Teaching Vocabulary by Using Semantic Mapping Strategy *(Quasy Experimental Study on the Seventh Graders Students of SMP Mandiri Pontianak Timur In Academic Years 2017/2018)*

Zulkarnaen

Sekolah Tinggi Bahasa Asing Pontianak

zulkarnaenabang7@gmail.com

Abstract *- This research was conducted to answer the research question: "How effective is the use of Semantic Mapping to increase vocabulary achievement on the Seventh Graders Students of SMP Mandiri Pontianak?" method of this research is a Quasi-experimental Study. A Quasi-experimental Study requires one experimental group and one control group and needs the test namely Pretest and Posttest. The treatments were conducted in three time meetings with the purpose of knowing the effectiveness of the teaching of vocabulary using Semantic Mapping. The research findings showed the mean score of pretest in experimental group is 6,70 and the mean score of posttest is 7,82 and categorized ".good". The result of computation on the t-test with 2,70 is higher than the t-table for the degree of freedom N-1 (60-1)=59 is 2,021. Moreover, the computation on Effect Size of the treatment is 2,01. It is categorized "highly effective" because the result of 2,02 is higher than 0.8 that is the high level of effectiveness on Effect Size criteia proposed by Burn (ES > 0.8 = 2,01 >0.8). From the computation, it can be concluded that the teaching of vocabulary by using Semantic Mapping "highly effective". Therefore, the null hypothesis that says "The use of Semantic Mapping is not effective to increase the students' vocabulary achievement" is rejected. And the alternative hypothesis that says "The use of Semantic Mapping is effective to increase the students' vocabulary achievement is effective" is accepted.*

Keywords: *Teaching Vocabulary, Semantic Mapping, Strategy*

I. INTRODUCTION

In previous studies of this research so many studies have been done in the discipline of teaching vocabulary. A study inquired by Chain (2007) investigated whether or not the use of explanation facilitates children's ability to derive accurate word meanings from story context. study found that explanation is a useful

instructional technique that facilitates children's ability to derive word meanings from context .

Rosenthal & Ehri (2008) determine whether spelling improves students' memory for pronunciation and knowledge of meanings of new vocabulary words. The study indicated that learning the correct pronunciation was more challenging for the students than learning the definition. Schmitt (2000:3) argues: "The mechanics of vocabulary learning are still something of a mystery, but one thing we can be sure of is that words are not instantaneously acquired, at least not for adult second language learners. Rather, they are gradually learned over a period of time from numerous exposures. This incremental nature of vocabulary acquisition manifests itself in a number of ways. We have all had the experience of being able to recognize and understand a word when we see it in a text or hear it in a conversation, but not being able to use it ourselves. This common situation shows that there are different degrees of knowing a word. Being able to understand a word is known as *receptive knowledge* and is normally connected with listening and reading. If we are able to produce a word of our own accord when speaking or writing, then that is considered *productive knowledge* (*passive/active* are alternative terms)".

Nash & Snowling (2006) investigate the efficacy of two forms of vocabulary intervention (definition method and the context method). Both groups showed greater knowledge of the taught vocabulary directly after instruction. Three months later, the context group showed significantly better expressive vocabulary knowledge and comprehension of text containing the targeted vocabulary In teaching a foreign language, it seems that it is hard to use a single method all of the time. The suitability of a method to a language learner depends on many factors. The most common factors that affect the choice of a method are age , aptitude, second language level, interests, the time he can devote to language learning, the size of the group to which he belongs (Mackey in Setiyadi, 2006: 177). Hatch and Brown in Ghazal (1995:84) define: Vocabulary is central to language and is of great significance to language learners. Words are the building blocks of a language since they label objects, actions, ideas without which people cannot convey the

intended meaning. The prominent role of vocabulary knowledge in second or foreign language learning has been recently recognized by theorists and researchers in the field. Accordingly, numerous types of approaches, techniques, exercises and practice have been introduced into the field to teach vocabulary.

While, Hulstjin in Ghazal (1995) states, " It has been suggested that teaching vocabulary should not only consist of teaching specific words but also aim at equipping learners with strategies necessary to expand their vocabulary knowledge." In related to the purpose of teaching vocabulary and how the important it is, one reason teachers are concerned about teaching vocabulary is to facilitate the comprehension of a text that students will be assigned to read. If students do not know the meaning of many of the words that they will encounter in a text, their comprehension of that selection is likely to be compromised. When the purpose of vocabulary instruction is to facilitate the comprehension of a selection, it is obvious that this instruction must take place as an introduction before the reading of the selection.

Brown (2006:1) says, "Teaching is guiding and facilitating learning, enabling the learners to learn, setting the condition for learning". While, Harmer (2001: 114) argues that teaching means the interaction between the teacher and the students in many cultures. Besides teaching in the classroom, the teacher must consider the teaching model itself. Joyce in Trianto (2007:5) states that a teaching model is a planning or a pattern that is used as a guide in planning a tutorial teaching in the classroom.

In other case, according to Kimble and Garmezy in Brown (2007:7) say that learning is the process of acquiring or getting knowledge from a subject or a skill by studying, experiencing, and instructing. In order to know a particular subject, one must learn it. Furthermore, John (2006:73) says, "language learning is essentially like learning other domains of knowledge: that whether people are learning mathematic, or learning to drive a car, or learning Japanese, they are not engaging in any essentially different kind of mental activity". Moreover, John in Muriel (2006:72) argues, "learning essentially involves development from

controlled to automatic processing of component skills, freeing learners' controlled processing capacity for new information and higher-order skills".

In term of foreign language learning, it involves two distinct processes. They are language learning and language acquisition. Language learning is a conscious process of knowing of a language and the result is only to know the language. On the other hand, language acquisition is a subconscious or natural way of knowing language. Language learning environment determines the condition in the classroom.

In schools, the students are introduced and taught English like other important subject as one of compulsory subjects. However, English is still regarded as a difficult subject and a difficult language to be mastered by the students. One of the elements of English that is regarded very difficult to be mastered is vocabulary because English are not taught on Elementary school in Kurikulum 2013. Learning vocabulary is not easy for learners. Zihong (2000) cited in Elyansyah (2007:3) said that without sufficient vocabulary one could not communicate effectively on expressing idea.

Visnja Pavicic (2003) dealt with a way to improve students' abilities to explore, store and use of vocabulary items. He determined the role of vocabulary teaching and how a teacher could help their learners. He laid emphasis on self initiated independent learning with strategies, in which formal practices, functional practices and memorizing could be included. He said that the teacher should create activities and tasks to help students to build their vocabulary and develop strategies to learn the vocabulary on their own.

Semantic mapping can help the English teacher in teaching. Using semantic mapping in teaching can increase students' interest and motivation while illustrating concepts and procedures in a more easily understood way. In this research, the writer will use word maps concepts such as family, zoo and hobbies. Based on the above explanation the writer intends to investigate whether the semantic mapping are effective in teaching vocabulary to the seventh graders of junior high school students. Morin and Goebel (2000) cited in Sasan (2011: 3) state

semantic mapping as a strategy that supports the students recall words better. Duffy (2009 : 1) says that semantic is one to explain how to categorize word meanings. it way are a simple but very effective strategy. Semantic mapping can help students visualize how word meanings can be categorized. In the teaching and learning the English language process, the teacher must be able to make the class as a place in teaching learning, so that the teacher must be able make various activities and attractive materials. In this research, the writer used Semantic mapping as a strategy to help the students increased their vocabulary achievement. This research conducted on the Seventh Graders Students of SMP Mandiri Pontianak. There are two reasons of doing the research at SMP Mandiri Pontianak Timur. Firstly, the students do not master vocabulary well. Secondly, the students at SMP Mandiri Pontianak learn English only at the school without taking any private course.

II. METHODS

In solving the problem it is important to decide the method of research. According to Singh (2006:79) “Research methodology involves such general activities as identifying problems, review of the literature, formulating hypotheses, procedure for testing hypotheses, measurement, data collection analysis of data, interpreting results and drawing conclusions. Thus, research methodology consists of all general and specific activities of research”. The method of research is decided depending on what the researcher intends to investigate that is the effectiveness of using semantic mapping in teaching vocabulary as the strategy on the seventh grades students. Therefore, the appropriate form of the research that is applied in this research is Quasi-Experimental study. Quasi experimental design is a research design to approximate the condition of the true experiment in a setting which does not allow the control and the manipulation of all relevant variables. On relation to quasi-experimental, Cohen (2000:214) argues that an interaction effect may occur as a result of the pretest measure sensitizing the subjects to the experimental variable. Interaction effects can be controlled for by adding to the pretest-post-test control group design two more groups that do not experience the pretest measures.

According to Yogesh (2006: 26) Experimental method is a scientific method that is oriented to the future in the sense that the researcher is seeking to evaluate something new. Experimentation can be considered a technique of deliberately staging a situation designed to force nature to provide a "yes" or "no" answer to a specific hypothesis concerning the phenomena under discussion.

Quasi experimental research typically involves applied settings where it is not possible to control all relevant variables but only some of them. The design of this method is as follows:

Subject	Pretest	Treatment	Post test
A	T1	X	T2
B	T2	O	T2

Notes:
A : Experimental group
B : Control group
T1: Pretest
T2: Posttest
X: Treatment
O: No treatment

In this research, the experimental group will start by giving the students pretest. After that the design continued with treatments and ended with a post test. And the second group does not get receive a treatment after pretest. A population is an Individual or group that represents all the members of certain group or category of interest (Urdan 2005:1) . Burns (2000:83) defines, "A population is an entire group of people or objects or events which all have at least one characteristic in common, and must be defined specifically and ambiguously". The population of this research is the seventh graders students of SMP Mandiri Pontianak. The seventh graders students consist of 2 classes, they are class VII A, and VII B. The

total numbers of the students are 60 students. The number of students for each class is as follows:VIIA = 30 students; VII B = 30 students

Arikunto (2006: 108) states that sample is a portion or the representatives of population which is observed. He also says that if subjects are less than 100, it is better to take the whole subjects so that the research will be a population research. If the subjects are big, it can be taken between 10%-15% or 20%-25% 0r more. According to Burns (2000:83) a sample is "any part of population…". The writer used the cluster sampling. Yogesh (2006) says, "Sampling is indispensable technique of behavioral research, the research work cannot be undertaken without use of sampling ". In this research, the sample of the subject is the seventh grades students of SMP Mandiri Pontianak. The samples of this research are class VII A as an experimental group and class VII B as a control group.

Choosing an appropriate technique to collect data is very important. There are some techniques that can be used in a research. According to Nawawi (1991:120) there are six techniques one can use to gain data of the research, they are; Direct observation Technique; Indirect observation technique; Direct communication technique; Indirect communication technique; Measurement technique; Documentary technique. In this research, the writer used the measurement technique to measure the students' achievement in memorizing vocabulary through power point flashcard. The measurement was administered twice. First, pre-test to collect the data before the treatment was held, so that the writer knows the students' pre- condition before the treatment. The second one is post- test to collect the data after the treatment was given. The result of both pre-test and post test are measured by using t-test in order to figure out the significance of interval score of pre-test and post-test.

Cohen (2000:105) states that whilst earlier versions of validity were based on the view that it was essentially a demonstration that a particular instrument in fact measures what it purports to measure. Furthermore, cohen says that more recently validity has taken many forms. Blerkom (2009:57) argues, "The most important characteristic of a test is validity". A test is said to be valid when it measures what it intends to measure or it can interpret the result of the test appropriately. Since the

aim of research is to find the truth, the validity is an important aspect. And the truth can only be gained by using a valid instrument. The validity of the instrument will always be questioned in a research. No wonder that the validity is the essence of the truth of the research result. Therefore, it is compulsory for the writer to include the validity. Grondlund (1982:132) suggests three procedures to test the content validity of measurement instrument; Identifying the subject matter topic and behavior outcomes to be measured; Building up a table of specification, which specifies the sample of test item to be measured.; Constructing the questionnaires closely fits the table of specifications.

TABLE 1

Table of specification of Test Items

NO	Concrete Noun	Items Number	Total
1.	Family	1,2,10,12,17,18,21,22,25,26	10
2.	Zoo	4,5,7,13,14,15,19,27,28,29	10
3.	Hobbies	3,6,8,9,11,16,20,23,24,30	10
Total			30

III. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

To answer the research problem, the writer analyzed the data which were obtained through an objective test. The test which had been carried out comprises two parts, namely pretest and posttest as follows :

TABLE 2

The Result of the Student's Pretest-Posttest Score in Experimental Group

No	Sample	Pretest (X_1a)	Posttest (X_1b)	Interval (X_1)	Interval Squared (X_1^2)
1	JU	6.00	6.66	0.66	0.44
2	RW	5.33	7.66	2.33	5.43
3	KR	7.00	8.33	1.33	1.77
4	SH	6.33	7.00	0.67	0.45
5	NF	5.33	7.00	1.67	0.45
6	IS	6.00	6.66	0.66	0.44
7	FF	4.66	6.00	1.34	1.80
8	MP	7.66	8.66	1.00	1.00
9	DK	7.00	9.00	2.00	4.00
10	IR	6.33	7.00	0.67	0.45
11	PA	8.00	9.00	1.00	1.00
12	AW	6.33	8.00	1.67	2.79
13	JM	8.00	9.33	1.33	1.77
14	TS	7.66	8.33	0.67	0.45
15	AS	8.66	9.00	0.34	0.16
16	SB	7.00	7.66	0.66	0.44
17	RS	7.33	9.33	2.00	4.00
18	DI	7.33	8.66	1.33	1.77
19	AY	5.33	6.00	0.67	0.45
20	RL	7.66	9.00	1.34	1.80
21	AF	7.66	8.33	0.67	0.45
22	RD	4.33	5.66	1.33	1.77
23	HR	4.66	6.00	1.34	1.80
24	FT	7.66	8.66	1.00	1.00
25	SM	6.66	7.66	1.00	1.00
26	YS	8.33	9.33	1.00	1.00
27	RR	6.33	7.66	1.33	1.77
28	AR	6.00	7.33	1.33	1.77

29	MR	7.00	8.00	1.00	1.00
30	MY	7.33	7.66	0.33	1.77
	TOTAL	**200.90**	**234.57**	**33.67**	**44.19**

TABLE 3

The Result of the Student's Pretest-Posttest Score in Control Group

No	Sample	Pretest (X_1a)	Posttest (X_1b)	Interval (X_1)	Interval Squared (X_1^2)
1	AN	5.66	6.33	0.67	0.45
2	SN	6.66	7.00	0.34	0.12
3	FA	4.33	4.66	0.33	1.77
4	AL	6.33	6.66	0.33	1.77
5	AT	6.33	7.00	0.67	0.45
6	BH	4.66	5.33	0.67	0.45
7	RN	6.33	6.66	0.33	1.77
8	DW	5.33	5.66	0.33	1.77
9	RJ	5.66	6.33	0.67	0.45
10	MM	6.33	6.66	0.33	1.77
11	SG	7.00	7.66	0.66	0.44
12	SP	5.33	6.00	0.67	0.45
13	BL	5.00	5.66	0.66	0.44
14	IK	4.00	4.33	0.33	1.77
15	JK	5.66	6.00	0.34	0.12
16	VK	6.33	6.66	0.33	1.77
17	NI	7.00	7.33	0.33	1.77
18	DD	5.66	6.00	0.34	0.12
19	YN	5.66	6.00	0.34	0.12
20	FD	4.00	4.33	0.33	1.77
21	RO	4.66	5.66	1.00	1.00
22	KK	4.33	4.66	0.33	1.77
23	RZ	4.00	4.33	0.33	1.77
24	WN	6.33	7.00	0.67	0.45
25	AL	5.66	6.00	034	0.12
26	RW	4.00	4.33	0.33	1.77

27	VI	5.66	6.33	0.67	0.45
28	AN	6.33	6.66	0.33	1.77
29	WR	5.66	6.33	0.67	0.45
30	RA	6.33	6.66	6.66	1.77
	TOTAL	**166.22**	**180.22**	**14.00**	**30.86**

The Analysis of The Student's Individual Score of Pretest-Posttest in Experimental Group. The score of pretest of the experimental group is **200.90.** therefore, the mean score is **200.90 : 30 = 6.70** (it is considered "average to good"). Meanwhile, the score of posttest of the experimental group is **234.57**. therefore, the mean score is **234.57 : 30 = 7.82** (it is considered "average to good")

The Analysis of The Student's Individual Score of Pretest-Posttest in Experimental Group. The score of pretest of the experimental group is **166.22**. therefore, the mean score is **166.22 : 30 = 5.51** (it is considered "poor to average"). Meanwhile, the score is **180.22 : 30 = 5.01** (it is considered "average to good"). Based on the analysis above, we can see that there are significant different between pretest and posttest result in the experimental group

The Analysis of The Student's Mean Score. The interval of the student's mean score was obtained by using this formula :**M = M posttest – M pretest** The Analysis of The Student's Mean Score of Pretest-Posttest in Experimental Group. The interval of the student's mean score in experimental group is **1.12.** It is computed as following : $\mathbf{M_1}$ **= 7.82 – 6.70= 1.12**. The Analysis of The Student's Mean Score of Pretest-Posttest in Control Group. The interval of the student's mean score in control group is **0.50.** It is computed as following : $\mathbf{M_2}$ **= 6.01 – 5.51 = 0.50** The computation of the student's mean score show that the experimental group interval is higher than the control interval. It indicates that the experimental group performed a better achievement than control group. The Analysis of The Standard Deviation Squared of Each Group of The Experimental Group The standard deviation of the experimental group was computed as following :

$$S_1^2 = \frac{\Sigma X_1^{\,2} - (\Sigma X_1)^2 / N_1}{N_1}$$

$$= \frac{44. - (33.67)^2 / 30}{30} \qquad (x^2_0)$$

$$= \frac{44.19 - 1133.67 / 30}{30}$$

$$= \frac{44.19 - 37.79}{30}$$

$$= \frac{6.4}{30} = 0.22$$

The standard deviation of the experimental group is $S_1 = \sqrt{0.22} =$ **0.47.** It means that the standard deviation of the student's score from the mean score is **0.47.**The Analysis of The Standard Deviation of The Control Group**.**The standard deviation of the experimental group was computed as following :

$$\text{M=} \quad m + 1\frac{(\Sigma X)}{(N)} = 57 = 5\binom{567}{618} = 57 + 4{,}59 = 61{,}59 \; \frac{30.86 - (14)^2 / 30}{30}$$

$$= \frac{30.86 - 196 / 30}{30}$$

$$= \frac{30.86 - 6.54}{30}$$

$$= \frac{24.32}{30} = 0.82$$

The standard deviation of the experimental group is $S_2 = \sqrt{0.82} =$ **0.90.** It means that the standard deviation of the students score from the mean score ia **0.90.**
Analysis of Significant Difference of Mean Score

$$t = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{\sqrt{\frac{(N_1 - 1)S_1^{\,2} + (N_2 - 1)S_2^{\,2}}{N_1 + N_2 - 2}\left\{\frac{1}{N_1} + \frac{1}{N_2}\right\}}}$$

$$= \frac{1.12 - 0.50}{\sqrt{\frac{(30 - 1)0.47 + (30 - 1)0.90}{30 + 30 - 2}\left\{\frac{1}{30} + \frac{1}{30}\right\}}}$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{\sum fx2.}{N} - \left\{\frac{\sum fx}{N}\right\} = 5}$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{4161}{618} - \{0.43\}} =$$

$$=]$$

$$= \frac{0.62}{\sqrt{0.69\{0.07\}}}$$

$$= \frac{0.62}{\sqrt{0.05}}$$

$$= \frac{0.62}{0.23} = \mathbf{2.70}$$

Interpretation : The result of computation of t-test is **2.70.** When the writer checks that t-distribution table of significance 5 % with df = $N_1 + N_2 - 2$, he finds : **df = 30 + 30 – 2 = 58** With **df = 58**, the t-table is **2.021.** It means that t-table value **(2.70)** is bigger than t-table. The significance different is interpreted that the use of "Semantic Mapping" is **effective** to increase the student's vocabulary achievement .Analysis on The Effect of The Treatment In order to know how well the effectiveness of the treatment given to the experimental group, the writer analyzed the effect of the treatment (Effect Size) as follow :

$$SE = \frac{Me - Mc}{Sc}$$

$$= \frac{7.82 - 6.01}{0.90}$$

$$= \frac{1.81}{0.90}$$

$$= \mathbf{2.01}$$

From the computation, it is known that the effect size of the treatment is qualified as **"high"** (see table 3.7). Therefore, the effectiveness of the use of "Semantic Mapping" in increasing the students vocabulary achievement is high.

Testing Hypothesis, From the t-test result, it is found that t-obtained **(2.70)** is higher than t-table with the level of significance **5% (2.021) or 2.70>2.00.** Therefore, it indicates **to reject the null hypothesis (Ho) and accept the alternative hypothesis (Ha).** So that, it can be concluded that the difference between the control group and the experimental group is significant.

Discussion

The use of "Semantic Mapping" in teaching vocabulary could help the students increase their vocabulary achievement in mastering English, there are so many kinds of nouns. One of them is related to concrete nouns. In learning English , there are four aspect as languages skills that should be mastered: speaking, writing, Listening and writing. The ability of learning those skills is through vocabularies because it plays important role to develop and support those skills.

This research was conducted in SMP Mandiri Pontianak Timur in academic year 2017 / 2018. Since it is categorized as a quasi-experimental study, so that two classes in that school were taken as the simple. Class VII A as the Control group and class VII B as the experimental group. Both of these groups consist of 30 students.

In the process of collecting data, both of these groups were given the same pretest and posttest in the form of written test (30 items of objective test). But, the treatment was only given to the experimental group. Otherwise, the control group was taught by using conventional technique. The experimental group was taught vocabulary by using semantic mapping. In this treatment, the students studied the family, zoo and hobbies. They studied to match the semantic mapping with the correct names and also studied to spell the words. In other case, the control group was taught vocabulary by using the conventional technique, where the students only studied to match the names of the concept; family, zoo and hobbies.

Based on data analysis, there is a significant score between experimental and control group. The score of pretest in experimental group **(6.70)** is higher than control group **(5.51).** The score of posttest in experimental group **(7.82)** is also higher than control group **(6.01).** It is proved that experimental group performs a better achievement than control group. Although the capability of experimental and

control group is already different from the beginning but the interval of the students mean score between experimental and control group shows that there is a significant score in experimental group after the treatment is given. The interval of the students mean score in experimental group is **1.12.** On the contrary, the interval of the students mean score in control group is **0.50.** It indicates that the use of "Semantic Mapping" also influences the students vocabulary achievement

From the t-test result, it is found that t-test obtained **(2.70)** is higher than t-table with the level of significance **5 % (2.021) or 2.70 > 2.021.** It indicates that the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Besides, the effect size of the treatment given to the experimental group is **2.01** (it is categorized **"high"**). Therefore, the effectiveness of the use of "Semantic Mapping" in increasing students vocabulary achievement on the seventh grades student of SMP Mandiri Pontianak Pontianak in academic year 2017 / 2018 is high.

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis of the students test result, the writer makes the conclusion as follows :

There is significant score between the score of pretest and posttest in experimental group after "By Using Semantic Mapping" is applied. The mean score of pretest in experimental group is **6.70** (it is considered "average to good"). After the treatment is given, the mean score of posttest increased become **7.82** (it is considered "average to good"). Therefore, the interval of the students mean score in experimental group is **1.12.** On the contrary, the mean score of pretest in control group is **5.51** (it is considered "poor to average") and in posttest is **6.01** (it is considered "average to good"). Therefore, the interval of the students mean score in control group is **0.50.** So that, the interval of the students mean score in experimental group is higher than control group. It indicates that the use of "Semantic Mapping" is effective to increase students vocabulary achievement

There is significant difference of the students achievement between experimental and control group. The result of t-value is **2.70.** It is bigger than t-table, for **df = 58** that is **2.021.** It means that "Semantic Mapping" is effective to increase students vocabulary achievement. The effect size of the treatment given to

the experimental group is **2.01.** It is qualified as **"high".** It is proved that the effectiveness of the use of "Semantic Mapping" in increasing students vocabulary achievement is mastering vocabulary on the seventh graders student of SMP Mandiri Pontianak in academic year 2017 / 2018 is high

REFERENCES

Arikunto & Suharsimi, (2010). *Prosedur Penelitian : Suatu Pendekatan Praktek,* Jakarta. PT. Rineka Cipta

Blerkom V. M. (2009). *Measurement and Statistics.* New York. Routledge.

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by Principle an interactive approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York: Longman

Burns, R. B. (2000). *Introduction to Research Methods,* the fourth edition. Person Education Australia. Longman

Cain, K. (2007, November 1). Deriving word meanings from context: Does explanation facilitate contextual analysis? *Journal of Research in Reading, 30*(4), 347–359.

Cohen, L., Manion L. & Morrison K. (2007). *Research Methods in Education,*. London and New York. Routledge

Duffy, G. G. (2009). *Explaining Reading. A Rescource For Teaching Concepts, Skills, and Strategies.* Guilford Press

Elyansyah, S. (2007). *Teaching Vocabulary by Using Pictures*. Thesis Unpublished. Pontianak: FKIP UNTAN

Ghazal, L. (1995). *Learning Vocabulary in EFL Context through Vocabulary Strategies.* Novitas Royal.

Grondlund, E. N. (1982). *Constructing Achievement Test, the Second addition.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.

Hadi Sutrisno. (2004). *Methodology Research, Fourth edition*. Yogyakarta: ANDI OFFSET

Harmer, J. (2001). *The Practical of English Language Teaching,* Third Addition. England and Associated Company: Longman.

Haycrafft, A. (1987). *An Introduction to English Learning and Teaching*. Singapore: Ban Mash Press Ptd.Ltd.

Lawrence Erlbaum Visnja Pavicic (2003), "Vocabulary and Autonomy"

Mc. Carthy, Michael. (1990). *Vocabulary*. Oxford: University Press

Nash, H., & Snowling, M. (2006, May 1). Teaching new words to children with poor existing vocabulary knowledge: A controlled evaluation of the definition and context methods. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders, 41*(3), 335–354.

Nawawi, H. (1983). *Metodologi Penelitian Bidang social.* Yogyakarta. Gajah Mada University Press

Rosenthal, J., & Ehri, L. (2008, February 1). The mnemonic value of orthography for vocabulary learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 100*(1), 175–191.

Sasan, B & Naim. (2011). *Enhancing Vocabulary Retention Through Semantic Mapping: Foreign Language Annals, Language Society and Culture.* Journals

Setiyadi, Ag Bambang. (2006). *Teaching English As A Foreign Language*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.

Siek and Publisher Pokozub. (1994) *Creative and Innovative Language Teaching*. London: Harper Collin

Trianto, (2007). *Model-model pembelajaran inovatif berorientasi konstruktivistik.* Jakarta: Prestasi Pustaka

Urdan, T. C. (2005**)** *Statistics in Plain English***.** London.

Wallace, J. M. (1982). *Teaching Vocabulary*. London: Briddles Ltd.

Yogesh, S. K. (2006). *Fundamental of Research*. Ansari Road, Daryaganj, New Delhi. New Age International Publishers Ltd