CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the writer presents discussion about research findings, hypothesis testing and discussions of the research findings.

A. **Research Findings**

The research findings discusses an analysis of the ability of the seventh graders of MTs N 1 Blitar in vocabulary mastery when they were taught using list group label strategy and when they taught vocabulary mastery without using list group label strategy. The subjects of the research consist of two classes. The data were described into two tables. The table 4.1 showed students' score and achievement in experiment class and the table 4.4 showed the students' score and achievement in control class. The data of this research were the pre-test score and post-test scores of experiment group and control group. The scores are presented as follows.

1. The data of experiment class

Table 4.1

Students' vocabulary mastery score before and after being taught using List

Group Label Strategy

No	Name	Pre test	Post test	Gain
1	Achmad Mirzaram Dhani	81	86	5
2	Achmad Nabil Nur Wahid	83	88	5
3	Ahmad Dailami	81	86	5
4	Ahmad Nur'alim	88	92	4
5	Ahmad Wafid Firdaus	83	94	11
6	Alessio Suryaningtyas Wahyu F.	88	97	9
7	A'mal Rifa'at Haibah	84	94	10
8	Bisma Harish Sofwan	84	88	4
9	Faiq Jauhari el Lathaif	78	80	2

10	Habib Rois Albana	80	84	4
11	Haris Meda Hermansyah	83	88	5
12	Ilham Fajar Rizqi	78	84	6
13	Kevin Budi Hernando	84	94	10
14	M. Danial Musthofa khan	84	91	7
15	M. Habib Mustofa	81	86	5
16	M. Harun Arosid	86	92	6
17	M. Makhaysa 'aza Fadhillah	80	81	1
18	M. Salman al Farisi	84	88	4
19	Moch.Verry Ardiansyah	86	91	5
20	Moh. Alfariza Nazwa Ni'am	83	88	5
21	Mohamad Khamim Tohari	86	91	5
22	Mohammad Charles Nur Okta Wijaya	83	92	9
23	mohammad rafi'i arifin	86	91	5
24	Muhammad Marvin Rohiid al Basith	84	88	4
25	Muhammad Syifau Linnuha	80	84	8
26	Muhammad Syukron Nur 'aziz	86	91	5
27	Ridwan Adi Kusuma	84	91	7
28	Slamet Riyadi	88	92	4
29	Thomas Abdi Romadoni	83	86	3
30	Zheyxal Sanjaya	80	81	1
	S student	**2499**	**2659**	**160**

Based on the table 4.1 above, it shows that the lowest score in pre-test was 78 and the highest score was 88. The highest score of post-test was 97 and lowest score was 80.

a. pre-test experimental group

Table 4.2

The output of statistic data of experimental class' score in pre-test

Statistics

PRE

N	Valid	30
	Missing	0
Mean		83.30
Median		83.50
Mode		84
Sum		2499

Based on the table 4.2 above, show mean of pre-test score 83.30. It means that the mean score is low.

b. Post-test of control class

Table 4.3

The output of statistic data of experiment class' score in post-test

Statistics

POST

N	Valid	30
	Missing	0
Mean		88.63
Median		88.00
Mode		88
Sum		2659

Based on the table 4.3 above, show mean of post-test score 88.63. The gain of mean score between pre-test and post-test was 5.33.

2. The data of control class

Table 4.4

Students' vocabulary mastery score before and after being taught without using List Group Label Strategy

No	Name	Pre-test	Post-test	Gain
1	Afrizal Farizki Ulul Azmi	80	81	1
2	Ahmad Rizqi Hidayat	78	81	3
3	Bima Kurniawan Al-ridho	81	84	3
4	Dwi Cahyono	84	86	2
5	Excell Swara Decembry Armanda P.	86	88	2
6	Ibrahim Kholilurrohman	88	91	3
7	M. Gandhi Prasetyo	78	84	6
8	M.Khoirul Anwar	86	86	0
9	Mirza Yoga Pratama	83	84	1
10	Moch. Aris Nur Ridwan	86	88	2
11	Moch. Panji Anom	81	84	3

12	Moh Bagus Eka Pratama	86	88	2
13	Moh Dhany Asmoro	78	80	2
14	Moh. Dwi Wahyudi	80	81	1
15	Mohammad Anwar Sholeh	84	84	0
16	Mohammad Dava Eka Atho'illah	80	81	1
17	Mohammad Viki Taufikun Nada	83	84	1
18	Muhamad Ngisommudin al Aziz	83	86	3
19	Muhammad Aan Firmansyah	86	88	2
20	Muhammad Asyam Hafizh	86	91	5
21	Muhammad Fahrizal Fahmi	88	88	0
22	Muhammad Ikmalil Ngatoillah	83	86	3
23	Muhammad Nazaril Akbar	84	86	2
24	Muhammad Ridho al Fahrezi	88	80	-8
25	Muhammad Zakyy yuladu Fajri	84	86	2
26	Rivanda Rangga Arizki	84	86	2
27	Rizki Wahyu Saputra	81	84	3
28	Robeth Fajar Maulana	84	81	-3
29	Wahyu jihat Firmansyah Maulidin	83	84	1
30	Yudha Aldi Wardana	84	86	2
	Student	**2500**	**2547**	**47**

Control class is a class which was taught vocabulary mastery without using list group label. The subjects of pre-test in control group consist of 30 students. Based on the result in pre-test, the highest score is 88 and the lowest score is 78. The highest score of post-test was 91 and lowest score was 81.

a. Pretest of control class

Table 4.5
The output of statistic data of control class' score in pre-test
Statistics

Pre

N	Valid	30
	Missing	0
Mean		83.33
Median		84.00
Mode		84
Sum		2500

Based on the table 4.5 above, show mean of pre-test score 83.33. it means the mean score is low.

    b. Post-test of control class

Table 4.6

The output of statistic data of control class' score in pre-test

Statistics

Post

N	Valid	30
	Missing	0
Mean		84.90
Median		85.00
Mode		84
Sum		2547

Based on the table 4.6 above, show mean of post-test score 84.90. the gain of mean score between pre-test and post-test was 1.57.

B. Hypothesis testing

In the hypothesis, the writer stated that there was a significant difference in the students' achievement of academic vocabulary mastery between the experimental and the control groups. In order to analyze the significant difference between the experimental and the control groups, *t*-test statistical analysis was applied. Before compute the *t-test*, the writer did the gained score analysis to know the homogeneity testing using F test (levene's Test), to know whether to use Equal variance Assumed (if variance is the same) or use equal variance not assumed (if the variance is different). The hypothesis in F test can be seen bellow:

1. Ho: both variance are the same (experimental and control group)

2. Ha: both variance are different (experimental and control group)

By applying the *t*-test analysis, the writer could accept or reject the null hypothesis. The results of the *t*-test statistical analysis are provided in table 4.7 below:

Table 4.7 result of T-TEST

Group Statistics

	group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
gain	Experiment	30	5.3333	2.46819	.45063
	Control	30	1.5667	2.41666	.44122

Table 4.8 result of T-Test

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
gain	Equal variances assumed	.480	.491	5.973	58	.000	3.76667	.63067	2.50425	5.02908
	Equal variances not assumed			5.972	57.974	.000	3.76667	.63067	2.50424	5.02909

Based on the table 4.7 (Group Statistics) above, it shows that F is 0.480 it means that F (0.480) is bigger than 0.050 and Ho is accepted. It can be concluded

that both variance experimental and control group are the same. The result is the writer used Equal Variance Assumed in making decision of T-test.

Based on the results of the hypothesis test results with t test above, there is a significant difference from the score of gain (gain) of the students' of the experimental group (M = 5.33, SD =2.46) and control group (M = 1.56, SD = 2.41) then H0 is rejected and Ha accepted. The mean of experimental class is 5.33 while the control class is 1.56. It means that the mean of students' score in experimental class is higher than the mean of students' score in control class. The gain of mean experiment class and control class is 3.77 and the interval of the differences ranged from 2.50 to 5.02.

The analysis of the homogeneity revealed that the two groups had the same variances or homogeneous, so the information from *Equal variances assumed* was used to interpret the *t*-test result. Based on the table 4.8 the significant value of the t (2-tailed)was 0.000.Because it was lower than the significant 0,050, it was concluded that there was a significant difference in the students' achievement between the experimental and the control groups in mastering academic vocabulary. It means that the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted and the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected. In other words, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference on students' score in the teaching vocabulary between those who were taught by using list group label and those who were not.

B. Discussion

The writer conducted the study by using quasi experimental research design. The pre-test and the post-test were administered to the experimental and the control groups, but the treatment was only given to the experimental group. The experimental group received the treatment by using List-Group-Label (LGL) strategy, whereas the control group was taught by using without LGL strategy. List Group-Label (LGL) strategy is a simple strategy which consists of three main steps. The activities in this strategy consist of listing, grouping, and labeling. The treatment was given to the experimental group for twice times before the post-test was administered.

This study was conducted to find out whether or not there was any significant difference in the students' achievement of academic vocabulary mastery between the experimental and the control groups after they got different treatment. In addition, the writer intended to know the effectiveness of List-Group-Label (LGL) strategy which contributed to the development of students' academic vocabulary mastery. The writer assumed that there was a significant difference in the students' achievement of academic vocabulary mastery between the experimental and the control groups after they got the treatment. It was also anticipated that List-Group-Label (LGL) strategy was effective strategy which contributed to the students' academic vocabulary mastery.

In order to prove these assumptions, the writer did hypotheses testing. The hypothesis was tested by using the t-test statistical analysis by applying Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) 16.0 application. Before applying the t-test

statistical analysis, an analysis to find out the normality and the homogeneity of the two samples were performed. The output data of the pre-test and post-test normality get from gain experimental and control group. The writer presented the mean of gain is 3.45 and SD is 3.07 and significant value in gain score of experimental and control group is 0.186 which was higher than significant 0,050. It means that the pre-test and post-test in experimental and control group from gain score is normally distribution.

The writer also checked the homogeneity of gain data from experiment and control group by using the tests of homogeneity of variances. The gain data was homogeneous because the significant coefficient was 0.491 and it was higher than the significant 5%.

Previously, the gain data between the experimental and the control groups was concluded to be normally distributed and homogeneous, so the writer continued the statistical analysis by using the *t*-test. It was applied to find out whether or not there was any significant difference in the students' achievement between the experimental and the control groups. The output of the *t*-test statistical analysis on the table 4.7 performed the mean of the experimental group was 5.33 and the mean of the control group was 1.56. It was determined that the gain mean between the two groups (experiment and control) was 3.77. The mean of the experimental group was higher than the mean of the control group and the significant (2-tailed) coefficient was 0.000 with the degree of freedom was 58. Because the significant (2-tailed) coefficient was lower than the significant coefficient 5%, the null hypothesis (there was no significant difference in the

students' achievement of academic vocabulary mastery between the experimental and the control groups) was rejected. On the contrary, the working hypothesis (there was a significant difference in the students' achievement of academic vocabulary mastery between the experimental and the control groups) was accepted. The result of the *t*-test statistical analysis proved that there was a significant difference in the students' achievement of academic vocabulary mastery between the experimental and the control groups after they got the treatment.

In this study, the writer focused on the use of List-Group-Label (LGL) strategy to develop students' academic vocabulary mastery. This strategy was 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 their vocabulary 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 can be used prior to beginning a unit. Teachers in any content area can use the same instructional strategy by generating a term or concept that will be the focus of study in the classroom.

In this study the writer suggests that a strategy can be applied in the teaching and learning process of academic vocabulary. This opinion was in line with the research findings of Rina Ardiyanti (2015) List-Group-Label (LGL) strategy contributed to the students' academic vocabulary mastery for improving their academic vocabulary.

Besides that, 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 Maulida rani Safitri (2016) List group-label strategy is a good way that makes students are interested in following the learning process which can improve students' vocabulary skill.

The implementation of List-Group-Label (LGL) strategy in this study showed that the students involved in the discussion well. It appears that List-Group-Label (LGL) strategy stimulates the students' active participation. Because the number of the students in the experimental group was relatively big (30 students), the writer could manage the classroom well and the students could concentrate on the learning activities. List-Group-Label strategy as the treatment for the experimental group affects the students' academic vocabulary mastery which is supported by the results of the statistical analysis. It makes the students learn academic vocabulary independently, encourages them to solve the problem and improve their academic vocabulary knowledge with the assist of their friends and the guides from the writer.

However, learning academic vocabulary by using List-Group-Label (LGL) took much time for both the teacher and the students in the classroom learning activities. It happened when the writer and the students gave the appropriate response, feedback or evaluation to justify why those labels were selected. These findings suggest that a good time management and a good knowledge about academic vocabulary related to the topic need to be concerned. Even so, List-Group-Label (LGL) strategy still can be beneficial for the students. Because the

activities are conducted step by step, the students can get better understanding to learn academic vocabulary. It can stimulate their background knowledge related to the topic and improve their skills in categorizing words. In addition, the students can participate in the discussion activities actively, learn independently, and be interested in learning academic vocabulary.