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ABSTRACT
The research aimed to find out the improvement of the students’ vocabulary mastery by List Group Label (LGL) at the first year students of SMP Nasional Makassar in 2011/2012 Academic Year. The researcher used a classroom action research method with cycle I and cycle II design, where each cycle consisted of four meetings. It employed vocabulary test instrument. A number of subjects of the research were 25 students in the first year class. They consisted of 12 women and 13 men. The research took real data from the school to know the students’ vocabulary mastery. The research findings indicated that using List Group Label (LGL) could improve the students’ nouns from cycle I to cycle II, where as in cycle I the students’ achievement in nouns was 57.70%, but after evaluation in cycle II the students’ nouns became 73.80%. On the other hand the students’ verbs developed too from cycle I to cycle II, where in cycle I the students’ achievement in verbs was 57.60%, but after evaluation in cycle II the students’ verbs became 74.60%. The findings indicated that there was improvement in the students’ vocabulary mastery from cycle I to cycle II, where in cycle I the students’ vocabulary mastery was 57.70%, but after evaluation in cycle II the students’ vocabulary mastery became 74.20%. While the standard targeted achievement was 62%.
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Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui peningkatan penguasaan kosakata siswa dengan Daftar Kelompok Label (LGL) pada siswa tahun pertama SMP Nasional Makassar di 2011/2012 Tahun Akademik. Peneliti menggunakan metode penelitian tindakan kelas dengan siklus I dan desain siklus II, di mana setiap siklus terdiri dari empat pertemuan. Penelitian ini menggunakan instrumen tes kosakata. Jumlah subyek penelitian adalah 25 siswa di kelas tahun pertama. Mereka terdiri dari 12 perempuan dan 13 laki-laki. Penelitian ini mengambil data ril dari sekolah untuk mengetahui penguasaan kosakata siswa. Temuan penelitian menunjukkan bahwa dengan menggunakan Daftar Kelompok Label (LGL) dapat meningkatkan kata benda dari siklus I ke siklus II, dimana pada siklus I siswa nomina prestasi siswa adalah 57, 70%, tapi setelah evaluasi pada siklus II nomina siswa menjadi 73, 80%. Di sisi lain kosakata kata kerja siswa dikembangkan juga dari siklus I ke siklus II, di mana pada siklus I siswa berprestasi di Kosakata kata kerja adalah 57, 60%, tapi setelah evaluasi pada siklus II kosakata kata kerja siswa menjadi 74, 60%. Temuan menunjukkan bahwa ada peningkatan siswa penguasaan kosakata dari siklus I ke siklus II, dimana pada siklus I siswa penguasaan kosakata adalah 57, 70%, tapi setelah evaluasi pada siklus II penguasaan kosakata siswa menjadi 74, 20%. Sementara standar yang ditargetkan pencapaian adalah 62%.

Kata Kunci: Kosakata, Prestasi, Daftar Grup Label.

There are many strategies and techniques that can be applied in teaching vocabulary. One of them is LGL. LGL is designed to help students make connections to prior knowledge. LGL was designed to help teachers activate
students’ schema in regards to a particular concept, to improve existing vocabulary, to organize verbal concepts, and to remember new vocabulary. The writer wants to explore how the use of LGL strategy to improve students’ vocabulary in learning English. Even though, there are many strategies, which can be used in improving students’ vocabulary, but the writer intends to investigate one of them, which can be used to solve the problems above, that is, name LGL strategy. LGL is one of strategies to improve students’ vocabulary.

Based on the several above opinions, the writer take conclusion that LGL is the strategy to encourage students to improve their vocabulary and categorization skills and organize concepts. Categorizing listed words, through grouping and labeling, helps students organize new concepts in relation to previously learned concepts. Vocabulary is the center stage of the true reading experience. Without vocabulary knowledge, the text is incomprehensible and therefore reading for pleasure is dissatisfying, and reading to learn results in learning difficulties. An increase in vocabulary knowledge will assist students with comprehension and fluency. Through vocabulary instruction, educators should expose students to a variety of listening, speaking, and writing activities to improve and increase students’ vocabulary knowledge. Keeping students actively engaged in various vocabulary instructions can provide students with a sense of comfort and begin to manipulate, research, and use words more in their speaking and writing vocabulary. Above are only a few strategies that can be used to motivate students to explore and increase vocabulary knowledge. Instruction should give various strategies to engage students and make vocabulary fun.

DEFINITION OF VOCABULARY

Having sufficient vocabulary is a very important in using English both spoken and written form. Nguyễn Yến (2003) stated that in learning a foreign language, vocabulary plays an important role. Therefore, one cannot speak, understand, read, or write a foreign language without having a lot of words.

“Vocabulary is central to language and of critical importance to the typical language learner” (Zimmerman1997:5). Lack of vocabulary knowledge will result in lack of meaningful communication. The main benefit that can be obtained from all learning strategies is autonomy, students can take charge of their own learning.
(Nation, 2001:222) and gain independence and self-direction. Nation (2001:222) believes that a large amount of vocabulary can be acquired with the help of vocabulary learning strategies and that the strategies prove useful for students of different language levels.

Nation (2001:218) categorized vocabulary learning strategies into three general classes:

1. Planning: choosing what to focus on and when to focus on:
   a. Choosing words
   b. Choosing the aspects of word knowledge
   c. Choosing strategies
   d. Planning repetition

2. Sources: finding information about words.
   a. Analyzing the word
   b. Using context
   c. Consulting a reference source in L1 and L2
   d. Using parallels in L1 and L2

3. Processes: establishing knowledge
   a. Noticing
   b. Retrieving
   c. Generating

1. Vocabulary presentation technique

Students’ success in learning vocabulary depends on a certain extent on the number of senses used in classroom (Allen, 1983), and in order to remember new vocabulary, there are numerous techniques concerned with vocabulary presentation as Gain and Redman in Uberman (1991) suggested the following type of vocabulary presentation techniques consists of verbal and visual techniques. Visual techniques are flashcards, photographs and pictures, wall charts, drawings, word pictures, regalia, mime, and gesture. Students can label pictures or objects or perform an action. Verbal techniques are consist of using illustrative situations, descriptions, synonyms, scales, and as described by Nation (1990: 58), using various forms of definition: definition by demonstration (visual definition), definition by abstraction, contextual definition by translation. Allen
and Valette (1972: 116) also suggest the use of categories organizing words into sets, subclasses and subcategories often aided by visual presentation. Those learners who more autonomous can make use of other techniques such as asking others to explain the meaning of an unknown item, guessing from context or using other of a variety of dictionaries.

**a. Visual technique**

This pertains to visual memory, which is considered especially helpful with vocabulary retention. Learners remember better the material that has been presented by means of visual aids. Visual technique lend themselves well to presenting concrete items of vocabulary Nouns; many are also helpful in conveying meaning of verbs and adjectives. They help students associate presented material in a meaningful way and incorporate it into their system of language values.

**b. Verbal explanation**

This pertains to the use of illustrative situation, synonymy, opposite, scales, definition and categories. Teachers can explain a word by giving the context or by mentioning its synonym or antonym.

**c. Use of dictionaries**

Using a dictionary is another technique of finding out meaning of unfamiliar word and expression. Students can make use of a variety of dictionaries: bilingual, monolingual, pictorial, thesauri and the like. As French Allen perceives them, dictionaries are “pass ports to independence.” And using them is one of the students. Centered learning activities. A number of techniques can be adapted to present new vocabulary items.

**CONCEPTS OF LGL**

List-Group-Label strategy is designed to encourage students to improve their vocabulary and categorization skills, organize their verbal concepts and, aid them in remembering and reinforcing new words them. LGL attempts to improve upon the way in which students learn and remember new words. This strategy seems appropriate for children at all grade levels across the curriculum. List-Group-Label or LGL is a vocabulary strategy where students are asked to generate a list of words, group them according to their similarities, then label the
List-Group-Label is a vocabulary strategy that engages students in a three-step process to Actively organize their understanding of content area vocabulary and concepts (retrieved from: http://www.adlit.org). LGL was introduced by Taba (1967). The rationale for using this strategy is based on the idea that categorizing words will help students organize new words and concepts in relation to already known words/concepts. Students’ activation of prior knowledge then aids them in making inferences and elaborations that could lead to deeper understanding of texts. LGL was originally used to aid students in remembering technical vocabulary in social studies and science. Many teachers also use it in other curriculums to help students focus on background knowledge.

The strategy encourages students to improve their vocabulary and categorization skills and organize concepts. Categorizing listed words, through grouping and labeling, helps students organize new concepts in relation to previously learned concepts. List-Group-Label makes words come alive for students through their conversations and reflections on the “meaning connections” between words. It actively engages students in learning new vocabulary and content by activating their critical thinking skills.

**METHODOLOGY**

The research design used in this research was Classroom Action Research (CAR). It was conducted in two cycles. The aim of this research was to increasing the students’ vocabulary achievement by using List Group Label at the first year students of SMP Nasional Makassar. In this research, the writer conducted in four stages, those were planning, observation, action and reflection.

1. **Research Location**

The research was conducted to the students of the first year of SMP Nasional Makassar.

2. **Research Time**

The research was conducted in 2012 / 2013 academic year. It was conducted for 2 months. It was started from March up to April.

This research subject was conducted in SMP Nasional Makassar, at the first year, 2011/2012 academic year. With used of List Group Label to know their improvement in studying vocabulary.
a. Classroom Action Research Preparation

1. Observation

The researcher was observed the subject for one week, which was called pre-action. The observer analyses the students’ ability to improve their vocabulary in order to apply the method well.

2. Lesson Plan

Before doing classroom action research, researcher prepares set of equipment in learning such as lesson plan and material to teach.

b. Research Variables and Indicators

1. Variables

There were two variables in this research. The used of LIST group Label is independent variable. Noun and verb were dependent variable.

2. Indicators

The indicator was used for all variables are the same that the sentence completion. The same complete was helpful for the students to get skill for word choices and sentence construction.

c. Research Procedure

Cycle I

The first cycle in this classroom action research consists of planning, action, observation and reflection as follows:

1. Planning

   a. Understanding the curriculum which is used by the school in the second semester 2012/2013.
   
   b. Making lesson plan based on the curriculum, and arrange material of lesson plan and it should base on the using of List Group Label.
   
   c. Preparing observation sheet.

2. Action

   a. The first meeting, the teacher explain about the method, how to work or used it. The teacher gave material or text and asks the students to list vocabulary nouns and verbs according text.
b. The teacher gave paper for each students and ask them write noun and verb they have get from the text.

c. The teacher asks them to looking for the meaning word of dictionary.

d. After they get the meaning word, the students writes list of words into subcategories.

e. In the end of cycle gave them evaluation and the teacher asked the students to collect their answer.

3. Observation

In this phase, the teacher observed the situation and the students’ activity in teaching and learning process by using observational sheet and at the end of the first cycle. The teacher evaluated the students’ vocabulary achievement to measure the effect of List Group Label.

4. Reflection

Reflection was to see the first cycle action process. It was meant to analyze, understand, and to make conclusion activity. The teacher analyzed and evaluated the teaching and learning process, and then gave reflection by seeing the result of the observation as the reconciliation for the second cycle.

Cycle II

In this cycle just like the first cycle, the second cycle was planned as long four times meeting. The phases that were done in this cycle were not different with the previous cycle. Everything that was still less in the first cycle was improved in the second cycle.

Technique of Data Analysis

The data get from cycle I and cycle II were analyzed through the following steps:

1. Scoring the students answer :

   Score: \[ \text{The correct answer} \times 100 \]
   
   Total number of item

2. To score the student’s answer of the vocabulary test by using the following formula.
Table 1. Student’s Answer of the Vocabulary Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. To classify the students’ score, there were seven classifications which were used as follows:
   a. 9.6 – 10 as excellent
   b. 8.6 – 9.5 as very good
   c. 7.6 – 7.5 as good
   d. 6.6 – 7.5 as fairly good
   e. 5.6 – 6.5 as fair
   f. 4.6 – 5.5 as poor
   g. 0 – 3.5 as very poor

(Layman in Halimah, 2000:25)

4. Computing the frequency and the rate percentage of the students’ score:

\[ P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100\% \]

Where:  
\( P \) = Percentages of the students  
\( F \) = Frequency of the students  
\( N \) = The number of sample

(Gay 1981:298)

5. To know the percentage of the students’ improvement by applying the following formula:

\[ P = \frac{X_2 - X_1}{X_1} \times 100 \]

Where  
\( P \) = percentage  
\( X_1 \) = 1st cycle  
\( X_2 \) = 2nd cycle

6. The observer analyzed the research by applying percentage technique through the following formula:
\[ P = \frac{F_4}{4 \times N} \times 100 \]

Where \( P \) = percentage
\( F_4 \) = Frequency
\( N \) = Total students

7. To calculate the mean score of the students’ test result. The researcher would use the following formula:

\[ \bar{X} = \frac{\sum X}{N} \]

Where:
\( \bar{X} \) = Mean score
\( \sum X \) = the total number
\( N \) = the number of sample

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the finding and discussion of the research. The finding consists of the data obtained through achievement test to see the students’ achievement after being taught the materials of vocabulary mastery through List Group Label and the data is collected through observation and evaluation to see the students’ improvement in learning vocabulary after given treatment in the first and second cycle of the research.

Findings

The results of the data findings found that teaching vocabulary by using List Group Label can improve the students’ achievement in noun and also can improve the students’ achievement in verb. In the further interpretation of the data analysis were given below:

1. The Students’ Improvement of Vocabulary in Using Noun.

The improvement of the students’ vocabulary in using noun, which focused on countable and uncountable nouns as indicators in the first year students of SMP Nasional Makassar as the result of the students’ score of cycle I and cycle II described as follows:
Figure 1: The chart of indicators of nouns in cycle I and cycle II.

The chart above indicates that the score of D-Test (46.60%) is fewer than score of cycle I (57.70%). It means that the students gained improvement, even though it is still classified as fair. This also means that the target in cycle I has not been achieved yet. So, the researcher decided to organize cycle II with several repairing activities and the result of cycle II (73.80%) is greater than D-Test and cycle I. It is classified as good. This means that there is a significant improvement of nouns (27.20%) and the target can be achieved. Finally, the List Group Label (LGL) is effective for students.

2. The students’ improvement of vocabulary in using verbs.

Table 2: The Students’ achievement in verbs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>D – T</th>
<th>CYCLE I</th>
<th>CYCLE II</th>
<th>IMPROVEMENT (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>59.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Irregular</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>55.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(\sum X)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>94.00</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>115.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>57.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows that the students’ vocabulary achievement in using regular and irregular verbs before implementation of method indicates that diagnostic test is poor (47.70%), but after implementation cycle I, the score of regular and irregular verbs improves in the result of cycle I (57.60%) is greater...
than diagnostic test. Where, the score of regular verb is higher than that in irregular verb. This means that there is an improvement of the students’ vocabulary in using verbs, but this is classified as fair, so the researcher decides to organize cycle II. Score of cycle II is greater than cycle I (74.60% > 57.60%). It is classified as fairly good which means that there is improvement of the students’ achievement in using verbs. Then, the improvement from D - Test to cycle II, greater than D – test to cycle I (27.60% > 10.60%). It is classified as fairly good to good. Based on the percentages above there is a significant improvement of student’s vocabulary in using verbs through List Group Label (LGL).

3. The improvement of the students’ vocabulary mastery by using List Group Label (LGL).

The improvement of the students’ achievement in vocabulary mastery at the first year students of SMP Nasional Makassar by using List Group Label (LGL) as result of table 1 and table 2. Will be explained as follows:

Table 3: The Students’ Achievement in vocabulary mastery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>D – TEST</th>
<th>CYCLE I</th>
<th>CYCLE II</th>
<th>IMPROVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Score %</td>
<td>Score %</td>
<td>Score %</td>
<td>DT – CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>46.60</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>57.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>57.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∑X</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>93.60</td>
<td>11.53</td>
<td>115.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>46.80</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>57.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows that the students’ improvement of vocabulary in using noun and verb before implementation of the method indicates that diagnostic test score is poor (46.60%), but after implementation of cycle I, the score of their vocabulary mastery improves in the result of cycle I (57.70%). It is greater than diagnostic test. This means that there is an improvement of the students’ vocabulary mastery, but this is classified as fair, so the researcher decides to organize cycle II. The score of cycle II is greater than cycle I (74.20% > 57.70%). It is classified as good which means that there is improvement of the students’ vocabulary mastery. Then, the improvement from D - Test to cycle II is greater than D – test to cycle I (27.40% > 10.85%). Based on the percentages above there is a significant improvement of the students by using List Group Label (LGL). The data can also be seen in form diagram below:
DISCUSSION

In this part, the discussion presents the method applied in teaching vocabulary. The application of List Group Label (LGL) in teaching vocabulary mastery at the first year students of SMP Nasional Makassar can improve the students’ achievement and their ability to understand the materials of vocabulary mastery in cycle I and cycle II. This can be proved by the result of findings about nouns dealing with countable nouns and uncountable nouns, verbs dealing with regular and irregular verbs. The result of the students’ activeness in teaching and learning process.

1. The students’ Nouns in vocabulary mastery

The description of data analysis through the test is explained in previous finding section showed that the students’ ability about improvement in nouns by using List Group Label (LGL) is significant. It is supported by result of the test value in cycle II was higher than value test of cycle I.

Table 5: The criteria and percentage of the students’ countable nouns achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>D-Test</th>
<th>Cycle I</th>
<th>Cycle II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>9.6-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>8.6-9.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>7.6-8.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Fairly Good</td>
<td>6.6-7.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>5.6-6.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>3.6-5.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>84.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>0-35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data of the students’ regular verbs achievement in rate percentage of score shows that none of the students could achieve fairly good up to excellent classification in D-Test. Most of the students (21 students) (84.00%) got poor classification, 4 students (16.00%) got fair classification. In cycle I, there are 3 students (12.00%) got poor classification, 14 students (56.00%) students got fair classification, and in fairly good classification there are 8 students (32.00%). Then, in cycle II became 17 students (68.00%) got good classification and only 8 students (32.00%) got fairly good classification.
Table 6: The criteria and percentage of uncountable nouns achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>D-Test</th>
<th>Cycle I</th>
<th>Cycle II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>9.6-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>8.6-9.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>7.6-8.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Fairly Good</td>
<td>6.6-7.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>5.6-6.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>3.6-5.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>92.00</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 25 100 25 100 25 100

The data of irregular verbs achievement in rate percentage of score shows that none of the students could achieve fairly good up to excellent classification in D-Test. In the cycle I, 5 students (20.00%) got fairly good classification, 13 students (52.00%) got fair classification and 7 students (28.00%) got poor classification. In the cycle II became improved, 7 students (28.00%) got good classification, 10 students (40.00%) fairly good classification and 8 students (32.00%) got fair classification.

2. The students’ irregular verbs achievement in vocabulary mastery.

The description of data analysis through the test as explained in previous finding section showed that the students’ ability about improvement in verbs by using List Group Label (LGL) is significant. It is supported by result of the test value in cycle II was greater than test value of cycle I.

Table 7: The criteria and percentage of the students’ regular verbs achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>D-Test</th>
<th>Cycle I</th>
<th>Cycle II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>9.6-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>8.6-9.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>7.6-8.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Fairly Good</td>
<td>6.6-7.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>5.6-6.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>3.6-5.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>92.00</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 25 100 25 100 25 100

The data of the students’ regular verbs achievement in rate percentage of score shows that none of the students could achieve fairly good up to excellent
classification in D-Test. In the cycle I, 7 students (28.00%) got fairly good classification, 10 (40.00%) students got fair classification and 8 students (32.00%) got poor classification. But in cycle II became improved, 17 students (68.00%) got good classification, and 8 students (32.00%) got fairly good classification.

Table 8: The criteria and percentage of the students’ irregular verbs achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>D-Test</th>
<th>Cycle I</th>
<th>Cycle II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>F %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>9.6-10</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>8.6-9.5</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>7.6-8.5</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 17</td>
<td>68.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Fairly Good</td>
<td>6.6-7.5</td>
<td>0 0 8</td>
<td>32.00  8</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>5.6-6.5</td>
<td>4 16.00</td>
<td>14 56.00</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>3.6-5.5</td>
<td>21 84.00</td>
<td>3 12.00</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>0-35</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 100</td>
<td>25 100</td>
<td>25 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data of the students’ irregular verbs achievement in rate percentage of score shows that none of the students could achieve fairly good up to excellent classification in D-Test. In the cycle I, 8 (32.00%) students got fairly good classification, 14 students (56.00%) got fair classification and only 3 students (12.00%) got poor classification. But in cycle II became improved, 17 students (68.00%) got good classification, only 8 students (32.00%) got fairly good classification.

CONCLUSION

Based on the research findings and discussion in the previous chapter, the researcher comes to the following conclusions.

1. The use of List Group Label (LGL) in presenting the vocabulary mastery material at the first year students of SMP Nasional Makassar improves the students’ vocabulary achievement significantly. The finding indicates that the mean score of students’ vocabulary in nouns and verbs in cycle II is higher than the mean score of test in cycle I (74.20% > 57.79%).

2. The use of List Group Label (LGL) is able to improve the students’ activeness and participation in teaching and learning process.

Based on the conclusion above, the researcher addresses the following suggestions as follows:
1. It is suggested that the teachers, especially those who teach English of the Junior high school by the use of List Group Label (LGL) as one alternative among other teaching methods can be used in teaching vocabulary mastery.

2. It is suggested that the English teachers use List Group Label (LGL) in presenting the vocabulary mastery materials, because it is effective to improve the students’ vocabulary achievement.

3. The students are expected to increase their ability in learning vocabulary through List Group Label (LGL) and keep on vocabulary with various materials of vocabulary.

4. It is suggested to the English teacher to maximize in giving guidance to the students in learning and teaching vocabulary process so that the students are able to understand the material easily.
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