

Chapter 5

Conclusion and Suggestion

Summary

The study was supported by a metacognitive theory. The theory postulates that inefficient learners who enhance their vocabulary mastery by digging their pre-existing knowledge. The theory stresses that one's pre-existing knowledge is a crucial metacognitive ability.

In conducting this research, the writer chose two classes as the experimental and control group. They were given the different treatments, mind mapping and word list. The population of this study was the second grade students of Elementary School. The writer conducted the treatments to both groups. Each group got different technique. The one that was applied in the experimental group was mind mapping technique and the one that was applied in the control group was word list. Before giving the treatments, the writer conducted the pre-test to those groups. After getting the pre-test, the students were given the treatments. After the ninth treatment, the post-test was administered. The theme for pre-test, treatments, and post-test were the same.

From the analysis by using t-test, the writer found out that those two groups have equal ability in vocabulary mastery. After that, the writer analyzed the post-test scores to prove if mind mapping brought a significant effect to their vocabulary mastery or not. The writer also used t-test to analyses the post-test scores. From the analysis, the writer found that the null hypothesis saying, “There is no significant difference in vocabulary mastery between the second grade students who were taught using mind mapping technique and those who were taught using word list technique” was accepted. It means that mind mapping technique did not give great contributions to the students’ vocabulary mastery, in this case the second grade students. At least, this technique could improve a little bit of students’ vocabulary mastery. It can be proved from the gain between the pre-test mean score and the post-test mean score. The one in experimental group increased 3.95 and the one in the control group increased 5.78. It means that the one in experimental group increased more than the one in the control group.

Conclusion

Mind mapping is not suitable for Elementary School Students. Related to data analysis of the research questions saying “Is there any significant difference between the vocabulary mastery of the second grade students who were taught by using mind mapping technique and one of those taught by using word list technique?”, the null hypothesis was accepted. There was no significant difference in the vocabulary mastery between the students taught by using mind mapping technique and those taught by word list technique. It seemed that mind mapping technique did not help them improve their vocabulary mastery in answering the research question

Suggestion

The writer realizes that this study was far from perfectness. Many things should be improved. Therefore, the writer wants to give some recommendations so that the research will be more useful for the future vocabulary teaching. After the study had been completely conducted and the data needed had been gained and processed, the writer came to several suggestions. There are many factors which should have been included, yet could not be covered in the study. Therefore, the following points are worth considering for future research.

1. The present study has not shown the real effects of the mind mapping model on the vocabulary teaching behavior. This is due to the school where the researcher conducted, did not allow the researcher to distribute the instrument (questionnaire) to the students. An open questionnaire and/ or an interview is suggested to be used to elicit the students' behavior toward this technique. These instruments will allow the subjects' behavior to justify their own vocabulary mastery using their own version.
2. The writer suggests this study should be done in different setting using larger samples. When the control and the experimental groups are in different place (junior or senior high school) possible interaction among the subjects can be minimized.
3. The teacher in the present study was the researcher itself. The results may be misleading or biased since the teacher also did the research. The other teacher should have been trained to teach the students both in the experimental and in the control class. Besides, the training for the teacher used in the study must be conducted with different topics or lesson plan.

4. The instrument used to detect the students' vocabulary mastery in the present study had not been tried out before. The results may be insignificant because there should have been try out test before the real test for the present study. Try out can be given to different students to see whether the instruments were suitable for second grade levels, including the multiple choices and the content of words used in the instruments.
5. According to the psychology of learning, students' characteristics, such as age, sex, social, cultural and economic backgrounds are important in teaching-learning process. The present study has not covered these variables. Future study may be made to examine possible interaction, in combination or separately, between the mind mapping technique and the subjects' characteristics, whether there are different effects obtained by the subjects of different age, sex, social, cultural, and economical background.
6. The mind mapping technique seems to be suitable for the students learning English for special purposes, such as science or social studies. Those students have more definite and specific objectives for learning English. Based on these specific and clearly defined objectives, we, teachers on vocabulary, can easily identify what

existing knowledge and which teaching techniques are needed in the vocabulary teaching. Future research therefore may be directed to examine the effectiveness of the mind mapping technique for teaching vocabulary for the students learning English for specific purposes. This study can be done in the content are vocabulary, in the non-English Department.

7. Since teachers also play an important role in the teaching and learning process, it would be worthwhile to examine the teachers' characteristics as well, in their interactions with the model used. For example, female teachers employing the mind mapping technique may have different effects on the subjects' learning purposes from male teachers.
8. A study can also be conducted to compare the students' mastery (achievement) in vocabulary with different parts of speech (adjective, adverbs, nouns, or verbs). The model may give different effects on the students' mastery in vocabulary with different parts of speech.

References

- Allen, V. F. (1983). *Techniques in Teaching Vocabulary*. England: Oxford University Press.
- Ariana, M. (2012). Mind Mapping and Brainstorming as Methods of Teaching Business Concepts in English as a Foreign Language. *Academica Science Journal* .Vol. 1, 71-80
- Bromley, K., DeVitis, L. I., & Modlo, M. (1995). *Graphic Organizers Visual Strategies for Active Learning*. New York.
- Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Brown, H. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. USA: Pearson Education.
- Buzan, T. (1993). *The Mind Map Book: How to Use Radiant Thinking to Maximize Your Brain's Untapped Potential*. London: BBC Books.
- Davies, M. (2010). *Concept mapping, mind mapping and argument: What are the differences and do they matter*. Springer Science Business Media.
- Ghazal, L. (2012). Learning Vocabulary in EFL Contexts Through Vocabulary Learning Strategies. *Novitas Royal: Research on Youth and Language* .
- Glatthorn, A. A. (2006). *Curriculum Leadership: Development and Implementation*. USA: Sage Publications.

- Goady, J.& Huckin, T. (1997). *Second Language Vocabulary Acquisition: A Rationale for Pedagogy*. United Kingdom: Cambridge Applied Linguistic.
- Hedge, T. (2008). *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hofland, C. (2007). Mind-Mapping in the English as a Foreign Language Classroom. *Fontys Teacher Training College Sittard*, 1-46.
- Huckin, J. G. (1997). *Second Language Vocabulary Acquisition: A Rationale for Pedagogy*. USA: Cambridge Applied Linguistics.
- Huyen, N. T. (2010). Learning Vocabulary Through Games. *Asian EFL Journals* .
- Lai, Y. L. (2005). *Teaching Vocabulary Learning Strategies Awareness, Beliefs, and Practice. A survey of Taiwanese EFL Senior High Teachers*. University of Essex.
- Laohawiriyanon, C., & Panatda, S. (2010). Using Mind Mapping Technique to Improve Reading Comprehension Ability of Thai EFL University Students. *The 2nd International Conference on Humanities and Social Sciences*.
- Longman. (2001). *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. England: Pearson Education Limited.

Lopez, C. L. (1997). The Role of the Teacher in Today's Language Classroom. *Teacher Development: Make The Right Moves* , 1-17.

Managing Vocabulary Learning. (2002). Republic of Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

Mayer, J. L. (1985). Schemata and Reading Comprehension. In *Ilha do Desterro A Journal of English Language, Literatures in English and Cultural Studies*.

Mcmillan, J. H. (2008). *Educational Research: Fundamental for the Consumer Fifth Edition*. United States of America: Pearson Education, Inc.

Nation, I. (1990). *Teaching and Learning Vocabulary*. United States: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Nation, P., & Chung, T. (2009). Teaching and Testing Vocabulary. In M. H. Long, & C. J. Doughty, *The Handbook of Language Teaching* (pp. 543-559). USA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Nation, P. (2002). *Managing Vocabulary Learning*. Republic of Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

Paul, D. (2007). *Teaching English to Children in Asia*. Hongkong: Pearson Longman Asia ELT.

Read, J. (2000). *Assessing Vocabulary*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching Second Edition*. USA: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. USA: Cambridge University Press.

Rohania, N. (2007). *Teaching Students Vocabulary Through Mapping Word Technique a t The Seventh Grade Students of SMPN 1 Mande Cianjur*. English Education Study Program.

Schmitt, N. (2002). *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics*. Great Britain: Hodder Arnold.

Scott, W. A., & Ytreberg, L. H. (2000). *Teaching English to Children*. United States of America: Longman.

Shen, W. (2003). Current Trends of Vocabulary Teaching and Learning Strategies for EFL Settings. *Feng Chia Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences* , 187-224.

Swadarma, D. (2013). *Mind Mapping dalam Kurikulum Pembelajaran*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia.

Ur, P. (2009). *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. United kingdom: Cambridge Univesity Press.