TEACHING IDIOMS THROUGH FLASH CARDS TO INCREASE VOCABULARY ACHIEVEMENT OF THE SEVENTH GRADE STUDENTS OF SMPN 1 GELUMBANG

Cici Siska Ulandari

Bengkulu University
E-mail: cicisiskaulandari@gmail.com

Abstract: The objective of this study was to find out whether or not there is any significant difference between the students who learn vocabulary by using idioms through Flash Cards and those who learn vocabulary without using idioms through Flash Cards. This study used one of the quasi-experimental designs that are the pre-test and post-test non equivalent control group design. The population and the sample of this study comprised 72 seventh grade students of SMP Negeri 1 Gelumbang in the academic year 2013/2014. These students were divided into two groups – the experimental and control groups. Each group consisted of 36 students. The data were obtained through vocabulary test. The test was administered twice as the pre-test and post-test. The test was in the forms of multiple-choice. The data were analyzed using paired and independent sample t-tests. The result of the study indicated that there was a significant difference in students' vocabulary achievement (t=31.611, p<0.05).
Keywords*: Teaching, Vocabulary, Idioms, Flash Cards*

Language has four skills. They are listening, speaking, reading, and writing. These skills also have some aspects that students have to learn, like grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary. The English Language Curriculum (2006) states,

> Language skills are interdependent. Listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills are not thought of by language users as independent skills; they are rather perceived as interdependent where one skill often activates the other skills as well as the paralinguistic skills for the achievement of effective communication (p. 5).

Vocabulary needs to be taught in English and across the curriculum. In addition, teaching vocabulary "is more than teaching words; it is teaching how they are put together, how they are learned, and how they are used" (Nagy, 2012, p. 71). Research suggests, "Vocabulary is enormously important to children's development, especially in reading. Research clearly indicates that children with larger vocabularies have higher school achievement in general" (Smith, 2008, p. 240). It means vocabulary is an important thing in teaching and learning process to increase students' achievement in school. It is difficult to teach students vocabulary in many things.

In fact, it is difficult to learn and teach idioms for many reasons. The main reason, Hussein (2000, p. 2) says,

> Idioms are not literal: they do not mean what they say, the easiest are those which have exact counterparts in the learner's mother tongue, and the most difficult ones are those which have no counterparts and whose meaning cannot be derived from the conjoined meaning of their constituents.

Based on the study conducted with the title "Teaching Idioms through Flash Cards to Increase Students' Vocabulary Achievement of the Seventh Grade Students of SMP N 1 Gelumbang", it was found that the students in SMP N 1 Gelumbang still lacked of vocabulary.

The problem of the study is formulated in the following question"; is there any significant difference in vocabulary achievement between the students who learn vocabulary by using idioms through Flash Cards and the students who learn vocabulary without using idioms through Flash Cards?

Objective of the Study

The objective of this study is to find out whether or not there is any significant difference between the students who learn vocabulary by using idioms through Flash Cards and those who learn vocabulary without using idioms through Flash Cards?

Method of the Study

This study was intended to find out whether or not idioms through flash cards increase students' vocabulary achievement. This study used quasi-experimental designs, specifically non-equivalent control group design. This study was conducted to the seventh grade student at SMP N 1 Gelumbang. This study used syllabus for 16 meeting because syllabus was used as the guide for teacher in the classroom.

Population and Sample

The population of this study was seventh grade students of SMP N 1 Gelumbang. The number of the students was 248, which comprised seven classes taught by the same teacher of English. The samples of this study consisted of two classes; they were 7.3 and 7.4 they were chosen as the sample because both classes were taught by the same teacher of English and their English score was lower than the other classes. This study used purposive sampling method. Lottery was used to determine the experimental and control group. Each group consisted of 36 students. The result of lottery showed that class 7.4 became the experimental group while class 7.3 was the control group.

Variables of the Study

In this study, the two variables are *idioms through flash cards* and *students' vocabulary achievement.*

Technique for Collecting Data

In the beginning of this study, pre-test was given before starting the teaching while post-test was given at the end of the experimental and control groups. Before the study, the other students who were not taken as the sample was given try out to find how many items were valid. This study used vocabulary test. The test consisted of 50 items in the forms of multiple-choices.

There were fifty questions for vocabulary test. To check the validity of the test, the data were analyzed by using corrected item-total correlation in SPSS version 21. The value of these valid questions should be higher than r-table 0.456. If the r-obtained was less than 0.456, it was not valid. After the calculation there were 19 items which considered as not valid. Therefore the vocabulary test consisted of thirty-one questions in the forms of multiple choices.

To get the result of the reliability, this study used Cronbach Alpha in SPSS version 21 (statistical package for social science) program in order to make the test have a high degree of content validity and to run the analysis of the reliability of the test. A standard value for reliability is 0.70 from the calculation; the result of the reliability coefficient was 0.968 which was higher than the standard value. It can be concluded that the test was reliable.

Technique for Analyzing the Data

This study took score from the result of vocabulary test. In scoring students' work, the study used t-test to find out whether or not the two means were different significantly. The data were analyzed in SPSS 21, the procedure as follows:
1. The result of the pre-test and post-test in experimental group was analyzed by using paired-sample t-test to find out whether or not there was a significant difference in English vocabulary achievement of the experimental group before and after the treatment.
2. The result of the pre-test and post-test in control group was analyzed by using paired-sample t-test to find out whether or not there was a significant difference in English vocabulary achievement of the control group before and after the treatment.
3. To find whether or not there was a significant difference between the two groups, independent sample t-test was applied.

Findings and Interpretations
Results of the Pre-Test and Post-Test of the Experimental Group
      In the pre-test, the lowest score was 29, the highest score was 68, and the mean was 47.00. In the post-test, the lowest score was 71, the highest score was 94, and the mean was 82.27. Appendix I give the complete results of the test. There were no students (0%) in excellent category and good category, seven students (19.4%) were in average category, seventeen students (47.2%) were in poor category, and twelve students (33.3%) were in failed category.
      In the post-test, nine students (25%) were in excellent category, twenty-seven students (75%) were in good category, no one of the students got the score between 0-40 (0%). Therefore, no students were in fair, poor and failed categories.

Results of the Pre-Test and Post-Test of the Control Group
      In the pre-test, the lowest score was 29, the highest score was 65, and the mean was 45.41 in the post-test, the lowest score was 42, the highest score was 74, and the mean was 56.86. In the pre-test there were no students (0%) in excellent category and good category, five students (14%) were in average category; twenty three students (64%) were in poor category, and eight students (22%) were in failed category. In the post-test, no students (0%) were in excellent category, three students (8%) were in good categories, thirteen students (36%) were in average category, twenty students (56%) were in poor category, and there were no student in fail category.
      In other side, it could be seen that the students of the experimental group were graded higher than those of the control group. In the experimental group there were nine students (25%) who accomplished to get excellent category, and there were twenty-seven students (75%) were categorized good category. There were no students (0%) in average, poor and failed categories. That means that the experimental group could reach the score that expected in this study. In contrast, in control group, there were no students (0%) in excellent category, and three students (8%) were in good categories. Thirteen students (36%) were in average category, twenty students (56%) in poor category and there were no students (0%) in failed category. The results obviously indicated that students of the control group made little improvement in the post-test.

Statistical Analyses
      There were three statistical analyses in this study: (1) the statistical analysis on the experimental group by using paired sample t-test, (2) the statistical analysis on the control group by using paired sample t-test, (3) the difference analysis of the results of the post-test in the experimental and control group by using independent sample t-test.

Statistical Analysis on the Experimental Group
      Based on paired sample statistical analysis, the mean of the pre-test was 47.00, and the mean of the post-test was 82.27. The standard deviation of the pre-test was 9.33 and the standard deviation of the post-test was 4.62. The standard error mean of the pre-test was 1.55 and the standard error mean of the post-test was 0.77. The detail statistical result shows the result of the paired sample t-test: the mean difference between pre-test and post-test in the experimental group was 35.27, with standard deviation 6.69, the standard error mean was 1.11.
      At the significance level < 0.025 for two tailed testing with the degree of freedom 35, the critical value of t-table is 2.035. Since the value of t-obtained was greater than the critical value of t-table (31.611 > 2.035) and significant level is less than 0.05. It means that there was a significant difference in the achievement before and after the treatment in the experimental group. Besides, the result of statistical showed that the mean scores after the treatment was greater than before.

Statistical Analysis on the Control Group
      Based on pair-sample, the mean of the pre-test was 45.41 and the mean of the post-test was 56.86. The standard deviation of the pre-test was 8.44, and the standard deviation of the post-test was 8.03. The standard error mean of the pre-test was 1.40 and the standard error mean of the post-test was 1.33. On the basis of paired sample test, the mean difference between the pre-test and post-test in the control group was 11.44, with standard deviation 6.75 the standard error mean was 1.12. Table 9 shows the paired sample test.

At the significance level < 0.025 for two tailed testing with the degree of freedom 35, the critical value of t-table is 2.035. Since the value of t-obtained was greater than the critical value of t-table (10.172 > 2.035) and significant level is less than 0.05. Besides, the result of statistical showed that the mean scores after the treatment was greater than before.

Difference Analysis of the Post-Test in the Experimental and the Control Groups
Therefore, this study used equal variance not assumed in analyzing the t-test result. The mean difference was 25.417 with the standard error difference 1.545. The t-obtained was 16.446. At the significance level, < 0.025 for two tailed testing with the degree of freedom was 70; the critical value of t-table was 1.994. Since the value of t-obtained is greater than the critical value of t-table (16.446 > 1.994) and the significance level is less than 0.05, it means that there was a significant difference in the vocabulary achievement between the experimental group and control group.

Conclusion
Based on the results of data analyses and interpretations, it can be concluded that there was a significant difference in students' vocabulary achievement before and after being given treatment using Idioms through Flash Cards. The results of the study showed that students who were taught by using Idioms through Flash Cards had higher score in the post-test. It means that the students score improved significantly in the post-test from the pre-test.

Suggestions
The use of appropriate media in teaching English, especially vocabulary, would be more effective. Referring to above conclusion, three suggestions are proposed: Firstly, teacher should be creative in teaching by applying different methods or strategies to motivate students. Secondly, teaching vocabulary must be integrated with other skills. Applying Idioms through Flash Cards, teaching vocabulary can be integrated with listening, speaking, reading and writing skills. The last suggestion is addressed to government. The government should pay attention to improving facilities in school.

References
Anderson, J. C. & Nagy, W. E. (1991). The vocabulary conundrum. *American Educator*, 10-40
Arikunto, S. (2006). Prosedure penelitian: suatu pendekatan praktek. Jakarta: *Rhineka Cipta*
Arikunto, S. (2002). Prosedure penelitian: suatu pendekatan praktek. Jakarta: *Rhineka Cipta*
Candlin, D. (1984). Four key ways to help English language learners improve
    their academic vocabulary. *Eye on Education*. Retrieved from
    http://media.routledgeweb.com/eoe/whitepapers/arechiga_final.pdf
Devon, H. A., Block, M. E., Moyle-Wright, P., Ernst, D. M.,
    Hayden, S. J., Lazzara, D. J., Savoy, S. M., Kostas-Polston, E. (2007). *A psychometric toolbox for testing validity and realibility. Journal of Nursing Scholarship, 39* (1), 155-164. Retrieved from
    http://www.researchgate.net/publication/228739294_A_psychometric_toolbox_for_testing_validity_and_reliability/file/d912f50b4bd4f17c0f.pdf
Dickinson, D. (2000). First impressions: Children's knowledge of words gained
    from a single exposure. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 5, 7-73.
English Language Curriculum. (2006). English Language. 1-70. Retrieved from
    http://www.crdp.org/crdp/all%20curriculum/English/English%20language%20curriculum.pdf
Evans, B. (2007). Student Attitudes, Conceptions, and Achievement in
    Introductory Undergraduate College Statistics. *The Mathematics Educator. 17* (2). 1-30. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ841563.pdf
Frey, Lawrence R., Carl H. Botan, and Gary L. Kreps (2007) Investigating
    Communication: *An Introduction to Research Methods*. 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon 2(1), 1-47
Gabr. H. (n.d). The research hypothesis, variables and sampling. *Architectural*

Research Methods, 1-10. Retrieved from http://www.egyptarch.net/hishamgabr/lectures/Lecture%205A%20Hypotheses%20&%20Variables.pdf

Gu, P. Y. (2003). Vocabulary Learning in a Second Language: *Person, Task, Context and Strategies*. *TESL–EJ* 7:2, 10–35

Golafshani, N. (2003). Understanding reliability and validity in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report, 8* (4), 1-60. Retrieved from http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR8-4/golafshani.pdf

Hulley, S.B. (2001). Designing clinical research: An epidemiologic approach (2nd ed.). Philadelphia.

Hussein, R. F., Khanji, R., & Makhzoomy, K. F. (2000). The acquisition of idioms: Transfer or what? *Lang. and Trans., 12*, 1-34. Retrieved from http://www2.ju.edu.jo/sites/Academic/rrkhanji/Lists/Published%20Research/Attachments/12/Abstract.pdf

Jarvie, B. (1993): "Avoidance of idioms in a second language: The effect of L1-L2 similarity", in: *Studia Linguistica* 54, 148-196. Retrieved from http://www.metaphorik.de/sites/www.metaphorik.de/files/journal-pdf/15_2008_andreou-galantomos.pdf

Judd, E. L. (1978). Vocabulary Teaching and TESOL: A need for revolution of existing assumptions. *TESOL Quarterly*, 12 (1), (pp. 71-76)

Keith. S. (1986). Second language incidental vocabulary retention: The effect of picture and annotation types. *CALICO Journal, 20*(1), 1-58.

Kirk, R. E. & Miller. K (1986). *Experimental design*. Retrieved from http://www.superduperinc.com/handouts/pdf/212_Idioms.pdf

Konza, D. (2011). Vocabulary. *Department of Education and Children's Services*. Retrieved from http://www.decd.sa.gov.au/literacy/files/links/UtRP_1_4_v2.pdf

Latham, B. (2007). Sampling: What is it? Retrieved from *http://webpages.acs.ttu.edu/rlatham/Coursework/5377(Quant))/Sampling_Methodology_Paper.pdf*

Liontas, J. I. (1997). Building castles in the air: The comprehension processes of Modern Greek idioms. *Paper presented at the 15th International Symposium on Modern Greece, Kent State University, Kent, OH.* 1-32.

Lohr, S. L. (2007). Sampling: design and analysi*s*. Albany: *Duxbury Press*, 1- 23

Maisa, S., & Karunakaran, T. (2009). Idioms and importance of teaching idioms to ESL students: A study on teacher beliefs. *Asian Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences (AJHSS), 1*(1), 1-122. Retrieved from http://ajhss.org/pdfs/Idioms%20and%20Importance%20of%20Te.........pdf

Manthyla. K. (2004). 'The Lemmatisation of Idioms'. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer. 12-91. Retrieved from http://www.kalbos.lt/zurnalai/14_numeris/03.pdf

McCarten, J. (2007). Teaching vocabulary. *Cambridge university press,* (13). 1-36. Retrieved from http://www.egyptarch.net/hishamgabr/lectures/Lecture%205A%20Hypotheses%20&%20Variables.pdf

McCarthy, M. (1998): Spoken language and Applied Linguistics, *Cambridge: CUP*. Retrieved from http://www.metaphorik.de/sites/www.metaphorik.de/files/journal-pdf/15_2008_andreou-galantomos.pdf

McMarthy, M., & O'Dell Felicity. (2008). English idioms in use. Cambridge: *Cambridge University Press.*

Nagy,W. E., and Scott, J. A. (2012). Vocabulary processes. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, and R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research*, 3. 60–150. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

National Reading Panel (2000). Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*:* Reports of the subgroups. Washington DC: *National Institute of Child Health and Development*.

Richards, J. C. (1976). The role of vocabulary teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 10 (1), 77-89.

Smith, M. K. (2008). Measurement of the size of general English vocabulary through the elementary grades and high school. *Genetic Psychological Monographs*, 24, 240–345.

Schmitt, N. (2008). Vocabulary Learning Strategies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 199–227.

Sökmen, A. (2007). Current trends in teaching second language vocabulary. Cambridge: *Cambridge University Press,* 8–57.

Stathi, K. (2006). Corpus linguistics meets cognitive linguistics: A Frame Work of the Analysis of Idioms. *German Cognitive Linguistics Association.* 9-27**.**

Stuckey, K & Daymut, J. A. (2008). Idioms—"As Easy as ABC". *A comprehensive program. (212), 1-2.* Retrieved from http://www.superduperinc.com/handouts/pdf/212_Idioms.pdf

The Universal Dictionary of the English Language. (1958). Henry Cecil Wild (ed.) Great Britin: Butler and Tanner Ltd

Telford. J. K. (2007). A brief introduction to design of experiments. *Johns Hopkins APL Technical Digest,* 27 (3). 1-9. Retrieved from http://www.jhuapl.edu/techdigest/TD/td2703/telford.pdf

Tomlinson, B. (Ed.) (1998). Materials development in language teaching. Cambridge: *Cambridge University Press,* 10-43

Trochim. W. M. (2002). Research methods knowledge base. 1-34. Retrieved from http://trochim.human.cornell.edu/kb/variable.htm

Twaddell, F. (1973). Vocabulary Expansion in the TESOL Classroom. TESOL Quarterly, 7 (1). pp 61-79).