



Word-Wall Technique in Improving Students' Vocabulary Mastery at the first Grade of SMPN 4 Kajuara Kabupaten Bone

Misrawati^{1*}, Sitti Nurjannah², Muthmainnah Mursidin³

¹Bahasa Inggris/SMPN 4 Kajuara Kabupaten Bone

Email: misrawati08@gmail.com

²Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris/Universitas Islam Makassar

Email: sittinurjannah.dty@uim-makassar.ac.id

³Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris/Universitas Islam Makassar

Email: muthmainnahmursidin.dty@uim-makassar.ac.id

Abstract. This research aims to know (1) whether the use of word wall technique is able to improve students' vocabulary mastery, (2) the students' interest to learn vocabulary by using word wall technique. This research was conducted at SMPN 4 Kajuara Kabupaten Bone academic year 2017-2018. The subject of this research consisted of 52 students of first grade. The design of the research was quasi-experimental design where the research used two group, they were experimental group and control group. There were 2 classes as a sample namely VII-A as experimental group (taught by word wall) with the total number of 26 students and VII-B as control group (without word wall) with the total number of 26 students. The researcher administered pre-test and post-test to both groups. The result of data shows that there an improvement and interest of using word wall technique toward the students' vocabulary mastery. Thre percentage of students' pre-test of experimental group was 19.34 and the score of post-test was 41.74. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis (H_a) of this research is accepted. It means that the use of ward wall technique improves students' vocabulary mastery at the first grade of SMPN 4 Kajuara Kabupaten Bone.

Keywords: Vocabulary; Word-wall Technique; Achievement.

Abstrak: Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui (1) apakah penggunaan teknik dinding kata mampu meningkatkan penguasaan kosakata siswa, (2) ketertarikan siswa untuk belajar kosakata dengan dinding kata. Penelitian ini telah diadakan di SMPN 4 Kajuara Kabupaten Bone tahun pelajaran 2017/2018. Pokok persoalan pada penelitian ini terdiri dari 52 siswa kelas satu. Bentuk penelitian adalah berbentuk quasi-experimental dimana penelitian menggunakan dua kelompok, yaitu kelompok eksperimen dan kelompok control. Ada dua kelas sebagai sampel yakni, VII A sebagai kelompok eksperimen (mengajar dengan dinding kata) dengan jumlah 26 siswa dan VII B sebagai kelompok kontrol (tanpa dinding kata) dengan jumlah 26 siswa. Peneliti memberikan pre-test and post-test untuk kedua kelompok. Hasil dari data menunjukkan ada peningkatan dan ketertarikan dengan menggunakan teknik didinding kata terhadap peningkatan kosakata siswa. Persentasi skor siswa sebeum diajarkan dengan menggunakan teknik dnding kata adalah 19.34% dan setelah mengajar dengan teknik dinding kata adalah 41.76%. Oleh karena itu, hipotesis altenatif (H_a) untuk penelitian ini diterima. Itu berarti bahwa penggunaan teknik dinding kata meningkatkan penguasaan kosakata siswa di kelas satu SMPN 4 Kajauara Kabupaten Bone.

Kata kunci: Kosa kata; teknik dinding kata.

BACKGROUND

English as a foreign language is the most important language and it is used an international communication in the world. Now days in the era of globalization everyone the race for English master to facilitate their communication on the international scale. English is the most old and in fact indeed many countries use English as their national language before English as international language was made, such as the U.S., which also uses English is national language.

Indonesian government has put in the curriculum as a subject to learn. It is compulsory subject from junior high school to education, even now it is also tough in elementary school as an optional subject. The difficulties of learning English are not only at junior high school but also at the senior high school and even at the university. Every school in Indonesia has to give the best service for students' with quality teacher or professional teacher to teach the students' facilities etc.

The process of learning English as foreign language is the same with the process how children learn to talk for the first time. In teaching English involves language skills namely: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. They are closely and cannot be separated.

Vocabulary is a basic component in learning English because when the students' learn English, they must know vocabulary first. The students' who are less in vocabulary, will be difficult in understanding the text, unable to speak English, and difficult to write their own idea. Whereas, vocabulary is very important because it will carry the students' in English learning process.

In teaching and learning process there are many problems for teacher and students'. The researcher will conducted preliminary study in SMPN 4 Kajuara Kabupaten Bone, there are many students who got problem in English subject. The students' difficulties to speak using English because their vocabulary achievement is still low. Because of that, the researcher will be applied word wall technique as a method in teaching and learning process. This method can make students active in the classroom.

In addition, word wall can make students' confidence more increase. The researcher uses more theme and use favorites' word, which is make students increase and active in the classroom. The activity that the students will pronounce the words on the wall after researcher, that is to train students' pronunciation. Besides that, the students easy to understand make a sentence and memorizing the words.

There are many techniques which can be applied to teaching English especially for teaching vocabulary to make the students enjoy, happy, and interesting. The researcher applies one of them, namely "word wall" the researcher uses this technique because word wall is effective ways to improve students' vocabulary mastery. Word wall activity is recognized as the best way for teaching learning English at school, especially in building the students' vocabulary, Cronsberry (2004: 3). It is relevant to Green that word wall is collection of words which are displayed in large visible letters on a wall, bulletin board, or other display surface in a classroom. The word wall is designed to be an interactive tool for students' or others to use, and contains an array of words that can be used to effective the students' vocabulary.

Based on the explanation above the researcher thinks that it is reasonable enough to be the reason why the researcher is interested to do experimental research under the title "*Improving students' vocabulary mastery by using word wall technique at the first grade of SMPN 4 Kajuara Kabupaten Bone*". This research is an effort to evaluate and improve the students' vocabulary acquisition. It focuses on three kinds of vocabulary, namely noun, verb and adjective.

METHOD

Research Method And Design

The method used in this research was quasi experimental design in which two groups. They were experimental group and control group. Pre-test was administered before treatment, while post-test was administered after treatment to measure its effect. The design of the research is described as follows:

| | | | |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| E | O ₁ | X ₁ | O ₂ |
| C | O ₁ | X ₂ | O ₂ |

The population of this research was the seven grade (VII) students in SMP Negeri 4 Kajuarra in academic of year the 2017-2018. The number of population was 52 students' consisted of two classes, each classes consisted of 26 students.

The sample of the research consisted of 2 classes as a sample of this research. They consisted of 52 students' as experimental group and control group. The experimental group consists of 26 students and control group consisted of 26 students'.

The instrument is explained as follows:

1. Test

It aims to find out competence of the students' in learning English Vocabulary mastery. The test consisted of pre-test and post-test. There were two tests that used in this research, they were:

- Multiple choice tests that consist of 10 items. The students' chose the correct answer. The score for each item is 10.
- Fill in the blank tests that consist of 10 items. The students' chose the correct answer. The score for each item is 10.

2. Observation

It aims to find out participation of the students' during teaching and learning process. This observation used research experiment to know learning process and students' interest by using word wall technique in teaching vocabulary achievement.

3. Questionnaire

It aims to find out the students motivation and interest in teaching and learning process. This questionnaire used after treatment by using word wall technique. The questionnaire consisted of 14 questions, the students' choose yes category or no category.

The data collections from the subject were analyzed quantitatively. Quantitative analysis uses the data from the adjective test and

quantitative analysis uses the data from questionnaire.

The steps take in quantitative analysis are as follows:

- Scoring the student answer of pre-test and post-test.

$$p = \frac{F}{N} \times 100\%$$

In which:

p = *percentage*

F = *frequency*

N = *the total sample*

- Calculating the mean score of the students vocabulary by using formula

$$X_1 = \frac{\sum x_1}{N_1}$$

$$\text{and } X_2 = \frac{\sum x_2}{N_2}$$

Where:

X_1 = mean score of the experimental group

X_2 = mean score of the control group

$\sum x_1$ = total raw score of the experimental group

$\sum x_2$ = total raw score of the control group

N_1 = total number students of the experimental group

N_2 = total number students of the control group

(Hatch and Farhadi 1982)

- Finding standard deviation of the students pretest and post-test by the applying the formula below:

- The formula used for experimental group:

$$\sum x^2 = \sum x^2 - \frac{\sum x^2}{N}$$

- The formula used for control group:

$$\sum y^2 = \sum y^2 - \frac{\sum y^2}{N}$$

Where:

$\sum x^2$ = sum of square deviation of experimental group

$\sum y^2$ = sum of square deviation of control group

N_x = the number of student of experimental group

N_y = the number of students of control group

(Arikunto 2006)

- To know the significance difference of testing hypothesis by using t-count formula:

$$t = \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left[\frac{\sum x^2 + \sum y^2}{N_x + N_y - 2}\right] \left[\frac{1}{N_x} + \frac{1}{N_y}\right]}}$$

Where:

t = significance difference between experimental and control group

M_x = mean score of deviation in experimental group

M_y = mean score of deviation in control group

$\sum x^2$ = sum of square deviation of experimental group

$\sum y^2$ = sum of square deviation of control group

N_x = number of student of experimental group

N_y = number of student of control group

(Arikunto 2006)

- Classifying the students' score based on the following categories

| No | Mastery level | Category |
|----|---------------|-------------|
| 1 | 95-100 | Excellent |
| 2 | 85-90 | Very good |
| 3 | 75-80 | Good |
| 4 | 65-70 | Fairly good |
| 5 | 55-60 | Fair |
| 6 | 35-50 | Poor |
| 7 | 0-30 | Very poor |

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Findings

Refer to the last chapter, the researcher used test in collecting data. It was given to the first grade students at SMPN 4 Kajurua as a subject of the research. The test consists of 20 questions. The

types of test are 10 multiple choice, and 10 fill in the blank. There were 26 students as a subject of this research.

The students were given pre-test before giving treatment. The result of pre-test indicated that students in vocabulary are poor although sometimes they were difficult to interpret the words in a context. After getting the result of students pre-test, the researcher gave treatment for the students by teaching them using word wall technique. When teaching learning process was running, the students felt happy, enjoy, and comfortable in participating the learning process.

After the treatment was done, the researcher administered a post test to all the students. This post test used to know students vocabulary mastery after taught by using word wall. The researcher wanted to know how far the students understanding about the use of some vocabulary in a context and remember about some words that given to the students when treatment process is done.

1. Scoring the students answer of pre-test and post test in experimental group

Table 4.1 The scoring students' vocabulary mastery in experimental group

| Experimental group | Score of pre-test | Score of post-test | Gained score |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| Average | 19.34 | 41.76 | 22.42 |

The mean score of the pre-test result:

$$X_1 = \frac{\sum x_1}{N_1} = \frac{503}{26} = 19.34\%$$

This pre-test was given to the students. Pre test was the same as post test. The students should answer 20 questions. There were 26 students as respondent or subject of the research. It was done before the treatment process by using word wall technique in teaching vocabulary. The data of students' achievement in pre test and post test can be seen in table.

According to the criterion provided by Depdikbud, learning process can be said to be successful if students' achievement is 65 % and above seeing from the result of the pre-test that is only 19.34%, because the students vocabulary is still low. The researcher concludes that the students did not master the material well.

The mean score of the post-test result:

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &= \frac{\sum x_1}{N_1} \\ &= \frac{1086}{26} \\ &= 41.76 \end{aligned}$$

After the treatment, the students were given post test. The test was the same as the pre test. The post test administered after using word wall technique in teaching and learning vocabulary. The students must answer 20 questions. There were 26 students as subject of the research. The data of students' achievement in post test can be seen in table.

Base on the table 4.1 the students percentage achievement of post test was 41.67. The comparison of pre-test and post-test in experimental group was different, the students vocabulary achievement was improved after using word wall technique as media in teaching and learning process.

1. Scoring the students answer of pre-test and post test in control group

Table 4.2 the scoring of students' vocabulary mastery in control group

| Control group | Score of pre-test | Score of post-test | Gained score |
|---------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| Average | 14.80 | 27.69 | 12.89 |

The mean score of the pre test result:

$$\begin{aligned} X_2 &= \frac{\sum x_2}{N_2} \\ &= \frac{385}{26} \\ &= 14.80\% \end{aligned}$$

In control class there were 26 students as a subject. In this test the researcher administered the same test as experimental group. In teaching learning process the researcher uses verbal explanation in the classroom.

The percentage of pre-test in control group was 14.80%. The students' vocabulary in this class was very poor, no one student got a good score. The percentage achievement of the post-test result:

$$\begin{aligned} X_2 &= \frac{\sum x_2}{N_2} \\ &= \frac{720}{26} \\ &= 27.69 \end{aligned}$$

From the table 4.2, the researcher concludes that the student' vocabulary still low. The percentage only 27.69 that was indicated that the students vocabulary achievement in poor category. Base on table 4.2 can be conclude that the rate percentage of control group in post test was different in the percentage of pre-test, but increasing only 12.89.

2. Classifying the students' score of pre-test and post test in experimental group

Table 4.3 Classifying the students' scores of pre-test in experimental group

| No | Category | Score | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------------|-------------|--------|-----------|-------------|
| 1 | Excellent | 95-100 | 0 | 0% |
| 2 | Very good | 85-90 | 0 | 0% |
| 3 | Good | 75-80 | 0 | 0% |
| 4 | Fairly good | 65-70 | 0 | 0% |
| 5 | Fair | 55-60 | 0 | 0% |
| 6 | Poor | 35-50 | 0 | 0% |
| 7 | Very poor | 0-30 | 26 | 100% |
| Total | | | 26 | 100% |

The data above shows that from 26 students, all of students get score very poor. None of students who get score poor category, fair, fairly good, good, very good and excellent level.

Table 4.4 classifying the students' score of post-test in experimental group

| No | Category | Score | Frequency | Percentage |
|----|-------------|--------|-----------|------------|
| 1 | Excellent | 95-100 | 0 | 0% |
| 2 | Very good | 85-90 | 0 | 0% |
| 3 | Good | 75-80 | 0 | 0% |
| 4 | Fairly good | 65-70 | 0 | 0% |
| 5 | Fair | 55-60 | 3 | 11.53% |
| 6 | Poor | 35-50 | 2 | 7.69% |
| 7 | Very poor | 0-30 | 21 | 80.76% |

| | | |
|--------------|-----------|-------------|
| Total | 26 | 100% |
|--------------|-----------|-------------|

The table 4.4 shows that from 26 students, None of students who got score fairly good, good, very good and excellent level, there were 3 students in a fair score (11.53) as well as 2 students in poor (7.69) and 21 Students in very poor score (80.76). Based on the table 4.3 and 4.4 it could be concluded that the rate percentage of experimental class in post-test was higher than the percentage in pre-test.

3. Classifying the students' score of pre-test and post test in control group

Table 4.5 classifying the students' score of pre-test in control group

| No | Category | Score | Freq uency | Perce ntage |
|--------------|-------------|--------|---------------|----------------|
| 1 | Excellent | 95-100 | 0 | 0% |
| 2 | Very good | 85-90 | 0 | 0% |
| 3 | Good | 75-80 | 0 | 0% |
| 4 | Fairly good | 65-70 | 0 | 0% |
| 5 | Fair | 55-60 | 0 | 0% |
| 6 | Poor | 35-50 | 0 | 0% |
| 7 | Very poor | 0-30 | 26 | 100% |
| Total | | | 26 | 100% |

The table 4.5 shows that from 26 students in control group, all of students get poor category. None of students who got category classified as poor, fair, fairly good, good, very good and excellent level.

Table 4.6 classifying the students' score of post-test in control group

| No | Categ ory | Score | Frequ ency | Percen tage |
|--------------|----------------|--------|---------------|----------------|
| 1 | Excell ent | 95-100 | 0 | 0% |
| 2 | Very good | 85-90 | 0 | 0% |
| 3 | Good | 75-80 | 0 | 0% |
| 4 | Fairly good | 65-70 | 0 | 0% |
| 5 | Fair | 55-60 | 1 | 3,84% |
| 6 | Poor | 35-50 | 7 | 26,92 % |
| 7 | Very poor | 0-30 | 18 | 69,23 % |
| Total | | | 26 | 100% |

The data of table 4.6 shows that from 26 students, none of students who got fairly good, good, very good and excellent level, there was 1 student in a fair score (3.84) as well as 7 students in poor (26.92) and 18 Students in very poor score (69.23).

DISCUSSION

Based on the research finding, it shows that the mean scores between pre-test and post-test was different. The objectives of the study was to know if there was an improvement in applying word wall technique in teaching vocabulary mastery at the first grade of SMPN 4 Kajuara Kabupaten Bone academic year 2017/2018. The use of word wall technique could make the students enjoy in learning process, the students could be open their mind to mention or pronounce their vocabulary mastery. The students easily to remember the words by using word wall than just gave them category of words.

Analyzing the mean score gap in the post-test between the Experimental and control group ensures if the technique used was effective. The mean score of the Experimental group was 41.76% and 27.69% for Control group. It means that the gap of the students' score of the Experimental and Control group was 12.04%. Between experimental group and control group was different because, the researcher use word wall technique in experimental group and control group used verbal explanation. The explanation of the gap between the two classes indicates that the experimental group shows high improvement than the control group. The deviation of experimental group is higher between control group. Because, the sum-squared deviation of experimental group was 3957 and in control group was 3090.39. Therefore, there was significant difference between the mean score of two classes, the score was 3.03.

Based on the research method, the process of collecting data divided into three steps. Firstly, the step was giving pretest for the students, its mean that to know the students' vocabulary before being taught by word wall technique. Secondly, the step was giving treatment to the students, the treatment here was teaching vocabulary by word wall technique. Thirdly, the step was giving post-test, in the posttest the students were given a test to know their

vocabulary after they were get a treatment by word wall technique.

To sum up, based on the result of this research, which shown the students' scores were much higher after the treatment in Experimental class using word wall technique. The used of word wall technique was effective toward the students' vocabulary mastery. The researcher use observation checklist and questionnaire to find out the data of students interest to learn vocabulary mastery by using word wall technique. Base on the result of observation checklist and questionnaire, it could be concluded that most of students agree to learn English vocabulary mastery by using word wall technique. Because of that, learning activities more interesting and not makes the students bored, easy to understand the words given and enjoy in the learning process.

From the comparison of the result of post-test score between experimental and control group, the vocabulary mastery of experimental group was getting higher than control group. It means that the treatment of using word wall technique to the experimental group was successful.

Word wall technique was an effective for teaching vocabulary. The word "effective" here means that word wall technique gives positive change in the teaching and learning process. Here word wall technique helps the students to vocabulary mastery in interesting and communicative way. Word wall activities engage students while they learn key vocabulary, whether it is learning to explain a word, to compare it to other key concepts, or to spell it. According to Helen Van, Word Wall game is systematically organized collection of words displayed in large letters on a wall or other large display places in the classroom. It can be considered to give practice in all skills such as: reading, writing, and speaking because, to practice all skill in English the students' must master in vocabulary. Word Wall is concerned primarily with developing skill, but some of them are more actively oral and give better situation where the teacher wants to provide the relief. It is relevant to Green, argued that a word wall is an organized collection of large print words wall on the classroom. A word wall helps create a print rich environment for students, and

can be a wonderful tool that is designed to promote group learning.

From the explanation above, it could be concluded that word wall technique was an effective technique in teaching vocabulary. Such as the previous research which has been done at the first grade of SMPN 4 Kajuara Kabupaten Bone. This research was success and shows a better result. The teacher could be used this technique as alternative way in teaching English not only to memorize, understanding the words but the students were easier to make sentences. The class activity was more fun because the students' active to participate in the study so that they will not felt bored. Whether, the teacher could be used this technique for their class based on some certain learning objective even in the Elementary School, Junior High School level.

CONCLUSION

Based on the result of data analysis, some conclusion:

1. The students' vocabulary achievement before being taught by using word wall technique was not achieving the KKM. It means that the score are only able to answer some of the questions that has been tested. It could be seen from the score obtained by the students before taught using word wall technique that from 26 students.
2. The students' vocabulary achievement after being taught by using word wall technique still not achieve in category fair score, the students' achievement in vocabulary was still low but there was improvement.
3. There was students' improvement and interested to learn vocabulary mastery using word wall technique. The students score before being taught by using word wall technique was 19.34% and after being taught by using word wall technique was 41.76% in experimental group. Whether there was an improvement in teaching vocabulary mastery. The learning activities more interesting and not makes the students bored, easy to understand the words given and enjoy the learning process. The sum-squared deviation of experimental group was 3957 and in control group was 3090.39. Therefore, the deviation of experimental group is higher between control group. There was significant

4. difference between the mean score of two classes, t_{test} was $3.03 > t_{\text{table}}$ 1.708. In conclusion, word wall technique was effective to use in teaching vocabulary mastery for the first grade at SMPN 4 Kajuara Kabupaten Bone in academic year 2017/2018.

SUGGESTION

Based on the conclusion above, the researcher presents some suggestions as follows:

1. The teacher should be active, creative, and effective to arrange English materials.
2. The teacher should be able to manage the class to make the students more active in teaching English, especially in learning and teaching vocabulary.
3. The teacher should be able to choose a good method. For instance the teacher may use *word wall technique* as her method to make their students enjoy in the class. Because this method involved the participation of the students in learning and teaching process. By this method the students can encourage their motivation and increasing in learning with a fun learning Sources, the students can improve their English, especially in teaching vocabulary.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AJ. Thomson and AV. Martinet, *A Practical English Grammar* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), p.10.
- Arikunto, S, 2006. *Procedure Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: PT Asdi Mahasatya
- Collins, William, 1979. *Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary*. America: The United States of America, p. 604.
- Cronsberry, 2004. *Word Walls: A Support for Literacy in Secondary School Classrooms*.
- David Wilkins, 2002. *Linguistics in language teaching*. London: Edward Arnold, p.13.
- Davies, M. 2006. *A frequency dictionary of Spanish: Core vocabulary forlearners*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Depdikbud, 1982. *Materi Dasar Pendidikan Program Akta Mengajar V, (Buku II A)*, Jakarta: PPIPT Depdikbud.
- Finocchiaro, M. 1973. *Teaching English as Foreign Language*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Good, 1973. *The Dictionary Of Education*. New York: Mc Graw Hill Book Company.
- Graves, M.F. (2007). Vocabulary instruction in the middle grades. *Voices from the Middle, 15*(1): 13-19.
- Green, 1993. *Teaching Vocabulary With Word Wall*. New York.
- Hall J. Eugene, (1993). *Grammar for Use*, Jakarta: Bina Rupa Aksara, P. 8.
- Hatch, E, and Farhadi, H. (1982). *Research Design and Statistics For Applied Linguistic*. Rowley: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.
- Hornby, 1981. *Oxford Advance Learner's Dictionary 6th Edition*, Oxford University Press.
- Hedge, 2003. *Teaching & learning in the language classroom*. UK: OUP.
- J. Wallace Michael, *Teaching Vocabulary*, London: Biddles Ltd, Guilford and King's Lynn, 1989.
- Jeremy, Harmer. 1983. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*, London : Longman Group.
- Jerry, 010. *Intructional Sratgy Teaching Word Wall*. New York.
- Jumariati, 2010. *Improving the Vocabulary Mastery of EFL Students*. pbingfkipunlam: English Dept of FKIP Unlam, p. 7.

- Kamil, M. L. & Hiebert, E. H, 2005. *Teaching and learning vocabulary: Perspectives and persistent issues*. in E. H. Hiebert and M. L. Kamil (eds.), *Teaching and learning vocabulary: Bringing research to practice*, Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kasim, Nur Aeni, 2011. *Increasing The Students' Vocabulary Mastery By Using Word Wall Media*. Thesis. Makassar: FKIP UNM.
- Larsen Diane & Freeman, *Techniques & Principles in Language Teaching*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Longman dictionary of English language and culture*, 1998), England: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.
- Ma'rifat, Dwi. 2017. *A Case Study of Using in Teaching English Vocabulary to Uoung Learners*. Departement of English Education, Indonesia University of Education, 5(1), 49-55.
- M. Zaenuri, 2011. *A English Vocabulary I, Revised Edition*, Jakarta: unpublished.
- Nation, I.S.P. 2008. *Teaching Vocabulary: Strategies and Techniques*, Boston: Heinle Cengage Learning.
- _____, 1994. *New Ways in Teaching Vocabulary*. Alexandria: TESOL, p. 20.
- Nunan, D, 2003. *Practical English language teaching*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill/Contemporary.
- Parreren, 1989. *Vocabulary learning through reading: Which conditions shouldbe met when presenting words in texts?* AILA Review, 6, 76-85.
- Puspita, Nurul.2016. *The Influence of Using Bingo Game Towards Students' Vocabulary Mastery at The First Semester of The Seventh Grade of Mts N 2 Bandar Lampung*. Jurnal Tradisi Bahasa Inggris, 9(2), 380-394.
- Rohmati, Anisa, 2015. *Spelling Be In Teacheng Vovabulary*. Departement of English Education, Indonesia University of Education, 3(2), 1-15.
- Renandya, W. A, 2002. *Methodology in Language Teaching: an anthology of current practice*. New York: Cambridge.
- Scrivener, 1994. *The Teacher Trainer*. PPP and after, 75.
- Schmitt, Norbert, 2000. *Vocabulary in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press. p.5.
- Stahl, 2005. *Four problems with teaching word meanings and what to do to make vocabulary an integral part of instruction*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, p. 9.
- Tarone, 1974. *Speech Perception in Second Language Acquisition a: Suggestion Model*. Language Learning.
- Thorbury Scott, 2002. *How to Teach Vocabulary*, London: Longman
- Yusrika, Elsa Sitompul. 2013. *Teaching Vocabulary Using Flashcard and word List*. English Education Study Program of Indonesia University of Education, 1(1), 52-58.
- Yuliana Siregar, Anita, 2013. *Improving Students' Vocabulary Mastery Through Crossword Puzzle*. North Sumatera: English Department of Education State Institute for Islamic Studies, p. 11.
- Wallace, 1982. *Vocabulary Building and Word Study*. New York: Mc. Graw-Hill Book Company.
- Webster's, Random House, 2001. *Collage Dictionary*. America: United States of America, p. 842