	100	26.8	23.74	636.232	718.24	563.5876
15	70	70	-3.2	-6.26	20.032	10.24	39.1876
16	60	70	-13.2	-6.26	82.632	174.24	39.1876
17	70	90	-3.2	13.74	-43.968	10.24	188.7876
18	70	60	-3.2	-16.26	52.032	10.24	264.3876
19	90	70	16.8	-6.26	-105.168	282.24	39.1876
20	80	90	6.8	13.74	93.432	46.24	188.7876
21	70	60	-3.2	-16.26	52.032	10.24	264.3876
22	50	60	-23.2	-16.26	377.232	538.24	264.3876
23	70	80	-3.2	3.74	-11.968	10.24	13.9876
24	70	70	-3.2	-6.26	20.032	10.24	39.1876
25	90	100	16.8	23.74	398.832	282.24	563.5876
26	90	70	16.8	-6.26	-105.168	282.24	39.1876
27	70	80	-3.2	3.74	-11.968	10.24	13.9876
28	90	70	16.8	-6.26	-105.168	282.24	39.1876
29	60	50	-13.2	-26.26	346.632	174.24	689.5876
30	70	70	-3.2	-6.26	20.032	10.24	39.1876
31	60	50	-13.2	-26.26	346.632	174.24	689.5876
32	70	60	-3.2	-16.26	52.032	10.24	264.3876
33	80	60	6.8	-16.26	-110.568	46.24	264.3876
34	60	90	-13.2	13.74	-181.368	174.24	188.7876

Continuing Table 4.4. Working Table of Analyzing the Correlation

35	70	40	-3.2	-36.26	116.032	10.24	1314.788
36	80	100	6.8	23.74	161.432	46.24	563.5876
37	90	60	16.8	-16.26	-273.168	282.24	264.3876
38	100	100	26.8	23.74	636.232	718.24	563.5876
39	70	80	-3.2	3.74	-11.968	10.24	13.9876
40	70	90	-3.2	13.74	-43.968	10.24	188.7876
41	100	70	26.8	-6.26	-167.768	718.24	39.1876
42	60	70	-13.2	-6.26	82.632	174.24	39.1876
43	40	50	-33.2	-26.26	871.832	1102.24	689.5876
44	30	50	-43.2	-26.26	1134.432	1866.24	689.5876
45	70	100	-3.2	23.74	-75.968	10.24	563.5876
46	70	60	-3.2	-16.26	52.032	10.24	264.3876
47	50	70	-23.2	-6.26	145.232	538.24	39.1876
48	80	100	6.8	23.74	161.432	46.24	563.5876
49	90	90	16.8	13.74	230.832	282.24	188.7876
50	100	90	26.8	13.74	368.232	718.24	188.7876
51	50	60	-23.2	-16.26	377.232	538.24	264.3876
52	40	60	-33.2	-16.26	539.832	1102.24	264.3876
53	100	80	26.8	3.74	100.232	718.24	13.9876
54	100	100	26.8	23.74	636.232	718.24	563.5876
55	90	80	16.8	3.74	62.832	282.24	13.9876
56	80	90	6.8	13.74	93.432	46.24	188.7876
57	60	70	-13.2	-6.26	82.632	174.24	39.1876
58	60	60	-13.2	-16.26	214.632	174.24	264.3876
59	70	100	-3.2	23.74	-75.968	10.24	563.5876
60	60	80	-13.2	3.74	-49.368	174.24	13.9876
61	40	60	-33.2	-16.26	539.832	1102.24	264.3876
62	70	70	-3.2	-6.26	20.032	10.24	39.1876
63	70	100	-3.2	23.74	-75.968	10.24	563.5876
64	80	100	6.8	23.74	161.432	46.24	563.5876
65	60	80	-13.2	3.74	-49.368	174.24	13.9876
66	100	100	26.8	23.74	636.232	718.24	563.5876
67	100	90	26.8	13.74	368.232	718.24	188.7876
68	70	90	-3.2	13.74	-43.968	10.24	188.7876
69	80	100	6.8	23.74	161.432	46.24	563.5876
70	70	80	-3.2	3.74	-11.968	10.24	13.9876
71	50	60	-23.2	-16.26	377.232	538.24	264.3876
72	80	90	6.8	13.74	93.432	46.24	188.7876
73	90	80	16.8	3.74	62.832	282.24	13.9876
74	100	90	26.8	13.74	368.232	718.24	188.7876

Continuing Table 4.4. Working Table of Analyzing the Correlation

75	60	70	-13.2	-6.26	82.632	174.24	39.1876
N = 75	$\sum X =$ 5490	$\sum Y =$ 5720			$\sum XY =$ 11196	$\sum X^2 =$ 20432	$\sum Y^2 =$ 19754.67

Then, the writer determiner the degree of r_{xy} by implementing formula

as follows:

$$r_{xy} = \frac{\sum xy}{\sqrt{(\sum x^2)(\sum y^2)}}$$

Where:

r_{xy} = Coefficient correlation variables x and y

$\sum xy$ = The amount of multiplication between variable x and y

$\sum x^2$ = Deviation of X

$\sum y^2$ = Deviation of Y

Finally, from the working table, it can be known that:

$$\sum xy = 11196$$

$$\sum x^2 = 20432$$

$$\sum y^2 = 19754,67$$

$$\text{So, } r_{xy} = \frac{11196}{\sqrt{(20432)(19754.67)}}$$

$$= 0.557278$$

B. Discussion

After presenting the data, the writer analyzes all obtained data to give some consideration on the research.

1. Vocabulary Mastery

Vocabulary mastery test of the students of the eleventh grade students at Integrated Islamic Senior High School Qardhan Hasana Banjarbaru School Year 2016/2017. The presented data on the previous subchapter show that the most of students are in Excellent level 38.66%, 33.33% in good level, 16% in sufficient level. But there are 6.66% students' who are in low level, 4% in very low level, and 1.33% students get poor level. Thus, the total score of students' vocabulary mastery is 5490 from 75 students and the mean score is 73.2

2. Listening Ability

From the result of listening test of the eleventh grade students at Integrated Islamic Senior High School Qardhan Hasana Banjarbaru School Year 2016/2017. The presented data on the previous subchapter show that the most of students are in excellent level 49.33%, 22.66% in good level, 18.66% in sufficient level. But there are 8% students' who are in low level, 1.33% in very low level. However no one get poor level. Thus, the total score of students' listening ability is 5720 from 75 students and the mean score is 76.26

3. Correlation between students' vocabulary mastery and listening ability

Based on the counting above, r_{xy} is 0.557. By looking at the table of coefficient correlation degree of Person Product Moment, it can be known whether there is a significant correlation or not. For $N = 75$ r table in 5% is 0.227 and r table in 1% is 0.296. So, it appears the result that $0.227 < r_{xy} > 0.296$. So, it appears the result that $0.227 < 0.557 > 0.296$. According to Standard Classification of Correlation, the degree of correlation is positive and occurs in 0.400 - < 0.600 level. It can be stated that the correlation between vocabulary mastery and listing skill is sufficient category.

Staehr (2009) Investigates the role of both depth and breadth of vocabulary in 75 of learners' listening. His results revealed the sufficient correlation of both of breath and depth of vocabulary with listening ability (73.2 and 76.26) and that these two aspects together could contribute to half of the variance in listening ability scores.

The correlation between vocabulary mastery and listening ability relied on sufficient category (0.557) it means that there is sufficient positive correlation between vocabulary mastery and listening ability. So it can help the students understand the information in oral texts. by mastering vocabulary, listening will not come as a difficult thing to understand because the vocabulary that someone has mastered previously will guide and help him comprehend something that he is listening to. According to River (1993:462) stated that “a

learner of foreign language will understand much about oral languages or about what speakers say by mastering the vocabulary". It means that the null hypothesis (H_0) is denied and the hypothesis alternative (H_a) is accepted.