## CHAPTER IV

## RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter represents the finding and discussion of the research. This chapter consists of descriptive data, normality and homogeneity testing, hypothesis testing and discussion.

## A. Research Findings

## 1. Descriptive Data

The researchers present the descriptive statistics of the study. Students' vocabulary mastery results in the pre-test and post-test were divided into VII A as an experimental group of 26 students and VII B as a control group of 25 students. Students who are taught using the Duolingo application served as the experimental class, and students who are taught without the Duolingo application served as the control class. This study aimed to discover the effectiveness of using the Duolingo application to improve students' vocabulary mastery at MTS Subulussalam Sriwangi Grade VII.

The researcher administered pre-test before giving the treatment then administered post-test after giving the treatment for both experimental and control groups. To simplify the evaluation process, the researcher has already defined five criteria which could draw on the table below:

Table 4.1 The score's criteria

| Score | Criteria |
| :---: | :---: |
| $85-100$ | Excellent |
| $75-84$ | Very Good |
| $60-74$ | Good |
| $40-59$ | Poor |
| $0-39$ | Fail |

Supported on the table 4.1 above, There are 5 scores criteria consist of excellent, very good, good, poor, and fail. The one were categorized as being excellent students who got 85 to 100 as their scores. The category was called very good when the students got between 75 and 84 score. The students who were categorized as good got $60-74$ as their score. The students would be categorized as poor when the score was between 40 and 59. The last, students were categorized as failed when the score was between 0-39

## a. The Data Of Experimental Class

1. Pre-test of experimental group

A class who were taught using Duolingo application as treatment is mentioned as Experimental group. Pre-test was administered Before giving the treatment for experimental group.

Table 4.2 The pre-test score of experimental group

| NO | Name | Pre-test |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | ALN | 70 |
| 2 | BS | 60 |
| 3 | DFW | 60 |
| 4 | DA | 50 |
| 5 | DAP | 75 |
| 6 | DK | 85 |
| 7 | NSA | 65 |


| 8 | NDA | 75 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9 | NSA | 80 |
| 10 | PIR | 65 |
| 11 | PWA | 70 |
| 12 | RN | 75 |
| 13 | RT | 85 |
| 14 | RFD | 50 |
| 15 | SNA | 70 |
| 16 | SDR | 80 |
| 17 | TND | 45 |
| 18 | TSN | 55 |
| 19 | WA | 60 |
| 20 | ZVL | 65 |
| 21 | RA | 85 |
| 22 | RS | 55 |
| 23 | RFD | 70 |
| 24 | MP | 60 |
| 25 | MSS | 65 |
| 26 | NS | 60 |

26 students from the experimental class (Class VII A) took the pretest. The time allocation for pre-testing is around 60 minutes. The pretest took place on Saturday, June 8, 2021. The researchers used SPSS version 26.0 for descriptive statistics and percentages of students' pretest scores. The five criteria Excellent, Very Good, Good, Poor and Failed become the percentage (Table 4.1).The following is the data results:

Table 4.3 Descriptive statistics of pre-test of experimental group

| Descriptive Statistics |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | N | Minimum | Maximum | Sum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| PreTestEXP | 26 | 45 | 85 | 1735 | 66.73 | 11.220 |
| Valid $N$ <br> (listwise) | 26 |  |  |  |  |  |

Displayed on Table 4.3 above, the table displayed that 45 as the lowest and 85 as the highest score of pretest of experimental class, 68.73 was the mean of the score, the standard deviations showed 11.220, and the sum of data showed 1735. The pretest frequency distribution result of 26 students in experimental class could be seen on the following table:

Table 4.4 The pre-test Frequency Distribution Score

| Pre-test Experimental |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 45 | 1 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 |
|  | 50 | 2 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 11.5 |
|  | 55 | 2 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 19.2 |
|  | 60 | 5 | 19.2 | 19.2 | 38.5 |
|  | 65 | 4 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 53.8 |
|  | 70 | 4 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 69.2 |
|  | 75 | 3 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 80.8 |
|  | 80 | 2 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 88.5 |
|  | 85 | 3 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 26 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Supported on table 4.4 above, it could be viewed that no students' got the pretest frequency score between 0 and 39 from experimental class. There were only 1 student got the score between 40 and 59 mean their vocabulary mastery achievement was poor. While, 13 students got the score between 60 and 74 were achieved a good vocabulary mastery. Students whose score between 75-84 were categorized as good vocabulary mastery score. In addition, there were 3 students which score was between 85-100 that indicated as excellent score.
2. Post-test of experimental group

The researcher administered post test score as the information of knowing the effect of students' vocabulary mastery improvement as treatment activity for experimental group.

Table 4.5 The post test scores of experimental group

| NO | Name | Post-test |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | ALN | 80 |
| 2 | BS | 75 |
| 3 | DFW | 70 |
| 4 | DA | 60 |
| 5 | DAP | 85 |
| 6 | DK | 90 |
| 7 | NSA | 75 |
| 8 | NDA | 95 |
| 9 | NSA | 95 |
| 10 | PIR | 75 |
| 11 | PWA | 85 |
| 12 | RN | 80 |
| 13 | RT | 90 |
| 14 | RFD | 75 |
| 15 | SNA | 75 |
| 16 | SDR | 85 |
| 17 | TND | 65 |
| 18 | TSN | 70 |
| 19 | WA | 80 |
| 20 | ZVL | 70 |
| 21 | RA | 90 |
| 22 | RS | 75 |
| 23 | RFD | 80 |
| 24 | MP | 75 |
| 25 | MSS | 75 |
| 26 | NS | 70 |

The post test of experimental group was held on $13^{\text {th }}$ of June 2021 with 60 minutes as time allocation. The post test participants were the
same participants as pre-test. The test was designed as students' vocabulary mastery measurement after the students completed the treatment process with the Duolingo application. The researcher used version 26 of SPSS to find out the statistical descriptive of points received by students after passing the test. The five percentage criteria was divided into excellent, very good, good, poor and unsatisfactory
(Table 4.1). The following is The data result:
Table 4.6 Descriptive statistics of post-test of experimental group

| Descriptive Statistics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | N | Minimum | Maximum | Sum | Mean | Std. Deviation |  |
| PostTestEXP | 26 | 60 | 95 | 2040 | 78.46 | 8.918 |  |
| Valid N (listwise) | 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Showed on Table 4.6 above, the table showed that 60 become the lowest and 95 was the highest score of post-test of experimental, 78.46 indicated the mean of the score, 8.918 was accumulated as the standard deviations, and the sum of data was seen 2040. Next, the post-test frequency of 26 students in experimental class as follow:

Table 4.7 The post-test Frequency Distribution Score

| Post-Test Experimental |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 60 | 1 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 |
|  | 65 | 1 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 7.7 |
|  | 70 | 4 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 23.1 |
|  | 75 | 8 | 30.8 | 30.8 | 53.8 |
|  | 80 | 4 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 69.2 |
|  | 85 | 3 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 80.8 |


| 90 | 3 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 92.3 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 95 | 2 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 26 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

According to table 4.7 above, it could be viewed that 6 students got score between 60 and 74 achieved a good vocabulary mastery. 12 students got very good vocabulary mastery score between 75-84. In addition, there were 8 students which score was between $85-100$ that indicated as excellent score. Besides there was no student gained poor and fail criteria.

## b. The Data Of Control Class

1. Pre-test of control class

Controlled group is a class which was taught without using Duolingo application as treatment or in conventional strategy as usual. The researcher administered pre-test for control class before doing teaching learning process.

Table 4.8 The Pre-test Scores of Controlled Class

| No | Name | Pre-test |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | AS | 55 |
| 2 | AM | 45 |
| 3 | CAZ | 70 |
| 4 | E | 65 |
| 5 | IA | 60 |
| 6 | IAS | 50 |
| 7 | JA | 60 |
| 8 | JNV | 75 |
| 9 | KNH | 70 |
| 10 | KS | 65 |
| 11 | LF | 70 |
| 12 | LU | 65 |


| 13 | MM | 60 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 | MSA | 40 |
| 15 | NO | 65 |
| 16 | NR | 55 |
| 17 | SLS | 65 |
| 18 | SNR | 60 |
| 19 | UMS | 75 |
| 20 | UN | 55 |
| 21 | ZAN | 60 |
| 22 | DAT | 65 |
| 23 | MDN | 80 |
| 24 | AF | 50 |
| 25 | ASS | 60 |

The pre-test followed by 25 students of experimental class (VII B Class).The time allocation for doing the pre-test was about 60 minutes. The pre-test was held on Saturday, $8^{\text {th }}$ of June 2021. Excellent, very good, good, poor and fail were the percentage criteria (Table 4.1). The data result of descriptive statistics and the percentage shows as follow:

Table 4.9 The Descriptive statistics of Pre-test of Control Class

| Descriptive Statistics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | N | Minimum | Maximum | Sum | Mean | Std. Deviation |  |
| PreTestControlled | 25 | 40 | 80 | 1540 | 61.60 | 9.434 |  |
| Valid N (listwise) | 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

According to Table 4.9 above, the table displayed that 40 was the lowest and 80 was the highest score of post-test of control class, the mean of the score displayed 61.60, the standard deviations indicated 9.434 , and the sum of data was 1540 . Next, the post-test frequency of 25 students in control class as follow:

Table 4.10 Frequency Distribution Of Pre-test Score

| Pre-Test Control |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 40 | 1 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
|  | 45 | 1 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 8.0 |
|  | 50 | 2 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 16.0 |
|  | 55 | 3 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 28.0 |
|  | 60 | 6 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 52.0 |
|  | 65 | 6 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 76.0 |
|  | 70 | 3 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 88.0 |
|  | 75 | 2 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 96.0 |
|  | 80 | 1 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 25 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

According to table 4.10 above, it could be seen that 7 students found in poor criteria because their score was between 40-59. 6 students got score between 60 and 74 which achieved a good vocabulary mastery. 3 students whose vocabulary mastery score between 75-84 was very good. Meanwhile, there was no student which score between 85-100 was indicated as an excellent score.
2. Post-test of control class

To know the effect of students' vocabulary mastery improvement of controlled group which was taught without using Dulingo application, the researcher administered post test to get the score.

Table 4.11 The Post-test Scores of Control Class

| No | Name | Post-test |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | AS | 60 |
| 2 | AM | 55 |
| 3 | CAZ | 80 |
| 4 | E | 70 |
| 5 | IA | 65 |
| 6 | IAS | 60 |
| 7 | JA | 75 |
| 8 | JNV | 90 |
| 9 | KNH | 80 |
| 10 | KS | 75 |
| 11 | LF | 80 |
| 12 | LU | 70 |
| 13 | MM | 75 |
| 14 | MSA | 55 |
| 15 | NO | 75 |
| 16 | NR | 65 |
| 17 | SLS | 75 |
| 18 | SNR | 70 |
| 19 | UMS | 80 |
| 20 | UN | 70 |
| 21 | ZAN | 80 |
| 22 | DAT | 70 |
| 23 | MDN | 85 |
| 24 | AF | 65 |
| 25 | ASS | 70 |

The post test of controlled group was held on $17^{\text {th }}$ of June 2020 with 60 minutes as time allocation. The post test was followed by the same participants as pre-test in control class. The test was intended to know the students' vocabulary mastery after the students taught without using Duolingo application. There were five criterias: excellent, very good, good, poor and fail as the percentage (Table 4.1). The data result shows as follow:

Table 4.12 The Descriptive statistics of Post-test of Control Class

| Descriptive Statistics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | N | Minimum | Maximum | Sum | Mean | Std. Deviation |  |
| PostTestControlled | 25 | 55 | 90 | 1795 | 71.80 | 8.884 |  |
| Valid N (listwise) | 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Displayed on Table 4.12, the table showed that 55 as the lowest and 90 as the highest score of post-test of experimental class, the mean score indicated 71.80, the standard deviations showed 8.884, and the sum data referred 1795.The post-test frequency of 25 students in Controlled class as follows:

Table 4.13 Frequency Distribution Of Post-test Score

| Post-Test Controlled |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 55 | 2 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 |
|  | 60 | 2 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 16.0 |
|  | 65 | 3 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 28.0 |
|  | 70 | 6 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 52.0 |
|  | 75 | 5 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 72.0 |
|  | 80 | 5 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 92.0 |
|  | 85 | 1 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 96.0 |
|  | 90 | 1 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 25 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

According to table 4.13 above, it could be said that only 1 student was in poor criteria which the score was between 40-59. Then, 11 students score was between 60 and 74 achieved a good vocabulary
mastery. 5 students in score between 75-84 was very good. In addition, there were only 2 students which score between 85-100 was indicated as excellent score.

## 2. Normality , Homogeneity Testing And T-test

a. Normality Testing

The data have to be normally distributed is One of the requirement for using a parametric test. There are two formulas which can be done to test the normality of the data using saphiro-wilk and liliefors (Kolmogorofsmirnov) in SPSS. In this research, liliffors (Kolmogorof-smirnov) formula was used in testing the normality of the data through SPSS 26. The result of the normality testing for pre-test and post-test in both experimental and controlled group can be seen in the following table:

Table 4.14 Normality Testing
Liliefors (Kolmogorof-Smirnov)

| Tests of Normality |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Group | Kolmogorov-Smirnov ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | Shapiro-Wilk |  |  |
|  |  | Statistic | Df | Sig. | Statistic | df | Sig. |
| Experi ental | 1.Pre-test | . 102 | 26 | .200* | . 963 | 26 | . 443 |
|  | 2.Post-test | . 154 | 26 | . 115 | . 964 | 26 | . 472 |
| Control | 3.Pre-test | . 153 | 25 | . 136 | . 971 | 25 | . 670 |
|  | 4.Post-test | . 140 | 25 | .200* | . 963 | 25 | . 473 |
| *. This is a lower bound of the true significance. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a. Lilliefors Significance Correction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Showed on the table 4.14, it can be said that the significance data on the table Liliefors (Kolmogorof-Smirnov) above interpreted that the data from experimental class pre-test was 0.200 then 0.115 showed the post-
test. It may infer both pre-test and post-test were normally distributed due to the significance was shown higher than $\alpha=0.05$ (5\%). Besides, the significance data from pre-test in control class was 0.136 while the post-test in control class was 0.200 . It concludes that the pre-test and post-test in control class were normally distributed because they already fulfilled the criteria of normality testing statement.
b. Homogeneity Testing

The next step should be done in using parametric test is to identify whether the data is homogenous or not generally it is called as homogeneity testing. The researcher used SPSS 26 in testing the homogeneity of the data with Levene Statistics formula. The data is described homogenous when the significance of mean calculation result is higher than $\alpha=0.05$. The result shows on table below:

Table 4.15 Homogeneity Testing

| Test of Homogeneity of Variances |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
| Hasil | Based on Mean | .900 | 3 | 98 | .444 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Based on Median | .762 | 3 | 98 | .518 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Based on Median and with <br> adjusted df | .762 | 3 | 95.245 | .518 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Based on trimmed mean | .906 | 3 | 98 | .441 |  |  |  |  |  |

Relied on the table 4.5 above, it displayed 0.444 as the significance of the data between experimental and control class post-test. Thus, the data of
post-test was homogeneous because it was higher than $\alpha=0.05(0.444>$ $0.05)$.
c. T-test

After measuring the normality and homogeneity testing, $t$-test is used to measure the significant differences between students' vocabulary mastery in experimental and control classes. To answer the research question, the researcher used t-test calculation result using SPSS 26 to identify whether or not Duolingo application is an effective way in students' vocabulary mastery improvement. The recapitulation of $t$-test calculation can be seen as follow:

## Table 4.16 The Output of Group Statistics

| Group Statistics |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Kelas | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| Hasil | EXPERIMENTAL CLASS | 26 | 78.65 | 9.226 | 1.809 |
|  | CONTROL CLASS | 25 | 71.80 | 8.884 | 1.777 |

Displayed on the table 4.16, it shows the result of group statistics from post-test in experimental and control class. It displayed that the mean from experimental class is 78.65 while from control class is 71.80 which found the significant difference between the mean score between the experimental and control class. The standard deviation from both two classes also found difference score where the experimental class is 9.226 and the control class is 8.884 . Meanwhile, the standard error of mean from the experimental class
was higher than the control class which experimental class showed 1.809 and 1.777 for control class.

Table 4.17 The Output T-test

| Independent Samples Test |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Levene's <br> Test for <br> Equality of <br> Variances |  | t-test for Equality of Means |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | F | Sig. | T | Df | Sig. <br> (2- <br> tailed) | Mean <br> Difference | Std. Error Difference | $95 \%$ <br> Confidence Interval of the Difference |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lower | Upper |
| Hasil | Equal variances assumed | . 087 | . 769 | 2.701 | 49 | . 009 | 6.854 | 2.538 | 1.754 | 11.954 |
|  | Equal <br> variances <br> not |  |  | 2.703 | 49.000 | . 009 | 6.854 | 2.536 | 1.758 | 11.950 |

Based on the table 4.17, The independent sample test data showed that the result of $t(d f=49)=2.701$ and $p$-value or $\operatorname{sig}(2$-tailed $)$ is 0.009 . The researcher uses $\alpha=0.05$ (5\%) as the significant standard, therefore in chapter 3 have been explained that the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected since the p -value or $\operatorname{sig}$ (2-tailed) is higher than $\alpha=0.05(5 \%)$ and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted since the p-value or sig (2-tailed) is lower than $\alpha=0.05(5 \%)$. Therefore, it proved that the p -value or sig (2-tailed) is
calculated 0.009 which is lower than $\alpha=0.05(5 \%)$. It means that the using Duolingo application is effective to increase students' vocabulary mastery.

## 3. Hypothesis Testing

In order to response the research question which was determined in chapter 1: "Is there any significant difference score between vocabulary mastery of students who are taught by using Duolingo and vocabulary mastery of students who are taught without using Duolingo?", The statistical hypothesis is explained as follows:
a. (Ha): There is a significant effect of using Duolingo application to increase students' vocabulary mastery.
b. (Ho): There is no significant effect of using Duolingo application to increase students' vocabulary mastery.

From those explanation which correlate to this research required the assumption of the statistical hypothesis:
a. If the value of $\operatorname{Sig}(2$-tailed) $>\alpha=0.05$ (5\%). Then, the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted and the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected. It was stated that the mean scores of the experimental class are higher than the mean scores of the controlled class. So, it means that the use of Duolingo application is effective in students' vocabulary mastery improvement in the seventh grade students of Subulussalam Islamic Junior High School.
b. If the value of $\operatorname{Sig}(2$-tailed $)<\alpha=0.05$ (5\%). Then, the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is rejected and the null hypothesis (Ho) is accepted. It means that the mean scores of the experimental class are the same or lower than the mean scores of the controlled class. So, it indicated that the using of Duolingo application is not effective in improving students' vocabulary mastery in the seventh grade students of MTS Subulussalam Sriwangi.

Based on the $t$-test accumulation calculation of post-test from the experimental and control class, it could be inferred that the sig (2 tailed) was found 0.009 was lower than significance level of $\alpha=0.05(5 \%)$. Therefore, $\operatorname{Sig}(2$-tailed $)>\alpha=0.05$ (5\%) which requires that the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted and the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected. Thus, it indicates that the using of Duolingo application is effective in improving students' vocabulary mastery in the seventh grade students of MTS Subulussalam Sriwangi.

## B. Discussion

This research is aimed to investigate whether Duolingo application is effective for students' vocabulary mastery improvement. This research was done in MTS Subulussalam Sriwangi which is placed in Oku Timur sub district of South Sumatra. The subject of this research consists of 51 students which was separated into experimental and control classes. Pre-test for both experimental and control classes are administered to know the students' earlier vocabulary mastery. Then, the researcher gave the treatment using Duolingo application in learning activity for experimental class while the researcher gave
treatment using conventional learning activity as usual for control class. After providing the treatment, the researcher administered post-test for both classes. To analyze the data of this research used SPSS 26.

Based on the calculation of data findings from the description calculation in previous sub chapter above it could be viewed the difference score between experimental and control class. It proved from the prost-test mean result in experimental class was higher than control class. The mean in control class was found 71.80 while the mean in experimental class increased 78.46 after giving the treatment using Duolingo application.

The significance of the data of this research was found normality distributed, it proved from the normality testing used SPSS 26 used liliefors (kolmogorofsmirnov) formula. The data presented that the pre- test was 0.200 in experimental class and the control class was 0,136 . Meanwhile, the post-test score also showed that the data of Kolmogorov-Smirnov in the experimental class is 0.115 and the control class is 0.200 . It can be concluded that both of pre-test and post-test scores from both two classes is higher than $\alpha=0.05$.

Based on the homogeneity testing, it showed that that the significance from post-test between experimental and control class was higher than $\alpha=0.05$. It could be seen from 0.444 which is higher than $\alpha=0.05(0.444>0.05)$. It mean that the data from experimental and control class in post-test was proved as homogeneous data.

In addition, based on independent sample t-test data analysis proved (Ha) is accepted and (Ho) is rejected. It can be seen the statistical significance is shown
by the analyzed post-test data that the result of sig (2-tailed) is 0.009 that is lower than $\alpha=0.05$ (5\%). Therefore, it is proved that the using Duolingo application influenced significant different in students' vocabulary mastery than those taught by using conventional method.

From those data findings, it may be accomplished teaching English using Duolingo application as one of the learning media for seventh grade of MTS Subulussalam Sriwangi is effective. This finding was related to the research that was done by Dina Amalia (2019) entitled "The Effect of Duolingo Aplication on the Students's Achievement In Vocabulary". Relied on result and discussion of the research, it was said that Duolingo application had meaningful effect as learning media in developing students' vocabulary knowledge. As the last conclusion stated that Duolingo application can give a good effect on student' vocabulary mastery because the score of vocabulary test after the researcher doing treatment in experimental class was higher than the score of vocabulary test in controlled class. In addition, Using Duolingo application showed a good effect to be applied for students at the seventh-grade students of MTS Subulussalam Sriwangi.

