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**Abstract**

The main aim of this study was to find out the effect of using vocabulary self-collection strategy on students’ reading comprehension and their motivation at Language Development Center of UIN SuskaRiau. It was a quasi-experimental research which was carried out in Comparison Group Pre-test/Post-test Design. The sample of this research was students of the Language Development Center who took English course at Level 2. They were divided into two groups, namelyan experimental class (PB 15) and acontrol class (PB 16) with a total of 58 students. The data were collected by using a reading comprehension test and a questionnaire. Vocabulary self-collection strategy was applied as treatment. The result of this research shows that there was a significant effect ofthe treatment on the students’ reading comprehension in the experimental group. The t-test result was 4.259;and its df was 56, by comparing number of significance. If probability is >0.05, the null hypothesis (H0) is rejected. If probability is <0.05, the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. Because of the significance was 0.000 < 0.05, Ha was accepted; and consequently H0 was rejected. There was also a significant effect of the treatment on the students’ motivation inthe experimental group. The t-test result was 8.431;and its df was 56, by comparing number of significance. Because of the significance was 0.000 < 0.05, thus, Hawas accepted andH0 was rejected.
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1. **Introduction**

Reading is easy, but to understand what the author’s means is difficult. According to Burnes (1985), reading process is to reconstruct the author’s means. In fact, most of students have problems in reading. Even though they read the passage, they are still difficult to know what it is about.

Based on the definition above, it can be inferred that reading is a skill that presents the authors’ idea. In reading, readers must have a good interaction with texts in order to get the meaning of the text. Reading comprehension is the degree in which readers understand about what they read. They are using their reading comprehension skills to gather information from the text. The traditional reading classroom having students read the material, and answer the question based on the text could not produce a positive outcome on their reading comprehension. It means that by this way, the students have no good comprehension in reading.

The instruction of English language course within all Faculty Departments of the Islamic State University of SUSKA Riau has been centralized and managed by the Language Development Center (LDC). The Language Development Center is responsible for its curriculum, syllabuses, instructors, materials, assessment and evaluation. The course implemented in the curriculum/syllabus for English language has been designed to focus on language functions and communicative competence based on the topics which are developed through practices to acquire the four language skills; reading, listening, speaking, and writing supported by language components (vocabulary, pronunciation, structure and grammar) and are relevant to the topics in context for Survival English Levels (Basic, Intermediate and Advanced).

Teaching languages like English are administered 3 levels at Language Development Center. Level 1 is the basic level and the goal is the mastery of 4 language skills and language components, its material and objectives still focus on listening, speaking skills, vocabulary and basic grammar. Level 2 is intermediate level and the goal is also the mastery of 4 language skills and language components, its material and objectives focus on reading, writing skill, vocabulary and grammar. Level 3 is an advance level and the objectives are focused on listening, speaking, reading, writing and language components like grammar and vocabulary.

All of the students at the Language Center of UIN SUSKA RIAU should pass all levels. In learning English, one of the skills taught is Reading. There are many texts applicable at the second semester, such as, narrative, descriptive, expository, and argumentative/persuasive text. Many students are still difficult to comprehend the descriptive texts, it is the reason why the descriptive texts are chosen in this research. It helps students in a variety of classroom situation and must prepare to continue this practice in the workplace and in the real life decision making situation. In the classroom, students are required to read descriptive texts to complete class assignment. Given the importance of description comprehension, it is essential that all students become proficient text-based reasoning and an important toward this goal is to access university students’ ability to read and comprehend complete description texts.

Furthermore, Based on preliminary study at Language Development Center of UIN SUSKA Riau on January 5, 2016, the teacher explained about reading materials in teaching and learning process. Dealing with the students’ achievement and some factors, the teacher looked at the students’ condition in teaching and learning processes were insufficient. The English tutor or lecturer said that the Minimum Completeness Criteria (MCC) of English at Language Development Center of UIN SUSKA Riau was, but still more students obtained low English scores are lower than MCC. In reading comprehension of descriptive text, more students were not able to identify the main idea of the text, the detail information of the text, to find the meaning of vocabulary in context, identify theword reference, and make inferences about the text. it was found that they failed to find the topic of the text. They also had problem to determine the main idea of the paragraph. they also got the problem to identify inference, reference and supporting detail. Moreover the students were not motivated and interested in teaching and learning process, they fell bored when they had reading class.

 Generally, students’ classroom activities in reading subject are still reading the materials based on the textbook, finding out the meaning of the difficult words, and answering the questions based on the text. In fact, those students’ classroom activities cannot help much improve their reading comprehension and it makes students feel bored. The traditional reading classroom having students read the material, and answer the question based on the text could not produce a positive outcome on their reading comprehension. It means that by this way, the students have no good comprehension in reading.

In teaching and learning process, the lecturer must always be creative in planning and implementing the learning activities in which they do not only rely the activities on students’ textbook. In this case, teachers could modify their teaching especially in teaching reading and not always using the reading texts from the students’ text book. Teachers can use the strategy to make students easier to comprehend the text. To provide solution to this problem, a suitable learning strategy is proposed to improve students’ reading comprehension which is called vocabulary self-collection strategy (VSS) conducted by Blachowicz.

**Research Questions**

The formulation of the research will be formulated as follows:

1. How is students’ reading comprehension at UIN Suska before using Vocabulary self-collection strategy?
2. How is students’ reading comprehension at UIN Suska after using Vocabulary self-collection strategy?
3. Is there any significant different bewteen pre-test and post-test reading comprehension on control group?
4. Is there any signifcant different on post-test reading comprehension between experiment and control group?
5. Is there any signifcant different on pre-test reading motivation between experimental group and control group?
6. Is there any signifcant different between pre-test and post-test reading motivation on experimental group?
7. Is there any signifcant different between pre-test and post-test reading motivation on control group?
8. Is there any signifcant different between post-test reading motivation on experiment and control group.
9. Is there any signifcant effect of using vocabulary self-collection strategy (VSS) on students reading comprehension?
10. Is there any signifcant effect of using vocabulary self-collection strategy (VSS) on students’ reading motivation?
11. Is there any signifcant effect of using vocabulary self-collection strategy (VSS) on students reading comprehension and their reading motivation?
12. **Research Design**

This research is an experimental research. There are three variables: one independent variable and two dependent variables. The independent variable is the use of Vocabulary Self-collection Strategy(x), the first dependent variable is the students’ reading comprehension (y1) and the second dependent variable is student’s reading motivation (y2).

The research following “Quasi Experimental Design – Nonequivalent Pre-test and Post-test Control Group Design”. One group served as an experimental group and the other one as a control group . Creswell (2009: 155) states that when individuals are not randomly assigned, the procedure is called a Quasi Experiment. Furthermore, he explains that the pre-test and post-test control group design can be represented as follows:

 *Experimental class O*1*X O*2

*Controlled class* *O*3*O*4

The population of this research was students of the first year at Language Development Center of UIN SUSKA RIAU. The total number of the population was 7000. The target population was the second level of Language Development Center of UIN SUSKA RIAU Faculty of Economic majoring Acountant which consist of 9 classes. Based on the population of this research, the sample was selected by using cluster sampling. According to (Gay and Airasian, 2000), cluster sampling randomly selects groups not individuals. All the members of selected groups have similar characteristics, and three classes are chosen by using cluster sampling in this research.

**Instrumentation**

Research instrument is a device to get data needed for this research is students’ reading comprehension through VSS indicated by their scores of reading comprehension test, the instrument in this study is test. The type of the test is an objective one which content of reading comprehension texts. The tests are then administered two times; pre-test, and post-test. The data of the present study are quantitative data in the forms of the students’ reading comprehension scores of the experimental group and the control group.

1. Test
2. **Pre-test**

Before treatment the students in the experimental group will be given pre-test. The purpose was to know the students’ reading comprehension before treatment. Pre-test will be conducted for the first meeting. The number of students who follow the pre-test are 29 students. 20 questioners for Motivation. The test items which consist of 5 tests of multiple-choice, 5 tests of complete sentence, 5 tests of true or false, 5 tests of short answers, and 5 tests of translate of vocabularies. In this research, the test consisted of 5 reading tests with 25 questions in various topics.

1. **Treatment**

After pre-test the students in treatment use Vocabulary Self-collection Strategy while teaching and learning process. In teaching and learning process, the intact teacher applied and taught the teaching procedure based on the lesson plan.

1. **Post-test**

After finishing the treatment, the post-testwill give to the students. The purpose is to know there is improvement on the students’ reading comprehension after the treatment by using Vocabulary Self-collection Strategy in teaching and learning process. The test consisted of 25 items in various topics.

1. **Discussion**

 Pallant (2001) states that if the significance value is bigger than 0.05, this indicates that there is no violation of the assumption of equality of variance and that equal variances are assumed for the variable concerned and if the significance value is smaller than 0.05 this indicates that there is violation of the assumption of equality of variance. An independent sample t-test was conducted to determine any significant difference for hypothesis 1, 2, 3 and 4. Then, paired sample T-test was conducted to determine any significance difference for hypothesis 5, 6, 7 and 8. To find out the effect size of hypothesis 5, 6, 7 and 8 this research used eta-squared formula.

**Hypothesis 1**

The procedure of inferential statistics began with the statistical test on the following null hypothesis:

Ho1: There is nosignificant difference between reading comprehensionpre-test mean score of experimental groupand reading comprehensionpre-test mean score of control group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska

Ha1: There is asignificant difference between reading comprehensionpre-test mean score of experimental groupand reading comprehensionpre-test mean score of control group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska.

The result of pre-test reading comprehensiontestfor experimental and control group without considering students group was analyzed by using Independent Sample T-test and presented at the following Table

**TABLE IV.23**

**The Analysis of Independent Sample T-test of Pre-test Reading comprehensionScore between Experimental and Control Group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | t-test for Equality of Means |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equal variances assumedEqual variances not assumed | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lower | Upper |
| 1.235 | .271 | .083 | 56 | .934 | .276 | 3.321 | -6.377 | 6.928 |
|  |  | .083 | 53.576 | .934 | .276 | 3.321 | -6.383 | 6.935 |

Based on Independent T-test analysis for pre-test reading comprehensionscore of experimental and control groups on Table IV.23 above, it shows that there is no significant difference at pre-test reading comprehensionbetween experimental and control groups. T-test result is0.083, its df is56. So, in the conclusion p = 0.934, the 2-tailed value is bigger than 0.05 (p>0.05). The result shows that the mean scores did not differ much between both groups. It could be determined that the subjects in both groups are equivalent before giving the treatment at Language Development Center of UIN Suska.

Based on the analysis of Table IV.23, of the first hypothesis Ha1 is rejected and Ho1 is accepted. So, it can be concluded that “There is no significant difference between reading comprehensionpre-test mean score of experimental group and reading comprehensionpre-test mean score of control group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska”.

**Hypothesis 2**

The procedure of inferential statistics began with the statistical test on the following null hypothesis:

Ho2: There is nosignificant difference between reading comprehensionpost-test mean score of experimental groupand reading comprehensionpost-test mean score of control group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska.

Ha2: There is asignificant difference between reading comprehensionpost-test mean score of experimental groupand reading comprehensionpost-test mean score of control group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska.

The result of post-test reading comprehension for experimental and control groups was analyzed by using Independent Sample T-test and presented at the following Table IV.24

**TABLE IV.24**

**The Analysis of Independent Sample T-test of Post-testReading comprehensionScore between Experimental and Control Group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | t-test for Equality of Means |
| Equal variances assumedEqual variances not assumed | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lower | Upper |
| 13.873 | .000 | 4.259 | 56 | .000 | 12.345 | 2.899 | 6.538 | 18.152 |
|  |  | 4.259 | 39.453 | .000 | 12.345 | 2.899 | 6.484 | 18.206 |

Based on Independent T-test analysis for post-test reading comprehensionscore of experimental and control groups on Table IV.24 above, it shows that there is significant difference at post-test reading comprehensionbetween experimental and control groups. T-test result is 4.259, its df is 56, So, in the conclusion p = 0.000, the 2-tailed value is smaller than 0.05 (p<0.05). The result shows that the mean scores did differ much between both groups. It could be determined that the subjects in both groups are not equivalent after giving the treatment at Language Development Center of UIN Suska.

Based on the analysis of Table IV.24, of the second hypotheses, Ha2 is accepted and Ho2 is rejected. So, it can be concluded that “There is a significant difference between reading comprehensionpost-test mean score of experimental group and reading comprehensionpost-test mean score of control group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska”.

**Hypothesis 3**

The inferential statistics procedures started with the statistical test on the following null hypothesis:

Ho5: There is nosignificant improvement between reading comprehensionpre-test mean score of experimental groupand reading comprehensionpost-test mean score of experimental group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska.

Ha5: There is a significant improvement between reading comprehensionpre-test mean score of experimental group and reading comprehensionpost-test mean score of experimental group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska.

The result of the effect on implementing the treatment of vocabulary self-collectionstrategyon students reading comprehensionfor experimental group of the composite comparing score for both pre-test and post-test was analyzed by using Paired Sample T-test, and presented at the following Table 4.27:

**TABLE IV.25**

**The Analysis of Paired Sample T-test Between Pre-test and Post-test on Students Reading comprehensionfor Experimental Group**

**Paired Samples T-Test**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Paired Differences | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|  | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |  |  |  |
|  | Lower | Upper |
| Pair 1 Posttest - Pretest | 10.759 | 6.451 | 1.198 | 8.305 | 13.213 | 8.981 | 28 | .000 |

From the table IV.27 above, the output of paired sample t-test shows that the t-test result is 8.981, its df is 28, by comparing number of significance. If probability>0.05, null hypothesis (H0) is accepted. If probability<0.05 alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. Because the significance is 0.000 < 0.05, thus, Hais accepted while H0 is rejected.

Then, the writer found out the percentage of significant effect between pre-test and post-test of experimental class by looking for the effect size or eta-squared as follows:

*ῆ2* = $\frac{t^{2}}{t^{2}+n-1}$

*ῆ 2* = $\frac{(-8.981)^{2}}{(-8.229)^{2}+29-1}$

*ῆ 2* = $\frac{80.65}{80.65+28}$

*ῆ2=*0.74

*Eta-squared* = *ῆ 2 x 100%*

*Eta-squared =* 0.74 x 100% = 74%

The result of data analysis is based on inferential statistics which has identified that after conducting the treatment for 6 meetings or 12 class-hours by using vocabulary self-collectionstrategy can improve **74%** on the reading comprehension. Therefore, the **Ho5** hypothesis is rejected and **Ha5** is accepted that there is significant improvement between reading comprehensionpre-test mean score of experimental group and reading comprehensionpost-test mean score of experimental group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska.

**Hypothesis4**

The inferential statistics procedures started with the statistical test on the following null hypothesis:

Ho6: There is nosignificant improvement between reading comprehensionpre-test mean score of control groupand reading comprehensionpost-test mean score of control group at MLanguage Development Center of UIN Suska.

Ha6: There is a significant improvement between reading comprehensionpre-test mean score of control group and reading comprehensionpost-test mean score of control group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska.

The result of the effect on implementing the non-treatment of vocabulary self-collectionstrategy on students reading comprehensionfor control group of the composite comparing score for both pre-test and post-test was analyzed by using Paired Sample T-test, and presented at the following Table 4.28:

**TABLE IV.26**

**The Analysis of Paired Sample T-test between Pre-test and Post-test on Students Reading comprehensionfor Control Group**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Paired Differences | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| Lower | Upper |
| Pair 1 Posttest - Pretest | 1.310 | 5.959 | 1.107 | -.956 | 3.577 | 1.184 | 28 | .246 |

From the table IV.28 above, the output of paired sample T-test shows that the t-test result is 1.184, its df is 28, by comparing number of significance. If probability>0.05, null hypothesis (H0) is accepted. If probability<0.05 alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. Because the significance is 0.307> 0.05, thus, Haisrejected while H0isaccepted.

Then, the writer found out the percentage of significant effect between pre-test and post-test of control class by looking for the effect size or eta-squared as follows:

*ῆ2* = $\frac{t^{2}}{t^{2}+n-1}$

*ῆ 2* = $\frac{(1.184)^{2}}{(1.184)^{2}+29-1}$

*ῆ 2* = $\frac{1.08}{1.08+28}$

*ῆ2=*0.0476

*Eta-squared* = *ῆ 2 x 100%*

*Eta-squared =* 0.0476 x 100% = 4.76%

The result of data analysis is based on inferential statistics which has identified that after conducting the treatment for 6 meetings or 12 class-hours by without using vocabulary self-collectionstrategy can decrease **4.76%** on the speaking ability. Therefore, the **Ho6** hypothesis is accepted and **Ha6** is rejected that There is no significant improvement between reading comprehensionpre-test mean score of control group and reading comprehensionpost-test mean score of control group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska.

**Hypothesis 5**

The procedure of inferential statistics begins with the statistical test on the following null hypothesis:

Ho3: There is nosignificant difference between motivation pre-questionnaire mean score of experimental groupand motivation pre-questionnaire mean score of control group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska.

Ha3: There is asignificant difference between motivation pre-questionnaire mean score of experimental group and motivation pre-questionnaire mean score of control group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska.

The result of motivation pre-questionnaire scorefor experimental and control groups was analyzed by using Independent Sample T-test and presented at the following Table IV.25

**TABLE IV.27**

**The Analysis of Independent Sample T-test of Pre-questionnaire Score between Experimental and Control Group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | t-test for Equality of Means |
| F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| Lower | Upper |
| Equal variances assumedEqual variances not assumed | 15.906 | .000 | .120 | 56 | .905 | .207 | 1.721 | -3.241 | 3.654 |
|  |  | .120 | 45.512 | .905 | .207 | 1.721 | -3.258 | 3.672 |

Based on Independent T-test analysis for pre-questionnaire score of experimental and control groups on Table IV.25 above, it shows that there is no significant difference at pre-questionnaire score between experimental and control groups. T-test result is Z0.120, its df is 56. So, in the conclusion p = 0.905, the 2-tailed value is bigger than 0.05 (p>0.05). The result shows that the mean scores did not differ much between both groups. It could be determined that the subjects in both groups are equivalent before giving the treatment at Language Development Center of UIN Suska.

Based on the analysis of Table IV.25, of the third hypothesis Ha3 is rejected and Ho3 is accepted. So, it can be concluded that “There is no significant difference between motivation pre-questionnaire mean score of experimental group and motivation pre-questionnaire mean score of control group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska”.

**Hypothesis 6**

The procedure of inferential statistics began with the statistical test on the following null hypothesis:

Ho4: There is no significant difference between motivation post-questionnaire mean score of experimental group and motivation post-questionnaire mean score of control group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska.

Ha4: There is a significant difference between motivation post-questionnaire mean score of experimental group and motivation post-questionnaire mean score of control group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska.

The result of post-questionnaire scoresfor experimental and control groups was analyzed by using Independent Sample T-test and presented at the following Table IV.26.

**TABLE IV.28**

**The Analysis of Independent Sample T-test of Post-questionnaire Score between Experimental and Control Group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | t-test for Equality of Means |
| F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| Lower | Upper |
| Equal variances assumedEqual variances not assumed | 21.392 | .000 | 8.431 | 56 | .000 | 14.322 | 1.699 | 10.919 | 17.725 |
|  |  | 8.431 | 37.982 | .000 | 14.322 | 1.699 | 10.883 | 17.761 |

Based on Independent T-test analysis for post-questionnaire score of experimental and control groups on Table IV.26 above, it shows that there is a significant difference at post-questionnaire score between experimental and control groups. T-test result is 8.431, its df is 56. So, in the conclusion p = 0.000, the 2-tailed value is smaller than 0.05 (p<0.05). The result shows that the mean scores diddiffer much between both groups. It could be determined that the subjects in both groups are not equivalent after giving the treatment at Language Development Center of UIN Suska.

Based on the analysis of Table IV.26, of the fourth hypotheses Ha4 is accepted and Ho4 is rejected. So, it can be concluded that “There is a significant difference between motivation post-questionnaire mean score of experimental group and motivation post-questionnaire mean score of control group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska”.

**Hypothesis 7**

The inferential statistics procedures started with the statistical test on the following null hypothesis:

Ho7: There is nosignificant improvement between motivation pre-questionnaire mean score of experimental groupand motivation post-questionnaire mean score of experimental group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska.

Ha7: There is asignificant improvement between motivation pre-questionnaire mean score of experimental groupand motivation post-questionnaire mean score of experimental group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska.

The result of the effect on implementing the treatment of vocabulary self-collectionstrategy on students motivation on reading comprehensionfor experimental group of the composite comparing score for both pre-questionnaire and post-questionnaire was analyzed by using Paired Sample T-test, and presented at the following Table 4.29:

**TABLE IV.29**

**The Analysis of Paired Sample T-test between Pre-questionnaire and Post-questionnaire on Student Motivation in Reading comprehensionfor Experimental Group**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Paired Differences | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| Lower | Upper |
| Pair 1 Posttest - Pretest | 17.61724 | 5.27169 | .97893 | 15.61200 | 19.62248 | 17.996 | 28 | .000 |

From the table IV.29 above, the output of paired sample test shows that the t-test result is 17.996, its df is 28, by comparing number of significance. If probability>0.05, null hypothesis (H0) is accepted. If probability<0.05 alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. Because the significance is 0.000<0.05, thus, Ha is accepted while H0 is rejected.

Then, the writer found out the percentage of significant effect between pre-questionnaire and post-questionnaire of experimental class by looking for the effect size or eta-squared as follows:

*ῆ2* = $\frac{t^{2}}{t^{2}+n-1}$

*ῆ 2* = $\frac{(17.996)^{2}}{(17.996)^{2}+29-1}$

*ῆ 2* = $\frac{323.856}{323.856+28}$

*ῆ2=*0.503

*Eta-squared* = *ῆ 2 x 100%*

*Eta-squared =* 0.920 x 100% = 92%

The result of data analysis is based on inferential statistics which has identified that after conducting the treatment for 6 meetings or 12 class-hours by using vocabulary self-collectionstrategy can improve **92%** on the student motivation on speaking ability. Therefore, the **Ho7** hypothesis is rejected and **Ha7** is accepted that There is significant improvement between motivation pre-questionnaire mean score of experimental group and motivation post-questionnaire mean score of experimental group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska.

**Hypothesis 8**

The inferential statistics procedures started with the statistical test on the following null hypothesis:

Ho8: There is nosignificant improvement between motivation pre-questionnaire mean score of control groupand motivation post-questionnaire mean score of control group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska.

Ha8: There is asignificant improvement between motivation pre-questionnaire mean score of control groupand motivation post-questionnaire mean score of control group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska.

The result of the effect on implementing the non-treatment of vocabulary self-collectionstrategy on student motivation on reading comprehensionfor control group of the composite comparing score for both pre-questionnaire and post-questionnaire was analyzed by using Paired Sample T-test, and presented at the following Table 4.29:

**TABLE IV.30**

**The Analysis of Paired Sample T-test between Pre-questionnaire and Post-questionnaire on Student Motivation in Reading comprehensionfor Control Group**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Paired Differences | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| Lower | Upper |
| motivation\_postquestionnaire - motivation\_prequestionnaire | 3.502 | 3.133 | .582 | 2.311 | 4.694 | 6.021 | 28 | .000 |

From the table IV.30 above, the output of paired sample T-test shows that the t-test result is 6.021, its df is 28, by comparing number of significance. If probability>0.05, null hypothesis (H0) is accepted. If probability<0.05 alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. Because the significance is 0.000< 0.05, thus, Haisaccepted while H0 isrejected.

Then, the writer found out the percentage of significant effect between pre-questionnaire and post-questionnaire of control group by looking for the effect size or eta-squared as follows:

*ῆ2* = $\frac{t^{2}}{t^{2}+n-1}$

*ῆ 2* = $\frac{(6.021)^{2}}{(6.021)^{2}+29-1}$

*ῆ 2* = $\frac{36.25}{36.25+28}$

*ῆ2=*0.288

*Eta-squared* = *ῆ 2 x 100%*

*Eta-squared =* 0.564 x 100% = 56.4%

The result of data analysis is based on inferential statistics which has identified that after conducting the treatment for 6 meetings or 12 class-hours by using non- vocabulary self-collectionstrategy can improve **56.4%** on the student motivation in reading comprehensionof control group. Therefore, the **Ho8** hypothesis is rejected and **Ha8** is accepted that there is asignificant improvement between motivation pre-questionnaire mean score of control group and motivation post-questionnaire mean score of control group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska.

1. **Conclusion**

The main goal of the research was to explore the effects of vocabulary self-collection strategyon students’ reading comprehension and their motivation and the objectives of the study are:

a) To find out to what extent vocabulary self-collection strategy gives the effect to students’ reading comprehension.

b) To find out to what extent vocabulary self-collection strategy gives the effect to students’ motivation.

After conducting a quasi-experimental research for 5 meetings or 10 class-hours of each class as class samples of this research with duration of time within one month at Language Development Center of UIN Suska. The research design was a quasi-experimental research of the pre-test-post-test and pre-questionnaire-post-questionnaire single group design which were based on Gay and Airasian (2003). The last findings of the research as follows:

1. Based on the data presentation of students reading comprehension score, pre-test reading comprehension score of experimental group was categorized as Lesscategory (44.9%), post-test reading comprehension score of experimental group was categorized as Sufficient (62). Then, pre-test reading comprehension score of control group was categorized as Lesscategories (34.4%), post-test reading comprehension score of control group was categorized as Sufficient (48.3%).
2. Based on the data presentation of students motivation on reading comprehension score, pre-questionnaire score of experimental group was categorized as Good category (65.5%), post-questionnaire score of experimental group was categorized as Very Good (100). Then, pre-questionnaire score of control group was categorized as Good category (72.4%), post-questionnaire score of control group was categorized as good category (48.3%).
3. Based on Independent T-test analysis for pre-test reading comprehension score of experimental and control groups on Table IV.23 above, it showed that there is no significant difference at pre-test reading comprehension between experimental and control groups. T-test result was 0.069, its df was 56, standard deviation of experimental group was 12.563 and control group was 14.139. So, in the conclusion p = 0.945, the 2-tailed value was bigger than 0.05 (p>0.05). The result showed that the mean scores did not differ much between both groups. It could be determined that the subjects in both groups were equivalent before giving the treatment at Language Development Center of UIN Suska. Based on the analysis of Table IV.23, of the first hypothesis Ha1 is rejected and Ho1 is accepted. So, it can be concluded that “There is no significant difference between reading comprehension pre-test mean score of experimental group and reading comprehension pre-test mean score of control group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska”.
4. Based on Independent T-test analysis for post-test reading comprehension score of experimental and control groups on Table IV.24 above, it showed that there is significant difference at post-test reading comprehension between experimental and control groups. T-test result was 4.259, its df was 56, standard deviation of experimental group was 6.552 and control group was 14.168. So, in the conclusion p = 0.000, the 2-tailed value was smaller than 0.05 (p<0.05). The result showed that the mean scores did differ much between both groups. It could be determined that the subjects in both groups were not equivalent after giving the treatment at Language Development Center of UIN Suska. Based on the analysis of Table IV.24, of the second hypotheses Ha2 is accepted and Ho2 is rejected. So, it can be concluded that “There is a significant difference between reading comprehension post-test mean score of experimental group and reading comprehension post-test mean score of control group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska”.
5. Based on Independent T-test analysis for pre-questionnaire score of experimental and control groups on Table IV.25 above, it showed that there is no significant difference at pre-questionnaire score between experimental and control groups. T-test result was 0.131, its df was 56, standard deviation of experimental group was 10.49 and control group was 6.46. So, in the conclusion p = 0.897, the 2-tailed value was bigger than 0.05 (p>0.05). The result showed that the mean scores did not differ much between both groups. It could be determined that the subjects in both groups were equivalent before giving the treatment at Language Development Center of UIN Suska. Based on the analysis of Table IV.25, of the third hypothesis Ha3 is rejected and Ho3 is accepted. So, it can be concluded that “There is no significant difference between motivation pre-questionnaire mean score of experimental group and motivation pre-questionnaire mean score of control group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska”.
6. Based on Independent T-test analysis for post-questionnaire score of experimental and control groups on Table IV.26 above, it showed that there is a significant difference at post-questionnaire score between experimental and control groups. T-test result was 8.430, its df was 56, standard deviation of experimental group was 3.608 and control group was 8.406. So, in the conclusion p = 0.000, the 2-tailed value was smaller than 0.05 (p<0.05). The result showed that the mean scores did differ much between both groups. It could be determined that the subjects in both groups were not equivalent after giving the treatment at Language Development Center of UIN Suska. Based on the analysis of Table IV.26, of the fourth hypotheses Ha4 is accepted and Ho4 is rejected. So, it can be concluded that “There is a significant difference between motivation post-questionnaire mean score of experimental group and motivation post-questionnaire mean score of control group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska”.
7. A Paired Sample T-test was used to analyze the effect on implementing the treatment of vocabulary self-collection strategyon students reading comprehensionfor Experimental Group. the t-test result was -8.229, its df was 28, by comparing number of significance. If probability>0.05, null hypothesis (H0) is accepted. If probability<0.05 alternative hypothesis (Ha) was accepted. Because the significance was 0.000 < 0.05, thus, Ha was accepted while H0 was rejected.. The result of data analysis was based on inferential statistics which has identified that after conducting the treatment for 5 meetings or 10 class-hours by using vocabulary self-collection strategycan improve **70%** on studentreading comprehensionat Language Development Center of UIN Suska. Therefore, **Ho5** hypothesis is rejected and **Ha5** is accepted that there is significant improvement between reading comprehension pre-test mean score of experimental group and reading comprehension post-test mean score of experimental group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska.
8. A Paired Sample T-test was used to analyze the effect on implementing the non-treatment of role play strategyon students reading comprehensionfor Control Group. t-test result was 1.04, its df was 28, by comparing number of significance. If probability>0.05, null hypothesis (H0) is accepted. If probability<0.05 alternative hypothesis (Ha) was accepted. Because the significance was 0.307> 0.05, thus, Hawas rejected while H0 was accepted. The result of data analysis was based on inferential statistics which has identified that after conducting the non-treatment for 5 meetings or 10 class-hours by non-treatment ofvocabulary self-collection strategycan decrease**3.71%** on reading comprehensionat Language Development Center of UIN Suska. Therefore, **Ho6** hypothesis is accepted and **Ha6** is rejected that There is nosignificant improvement between reading comprehension pre-test mean score of control group and reading comprehension post-test mean score of control group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska.
9. A Paired Sample T-test was used to analyze the effect on implementing the treatment of vocabulary self-collection strategytoward student motivation on reading comprehensionfor Experimental Group. t-test result was -5.325, its df was 28, by comparing number of significance. If probability>0.05, null hypothesis (H0) is accepted. If probability<0.05 alternative hypothesis (Ha) was accepted. Because the significance was 0.000<0.05, thus, Ha was accepted while H0 was rejected. The result of data analysis was based on inferential statistics which has identified that after conducting the treatment for 5 meetings or 10 class-hours by using vocabulary self-collection strategycan improve **50.3%** on students motivationat Language Development Center of UIN Suska . Therefore, **Ho7** hypothesis is rejected and **Ha7** is accepted that There is asignificant improvement between Motivation pre-questionnaire mean score of experimental group and motivation post-questionnaire mean score of experimental group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska.
10. A Paired Sample T-test was used to analyze the effect on implementing the non-treatment of vocabulary self-collection strategytoward students motivation for Control Group. t-test result was 3.369, its df was 28, by comparing number of significance. If probability>0.05, null hypothesis (H0) is accepted. If probability<0.05 alternative hypothesis (Ha) was accepted. Because the significance was 0.002< 0.05, thus, Hawas accepted while H0 was rejected. The result of data analysis was based on inferential statistics which has identified that after conducting the non-treatment for 5 meetings or 10 class-hours by using non-vocabulary self-collection strategycan improve **28.8%** on students motivation at Language Development Center of UIN Suska. Therefore, **Ho8** hypothesis is rejected and **Ha8** is accepted that There is a significant improvement between motivation pre-questionnaire mean score of control group and motivation post-questionnaire mean score of control group at Language Development Center of UIN Suska.
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