CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter consists of findings: the extent of morphological awareness of students, the extent of vocabulary size of students, and the relationship between morphological awareness and vocabulary size of students in Smart course, Pare, and discussion.

4.1. Findings

4.1.1. The Extent of Students' Morphological Awareness in Smart Course, Pare

To find the extent of morphological awareness of students in Smart course, it counted the scores of morphological awareness (MA) test as follows:

Table 4.1
Total Scores of morphological awareness test of students in Smart Course, Pare

No	NAME	RIGHT ANSWERS OF MA		TOTAL OF RIGHT ANSWERS (MA 1 & MA 2)	SCORE $S=\frac{R}{N} 100$
		MA 1	MA 2		
1	Nashran Humaidi	26	16	42	75
2	Naufal E	18	17	35	62,5
3	M.Burhanuddin R	27	17	44	79
4	Maruli Chaniago	32	14	46	82
5	Joni	18	12	30	54
6	M.Imran H.	28	17	45	80

40

7	Aziz	28	18	46	82
8	M.Iqbal Ma'rul	22	20	42	75
9	Diki Nur Faiz	26	16	42	75
10	Yusup Miranda	31	19	50	89
11	Muh Farid Hidayat	26	20	46	82
12	Opik	24	19	43	77
13	Fikri	27	19	46	82
14	Dwi Agus K	20	16	36	64
15	Abu Bakar S	21	14	35	62,5
16	Imam Widodo	13	4	17	30
17	Ismail Shaleh	27	15	52	75
18	Fitra	24	13	37	66
19	Mustafah	24	14	38	68
20	Zaid Ardha A L A	21	18	39	70
21	Febriyan Adi S	28	14	32	57
22	Frischa Amelia	20	15	35	62,5
23	Lusiana Indah P	17	11	28	50
24	Sally Kurnia S	23	16	39	70
25	Rizky Camelina	24	15	39	70
26	Alina Syafitri	17	9	26	46
27	Hana	21	11	32	57
28	Pipit Suci	29	19	48	86
29	Ariska Tiara Putri	23	17	40	71
30	Lela	15	15	30	54
31	Zanuba	24	15	39	70
32	Andi Jaya	30	20	50	89
33	Virtuoso S	26	19	45	80
34	Arianto K	30	18	48	86
35	Arip	24	14	38	68
36	Irdan	19	14	33	59
37	Alifian Ferry A	13	4	17	30
38	Pangestu	16	5	21	37,5
39	Ahmat Sangadji	19	12	31	55
40	Nuzul Banda	24	15	39	70
41	Paul Baru	21	14	35	62,5
42	Urbanus Momo	25	17	42	75

The data of students' morphological awareness were collected through morphological awareness test conducted on June, 17th 2016. This test is divided into two parts. Part 1 (MA 1) was Morpheme identification test. It consists of 14 items with total score 36 points where each item has more than two points. Meanwhile, part 2 (MA 2) was morphological structure test. It consists of 20 items which were scored one point in each item. Thus, total score of this test are 56 points. As the subjects of the participants were taken from grammar class and speaking class, the writer gave the scores of students tests based on their class clearly into below:

Table 4.2
Scores of morphological awareness test of students in the Grammar class

No	NAME	RIGHT ANSWERS OF MA		TOTAL OF RIGHT ANSWERS (MA 1 & MA 2)	SCORE $S=\frac{R}{N}100$
		MA 1	MA 2		
1	Nashran Humaidi	26	16	42	75
2	Naufal E	18	17	35	62,5
3	M.Burhanuddin R	27	17	44	79
4	Maruli Chaniago	32	14	46	82
5	Joni	18	12	30	54
6	M.Imran H.	28	17	45	80
7	Aziz	28	18	46	82
8	M.Iqbal Ma'rul	22	20	42	75
9	Diki Nur Faiz	26	16	42	75
10	Yusup Miranda	31	19	50	89
11	Muh Farid Hidayat	26	20	46	82
12	Opik	24	19	43	77
13	Fikri	27	19	46	82

14	Dwi Agus K	20	16	36	64
15	Abu Bakar S	21	14	35	62,5
16	Imam Widodo	13	4	17	30
17	Ismail Shaleh	27	15	52	75
18	Fitra	24	13	37	66
19	Mustafah	24	14	38	68
20	Zaid Ardha A L A	21	18	39	70
21	Febriyan Adi S	28	14	32	57

Based on the total score of MA test of student in grammar class, frequency distribution would be given as frequency distribution score and mean. In order to make distribution, there were several steps as follow:

1) Looking for maximum and minimum score

Maximum score = 89

Minimum score = 30

2) Looking for interval

$$P = \frac{range\ (R)}{amount\ of\ students\ (K)}$$

a)   Counting Range (R)

R = maximum data – minimum data

R = 89 – 30

R = 59

b)   Counting amount of students (K) with Sturges:

K = 1 + 3,3 log. N

$K = 1 + 3,3 \log. 21$

$K = 1 + 3,3 . 1,32$

$K = 1 + 4,36$

$K = 5,36$ integrated into 5

c) Interval (P)

$$P = \frac{range\ (R)}{amount\ of\ students\ (K)}$$

$$P = \frac{59}{5}$$

$P = 11,8$ integrated into 12

3) Deciding Mean

Based on the table above, the maximum score of MA test was 89. While, the minimum score of MA score was 30. In order to know the mean of variable x (MA), it counted as follow:

Table 4.3
Frequency Distribution Mean Score of MA test of students in Smart Course, Pare

Interval	F	F%	X	Fx	Mean
30 – 41	1	4,8%	35,5	35,5	$M = \frac{Fx}{N}$
42 – 53	0	0%	47,5	0	$= \frac{1489,5}{21}$
54 – 65	5	23,8%	59,5	297,5	

66 – 77	8	38,1%	71,5	572	= 70,9
78 – 89	7	33,3%	83,5	584,5	
Jumlah	**N= 21**	**100%**		**1489,5**	

4) Deciding qualification of variable X

Based on the result of the table above, the mean of students in grammar class was 70,9. In order to know the quality of the result, the table below was given:

Table 4.4
Quality of Variable of the Score Students' MA test

Interval	Quality
81 – 100	Very Good
61 – 80	Good
41 – 60	Enough
21 – 40	Low
00 – 20	Poor

Based on the table above, the writer concluded that mean score of students in grammar class in MA test was categorized in the interval 61 - 80. It meant that the morphological awareness of students was **"Good"**.

Table 4.5
Scores of morphological awareness test of students in speaking class

No	NAME	RIGHT ANSWERS OF MA		TOTAL OF RIGHT ANSWERS (MA 1 & MA 2)	SCORE $S=\frac{R}{N}$ 100
		MA 1	MA 2		
1	Frischa Amelia	20	15	35	62,5
2	Lusiana Indah P	17	11	28	50
3	Sally Kurnia S	23	16	39	70
4	Rizky Camelina	24	15	39	70
5	Alina Syafitri	17	9	26	46
6	Hana	21	11	32	57
7	Pipit Suci	29	19	48	86
8	Ariska Tiara Putri	23	17	40	71
9	Lela	15	15	30	54
10	Zanuba	24	15	39	70
11	Andi Jaya	30	20	50	89
12	Virtuoso S	26	19	45	80
13	Arianto K	30	18	48	86
14	Arip	24	14	38	68
15	Irdan	19	14	33	59
16	Alifian Ferry A	13	4	17	30
17	Pangestu	16	5	21	37,5
18	Ahmat Sangadji	19	12	31	55
19	Nuzul Banda	24	15	39	70
20	Paul Baru	21	14	35	62,5
21	Urbanus Momo	25	17	42	75

Based on the total score of MA test of student in speaking class, frequency distribution would be given as frequency distribution score and mean. In order to make distribution, there were several steps as follow:

1) Looking for maximum and minimum score

   Maximum score = 89

   Minimum score = 30

2) Looking for interval

   $$P = \frac{range\ (R)}{amount\ of\ students\ (K)}$$

   a) Counting Range (R)

   R = maximum data – minimum data

   R = 89 – 30

   R = 59

   b) Counting amount of students (K) with Sturges:

   K = 1 + 3,3 log. N

   K = 1 + 3,3 log. 21

   K = 1 + 3,3 . 1,32

   K = 1 + 4,36

   K = 5,36 integrated into 5

   c) Interval (P)

$$P = \frac{range\ (R)}{amount\ of\ students\ (K)}$$

$$P = \frac{59}{5}$$

P = 11,8 integrated into 12

d) Deciding Mean

Based on the table above, the maximum score of MA test was 89. While, the minimum score of MA score was 30. In order to know the mean of variable x (MA), it counted as follow:

Tabel 4.6
Frequency Distribution Mean Score of MA test of students in speaking class

Interval	F	F%	X	Fx	Mean
30 – 41	2	9,5%	35,5	71	
42 – 53	1	4,76%	47,5	47,1	$M = \frac{Fx}{N}$
54 – 65	6	28,6%	59,5	357	$= \frac{1489,5}{21}$
66 – 77	7	33,3%	71,5	500,5	
78 – 89	5	23,8%	83,5	417,5	= 66,3
Jumlah	**N= 21**	**100%**		**1393,1**	

e) Deciding qualification of variable X

Based on the result of the table above, the mean of students in speaking class was 66. In order to know the quality of the result, the table below was given:

Table 4.7
Quality of Variable of the Score Students' MA test

Interval	Quality
81 – 100	Very Good
61 – 80	Good
41 – 60	Enough
21 – 40	Low
00 – 20	Poor

Based on the table above, the writer concluded that mean score of students in speaking class in MA test was categorized in the interval 61 - 80. It meant that the morphological awareness of students was **"Good"**.

Based on the results of MA test both in grammar and speaking class, it showed that the mean score of grammar class was 71 while,

speaking class was 66. Thus, the morphological awareness of students in grammar class was higher than speaking class.

4.1.2. The Extent of Vocabulary Size of Students in Smart Course, Pare

To find the extent of vocabulary size of students in Smart course, it counted the scores of Vocabulary Level Test (VLT) test as follows:

Table 4.8

Total Scores of VLT's Students in Smart Course, Pare

No	NAME	VLT			TOTAL OF RIGHT ANSWERS (2000, 3000, 5000)	SCORE $S=\frac{R}{N} 100$
		2000	3000	5000		
1	Nashran H.	28	20	11	59	66
2	Naufal E	24	16	14	54	60
3	M.Burhanuddin R.	21	16	10	47	52
4	Maruli Chaniago	29	26	22	77	85,5
5	Joni	23	18	8	49	54
6	M.Imran H.	26	20	24	70	78
7	Aziz	26	23	18	67	74
8	M.Iqbal Ma'rul	27	23	10	60	67
9	Diki Nur Faiz	25	21	8	54	60
10	Yusup Miranda	29	28	30	87	97
11	M.Farid Hidayat	25	29	27	81	90
12	Opik	11	13	3	27	30
13	Fikri	26	19	18	63	70
14	Dwi Agus K	16	11	8	35	39
15	Abu Bakar S.	17	15	13	45	50
16	Imam Widodo	14	10	4	28	31
17	Ismail Shaleh	12	9	3	24	27
18	Fitra	8	9	10	27	30
19	Mustafah	7	9	7	23	26

20	Zaid Ardha	15	14	10	39	43
21	Febriyan Adi S	7	3	2	12	13
22	Frischa Amelia	9	11	3	23	26
23	Lusiana Indah P	7	5	5	17	19
24	Sally Kurnia S	24	18	22	64	71
25	Rizky Camelina	17	13	4	34	38
26	Alina Syafitri	20	15	6	41	45,5
27	Hana	16	16	9	41	45,5
28	Pipit Suci	22	20	12	54	60
29	Ariska Tiara Putri	18	16	10	44	49
30	Lela	10	8	2	20	22
31	Zanuba	6	10	3	19	21
32	Andi Jaya	17	16	14	47	52
33	Virtuoso S	21	19	9	49	54
34	Arianto K	9	10	10	29	32
35	Arip	19	16	13	48	53
36	Irdan	12	3	10	25	28
37	Febriyan Adi S	7	3	2	12	13
38	Pangestu	9	4	7	20	22
39	Ahmat Sangadji	9	7	0	16	18
40	Nuzul Banda	11	12	2	25	28
41	Paul Baru	18	11	3	32	35,5
42	Urbanus Momo	8	6	5	19	21

The data of students' vocabulary size were collected through VLT conducted on June, 18th 2016. This test consists of 3 levels; 2,000 word-level, 3,000 word-level, and 5,000 word-level. Each level consists of ten parts where 3 items are in each part. Thus, total of the items are 30 in each level. Overall this test consists of 90 items. As each item scored 1 point, the total score of this test are 90 points. In order to know the results of students

both in grammar class and speaking class, the writer gave the data clearly

into below:

Table 4.9

Scores of VLT's Students in Grammar Class

No	NAME	VLT			TOTAL OF RIGHT ANSWERS (2000, 3000, 5000)	SCORE $S=\frac{R}{N}$ 100
		2000	3000	5000		
1	Nashran H.	28	20	11	59	66
2	Naufal E	24	16	14	54	60
3	M.Burhanuddin R.	21	16	10	47	52
4	Maruli Chaniago	29	26	22	77	85,5
5	Joni	23	18	8	49	54
6	M.Imran H.	26	20	24	70	78
7	Aziz	26	23	18	67	74
8	M.Iqbal Ma'rul	27	23	10	60	67
9	Diki Nur Faiz	25	21	8	54	60
10	Yusup Miranda	29	28	30	87	97
11	M.Farid Hidayat	25	29	27	81	90
12	Opik	11	13	3	27	30
13	Fikri	26	19	18	63	70
14	Dwi Agus K	16	11	8	35	39
15	Abu Bakar S.	17	15	13	45	50
16	Imam Widodo	14	10	4	28	31
17	Ismail Shaleh	12	9	3	24	27
18	Fitra	8	9	10	27	30
19	Mustafah	7	9	7	23	26
20	Zaid Ardha	15	14	10	39	43
21	Febriyan Adi S	7	3	2	12	13

Based on the total score of VLT, frequency distribution would be given as frequency distribution score and mean. In order to make distribution, there were several steps as follow:

1) Looking for maximum and minimum score

Maximum score = 97

Minimum score = 13

2) Looking for interval

$$P = \frac{range\ (R)}{amount\ of\ students\ (K)}$$

a) Counting Range (R)

R = maximum data – minimum data

R = 97 – 13

R = 84

b) Counting amount of students (K) with Sturges:

K = 1 + 3,3 log. N

K = 1 + 3,3 log. 21

K = 1 + 3,3 . 1,32

K = 1 + 4,36

K = 5,36 integrated into 5

c) Interval (P)

$$P = \frac{range\ (R)}{amount\ of\ students\ (K)}$$

$$P = \frac{84}{5}$$

P = 16,8 integrated into 17

3) Deciding Mean

Based on the table above, the maximum score of VLT was 97. While, the minimum score of VLT score was 13. In order to know the mean of variable Y (VLT), it counted as follow:

Table 4.10
Frequency Distribution Mean Score of VLT of Grammar Class

Interval	F	F%	X	Fx	Mean
13 – 29	3	14,2%	21	63	
30 – 46	5	23,9%	38	190	$M = \frac{Fx}{N}$
47 – 63	6	28,6%	55	330	$= \frac{1138}{21}$
64 – 80	4	19%	72	288	
81 – 97	3	14,2%	89	267	= 54,1
Jumlah	**N=21**	**100%**		**1138**	

4) Deciding qualification of variable Y

Based on the result of the table above, mean of the students' vocabulary size in grammar class was 54,1. In order to know the quality of the result, the table below was given:

Table 4.11

Quality of Variable of the Result Students' MA test

Interval	Quality
81 – 100	Very Good
61 – 80	Good
41 – 60	Enough
21 – 40	Low
00 – 20	Poor

Based on the table above, it concluded that mean score of students' VLT in grammar class was categorized in the interval 41 - 60. It meant that the vocabulary size of students was **"Enough"**.

Table 4.12

Scores of VLT Students in Speaking Class

No	NAME	VLT			TOTAL OF RIGHT ANSWERS (2000, 3000, 5000)	SCORE $S=\frac{R}{N}$ 100
		2000	3000	5000		
1	Frischa Amelia	9	11	3	23	26
2	Lusiana Indah P	7	5	5	17	19
3	Sally Kurnia S	24	18	22	64	71
4	Rizky Camelina	17	13	4	34	38
5	Alina Syafitri	20	15	6	41	45,5
6	Hana	16	16	9	41	45,5
7	Pipit Suci	22	20	12	54	60
8	Ariska Tiara Putri	18	16	10	44	49
9	Lela	10	8	2	20	22
10	Zanuba	6	10	3	19	21
11	Andi Jaya	17	16	14	47	52
12	Virtuoso S	21	19	9	49	54
13	Arianto K	9	10	10	29	32
14	Arip	19	16	13	48	53
15	Irdan	12	3	10	25	28
16	Febriyan Adi S	7	3	2	12	13
17	Pangestu	9	4	7	20	22
18	Ahmat Sangadji	9	7	0	16	18
19	Nuzul Banda	11	12	2	25	28
20	Paul Baru	18	11	3	32	35,5
21	Urbanus Momo	8	6	5	19	21

Based on the total score of VLT, frequency distribution would be given as frequency distribution score and mean. In order to make distribution, there were several steps as follow:

1) Looking for maximum and minimum score

Maximum score = 71

Minimum score = 18

2) Looking for interval

$$P = \frac{range\ (R)}{amount\ of\ students\ (K)}$$

a) Counting Range (R)

R = maximum data – minimum data

R = 71 – 18

R = 53

b) Counting amount of students (K) with Sturges:

K = 1 + 3,3 log. N

K = 1 + 3,3 log. 21

K = 1 + 3,3 . 1,32

K = 1 + 4,36

K = 5,36 integrated into 5

c) Interval (P)

$$P = \frac{range\ (R)}{amount\ of\ students\ (K)}$$

$$P = \frac{53}{5}$$

P = 10,6 integrated into 11

d) Deciding Mean

Based on the table above, the maximum score of VLT was 71. While, the minimum score of VLT score was 18. In order to know the mean of variable Y (VLT), it counted as follow:

Table 4.13
Frequency Distribution Mean Score of VLT in Speaking Class

Interval	F	F%	X	Fx	Mean
18 – 28	10	47,6%	23	230	
29 – 39	3	14,3%	34	105	$M = \frac{Fx}{N}$
40 – 50	3	14,3%	45	135	$= \frac{760,5}{21}$
51 – 61	4	19%	56	224	
62 – 71	1	4,8%	66,5	66,5	= 36,2
Jumlah	**N=21**	**100%**		**760,5**	

e) Deciding qualification of variable Y

Based on the result of the table above, mean of the students' vocabulary size in speaking class was 36,2. In order to know the quality of the result, the table below was given:

Table 4.14
Quality of Variable of the Result Students' VLT test

Interval	Quality
81 – 100	Very Good
61 – 80	Good
41 – 60	Enough
21 – 40	Low
00 – 20	Poor

Based on the table above, it was concluded that mean score of students' VLT in the speaking class was categorized in the interval 21 - 40. It meant that the vocabulary size of students was **"Low"**.

Based on the results of VLT both in grammar and speaking class, it showed that the mean score of grammar class was 54,1 while, speaking class was 36,2. Thus, the vocabulary size of students in grammar class was higher than speaking class.

4.1.3. The Relationship between Morphological Awareness and Vocabulary Size of Students in Smart Course Pare.

In order to get the answer of the last research question whether there is relationship between variable X (morphological awareness) and variable Y

(vocabulary size) of students in Smart Course in Pare, the writer used statistical hypothesis using *Pearson Product Moment* as follow:

a. H_1 and H_0 in the sentence

H_1 = there is relationship between variable X (morphological awareness) and variable Y (vocabulary size) or there is relationship between students' morphological awareness and their English vocabulary size in Smart Course, Pare.

H_0 = there is no relationship between variable X (morphological awareness) and variable Y (vocabulary size) or there is no relationship between students' morphological awareness and their English vocabulary size in Smart Course, Pare.

b. H_1 dan H_0 in statistic

$H_1 : r_{value} > r_{table}$

$H_0 : r_{value} \leq r_{table}$

c. Table of *Pearson Product Moment*

Table 4.15
Table of *Pearson Product Moment*

NO	X (MA)	Y (VLT)	XY	X2	Y2
1	75	66	4950	5625	4356
2	62,5	60	3750	3906,25	3600

3	79	52	4108	6241	2704
4	82	85,5	7011	6724	7310,25
5	54	54	2916	2916	2916
6	80	78	6240	6400	6084
7	82	74	6068	6724	5476
8	75	67	5025	5625	4489
9	75	60	4500	5625	3600
10	89	97	8633	7921	9409
11	82	90	7380	6724	8100
12	77	30	2310	5929	900
13	82	70	5740	6724	4900
14	64	39	2496	4096	1521
15	62,5	50	3125	3906,25	2500
16	30	31	930	900	961
17	75	27	2025	5625	729
18	66	30	1980	4356	900
19	68	26	1768	4624	676
20	70	43	3010	4900	1849
21	57	13	741	3249	169
22	62,5	26	1625	3906,25	676
23	50	19	950	2500	361

24	70	71	4970	4900	5041
25	70	38	2660	4900	1444
26	46	45,5	2093	2116	2070,25
27	57	45,5	2593,5	3249	2070,25
28	86	60	5160	7396	3600
29	71	49	3479	5041	2401
30	54	22	1188	2916	484
31	70	21	1470	4900	441
32	89	52	4628	7921	2704
33	80	54	4320	6400	2916
34	86	32	2752	7396	1024
35	68	53	3604	4624	2809
36	59	28	1652	3481	784
37	30	21	630	900	441
38	37,5	22	825	1406,25	484
39	55	18	990	3025	324
40	70	28	1960	4900	784
41	62,5	35,5	2218,75	3906,25	1260,25
42	75	21	1575	5625	441
TOTAL	**2835,5**	**1904**	**136049,3**	**200149,3**	**105709**

d. Quantification of *Pearson Product Moment*

Based on the table above, *Pearson Product Moment*, it can be known as follow:

N   = 42

X   = 2835,5

Y   = 1904

XY= 136049,3

X^2 = 200149,3

Y^2 = 105709

The formula of counting *Pearson Product Moment* was as follow:

$$r_{xy} = \frac{N \Sigma xy - (\Sigma x)(\Sigma y)}{\sqrt{[N \Sigma x^2 - (\Sigma x)^2][N \Sigma y^2 - (\Sigma y)^2]}}$$

$$= \frac{42 \times 136049,3 - (\Sigma 2835,5)(\Sigma 1904)}{\sqrt{[42 \Sigma 200149,3 - (\Sigma 2835,5)^2][42 \Sigma 105709 - (\Sigma 1904)^2]}}$$

$$= \frac{5714070,6 - 5398792}{\sqrt{[8406270,6 - 8040060,25][4439778 - 3625216]}}$$

$$= \frac{315278,6}{\sqrt{366210,35 \times 814562}}$$

$$= \frac{315278,6}{\sqrt{298301035116,7}}$$

$$= \frac{315278,6}{546169,4197}$$

$$= 0,577$$

Based on the formula of *Pearson Product Moment* above, it can be known that the result of r_{value} was 0,577. In order to know the hypothesis testing, it would compare r_{value} with r_{table} *Pearson product moment* where n (42) in the correlation coefficient at 5% or 0.05 margin of error. Thus, the result of r_{table} where n = 42, significant at 0,05-level was 0,304.

In order to make the result more valid, the writer also used Pearson Product Moment using SPSS 16.0. The result obtained from this computation was presented in the following table:

Table 4.16
SPSS Analysis of Pearson Correlations between
Morphological Awareness Test And Vocabulary Level Test
Scores (n=42)

Correlations

		MA Score	VLT Score
Morphological Awareness	Pearson Correlation	1	.578[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	42	42
Vocabulary Size	Pearson Correlation	.578[**]	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	42	42

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4.8 showed the SPSS analysis of Pearson Correlation coefficient between the scores of morphological awareness and vocabulary size tests to 42 students. The Pearson Analysis produced a positive average correlation of 0,578, which meant students' morphological awareness was found to be correlated with their vocabulary size. This Correlation Analysis was calculated at 0,05 (5%) –level but the result showed that this calculated was also significant at 0,01 –level (1%) margin of error.

4.1.4. Hypothesis Testing

The hypothesis testing tested the hypothesis which the writer stated "there is significant correlation between Morphological Awareness and Vocabulary size of students in Smart course, Pare."

To test the hypothesis, it was done by compare r_{value} with r_{table} of *Pearson Product Moment* with n = (42), and significant at 0.05 –level margin of error.

Based on the hypothesis analysis above, the result of r_{value} is 0,578 and r_{table} with n = 42, in the significant at 0,05 –level was 0,304. As r_{value} was higher than r_{table} (0,578 > 0,304) so, H_0 was rejected and H_1 was accepted. Therefore, the conclusion was there is significant correlation between Morphological Awareness (variable X) and Vocabulary size (variable Y) of students in Smart course, Pare.

Furthermore, in order to know more about the strength of the correlation between morphological awareness (variable x) and vocabulary size (variable y) of students in Smart course, Pare, the result of r_{xy} = 0,578 was shown in the table of interpretation value of *r Pearson Product Moment*, was between 0,40 – 0,59 which means that the correlation between variable X and variable Y was average.

Therefore, the results showed that there was relationship between morphological awareness (variable X) and vocabulary size (Y) of students in Smart Course, Pare in the level of correlation in average.

4.2 Discussion

Based on the table 4.4, the mean of morphological awareness test score of grammar class was categorized "Good" (70,9). There was 1 student got lowest score and 7 students got highest score. Meanwhile, in the table 4.7, the mean of morphological awareness test score of speaking class showed category "Good" (66,3). 5 students got highest score and 2 students got lowest score. In addition in the VLT, grammar class got mean 54,1 (table 4.10) categorized "Enough". 3 students got lowest score and 3 students got highest score. Meanwhile, speaking class showed the mean 36,2 (table 4.13) categorized "Low". Only 1 student got highest score and 10 students got lowest score. It can be stated that the students

of grammar class did better both in MA test and VLT rather than speaking class. In addition, the correlation between morphological awareness and vocabulary size of students in table 4.7 where Pearson Correlation using SPSS 16 was calculated showed that Pearson Analysis produced a positive average correlation at 0,578, significant at 0,05 –level (5%) margin of error. Thus, the writer hypothesis was accepted where $r_{value} = 0,578$ was higher than $r_{table} = 0,304$. In statistics, it was written as $H_1 = r_{value} > r_{table}$. In conclusion, H_1 was accepted, "there was relationship between morphological awareness and vocabulary size of students in Smart course, Pare."

This study has different result from the previous study. As Nurhemida (2007) investigated the relationship between morphological awareness and vocabulary knowledge in the context of English as Foreign Language (EFL) for senior high school students in Indonesia. She took 2 different area of studies; social science class and natural science and analyzed it using ANOVA. The results showed that natural science class had better score of the test than social science. In addition the final result, there was significant relationship between morphological awareness and vocabulary size of students. Another research is done by Rosalina (2012) in her thesis who examined the correlation between morphological awareness and vocabulary size of students in senior high school in Bandar Lampung. The result showed that morphological awareness contributes 62,3% to their vocabulary size and 37,7%. This means that there is

correlation between morphological awareness and vocabulary size of students in SMA Bandar Lampung. In addition, Al-Farsi (2008) analyzed morphological awareness and its relationship to vocabulary knowledge and morphological complexity among Omani EFL University students. The result showed that no relationships were found between morphological awareness and vocabulary size and word complexity among Omani University students. Based on the previous studies, the writer got the gap to investigate students in Smart course, Pare as EFL and to find out whether any relationship between morphological awareness and vocabulary size of students in a course. The result showed that there was relationship between morphological awareness and vocabulary size of Smart course with the level of correlation in average.

In this research, the analysis presented the relationship between morphological awareness and vocabulary size of students in Smart course. This is expected that the result of this study might be useful for reader to know the relationship of morphological awareness and vocabulary size. Thus, the reader is able to use morphological strategy to acquire vocabulary knowledge.