

INCREASING STUDENTS' VOCABULARY BY USING LIST-GROUP-LABEL STRATEGY AT THE SEVENTH GRADE OF MTs DDI DARUL ULUM KALANGKANGAN

Moh Firmansyah

English Education Study Program
Teacher Training and Education Faculty of Madako University

ABSTRACT

This research aims to find out whether the use of List-Group-Label Strategy can increase students' vocabulary at the seventh grade of MTs DDI Darul Ulum kalangkangan. This research design belongs to a quasi-experimental research. There were two classes, namely VII A as control class (without List-Group-Label Strategy) with the total number of 23 students and VII B as experiment class (taught by List-Group-Label Strategy) with the total number of 22 students. The researcher gave pre-test and post-test to both groups. The researcher used SPSS 16.0 program to analyze the data. The result of data analysis showed that List-Group-Label strategy give a significant effect to the increasing students vocabulary specially noun. The mean score of post-test experiment (65.4091) was higher than the mean score of post-test control (49.6087). Then, the testing hypothesis showed that the value of score T_{test} is greater than T_{table} ($-2.862 > 1.681$). In conclusion, the application of List-Group-Label strategy is effective to increasing students' vocabulary especially noun.

Key words: Increasing, noun, and List-Group-Label.

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui apakah penggunaan strategi Daftar-Kelompok-Nama dapat meningkatkan kosakata siswa pada kelas Tujuh MTS DDI Darul Ulum kalangkangan. Penelitian ini menggunakan model metode eksperimen semu. Ada dua kelas dalam penelitian ini, kelas kontrol VII A (tanpa Daftar-Kelompok-Nama) dengan jumlah siswa 23 dan VII B sebagai kelas eksperimen (mengajar strategi Daftar-Kelompok-Nama) dengan jumlah 22 siswa. Peneliti memberikan pre-test dan post-test untuk kedua kelompok. Peneliti menggunakan SPSS 16.0 untuk menganalisis data. Hasil dari analisis data menunjukkan bahwa strategi Daftar-Kelompok-Nama memberikan pengaruh yang signifikan kepada siswa dalam meningkatkan kosakata siswa khususnya kata benda. Nilai rata-rata pada post-test eksperimen (65.4091) lebih tinggi dibandingkan dengan nilai rata-rata pada post-test kontrol (49.6087). Kemudian, uji hipotesis menunjukkan bahwa T_{test} lebih besar dari T_{table} ($-2.862 > 1.681$). Dapat disimpulkan, penerapan dari strategi Daftar-Kelompok-Nama efektif meningkatkan kosakata siswa khususnya kata benda.

Kata Kunci: Meningkatkan, kata benda, Daftar-Kelompok-Nama.

1. Introduction

Vocabulary is one of the important elements of language proficiency that become the four bases of how well learners speak, write, listen, and read. According to Ricards (2001) said that the process of teaching and learning vocabulary in English requires seriousness to get to success. It means that vocabulary is all the words of a language or the words used by a particular person or group.

Furthermore, According to Napa (2006) said that no language exists without words, words are signs of symbol for ideas the more words we learn, the more ideas we should have so we can communicate the ideas more effectively. It means that vocabulary is a collection of words which has meaning.

However, According to Thornbury (2005) said that without vocabulary nothing can be conveyed only with sufficient vocabulary one can express his ideas effectively, can understand the language task and foreign language conversation with the limited vocabulary the students will have the difficulties in learning and understanding the foreign language. It can be concluded that very important to know the first vocabulary when learning the language.

In addition, vocabulary is important that should we have known. The words or vocabularies can be spoken and also written Aebersold and Field (2009) said that classify vocabulary into two terms, there are Active vocabulary (productive vocabulary) and Passive vocabulary (receptive vocabulary). Meanwhile, According to Wallace (1982) said that the teacher follows the principles in mastering vocabulary as follows: Aims, Quantity, Needs, Frequent exposure and Repetition, Meaningful presentation, and Situation of presentation.

According to Bellafiore (1968) said that the more vocabulary we know, the easier it is to learn English. It can be concluded before learning English we first understand the meaning of the vocabulary so that it is easier to understand.

Based on the discussion above, the researcher did a research teaching vocabulary by using List-Group-Label strategy at MTs DDI Darul Ulum Kalangakangan exactly in seventh grade as a subject. MTs DDI Darul Ulum Kalangakangan uses Curriculum 2013 in teaching and learning process. In teaching and learning process, the students are expected to be able to increase, apply and analyze of the words. According to Gifford (2010) said that LGL strategy is used to develop students' thinking in categorizing their vocabulary and give motivation to the students to understand vocabulary more easily. Moreover, according to Ruddell (2014) said that the LGL strategy has three steps in its implementation. The first step is the list, the list is writing vocabulary related to the given theme. The second step is the group, the group is a group of related vocabulary, the last step is the label, and the label is giving the name to the group of words that have been grouped.

Through, List-Group-Label (LGL) strategy allows the students to work in the group while they are brainstorming and listing the words related to a topic. The activities in this strategy include listing, grouping, and follow up need students' active role and participation and they need to interact with each other.

2. Method of the Research

The design of this research was a quasi-experimental research design. The researcher applied it to find out whether the used of List-Group-Label strategy can increase students' vocabulary or not. This research involved two groups, the first group as an experiment group with pre-test, treatment, and post-test design and the second group as a control group with pre-test and post-test. The control group was not applied to treatment by the researcher. After conducting several meetings, the students were tested again in post-test to measure the students'

achievement of vocabulary after conducting the treatment. The sample of this research was the seventh grade of MTs DDI Darul Ulum Kalangkangan in academic year 2017/2018. It was determined by applying purposive sampling. The total numbers of the sample were 45 students.

3. Findings and Discussion

3.1 The Result of Pre-test and post-test in control class

The result of the test would be described in following table:

Table 4.1
The Result of Pre-Test in control Class

No	Name	Scores	Score obtained	Category	Qualification
1	AFF	10	28	Poor	Failed
2	ASM	14	40	Poor	Failed
3	ARY	18	51	Poor	Failed
4	ALW	11	31	Poor	Failed
5	ARH	16	45	Poor	Failed
6	AWD	8	22	Poor	Failed
7	DSI	16	45	Poor	Failed
8	FDL	16	45	Poor	Failed
9	HKL	13	37	Poor	Failed
10	HLN	10	28	Poor	Failed
11	ISK	20	57	Poor	Failed
12	MFR	20	57	Poor	Failed
13	MSR	13	37	Poor	Failed
14	NRL	20	57	Poor	Failed
15	NRW	21	60	Poor	Failed
16	PLD	8	22	Poor	Failed
17	RHT	8	22	Poor	Failed
18	RSK	8	22	Poor	Failed
19	RSKS	11	31	Poor	Failed
20	SPY	11	31	Poor	Failed
21	SKN	19	54	Poor	Failed
22	TSY	22	62	Poor	Failed
23	TRA	24	68	Poor	Failed
Total (Σ)		337	952		

From the table above showed the results of the students' pre-test score controlled class. The data showed at pre-test the maximum score is 68 and the minimum score was 22. 1 student who got the maximum and 4 students who got the minimum score at the pre-test in controlled class. The researcher concluded that in the pre-test most of the students got the poor grade.

Table 4.2
The Result of Post-Test in control Class

No	Name	Scores	Score obtained	Category	Qualification
1	AFF	24	68	Poor	Failed
2	ASM	22	62	Poor	Failed
3	ARY	22	62	Poor	Failed
4	ALW	7	20	Poor	Failed
5	ARH	20	57	Poor	Failed
6	AWD	12	34	Poor	Failed
7	DSI	24	68	Poor	Failed
8	FDL	15	42	Poor	Failed
9	HKL	11	31	Poor	Failed
10	HLN	13	37	Poor	Failed
11	ISK	20	57	Poor	Failed
12	MFR	19	54	Poor	Failed
13	MSR	21	60	Poor	Failed
14	NRL	24	68	Poor	Failed
15	NRW	24	68	Poor	Failed
16	PLD	8	22	Poor	Failed
17	RHT	7	20	Poor	Failed
18	RSK	14	40	Poor	Failed
19	RSKS	11	31	Poor	Failed
20	SPY	11	31	Poor	Failed
21	SKN	21	60	Poor	Failed
22	TSY	25	71	Fair	Successful
23	TRA	24	68	Poor	Failed
Total (Σ)		399	1131		

The data showed at post-test the maximum score is 71 and the minimum score was 20. 1 student who got the maximum and 2 students who got the minimum score in post-test at controlled class. The researcher concluded that in the post-test the students had the achievement.

3.2 The Result of Pre-Test and Post-Test in Experiment Class

The score they got in these test would be described in following table:

Table 4.4
The Result of Pre-Test in experiment Class

No	Name	Scores	Score obtained	Category	Qualification
1	AGS	9	25	Poor	Failed
2	FKI	17	48	Poor	Failed
3	FDY	18	51	Poor	Failed
4	HDR	20	57	Poor	Failed
5	HRD	20	57	Poor	Failed
6	HKL	8	22	Poor	Failed
7	JNT	7	20	Poor	Failed
8	MFT	25	71	Fair	Successful

9	MIL	9	25	Poor	Failed
10	MRY	13	37	Poor	Failed
11	MSHL	13	37	Poor	Failed
12	MZL	12	34	Poor	Failed
13	MPG	12	34	Poor	Failed
14	MRSW	10	28	Poor	Failed
15	MAR	12	34	Poor	Failed
16	NAL	17	48	Poor	Failed
17	PKN	23	65	Poor	Failed
18	RMD	11	31	Poor	Failed
19	RDH	18	51	Poor	Failed
20	RFI	10	28	Poor	Failed
21	SPA	13	37	Poor	Failed
22	SLA	10	28	Poor	Failed
Total (Σ)		307	868		

The table above showed the results of the students' pre-test score and post-test score in the experimental class. The data showed at pre-test the maximum score is 71 and the minimum score was 20. 1 student got the maximum and 1 student got the minimum score at the pre-test in experimental class. The researcher concluded that in the pre-test most of the students got the poor grade.

Table 4.5
The Result of Post-Test in experiment Class

No	Name	Scores	Score obtained	Category	Qualification
1	AGS	23	65	Poor	Failed
2	FKI	29	82	Good	Successful
3	FDY	28	80	Good	Successful
4	HDR	20	57	Poor	Failed
5	HRD	21	60	Poor	Failed
6	HKL	10	28	Poor	Failed
7	JNT	13	37	Poor	Failed
8	MFT	34	97	Excellent	Successful
9	MIL	22	62	Poor	Failed
10	MRY	13	37	Poor	Failed
11	MSHL	25	71	Fair	Successful
12	MZL	25	71	Fair	Successful
13	MPG	29	82	Good	Successful
14	MRSW	17	48	Poor	Failed
15	MAR	29	82	Good	Successful
16	NAL	24	68	Poor	Failed
17	PKN	33	94	Excellent	Successful
18	RMD	20	57	Poor	Failed

19	RDH	24	68	Poor	Failed
20	RFI	12	34	Poor	Failed
21	SPA	14	40	Poor	Failed
22	SLA	25	71	Fair	Successful
Total (Σ)		490	1391		

The data showed at post-test the maximum score is 97 and the minimum score was 28. 1 student got the maximum and 1 student got the minimum score in post-test at experimental class. The researcher concluded that in the post-test the students had the achievement. It means that there is the significant improvement after taught students by using List-Group-Label Strategy.

4. Discussion

4.1 The Result of Observation

The researcher had analyzed the data collection. It described the application of List-Group-Label Strategy increasing students' vocabulary in the seventh grade of MTs DDI Darul Ulum Kalangkangan.

Based on the students' achievement of Curriculum (K13) is 70, it can be seen that all the pre-test in the control and experiment class except 1 student got 71 fair grade, has not achieved completeness, this is caused by the students initial knowledge of the material to be taught. Then, in the control class in the post-test, only 2 students got fair value and 21 students got poor. Where control class was not applied List-Group-Label strategy. While the experimental classes there were 2 students got the excellent grade, 4 students got the good grade, 5 students got the fair grade and 11 students got the poor grade. Then, the students in the pre-test had 31 scores and in the post-test achieves 71 scores because the students include the criteria of students who are active and diligent in class. While students who got 45 scores in the pre-test after post-test only got 65 scores because the students are less active and lazy in the class.

4.2 The Procedure of Treatments

Firstly, the researcher conducted pre-test control and experiment. The result of pre-test control and experiment showed that before implementing the treatment. The students still poor in vocabulary. The pre-test control showed that from 23 students, 23 students got very poor grade. While the pre-test experiment showed that from 22 students, 1 student got the fair grade and 21 students got very poor grade.

Secondly, the researcher applied treatments to the students. It was done in three meetings. The treatment was the application of List-Group-Label strategy. The researcher taught the students by List-Group-Label strategy in increasing vocabulary students. The treatments were three meetings as follow:

1. First meeting

The researcher explained and introduced List-Group-Label Strategy in the learning process. Then, the researcher explained the definition of noun and gave the example of noun to the students.

2. Second meeting

The researcher gave the example of List-group-Label to the students with determined the theme. Then, the researcher divided the students into some groups and determined the theme. Then, the researcher gave the same activity but the theme of different.

3. Third meeting

The last treatment, the researcher gave the same activity with the third treatment but the theme was different.

The last, the researcher conducted post-test control and experiment after applying the treatment. The result of the post-test control group showed that from 23 students, 1 student got the fair grade and 22 students got the poor grade because control class is not applied treatment. While the result of post-test experiment group showed that from 22 students, 2 students got the excellent grade, 4 students got the good grade, 3 students got the fair grade, 13 students got the poor grade.

References

- Aebersold, et all. 2009. *From Reader to Reading Teacher*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bellafiore. 1968. *Words at Work*. Amsco School Pubns Inc.
- Gifford. 2010. *Broadening Concepts Through Vocabulary Development*.
- Napa. P. A. 2006. *Vocabulary Development Skill*. Jakarta: Kanisius.
- Richards, Jack. C. 2001. *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ruddell. 2005. *Teaching Content Reading and Writing (RevisedEd.)*. United States of America: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Thornbury. 2005. *How to Teach Vocabulary*, London: Longman.
- Wallace, J.M. 1982. *Technique in Teaching Vocabulary*, London: Biddles Ltd.