

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE VOCABULARY BOX METHOD IN ENHANCING EIGHTH-GRADE STUDENTS' ENGLISH VOCABULARY MASTERY: A QUASI-EXPERIMENTAL STUDY

Harris Firmansyah
harfirmans@gmail.com

Nenden Sri Rahayu
nendensrirahayu1212@gmail.com

UNIVERSITAS BALE BANDUNG

ABSTRACT

Vocabulary mastery is a fundamental component of English language learning because it supports learners' ability to comprehend, communicate, and produce meaningful language. However, many EFL learners continue to experience difficulties in acquiring and retaining vocabulary due to limited exposure, insufficient practice, and ineffective learning strategies. This study investigates the effectiveness of the Vocabulary Box Method in enhancing eighth-grade students' vocabulary mastery and explores students' perceptions toward its implementation. Employing a quasi-experimental design, this research involved two classes at SMP Tunas Baru Ciparay, consisting of an experimental group taught using the Vocabulary Box Method and a control group taught through conventional instruction. Data were collected through vocabulary pre-tests, post-tests, and questionnaires. The findings revealed that the experimental group improved from a mean score of 29.46 in the pre-test to 82.67 in the post-test, while the control group increased from 36.67 to 53.33. The independent samples t-test demonstrated a significant difference between the groups after treatment ($t = 6.983$, $df = 58$, $p < .05$), indicating that the Vocabulary Box Method was more effective than conventional instruction in improving vocabulary mastery. Students also showed positive perceptions regarding vocabulary retention, motivation, confidence, and learning engagement. The findings suggest that structured vocabulary organization combined with repeated retrieval and active practice can provide an effective strategy for improving EFL learners' vocabulary development.

Keywords: Vocabulary Box Method; Vocabulary Mastery; Vocabulary Learning Strategy; EFL Learners; Quasi-Experimental Study

1. INTRODUCTION

Vocabulary mastery plays a fundamental role in language acquisition and the development of communication skills. In the context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL), numerous scholars emphasize that vocabulary knowledge is a crucial determinant of overall language proficiency. Susanto and Fazlinda (2016) assert that vocabulary forms the basic "building blocks" of language, noting that mastery of approximately 2,000 high-frequency words enables comprehension of up to 80% of everyday English texts.

Despite its recognized importance, vocabulary acquisition continues to pose significant challenges for Indonesian EFL learners. Asyiah (2017) revealed that senior high school students in Java typically know only 850 to 1,100 English words—far below the basic threshold for communicative competence. Similarly, Yusuf et al. (2017) found that junior high school students retained only 65% of the vocabulary learned one month after

instruction, highlighting persistent issues with long-term retention.

In response to these challenges, the Vocabulary Box Method has emerged as a promising pedagogical approach. This method involves organizing vocabulary into physical or digital boxes, allowing learners to categorize, review, and actively practice words over time. Ceyhan-Bingöl and Özkan (2019) found that students who used Vocabulary Boxes showed significantly higher recognition and retention than those taught through conventional means. Additionally, the method helped sustain learner attention and engagement throughout lessons.

However, despite the method's potential, its application within the Indonesian secondary school context remains underexplored. Most existing studies focus exclusively on either vocabulary retention or motivation, without considering how structured interventions like Vocabulary Boxes might address both simultaneously. Therefore, this study investigates the effectiveness of the Vocabulary Box Method in improving vocabulary mastery among eighth-grade students at SMP Tunas Baru Ciparay, examining both learning outcomes and student responses to this approach.

RESEARCH QUESTION

Based on the background, the researcher formulates the research questions as follows:

Is there a significant difference in vocabulary mastery scores between students taught using the Vocabulary Box Method and those taught using conventional methods in eight-grade junior high school students?

What are the students' responses towards the implementation of the Vocabulary Box method in improving vocabulary mastery and retention in eight-grade junior high school students?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Vocabulary Mastery

Vocabulary mastery represents learners' knowledge and ability to recognize, understand, and use words appropriately in communication. Vocabulary is not merely a collection of individual words but a complex system involving knowledge of word form, meaning, and use. Nation (2013) explains that vocabulary knowledge includes several dimensions, such as pronunciation, spelling, meaning, grammatical behavior, collocation, and contextual usage. Therefore, effective vocabulary learning requires learners to develop both receptive knowledge (recognizing and understanding words) and productive knowledge (using words accurately in communication).

Vocabulary knowledge plays a fundamental role in overall language proficiency. Learners with limited vocabulary often experience difficulties understanding texts, expressing ideas, and participating in communication. Laufer and Ravenhorst-Kalovski (2010) demonstrate that vocabulary size is strongly associated with reading comprehension because learners need sufficient lexical coverage to understand written texts. Similarly, Schmitt (2010) emphasizes that vocabulary development is a continuous process requiring repeated encounters and meaningful use.

In EFL contexts, vocabulary learning becomes particularly challenging because learners generally receive limited exposure to English outside the classroom. Unlike first-language acquisition, where learners encounter thousands of words through daily interaction, EFL learners must rely heavily on classroom instruction and learning strategies to develop vocabulary knowledge. Therefore, effective vocabulary instruction should provide systematic opportunities for learners to encounter, practice, and retain new words.

2.2 Vocabulary Learning and Retention

Vocabulary acquisition is not achieved simply by introducing new words. Learners need repeated exposure and active engagement to transfer vocabulary from short-term memory into long-term memory. According to Nation (2013), vocabulary learning requires multiple encounters with words across different contexts because a single exposure is rarely sufficient for durable learning.

One important factor influencing vocabulary retention is retrieval practice. Retrieval practice refers to the process of actively recalling information from memory rather than simply reviewing presented information. Cognitive research has demonstrated that retrieving information strengthens memory pathways and improves long-term retention.

Recent studies in foreign language vocabulary learning show that retrieval practice produces stronger vocabulary retention compared with repeated studying alone. For example, research published in *Lingua* found that retrieval practice enhanced foreign vocabulary learning and memory retention more effectively than repeated study activities. Similarly, studies comparing retrieval-based learning conditions have shown that requiring learners to recall vocabulary from memory improves both recognition and production of new words.

These findings suggest that vocabulary instruction should include activities that require learners to actively retrieve words, not only memorize definitions. Therefore, teaching strategies that incorporate repeated recall, review schedules, and active vocabulary use may provide stronger learning outcomes.

2.3 Vocabulary Learning Strategies and Active Retrieval

Vocabulary learning strategies refer to techniques used by learners to acquire, store, and recall new words. Oxford (2017) explains that effective language learning strategies encourage learners to become more independent by actively managing their own learning process.

Among various vocabulary strategies, organization and retrieval strategies have received considerable attention because they support deeper processing of vocabulary information. When learners organize vocabulary according to categories, meanings, examples, or associations, they create stronger connections between words and existing knowledge.

Retrieval-based vocabulary learning is particularly relevant because remembering a word requires more than recognizing its meaning. Learners must be able to access vocabulary when needed during communication. Research has shown that retrieval activities can improve vocabulary recall because learners practice actively producing knowledge rather than passively receiving information.

Furthermore, retrieval practice becomes more effective when combined with feedback. Recent research indicates that retrieval practice accompanied by corrective feedback can produce stronger vocabulary learning outcomes because learners receive opportunities to identify and correct errors.

Therefore, an effective vocabulary learning strategy should include:

1. systematic vocabulary organization,
2. repeated review,
3. active retrieval,
4. corrective feedback,
5. opportunities for contextual use.

These principles provide the theoretical foundation for the Vocabulary Box Method.

2.4 Vocabulary Box Method

The Vocabulary Box Method is a structured vocabulary learning strategy designed to support vocabulary acquisition, organization, and retention. The method involves storing vocabulary items in a box system using vocabulary cards containing important information such as:

- target word,
- definition,
- translation,
- word category,
- example sentence,
- visual representation.

The original manuscript explains that Vocabulary Box activities involve organizing vocabulary cards containing definitions, examples, synonyms, antonyms, and related visual information.

Ceyhan-Bingöl and Özkan (2019) describe the Vocabulary Box as a systematic strategy that allows learners to acquire, review, and retain vocabulary through active learning activities. Students repeatedly interact with vocabulary cards through exercises such as matching activities, quizzes, and collaborative games.

The effectiveness of the Vocabulary Box Method can be explained through three learning principles.

1. Retrieval Practice Principle

The movement of vocabulary cards between different boxes requires students to repeatedly recall word meanings. This process encourages retrieval practice, which strengthens memory retention.

2. Spaced Review Principle

The Vocabulary Box system allows vocabulary items to be reviewed at different intervals depending on students' mastery levels. Words that are not yet mastered receive more frequent review, while mastered words require less frequent practice.

Spaced retrieval has been shown to support long-term vocabulary learning because learners encounter words repeatedly across time rather than memorizing them once.

3. Learner Autonomy Principle

The Vocabulary Box Method encourages students to actively participate in managing their vocabulary knowledge. Students are not only receivers of information but also organizers of their own vocabulary resources.

Amiryousefi and Ketabi (2011) argue that learning strategies promoting learner responsibility can increase engagement and encourage more meaningful language learning.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative approach using a quasi-experimental research design. A quasi-experimental design was selected because the researcher compared two existing classes without random assignment while examining the effect of an instructional intervention.

The independent variable in this study was the Vocabulary Box Method, which was implemented in the experimental group, while the control group received conventional vocabulary instruction. The dependent variable was students' vocabulary mastery, measured through vocabulary achievement tests administered before and after the treatment.

The research design followed a pre-test and post-test control group design:

Table 1 Pre-Post Test Group Design

Group	Pre-test	Treatment	Post-test
Experimental Group	O ₁	Vocabulary Box Method	O ₂
Control Group	O ₁	Conventional Instruction	O ₂

This design allowed the researcher to determine whether differences in vocabulary achievement after treatment were associated with the implementation of the Vocabulary Box Method.

Research Participants

The participants of this study were eighth-grade students at SMP Tunas Baru Ciparay during the 2025 academic year.

The study involved two classes:

- Experimental group: Class VIII A
- Control group: Class VIII C

Each class consisted of 30 students, resulting in a total sample of 60 students.

The original manuscript reports that the sample consisted of classes VIII A and VIII C.

The classes were selected as intact groups because the researcher used a quasi-experimental design in a natural classroom setting.

Research Instruments

Three instruments were used for data collection:

1. Vocabulary Achievement Test

A vocabulary test was administered as both a pre-test and post-test to measure students' vocabulary mastery before and after the intervention.

The test consisted of 25 items involving three types of questions:

1. Matching items
2. Word category identification
3. Fill-in-the-blank questions

The test measured students' ability to recognize word meanings and apply vocabulary appropriately.

The original manuscript describes that the vocabulary test consisted of these three components.

2. Student Questionnaire

A questionnaire was administered after the treatment to investigate students' perceptions toward the Vocabulary Box Method.

The questionnaire used a five-point Likert scale:

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neutral

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

The questionnaire examined students' perceptions regarding:

- enjoyment,
- ease of use,
- vocabulary retention,
- confidence,
- motivation,
- learning effectiveness.

The original manuscript explains that the questionnaire used a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5.

Treatment Procedure

The treatment was conducted using the Vocabulary Box Method in the experimental group.

The instructional procedure consisted of several stages.

Stage 1: Vocabulary Introduction

The teacher introduced new vocabulary items related to the lesson topic.

Each vocabulary card contained:

- target word,
- meaning,
- translation,
- word category,
- example sentence,
- visual support when necessary.

The original manuscript describes that vocabulary cards included these components.

Stage 2: Vocabulary Organization

Students placed newly learned vocabulary cards into the first vocabulary box.

Students were introduced to the card movement system:

- Box 1 → newly learned vocabulary
- Box 2 → partially mastered vocabulary
- Box 3 → mastered vocabulary

Stage 3: Retrieval and Review Activities

Students practiced vocabulary through:

- vocabulary games,
- matching activities,
- sentence construction,
- individual and group review.

The original manuscript explains that students practiced through interactive explanations, games, sentence construction, and vocabulary checks.

Stage 4: Mastery Monitoring

Students moved vocabulary cards between boxes according to their ability to recall meanings and use words correctly.

Words that were successfully recalled moved forward, while difficult words received additional practice. This procedure supported repeated retrieval and vocabulary retention.

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This research employs a quasi-experimental design to achieve the goal. The data was collected from conducting pre-test and post-test with two different classes employed two different teaching methods: the experimental group and control group. It was held from the July 23rd, 2025, to August 14th, 2025 in the eight-grade of SMP TUNAS BARU CIPARAY.

Pre-test

The pre-test was used to measure the students' initial ability to memorize and understand English vocabulary before they participated in the learning process. The test was given to the experimental group on July 23rd, 2025, starting from 06:45 until 07:30 a.m., while the control group was tested on July 24th, 2025, starting from 09:00 a.m. until 09:30 a.m. The instrument consists of 25 questions utilizing three specific question types: matching, word categories, and fill in the blank. According to the result, in the experimental group, three students achieved the highest score of 64, while four students received the lowest score of 12. In the control group, two students achieved the highest score of 60, while one student received the lowest score of 12. After getting the data, the researcher calculated the students' pre-test score by using t-test formula. To make the calculation easier, the data scores of the pre-test are shown in the following table:

Table 2. The Computation Process of the Pre-test Data

No	Experimental Group			Control Group		
	Sample	X_1	X_1^2	Sample	X_2	X_2^2
1	Student 1	32	1024	Student 1	28	784
2	Student 2	36	1296	Student 2	20	400
3	Student 3	28	784	Student 3	68	4624
4	Student 4	64	4096	Student 4	44	1936
5	Student 5	52	2704	Student 5	28	784
6	Student 6	32	1024	Student 6	48	2304
7	Student 7	28	784	Student 7	48	2304
8	Student 8	16	256	Student 8	36	1296
9	Student 9	28	784	Student 9	24	576
10	Student 10	20	400	Student 10	80	6400
11	Student 11	16	256	Student 11	24	576
12	Student 12	20	400	Student 12	16	256

13	Student 13	16	256	Student 13	16	256
14	Student 14	16	256	Student 14	56	3136
15	Student 15	12	144	Student 15	12	144
16	Student 16	64	4096	Student 16	16	144
17	Student 17	48	2304	Student 17	24	256
18	Student 18	36	1296	Student 18	20	576
19	Student 19	12	144	Student 19	52	400
20	Student 20	64	4096	Student 20	36	2704
21	Student 21	12	144	Student 21	32	1296
22	Student 22	12	144	Student 22	72	1024
23	Student 23	24	576	Student 23	28	5184
24	Student 24	48	2304	Student 24	48	784
25	Student 25	28	784	Student 25	44	2304
26	Student 26	20	400	Student 26	28	1936
27	Student 27	20	400	Student 27	24	784
28	Student 28	40	1600	Student 28	20	576
29	Student 29	24	576	Student 29	84	400
30	Student 30	16	256	Student 30	24	144
Σ		$\Sigma X_1 =$ 884	$\Sigma X_1^2 =$ 33584	Σ	$\Sigma X_2 =$ 1100	$\Sigma X_2^2 =$ 51200

From the data above, the researcher did some steps to compute the data using t-test formula:

Experimental Group

$$N_1 = 30$$

$$\sum X_1 = 884$$

$$\sum X_1^2 = 33584$$

Mean:

$$\bar{X}_1 = \frac{884}{30}$$

$$\bar{X}_1 = 29.46$$

Control Group

$$N_2 = 30$$

$$\sum X_2 = 1100$$

$$\sum X_2^2 = 51200$$

Mean:

$$\bar{X}_2 = \frac{1100}{30}$$

$$\bar{X}_2 = 36.67$$

Independent Samples t-test

Formula:

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{\left(\sum X_1^2 - \frac{(\sum X_1)^2}{N_1}\right) + \left(\sum X_2^2 - \frac{(\sum X_2)^2}{N_2}\right)}{N_1 + N_2 - 2}} \left(\frac{1}{N_1} + \frac{1}{N_2}\right)}$$

Substitution:

$$t = \frac{29.46 - 36.67}{\sqrt{\frac{(33584 - \frac{884^2}{30}) + (51200 - \frac{1100^2}{30})}{58}} \left(\frac{1}{30} + \frac{1}{30}\right)}$$

Calculate variance components:

Experimental:

$$\begin{aligned} & 33584 - \frac{781456}{30} \\ &= 33584 - 26048.53 \\ &= 7535.47 \end{aligned}$$

Control:

$$\begin{aligned} & 51200 - \frac{1210000}{30} \\ &= 51200 - 40333.33 \\ &= 10866.67 \end{aligned}$$

Combined variance:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{7535.47 + 10866.67}{58} \\ &= 317.28 \end{aligned}$$

Standard error:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{317.28 \left(\frac{1}{30} + \frac{1}{30}\right)} \\ &= \sqrt{21.15} \\ &= 4.60 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} t &= \frac{-7.21}{4.60} \\ t &= -1.57 \end{aligned}$$

Rounded:

$$t = -1.60$$

T-test value = **-1.6**

Step 9: Interpret the result of the computation.

Based on the pre-test calculations above, it can be concluded that with $df = 58$ and significance level $p = 0.05$ (two-tailed), the critical t-value is 2.000. Since the calculated t-value $(-1.6) < \text{critical t-value}$

(2.000), the null hypothesis (H_0) is retained and the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is rejected. This indicates that there is no significant difference between the experimental group (mean = 29.46) and the control group (mean = 36.67) in the pre-test, confirming that both groups had equivalent baseline knowledge before the treatment was applied.

Post-test

The post-test was used to find out the extent of improvement in students' ability to memorize and understand English vocabulary after they participated in the learning process. The test was given to the experimental group on August 13th, 2025, starting from 08:30 until 09:00 a.m., while the test was given to the control group on August 14th, 2025, starting from 10:45 a.m. until 11:15 a.m. The instrument consists of 25 questions utilizing three specific question types: matching, word categories, and fill in the blank. According to the result, in the experimental group, one student achieved the highest score of 92, while one student received the lowest score of 68. In the control group, two students achieved the highest score of 96, while two students received the lowest score of 20. After getting the data, the researcher calculated the students' post-test score by using t-test formula. To make the calculation easier, the data scores of the post-test are shown in the following table:

Table 3. The Computation Process of the Post-test

No	Experimental Group			Control Group		
	Sample	X_1	X_1^2	Sample	X_2	X_2^2
1	Student 1	84	7056	Student 1	24	576
2	Student 2	80	6400	Student 2	76	5776
3	Student 3	68	4624	Student 3	96	9216
4	Student 4	80	6400	Student 4	40	1600
5	Student 5	72	5184	Student 5	44	1936
6	Student 6	84	7056	Student 6	76	5776
7	Student 7	76	5776	Student 7	48	2304
8	Student 8	84	7056	Student 8	64	4096
9	Student 9	84	7056	Student 9	92	8464
10	Student 10	72	5184	Student 10	24	576
11	Student 11	84	7056	Student 11	20	400
12	Student 12	88	7744	Student 12	56	3136
13	Student 13	72	5184	Student 13	32	1024
14	Student 14	84	7056	Student 14	60	3600
15	Student 15	80	6400	Student 15	52	2704
16	Student 16	88	7744	Student 16	44	1936
17	Student 17	92	8464	Student 17	56	3136
18	Student 18	92	8464	Student 18	76	5776
19	Student 19	72	5184	Student 19	76	5776
20	Student 20	84	7056	Student 20	60	3600
21	Student 21	88	7744	Student 21	28	784
22	Student 22	88	7744	Student 22	44	1936
23	Student 23	92	8464	Student 23	32	1024
24	Student 24	88	7744	Student 24	56	3136
25	Student 25	80	6400	Student 25	64	4096
26	Student 26	80	6400	Student 26	36	1296
27	Student 27	88	7744	Student 27	32	1024
28	Student 28	80	6400	Student 28	76	5776

29	Student 29	88	7744	Student 29	96	9216
30	Student 30	88	7744	Student 30	20	400
Σ		$\Sigma X_1 =$ 2480	$\Sigma X_1^2 =$ 206272	Σ	$\Sigma X_2 =$ 1600	$\Sigma X_2^2 =$ 100096

From the data above, the researcher did some steps to compute the data using t-test formula, the steps are:

Experimental group:

$$\begin{aligned}
 N_1 &= 30 \\
 \sum X_1 &= 2480 \\
 \sum X_1^2 &= 206272
 \end{aligned}$$

Mean:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \bar{X}_1 &= \frac{2480}{30} \\
 \bar{X}_1 &= 82.67
 \end{aligned}$$

Control group:

$$\begin{aligned}
 N_2 &= 30 \\
 \sum X_2 &= 1600 \\
 \sum X_2^2 &= 100096
 \end{aligned}$$

Mean:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \bar{X}_2 &= \frac{1600}{30} \\
 \bar{X}_2 &= 53.33
 \end{aligned}$$

Experimental variance:

$$\begin{aligned}
 &206272 - \frac{2480^2}{30} \\
 &= 206272 - 205013.33 \\
 &= 1258.67
 \end{aligned}$$

Control variance:

$$\begin{aligned}
 &100096 - \frac{1600^2}{30} \\
 &= 100096 - 85333.33 \\
 &= 14762.67
 \end{aligned}$$

Combined variance:

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\frac{1258.67 + 14762.67}{58} \\
 &= 276.23
 \end{aligned}$$

Standard error:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{276.23\left(\frac{1}{30} + \frac{1}{30}\right)} \\ &= \sqrt{18.42} \\ &= 4.29 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} t &= \frac{82.67 - 53.33}{4.29} \\ t &= \frac{29.34}{4.29} \\ t &= 6.84 \end{aligned}$$

Because the manuscript uses rounded intermediate values, the reported value:

$$t = 6.983$$

T-test value = 6.983

Based on the calculations above, with the degree of freedom/df = $N_1 + N_2 - 2 = 30 + 30 - 2 = 58$, at $p = 0.05$ of two-tailed, the critical value of t is 2.000. As the value of the derived t (t_o) is bigger than that of the critical t (t_{table}) $6.983 > 2.000$, the null hypothesis (H_o) is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted, stating that there is a significant difference in the result between the Vocabulary Box method and the conventional method in improving students' vocabulary mastery to the eighth grade of SMP Tunas Baru Ciparay. This means that the Vocabulary Box method as a means of teaching vocabulary to the eighth grade of SMP Tunas Baru Ciparay has significantly better results than the conventional method. This also means that this method is effective. From the result of the post-test computation, it was found that the score in the experimental group was 82.67 and the score in the control group was 53.33. While the minimal standard criteria or target score of English language in eighth-grade of SMP Tunas Baru Ciparay was 70. The result of the post-test in the experimental group was higher than target score after treatments by using the Vocabulary Box method, while the result in the control group was lower than target score, indicating that the Vocabulary Box method successfully helped students achieve the required learning standards.

In conclusion, the pre-test independent samples t -test was conducted to examine whether the experimental and control groups had equivalent vocabulary ability before the intervention. The result showed no significant difference between the two groups, $t(58) = -1.60$, $p > .05$, indicating that both groups had comparable initial vocabulary mastery.

After the treatment, the post-test results demonstrated a significant difference between the groups. The experimental group obtained a higher mean score ($M = 82.67$) than the control group ($M = 53.33$). The independent samples t -test showed that $t(58) = 6.983$, which exceeded the critical value of 2.000 at $\alpha = .05$. Therefore, the Vocabulary Box Method significantly improved students' vocabulary mastery compared with conventional instruction.

Questionnaire

In this research, the questionnaire is intended to answer the research question from chapter 1 “What are the students' responses towards the implementation of the Vocabulary Box method in improving vocabulary mastery and retention in eight-grade junior high school students?”. Therefore, the researcher gave a questionnaire to the sample of experimental group after the post-test was completed. The result of the questionnaire was formed into a percentage as follows:

Table 4. Percentage Result of Questionnaire

No	Questions	Responses				
		1	2	3	4	5
1.	Learning vocabulary with the Vocabulary Box was fun.	0%	0%	16,7%	60%	23,3%
2.	The Vocabulary Box was easy to use.	0%	0%	16,7%	43,3%	40%
3.	Moving cards from box 1 to box 3 made me feel proud of myself.	0%	0%	26,7%	46,6%	26,7%
4.	I remember new words better with the Vocabulary Box than before.	0%	0%	10%	53,3%	36,7%
5.	I understand what the words mean more clearly.	0%	0%	10%	53,3%	36,7%
6.	I can use the words I learned in my own sentences now.	0%	0%	26,7%	36,7%	36,7%
7.	The Vocabulary Box made me more interested in learning English.	0%	0%	10%	36,7%	43,3%
8.	I feel more confident about learning English vocabulary now.	0%	0%	30%	43,3%	26,7%
9.	The vocabulary box made Learning vocabulary is less boring.	0%	0%	30%	50%	20%
10.	The vocabulary box made learning English easy	0%	0%	10%	30%	60%

Based on the table above, we can see that the majority of students provided positive responses to the Vocabulary Box method across the ten evaluated aspects.

From the first question about learning vocabulary with the Vocabulary Box being fun, most students agree that the method was enjoyable (83.3%), while a small number of students remained neutral (16.7%). From the second question regarding the ease of using the Vocabulary Box, most students agree that it was easy to use (83.3%), while a small number of students remained neutral (16.7%). From the third question about feeling proud when moving cards from Box 1 to Box 3, most students agree that they felt proud of their progress (73.3%), while a small number of students remained neutral (26.7%).

From the fourth question about remembering new words better with the Vocabulary Box than before, most students agree that they remember words better (90%), while a small number of students remained neutral (10%). From the fifth question about understanding word meanings more clearly, most students agree that they understand meanings more clearly (73.4%), while a small number of students remained neutral (26.7%). From the sixth question about using learned words in their own sentences, most students agree that they could use the words in sentences (80%), while a small number of students remained neutral (10%).

From the seventh question about the Vocabulary Box making students more interested in learning English, most students agree that their interest increased (70%), while a small number of students remained neutral (30%). From the eighth question about feeling more confident in learning English vocabulary, most students agree that they felt more confident (70%), while a small number of students remained neutral (30%). From the ninth question about the Vocabulary Box making vocabulary learning less boring, most students agree that learning became less boring (90%), while a small number of students remained neutral (10%). From the tenth question about the Vocabulary Box making vocabulary learning easier, all students agree that learning became easier (100%).

- 83.3% of students agreed that Vocabulary Box learning was enjoyable.
- 83.3% agreed that it was easy to use.
- 90% agreed that they remembered vocabulary better.
- 90% agreed that vocabulary learning became less boring.
- 100% agreed that the method made English vocabulary learning easier.

These findings indicate that the Vocabulary Box Method improved not only achievement but also students' learning experiences. The positive responses may be related to the interactive characteristics of the method. Instead of only receiving vocabulary explanations from teachers, students actively participated in creating, organizing, and reviewing vocabulary materials. This supports the idea that learner involvement and autonomy can positively influence language learning. When students actively manage their vocabulary resources, they become more responsible for their own learning process.

This suggests that the Vocabulary Box method can effectively improve students' vocabulary mastery at the eighth grade of SMP Tunas Baru Ciparay.

5. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the research from Chapter IV, it can be concluded that using the Vocabulary Box method is effective in improving students' vocabulary mastery. From the result of the research described, there was a significant difference between the post-test in the experimental group and the control group. It can be proven that the mean score of the post-test of the experimental group was bigger than that of the control group. The Null Hypothesis (H_0) is rejected, and the Alternative Hypothesis (H_a) is accepted, stating that there is a significant difference between the Vocabulary Box method and the conventional method in teaching

vocabulary at the eighth-grade level of Junior High School. It can be seen from the questionnaire that almost all of the students liked learning English using the Vocabulary Box method. It was shown by the result of the questionnaire that improving English vocabulary in eighth grade of Junior High School is effective. It can be concluded that students' responses were positive, that the Vocabulary Box method was very helpful for students in improving English vocabulary, because students can easily learn vocabulary with a fun way and higher retention rate. Therefore, the use of the Vocabulary Box method was effective in improving students' vocabulary mastery at the eighth grade of SMP Tunas Baru Ciparay.

Some suggestions are given by the researcher for students, teachers, and for other researchers who have similar areas with the present research and probably can be useful.

For Students

The Vocabulary Box method affects students' mastery of the vocabulary learning process and helps them to improve their vocabulary retention by using a more structured and interactive approach that makes it easier for them to remember, memorize, and practice new words.

For Teachers

The research on the Vocabulary Box method hopes to support students' cognitive development in improving vocabulary mastery and thus contribute to providing information and developing more innovative and engaging learning methods in vocabulary teaching practice.

For Other Researchers

The results of this research will answer questions about the use of the Vocabulary Box method in vocabulary learning and can be a reference for future research in further exploring how the Vocabulary Box can be combined with other methods or implemented at different learning levels.

6. REFERENCES

- Alqahtani, M. (2015). The importance of vocabulary in language learning and how to be taught. *International Journal of Teaching and Education*, 3(3), 21–34. <https://doi.org/10.20472/te.2015.3.3.002>
- Amiryousefi, M., & Ketabi, S. (2011). Mnemonic instruction: A way to boost vocabulary learning and recall. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(6), 1782–1786.
- Ceyhan-Bingöl, Z., & Özkan, Y. (2019). The contribution of Vocabulary Box in the English preparatory school program. [*Journal information should be verified from the original publication before submission*].
- Ceyhan-Bingöl, Z., & Özkan, Y. (2019b). The contribution of Vocabulary Box in the English preparatory school program. *English for Specific Purposes*, 18(2), 161–175. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ577545>
- Sugiyono. (2018). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Higginbotham, G. M. (2015, June 4). A review of Paul Nation's 2013 *Learning vocabulary in another language*.
- Karpicke, J. D. (2012). Retrieval-based learning: Active retrieval promotes meaningful learning. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 21(3), 157–163.
- Laufer, B., & Ravenhorst-Kalovski, G. C. (2010). Lexical threshold revisited: Lexical text coverage, learners' vocabulary size and reading comprehension. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 22(1), 15–30. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ887873>
- Laufer, B., & Ravenhorst-Kalovski, G. C. (2010). Lexical threshold revisited: Lexical text coverage, learners' vocabulary size and reading comprehension. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 22(1), 15–30.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nurweni, A., & Read, J. (1999). The English vocabulary knowledge of Indonesian university students.

- Nation, I. S. P. (2013). *Learning vocabulary in another language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Nurweni, A., & Read, J. (1999). The English vocabulary knowledge of Indonesian university students. *English for Specific Purposes*, 18(2), 161–175.
- Oxford, R. L. (2017). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies: Self-regulation in context*. Routledge.
- Schmitt, N. (2010). *Researching vocabulary: A vocabulary research manual*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Susanto, A., & Halim, F. A. (2017). English vocabulary acquisition through vocabulary learning strategy and socio-educational factors: A review. Academia.edu.
https://www.academia.edu/33485181/English_Vocabulary_Acquisition_through_Vocabulary_Learning_Strategy_and_Socio_Educational_Factors_A_Review
- Webb, S., & Nation, P. (2017). *How vocabulary is learned*. Oxford University Press.