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Abstract. The purpose of this research was to find if student with different literature preference has different vocabulary achievement in writing. In this research, what the researcher means by vocabulary achievement are word count, lexical density, and readability. The samples were students of English Study Program in Arts and Language Education Department in University of Lampung. This research was quantitative research; the researcher used Co-relational study, Ex-Post Facto design. There were two instruments: text writing test, and questionnaire. Result was received from mean average comparison between samples with difference preference and analyzed through ANOVA. Significance is showed in mean comparison of lexical density; with movie preference which has the highest average mean between other literature products preference. The researcher concluded that sample with difference preference has different vocabulary achievement in writing; with detail: the different preference affected sample’s vocabulary achievement in lexical density.
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INTRODUCTION

Writing is an important skill in English in which almost the majority of people will put it as the last skill that they need. From the researcher’s observation, many English tests in researcher’s hometown—including TOEFL and TOEIC preparation tests—didn’t tested writing skill. Hence, people’s motivation toward this skill is lacking. People prefer to improve their listening skill; influencing their speaking skill; and mastering their reading skill. It happens because these skills are favorable and useful in every English test.

Even though both are productive skills, writing is different from speaking. In speaking, people work spontaneously. While in writing, people can choose words more accurately. Also, people can strategize what they will tell and how they tell better than speaking. If speaking is a commander and a soldier who fights and makes decisions depending on the situation, then writing is like a tactician which stands beside the king and make commands behind the scene more carefully. Even a president’s speech is written in advance and in detail.

The distinct use of writing diction can be seen in literature products like novel and drama. Each writer—novel writer and drama scriptwriter—has different style in how the writer tells his/her stories. Romance novel has romantic paragraphs on it; comedy movie has humorous lines.

Nowadays, the product grows widely. The genres option is more varied than in the past. Also, the uses of diction in these modern literature products are varied. Many words from other language are blended within; many new words, counted slang words, are born. Some people say that the deep-meaning contents from literature in early time are decreasing today.

Set those aside, what the researcher is trying to say is “how are those connected?” It is like the literature world just has that circumstance. Different writing diction, in this research is vocabulary, makes literature product born variedly.

The researcher then wondering, how the opposite will end? If writing diction make literature product varied, will literature products make people writing diction in some ways? Do people with some literature schemata can produce words in the same number? Do people who enjoy modern literature produce meaningless words more than those who read the early one? Does person who spend his/her time with the product have different diction or have words chosen skill better than people who spend less?

Collie and Slater (1987) explain that literature can be helpful in the language learning because of the personal involvement it foster in readers. They also point out that, very often, the process of learning is essentially analytic, piecemeal, and, at the level of the personality, fairly superficial. Engaging imaginatively with literature, enable learners to shift the focus of their attention beyond the more mechanical aspects of the foreign language system.

Collie and Slater (1987) believe that this can happen, and can have beneficial effects upon the whole language learning process, as long as the experience of
engaging with literature is kept sufficiently interesting, varied and non-directive to let the reader feel that he or she is taking possession of a previously unknown territory. Obviously, the choice of a particular literary work will be important in facilitating this creative relationship which the reader establishes with the text.

Lawal (2009) states, in his article, that a strong relationship exists between literature and language both as disciplines and social tools is no longer in doubt. Several scholars have expressed varying shades of conviction on the close relationship between language and literature, and empirical findings also abound on same.

Moody (1971) posits that literature consists of specialised forms, selections and collections of language, and as such the study of literature is fundamentally a study of language, for literature has as its target the society, and as its raw material, language either spoken or written. In the same vein, Wellek and Warren (1973) stress that language is the raw material of literature as stone or bronze is of sculpture, paints of picture, and sounds of music.

This research is focused on the use of English literature products in daily life in affecting students’ vocabulary achievement in writing. The researcher focused the vocabulary achievement into word count, lexical density, and readability. The literature products which would be used were common products: song, movie, and prose; The products which would be targeted were both authentic, wrote by native and using native culture; and non-authentic, wrote by non-native writer, not using native culture, and translated one from another country culture. The research is focused to find if student with different literature product preference have different vocabulary achievement in writing.

**METHOD**

The researcher used Co-relational Study, Ex-Post Facto design. The researcher had two phase of collecting data and used two kind instruments in each phase. The first instrument that the researcher would use was a deaf picture storybook. With the first instrument, the researcher would collect the vocabulary data that the samples produce. The second instrument was a closed-minded questionnaire. It would be used to get the samples exposure of the literature product that they preferred with.

The population of this research was all the students of English Department in Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of Lampung. 29 samples were selected by using Judgmental sample. This sample uses information from the past or existed from population which is used as sample as the base. The researcher selected the sample by looking into the existed information as the basis to decide the individual. Another reason why the researcher chose them was because they were Convenience sample.

The procedure would be started by conducting the first phase. The sample had been given a blank paper and a paper with a serial picture printed on it. They
would be asked to fill the paper based on what they saw in the picture; they would be asked to fill the paper based on their own imagination of the picture. The researcher would give thirty minute time limit.

After that, it continued to second phase, the researcher would give the samples a questionnaire. It would give the researcher the data of the samples exposure.

The population of this research was all the students of English Department in Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of Lampung. 29 samples were selected by using Judgmental sample. The researcher selected the sample by looking into the existed information as the basis to decide the individual. Another reason why the researcher chose them was because they were Convenience sample.

This research has two variables, X and Y. Dependent variable X is correlated with independent variable Y. Variable X taken from the paper contained the samples writing after be analyzed by text analysis software. After the analysis, the variable was divided into three levels (X₁, X₂, and X₃). Comparing variable X (X₁, X₂, and X₃) from the three subjects based the result from questionnaire, variable Y (preference). Then the researcher used ANOVA to draw the conclusion.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The first test was deaf story book; samples made a story based on the picture from a book without any dialog or narration. This test is to measure sample's vocabulary in writing. The highest number word produced is 178 words and the lowest is 39, with average 90 words; the highest density is 85% and the lowest is 48%, with average 65%; the highest readability is 9.2 and the lowest is 3.1, with average 4.8.

The second test was a questionnaire. There are three subjects in the questionnaire; the highest score from a subject determined which product samples prefer. The result showed:

1. There are 10 students preferring song and 5 students preferring movie.
2. In total 14 students are undecided, mean they are not really prefer one of the three subjects. Those students, all of them, have two highest subject score (not exactly in a same number, but the score have significant gap, which the researcher set, to determine what their preferred).
3. There is no students preferred prose. In the case number 2, the undecided students’ preference is between song and movie. There is no student preferred prose or undecided between prose and other two products.
Table 3. Statistical Result of the Correlation between Literature Product and Vocabulary Achievement in Writing

### ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4029.984</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2014.992</td>
<td>2.447</td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>21411.257</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>823.510</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25441.241</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical Density</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>815.178</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>407.589</td>
<td>6.458</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1640.957</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>63.114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2456.135</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.755</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.377</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td>.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>59.213</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.277</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61.968</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Descriptives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>106.7000</td>
<td>30.98763</td>
<td>9.79915</td>
<td>84.5328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movie</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>79.8000</td>
<td>23.17758</td>
<td>10.36533</td>
<td>51.0212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>82.7857</td>
<td>28.58235</td>
<td>7.63895</td>
<td>66.2828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>90.5172</td>
<td>30.14325</td>
<td>5.59746</td>
<td>79.0514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical Density</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58.5050</td>
<td>8.15050</td>
<td>2.57741</td>
<td>52.6745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movie</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>72.0320</td>
<td>10.02986</td>
<td>4.48549</td>
<td>59.5783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>68.3379</td>
<td>7.02024</td>
<td>1.87624</td>
<td>64.2845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>65.5841</td>
<td>9.36585</td>
<td>1.73919</td>
<td>62.0216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The researcher used statistical computerization *SPSS 17.0 for Windows.* Significance is determined by p<0.05. ANOVA revealed that from three level dependent variables compared with the independent variable, word count and readability showed insignificance; in the other hand, lexical density showed significance at level p<0.05 (p=0.005).

Statistical result ANOVA showed that samples literature preference affecting their lexical density percentage. From mean comparisons, samples with movie preference have the highest mean in lexical density and readability while samples with song have the highest mean in word production. Other than that, samples with undecided preference always placed 2nd highest mean. From statistical result ANOVA, only lexical density showed significance. In case of word count, it correlated with samples preference, but the significance is not high enough.

**Graph 1, 2, and 3. Means Plots of Word Count, Lexical Density, and Readability**
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Legend :  
VAR00001 = Word Count Mean  
VAR00002 = Lexical Density  
VAR00003 = Readability  
VAR00005 = Preference (2: song, 3: movie, 4: undecided)

Lawal (2009) states that a strong relationship is exist between literature and language. Proving Lawal’s words, the researcher found that a part of literature has connection with student vocabulary in writing. From the result of this research, the researcher found movie has the highest correlation Samples with movie
preference have the highest mean among other preferences. From that we can see that movie affect samples’ vocabulary better in term of writing. Samples which have undecided preference (didn’t prefer song or movie best) never have the lowest mean. The researcher believes that this happen because while the samples preference is between movie and song, the preference which gave the best effect to the achievement gave a big part.

With ANOVA, then the researcher finds that only lexical density have significant correlation. In other words, only lexical density which has high correlation with samples different preference. Then the researcher assumed that only data from lexical density achievement can be used due its significance.

The researcher concludes that the different preference of literature product only affects students’ lexical density; and movie give the best effect out of the other two subjects.

The researcher believes that the reason why movie give better effect because it contains two source of information for sample. While poetry gives visual information and song gives audio information, movie gives both visual and audio which commonly called audio-visual. Since movie give better quantity of information sources, samples have better chance to grasp information.

The researcher believe that the reason why movie give better effect because it contain two source of information for sample. While poetry gives visual information and song gives audio information, movie gives both visual and audio which commonly called audio-visual. Since movie give better quantity of information sources, samples have better chance to grasp information.

Commonly movie contain subtitle within it. Subtitle gives information of dialogue which spoken in the movie. Hence there is an elaboration information comprehension between subtitle, picture, and audio when we watch a movie; all of it in one packaged. The elaboration stimulates our brain harder and gives better result. It is in line with Akbulut (2007) argument that combining text with visual is more effective in facilitating vocabulary learning.

Cited from paper titled The Effect of Using Movies in Teaching Vocabulary by Al-Sarhan (2013):

“Researchers and academics become more aware of letting students experience the subject or at least to get them engaged in classrooms. Another way of teaching is by acting where some students have to perform a certain play and the others watch. For example, by watching a play, it is hard for students to forget the story of the play. Therefore, it is hard for them to forget some important key words that they have found in the context of the play.

Movies can be used to convey the word meaning through the context. The context is important as a framework where meaning of words can be figured out. Trying to figure out meaning of a word through movies is easier than trying to figure meaning out through reading.”
Most of the researchers agree that vocabulary should not be presented in isolation and should not be learned rote memorization. It is important that new vocabulary items be presented in context rich enough to provide clue to meaning and that students be given multiple exposure to items they should learn” (Celce-Murcia, 2001). Not only watching movies but also playing the scene back by students is helpful.

To close the discussion: through the finding, the researcher has proven some theories of connection between literature and language is true. Also, in this research, it found that a specific literature (product) called movie have the highest correlation with student’s vocabulary achievement in writing.

CONCLUSION

Between the three achievements measured, lexical density is the only one which has significance. Then, between three preferences, in lexical density, samples with movie preference have better mean score compared others.

If we look at the mean comparison, song has the lowest mean. Meanwhile, samples which their preference is in between song and movie have better score. The researcher believe that it happened because the samples duality of preference. While these samples prefer song they are also prefer movie. What the researcher believes is movie, which these samples also prefer, give the best support. In other words, it happened because they also prefer movie.

The samples with undecided preference have higher lowest score, yet lower highest score compared with samples with movie preference. Beside of individual intelligent, the researcher believes it caused because of their focus of preference. Undecided preference sample didn’t focus on one literature product and divided their attention when movie preference sample focused better in one product.

Thus, Thus, the researcher concludes that student with different literature product preference has different vocabulary achievement. In detail, movie is the best in affecting student vocabulary in writing; specifically in lexical density.
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