# CHAPTER IV

# RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter covers research findings and discussion. Those include the data of research findings, hypothesis testing, the result of normality and homogeneity testing, and discussion.

## A. The Data Descriptions

In this part, the reseacher presented the data of the student's vocabulary achievment before and after being taught by using List-Group-Label strategy. The researcher began by presenting the data that had been collected through the instrument pre test and post test. Then, it continued by analysing the data. The media that was used by the researcher to analyze the data was SPSS 23.0.

As the researcher mentioned before, the data was collected from the student at seventh grades level in SMPN 1 Kalidawir. There were two classes, VII E as the class that was given treatment( experimental class) and VII F the other was not given by treatment( control class). The experiment class was consisted by 30 students and the control class was about 32 students. Then, in determining the significance difference whether the class that was tught using LGL or the other class was not. The researcher used the result of the class score. The researcher did not use the result of individulas score among the students.

The resercher used test as the instrument of collecting data. The test was in the form of multiple choice. It consisted of 20 question for both pre test and post test.

Then, the data of this research was in the form of the student's vocbaulary scores that could be seen in the some following tables.

1. The data of control class.

The data was showed the data of control class. It showed the result of the treatment in the form of student's score in pre test and post test. Those were the data of 32 students of control class. The test was all in the form of multiple choices. It consisted of 20 questions which was contained of some criteria of vocabulary mastery.

Based on the data, it showed that the lowest score in pre test is 25 and the highest is 75. Continuing in post test score, the lowest was 25 and the highest score was 75. The researcher uses SPSS 23.0 for windows to analyze those were student's achievments. Then, the result of SPSS statistics could be seen on the table below:

a) Pre test of control class.

**Statistics**

Pretest

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| N | Valid | 32 |
| | Missing | 0 |
| Mean | | 53,13 |
| Median | | 57,50 |
| Mode | | 60 |
| Std. Deviation | | 14,298 |
| Minimum | | 25 |
| Maximum | | 75 |
| Sum | | 1700 |

Table 4.2

The stastitical output of pre test.

Based on the tabel above, the mean score was 53, 13. The sum of the score was 1700. Then, the lowest score was 25 and the highest was 75.

b) Post test of control class.

**Statistics**

Posttest

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| N | Valid | 32 |
| | Missing | 0 |
| Mean | | 56,25 |
| Median | | 60,00 |
| Mode | | 65 |
| Std. Deviation | | 14,142 |
| Minimum | | 25 |
| Maximum | | 75 |
| Sum | | 1800 |

Table 4.3

The stastitical output of post test.

Based on the table above, the mean score was 56, 25. The sum score was 1800. The lowest was 25 and the highest score was 75.

It could be concluded, the result of the descriptive statitical above were the gain of the mean score and sum score between pretest and post test. The gain of the mean score was 3, 12. Then, the gain of the sum score was 100.

2. The data of experimental class.

The result of the test was showed the result of the treatment after the student were taught by using LGL. This data was were in the form of student's score in pre test and post test. It was the data of 30 students of experiment class. The test was all in the form of multiple choices. It consisted of 20 questions which was contained of some criteria of vocabulary mastery.

Based on the data, it showed that the lowest score in pre test was 45 and the highest was 75. Continuing in post test score, the lowest was 70 and the highest

score was 90. The researcher uses SPSS 23.0 for windows to analyze those were student's achievment. Then, the result of SPSS statistics were able to be seen on the table below:

a. Pre test of experimental class

**Statistics**

Pretest

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| N | Valid | 30 |
| | Missing | 0 |
| Mean | | 62,33 |
| Median | | 65,00 |
| Mode | | 65 |
| Std. Deviation | | 10,148 |
| Minimum | | 40 |
| Maximum | | 75 |
| Sum | | 1870 |

Table 4.5

The stastitical output of pre test.

Based on the table above, it showed that the mean score of pretest was 62, 33. The sum of the score was 1870. Then, the lowest score was 40 and the highest was 75.

b. Post test of experimental class

**Statistics**

Posttest

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| N | Valid | 30 |
| | Missing | 0 |
| Mean | | 77,00 |
| Median | | 75,00 |
| Mode | | 70[a] |
| Std. Deviation | | 7,264 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Minimum | 60 |
| Maximum | 90 |
| Sum | 2310 |

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

Table 4.6

The stastitical output of post test.

Based on the table above, the mean score of post test was 77,00. The sum of the score was 2310. Then, the lowest was 60 and the highest score was 90.

Finally, it could be concluded that the sum of the score of pretest was 1870 and the sum of score of post test was 2310, thus between sum of them was gained 440. Then, the means score of pre test was 62, 33 and post test was 77, 00. Therefore, it showed that the gain of the mean score between pre test and post test was 14, 67.

**B. Hypothesis testing**

The hypothesis testing of this study as follow:

1. $H_0$ ( Null Hypothesis): There is no significant difference score between the students that are taught by using List-Group-Label and those are taught by using conventional method.
2. $H_a$ ( Alternative Hypothesis): There is significant difference score between the students that are taught by using List-Group-Label and those are taught by using conventional method.

The hypothesis of this present study is followed the rules as follow:

a) If the significant value is less than 0, 05. The null hypothesis($H_0$) is rejected and alternative hypothesis( $H_a$) is accepted.

b) If the significant value is less than 0, 05. The alternative hypothesis($H_a$) is rejected and null hypothesis($H_0$) is accepted.

In order to know, when there were any significant differences of the student's vocabulary achievment, students that were taught by using List-Group-Label and students that were not. The calculating should show wether the null hypothesis was rejected and alternative hypothesis was accepted. To analyze the data, the researcher uses SPSS 23.0. The result of statistical was presented below:

**Statistics**

| | | Experimental | Control |
|---|---|---|---|
| N | Valid | 30 | 32 |
| | Missing | 2 | 0 |
| Mean | | 77,00 | 55,94 |
| Std. Deviation | | 7,264 | 14,393 |
| Minimum | | 60 | 25 |
| Maximum | | 90 | 75 |

Table 4.7
The statistical output of Experimental and Control Class.

Based on the table above, it showed that there were two classes, experimental and control class. The experimental class showed there were 30 students which the mean score is 77, 00. The standard deviation is 7, 264. In other hand, the control class, the mean score was 55, 94. Then, the standard deviation was 14, 393.

In adittion, the researcher also presented the result of t- test testing by SPSS 23.0. The result was presented as follow:

**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 |
| Equal variances assumed | 3,837 | ,055 | -6,437 | 58 | ,000 | -14,66667 | 2,27850 | -19,22758 | -10,10575 |
| Equal variances not assumed | | | -6,437 | 52,536 | ,000 | -14,66667 | 2,27850 | -19,23771 | -10,09563 |

Table 4.8

Independent sample t-test.

The table of independent sample test showed that the significant value( sig 2 tailed) was 0.000 and it was smaller than 0.05. It meant that $H_0$ which was said that there is no significant difference score between the students that are taught by using List-Group-Label and those are taught by using conventional method is rejected. Then, $H_a$ which was said that there is significant difference score between the students that are taught by using List-Group-Label and those are taught by using conventional method is accepted. Therefore, it could be interpreted that there was significant differences of student's academic score betweem student's who were taught by using List-Group-Label strategy and students were not. It meant that

applying List-Group-Label strategy was effective to improve student's vocabulary mastery.

## C. The result of Normality And Homogeneity Testing

1. The result of normality testing

Normality testing was conducted to determine whether the gained data is normal distribution or not. The researcher uses SPSS one- sample kolmogorov- smirnove test by the value of significance (α) = 0, 05. The result could be seen as follow:

**One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test**

| | | Pretest | Posttest | Unstandardized Residual |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| N | | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| Normal Parameters[a,b] | Mean | 62,33 | 77,00 | ,0000000 |
| | Std. Deviation | 10,148 | 7,264 | 9,85527457 |
| Most Extreme Differences | Absolute | ,237 | ,175 | ,166 |
| | Positive | ,106 | ,175 | ,103 |
| | Negative | -,237 | -,134 | -,166 |
| Test Statistic | | ,237 | ,175 | ,166 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | | ,000[c] | ,020[c] | ,035[c] |

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.

Table 4.9

Normality testing.

a. $H_0$: The data is in normal distribution.
b. $H_1$: The data is not in normal distribution.

Standard significant of education is 0, 05. To determine the data has a normal distribution or has no a normal distribution, it should be seen in the result of normality testing. The test statistic on pre test is 0, 237.

It meant that it was bigger than 0, 05. When the the test statistic was bigger than 0, 05 $H_0$ is accepted and $H_1$ is rejected. Then, for the test statistical on post test was 0, 175. It also meant that it was bigger than 0, 05. Therefore, the the test statistic was bigger than 0, 0.5 $H_0$ is accepted and $H_1$ is rejected. The data pre test and post test have a normal distribution.

2. The result of homogeneity testing

Homogeneity testing was conducted to know the data was homogeneous variance or not. The researcher uses SPSS as usually by the value of significance 0, 05. The result was presented below:

**Test of Homogeneity of Variances**

Pretest

| Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1,124 | 4 | 24 | ,369 |

Table 4.10
Homogeneity testing.

a. $H_{0:}$ The data is homogeny
b. $H_{1:}$ The data is not homogeny

The standard significant was 0, 05. The table of homogeneity varieances above shows that the sig was 0, 369. Therefore, the sig was bigger than standard significant. It meant that $H_0$ is accepted and $H_1$ is rejected. The students of VII E had homogeny variances.

## D. Discussion

In the end, the data was anlyzed by using SPSS 23, 0. The students who were taught by applying list group label strategy got the significant improvement. It could be seen from the mean score of pre test of the students before teaching by applying this startegy and the mean score of the students after teaching by applying this strategy. The gained score that was achieved by the students who were taught by using LGL was 14, 67. In other hand, the control class or the students who were not taught by applying LGL had a less significant improvement than experimental class. The gain of mean score was 3, 12. It was based on the mean score of pretest and the mean score of post test of control class. Based on those means score between experiment class and control class. It can be summarized that the gained score of experimental class was higher than control class.

In adittion, the experimental class has better vocabulary achievment in post test than control class. The researcher used homogeneous selection to control extraneous variable, thus the students have homogenous ability on vocabulary mastery. It could be concluded that applying list group label strategy is effective in teaching vocabulary.

Based on the research in SMPN 1 Kalidawir. The researcher inferences that teaching English by applying LGL is quiet better that without using this strategy. The use of this strategy should be considered as the alternative startegy. The implementation of this strategy was proven by looking at the student's score before and after teaching by applying this strategy. In adittion, it could be also be compared by the other class who were not taught by applying this strategy. The focus is on

the gain of the pre test and post test mean of each class. The gained of the mean score on experimental class is better or higher than control class.

In this present study, the researcher focuses on the use of List-Group-Label (LGL strategy) to develop students' academic vocabulary mastery. This strategy is possible to be applied in developing vocabulary and the theory by Allen (2007:69) about List-Group-Label (LGL) is designed to encourage students to improve theirvocabulary and categorization skills, organize their verbal concepts, aid them in remembering and reinforcing new words, and activate their prior knowledge about the subject. The brainstorming and categorizing strategy could be used as the main important part. Teachers in any content area could apply the same instructional strategy by generating a term or concept that will be the focus of study in the classroom.

The implication of this present study could be seen based on the researcher explanation about the proccess while the researcher applied the treatment that was LGL to the class in chapter 3. The step could be seen when the students always came to the class and followed the instruction that was given by the researcher. In the first meeting of treating, both the researcher and students were confused about the strategy, the researcher got the difficulties how to explain as well as possible to the students, and students got confused about how this strategy worked. The researcher began by explaining carefuly and made the class as life and fun as possible. The researcher helped the students individualy when there were some students that did not quiet understand the explaination. In the end of the first meeting, the students could only write some word, not more than 20 words in paper. In the second meeting, the researcher still began by remembering how this strategy

worked. The researcher gave the topic and the some students or almost more than whole class played fun with this strategy. They may mentioned so many words than before, they also still remmebered about what they had studied in the last meeting. In the last treatment, students had known with the strategy, thus the researcher could not explain as before. The students looked like happy played with this strategy, work in group, then they also remembered the words that they had studies. It deals with the advantages that is explained by Brunner 2011:15 when the student allow for both small and large group discussion. It can apply in all kind of class, small group or large group discussion Surprisely, they may mentioned so many word, that looked like they have prepare before in their home. Therefore, the use of this strategy did not only increase the student's score but also improve and motivate the student's will in learning English.

Deeply, the use of LGL in experimental class is effective. The present research finding confirms the finding of the preceding studies. The previous study that is written by Rina Ardiyanti (2015) List-Group-Label (LGL) strategy contributed to the students' academic vocabulary mastery for improving their academic vocabulary. Another study, list group label strategy is strategy can become interesting learning method for students and become improving their vocabulary. This opinion was in line with the research findings of Hanik Kurnia Sari(2017) stated that LGL could be applied easily in the teaching and learning process and make the students participate in the learning activities actively.

In the end, the finding of applying LGL above, the use of LGL is succesfully increase the student's vocabulary mastery. It encourages students to recall their meomory when they ask to mention the word as many as they could. This stretegy

also motivates students in learning English. Students will not be shy when they work together in group. This strategy also life the class. When the class is getting bored with the same strategy that is used to be used by the teacher, it could be the new one. Finally, LGL is effective in teaching vocabulary. It is suggested to be applied by the English teacher. It could be as the main strategy or the alternative one in teaching vocabulary.