

**THE USE OF "WHAT'S MISSING?" GAME IN TEACHING VOCABULARY: An
Experimental Study at Grade 8th Student of SMPN 1 Lopok, Sumbawa in
Academic Year 2016/2017**



Submitted as a Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for Undergraduate
Degree in English Department Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
University of Mataram

A Journal

By:

NUANSA MILYAN

E1D110013

**ENGLISH DEPARTEMENT
FACULTY OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION
MATARAM UNIVERSITY
2017**



KEMENTERIAN RISET, TEKNOLOGI, DAN PENDIDIKAN TINGGI
UNIVERSITAS MATARAM
FAKULTAS KEGURUAN DAN ILMU PENDIDIKAN
JURUSAN BAHASA DAN SENI
Jl. Majapahit No. 62 Telp. (0370)623873 Fax. 6349 8 Mataram 83125



RATIFICATION

A journal entitled "The Use of "What's Missing?" Game in Teaching Vocabulary: An Experimental Study at Grade 8th Student of SMPN 1 Lepak, Sumbawa in Academic Year 2016/2017" by Nuansa Milyan (E1D110013) has been approved by the board of consultants as the requirement to achieve *Sarjana Pendidikan* (S.Pd) Degree in English Education Program Faculty of Teacher Training and Education Mataram University.

Mataram, July 2017
Second Consultant

Kurniawan Agriyanto, M Pd
NIP.197312192005011002

ABSTRACT

This research investigated the use of "What's Missing?" game in teaching vocabulary in junior high school level. It is aimed at identifying whether the game give significant effect to improve students' vocabulary mastery. It was conducted by applying experimental research design. The population of this study was the second grade students of SMPN 1 Lopok in academic year 2016/ 2017, consisting of 5 classes and two of them were used as sample for collecting the data. They were class VII.3 as experimental group and class VIII.4 as control group. Each class consisted of 25 students, they were treated by different material, control group treated by using conventional way due to the handbook in used such as grammar-translation method and the experimental group was treated by using "What's Missing Game?", they had been treated for 3 times and it was 80 minutes in each meeting. The data were collected from the students' pre-test and post-test score. Then the data were analyzed by using t-test. From the analysis, it was found that pre-test mean score of experimental group was 47.56 and of control group was 47.08. Meanwhile their post-test mean score were 60.92 and 52.28 alternately. The result of t-test was 2.42 while value of t-table was 2.01 at confidence level .05 (95%). This showed that the value of t-test is higher than t-table ($2.42 > 2.01$). It means that H_0 is rejected and H_a is failed to be rejected. It can be concluded that using "What's Missing?" game gave contribution and effective to increase student's vocabulary mastery.

Key words: *vocabulary, mastery, "What's Missing?" game*

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini meneliti tentang penggunaan permainan "What's Missing?" dalam mengajarkan kosakata di tingkat SMP. Hal ini bertujuan untuk mengidentifikasi apakah permainan tersebut memberi efek signifikan untuk meningkatkan penguasaan kosakata siswa. Penelitian ini dilakukan dengan menerapkan desain penelitian eksperimental. Populasi dalam penelitian ini adalah siswa kelas 8 SMPN 1 Lopok pada tahun ajaran 2016/2017, yang terdiri dari 5 kelas dan dua di antaranya digunakan sebagai sampel untuk mengumpulkan data. Kelas tersebut adalah kelas VIII.3 sebagai kelompok eksperimen dan kelas VIII.4 sebagai kelompok kontrol. Setiap kelas tersebut terdiri dari 25 siswa, mereka diberikan bahan ajar yang berbeda, kelompok kontrol dengan cara konvensional sesuai dengan buku pegangan yang digunakan seperti Grammar Translation Method dan kelompok eksperimen dengan menerapkan bahan ajar berupa permainan "What's Missing Game?". Mereka telah di berikan perlakuan kelas selama 3 kali dan 80 menit di setiap pertemuan. Data dikumpulkan dari hasil pre-test dan post-test siswa. Kemudian data dianalisis dengan menggunakan formula t-test. Dari hasil analisis diketahui bahwa nilai rata-rata pre-test kelompok eksperimen adalah 47,56 dan kelompok kontrol sebesar 47,08. Sedangkan nilai rata-rata post-test mereka adalah 60,92 dan 52,28. Hasil t-test adalah 2,42 sedangkan t-table adalah 2,01 pada tingkat kevalidan 0,05 (95%). Hal ini menunjukkan bahwa nilai t-test lebih tinggi dari t-tabel ($2,42 > 2,01$). Artinya H_0 ditolak dan H_a diterima. Dapat disimpulkan bahwa dengan menggunakan game "What's Missing?" ini dapat memberikan kontribusi dan efektif untuk meningkatkan penguasaan kosakata siswa.

Kata kunci: kosakata, penguasaan, permainan "What's Missing?"

I. Background of Study

Vocabulary is crucial for getting meaning from written or oral discourse. Without understanding words the learner may have serious problem to understand the message or to encode what the speakers say. In addition, Ruddell (2005) proves that the important relationship between vocabulary, comprehension and learning is, however more universally proclaimed than it is operationalized in the classroom.

The teacher was demanded to prepare the media that will help the students in successfully acquiring the English language and studies in class. One of the best ways out of the problem is how teacher should be active using a technique such as using games as medium, especially in teaching vocabulary. Generally, we know that student sometimes tire of the materials monotonous in class, so that by using media games will really help student easier to study, especially for those students in junior high school whom still has the strength childish and love to play games. According to Ludewig (2007), games are fun and motivating; the remarkable power of games to engage our attention is evident all around us. Individually, and as a culture, we spend vast amounts of time, energy, and resources to watch and participate in games.

Therefore, based on my work place at the moment in Lopok and the background above, brought me to carry out a research with a title "The Use of "What's Missing?" Game in Teaching Vocabulary: An Experimental Study At Grade 8th Student Of SMPN 1 Lopok In Academic Year 2016/2017". I found out that the students' learning base in SMPN 1 Lopok was little bit different with another junior high school in Mataram City where I had been done her teaching practice (PPL), the source of teaching and learning activity is still low. In hope that I can use the games, which is easy to do, interesting, and easily understood by pupils in grade 8th in junior high school actually by learning words in context of the recent material.

1.1 Purpose of Study

- To find if the use of WHAT'S MISSING? Game can improve students' English Vocabulary Mastery.

1.2 Hypothesis of Study

In this study, writer propose an Alternative Hypothesis (Ha) that the use of "What's Missing?" game can improve students' English Vocabulary Mastery at the eighth grade students of SMPN 1 Lopok" and Null Hypothesis (H0) that is "What's Missing?" game cannot improve students' English Vocabulary Mastery at the eighth grade student s of SMPN 1 Lopok".

1.3 Definition of Key Term

- a. Game
 - Game is an activity with rules, a goal and an element of fun (Hadfield: 1998: 4).
- b. "What's Missing?" Game

"What Missing?" game is the game where the teacher first prepares some things as media to be showed to student. Teacher should already prepare a slide show or in simply make a picture of a car and the parts, after students look it completely, teacher will take away one of the car's part. Based on Hadfield (1998: 4) this kind of game which played in group goes to cooperative games in which the players or teams work together towards a common goal to find what thing is missing. Then the speaker of each group will tell what thing is missing by mentioning what is the name of the thing was missing.
- c. Vocabulary
 - a. Vocabulary is the total number of words in a language (Horby: 1995)

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Since vocabulary as the subject that I used for the research, I got to give my opinion of what is the vocabulary itself. It is a fact that there is no language without vocabulary, and vocabularies are the building blocks of language, it means that vocabulary is the first important main core of language. Students learn the vocabulary for their further language and knowledge about content of language itself. Language and vocabulary

cannot be separated, it is sure that they have crucial relation each other. The relation between both of them is structured into message in communication. Meaning that vocabulary as words is really central to language and of critical importance to the typical language learners in the classroom, because they learn language in very first start by words or vocabulary.

2.1 Vocabulary in Language Learning

Vocabulary is the main and core of the language, words are the building of language science they label objects, action, ideas. Without vocabulary people cannot convey the intended meaning. Due to my views on vocabulary, it is not away difference with one of the experts' says, there Thornbury (1988) says that all languages have words. Languages emerges first as words, both historically, and in terms of way each of us learned our first and any subsequent languages. Although there are so many experts state their opinions, but those are got one destination and result which are to make student being help in language learning process and surely for receive the knowledge in easiest way.

Graves (1987), an expert of teaching children, describes some vocabulary learning tasks, such as learning to read known words, learning new meaning for known words, and moving words from receptive to expressive vocabularies. He points out further that in learning language and vocabulary children need to not only to learn new words, but also they need to learn how to learn words and how to learn about words.

Graves's tasks are represented slightly differently in Drum and Konopak's (1987) illustration. The illustration illuminates the task categories by showing the prior knowledge that the learners have for each task and the learning goal. Beck (1991) recommends a program of 'rich instruction' for teaching vocabulary and developing children's independent vocabulary learning abilities. Based on what their statement, the writer often see this process of a rich instructional vocabulary program in classroom approaches, such as teacher gives direct instruction to develop meaning in the immediate context of the materials and presentation of word learning strategies to encourage children toward increasingly independent identification of meaning of unknown words through meaning context and classroom resources using a reference aid such as dictionary,

it mostly happen in junior high school while learning English as foreign language.

2.2 Strategies of Teaching Vocabulary

There are so many strategies that have been use by teacher to teach vocabulary in classroom. According to Pacivic (1999), strategies of teaching vocabulary can be divided into three groups, such as following:

- Formal practice
- Functional practice
- Memorizing

2.3 “What’s Missing?” Game

This game is a good way to use as media to teach vocabulary and according to the strategies of teaching vocabulary by Pacivic (1999), this game is suitable with the memorizing technique which use in memory strategies based on intra-lingual and visual association. The way this game taught is more interesting to children and also suitable with their brain growth at their age as young learners of English than only teaching by giving explanation and theories.

III. RESEARCH METHOD

3.1 Research Design

This research was the kind of experimental research, the goal of this study was to figure out whether there was improvement of students’ vocabulary mastery by applying a game as teaching media for teach vocabulary or there is no effect.

3.2 Population and Sample of Research

The population of this research is the 8th grade student of SMPN 1 Lopok, Sumbawa, which consist of five classes and seated by 137 students. Then the sample was two classes in the 8th grade, the experimental group and the control group. Then, 2 classes were selected within the 5 classes by lottery: VIII.3 and VIII.4, VIII.3 class as the experimental group and VIII.4 class as the control group.

3.4 Data Collection

- a. Pre-Test is an instrumental which is conducted to get data from

both groups of the sample before giving any treatment and post test. The goals or aim of the pre-test is to measure student's preceding capability before the treatment is conducting.

- b. Post-Test is the end step of collecting data after giving treatment to both groups. The post-test aims to finding out the result of treatment that has been conducted, to know the improvements of students' vocabulary after being treated.

3.5 Method of Data Analysis

3.5.1 Descriptive Statistics

After the data is collected, it goes to analyses the descriptive statistic. Before it is done, the mean score (M) and standard deviation (SD) of students' score is calculated first. To get mean score of pre-test and post-test, the writer used the following formula:

$$Md_x = \frac{\sum d_x}{N} \quad \text{and} \quad Md_y = \frac{\sum d_y}{N}$$

Where:

Md_x = mean score of experimental group

Md_y = mean score of control group

d_x = pre-test and post-test score experimental group

d_y = pre-test and post test score control group

N = number of sample

Σ = sum of...

Arikunto (2010: 350)

Then, calculating the square deviation of both of groups uses the following formula:

$$\Sigma x^2 = \Sigma dx^2 - \frac{(\Sigma dx)^2}{N} \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma y^2 = \Sigma dy^2 - \frac{(\Sigma dy)^2}{N}$$

Where:

Σx^2 = the square deviation of the experimental group

Σy^2 = the square deviation of the control group

Σdx = deviation score of the experimental group

Σdy = deviation score of the control group

N = number of sample

Arikunto (2010: 351)

3.5.2 Hypothesis Testing

The following is a formula to test the hypothesis :

$t_{test} \geq t_{tabel}$, it means that H_0 is rejected (improving)

$t_{test} \leq t_{tabel}$, it means that H_0 is accepted (not improving)

To analyze the hypothesis is analyzed through identifying the significance of two mean scores of two deviations of both groups and the writer computed the two mean scores whether they are significant or not by using the following formula:

$$t\text{-test} = \frac{Mx - My}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\Sigma x^2 + \Sigma y^2}{Nx + Ny - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{Nx} + \frac{1}{Ny}\right)}}$$

Mdx = the mean deviation of score of the experimental group

Mdy = the mean deviation score of the control group

Σx^2 = the total sum of the derivation of the experimental group

Σy^2 = the total sum of derivational of control group

Nx = the number of sample of the experimental group

Ny = the number of sample of control group

Σ = the sum of...

Then, determining the degree of freedom uses the following formula.

$$df = N_x + N_y - 2$$

Where:

df = Degree of freedom

N_x = the number of sample of the experimental group

N_y = the number of sample of control group

(Arikunto, 2010: 356)

IV. FINDING AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Findings

4.1.1 Distribution of Data

The result of pre-test and post-test of experimental group and control group is presented in the table below.

Experimental Group				Control Group			
No	Sample	Score		No	Sample	Score	
		pre-test (x_1)	post-test (x_2)			pre-test (y_1)	post-test (y_2)
1	AMM	45	67	1	AKD	41	52
2	AS	50	68	2	AAJ	37	41
3	DM	32	37	3	AS	50	63
4	DN	70	83	4	AP	42	57
5	DZ	45	60	5	A	40	40
6	EL	50	63	6	AA	55	60
7	FH.	40	55	7	DTW	48	43
8	GWP	35	60	8	DAP	43	52
9	HW	45	43	9	FJ	29	35
10	IHY	31	40	10	FR	60	70

11	IL	40	50	11	IA	53	67
12	KYP	49	66	12	ID	48	50
13	MAR	44	60	13	J	53	60
14	MY	53	70	14	JH	51	55
15	MNY	48	55	15	PS	40	37
16	MFFT	52	65	16	RAR	55	62
17	M	58	70	17	RS	41	49
18	N	43	50	18	RN	49	53
19	NL	47	66	19	SDS	61	73
20	PK	52	63	20	SR	43	49
21	RS	65	80	21	SS	47	42
22	TH	52	68	22	TAK	41	48
23	VL	56	63	23	TS	33	28
24	WA	47	68	24	TK	61	61
25	YS	40	53	25	YAZ	56	60
Sum (Σ)		1189	1523	Sum (Σ)		1177	1307
Mean (\bar{X})		47.56	60.92	Mean (\bar{Y})		47.08	52.28
Highest		70	83	Highest		61	73
Lowest		31	37	Lowest		29	28

From the table above, it shows that the total score of pre-test for each group was 1189 for experimental group followed with the mean score is 47.56 and total score 1177 for control group with the mean score is 47.08. Moreover, the total score of post-test of experimental group reached 1523 with the mean score 60.92, while the control group got the total score 1307 with the mean 52.28. From the data it can be identified that both of the group had almost the same background in vocabulary mastery.

There is an increasing for both groups after conducting treatment, the results show that the mean scores of post-test in both groups were higher than the mean scores of pre-test, and the score apparently higher in experimental group. Therefore, I finally can assume temporarily that there is an effect of using "What's Missing?" Game in teaching vocabulary at the

second grade students of SMPN 1 Lopok. Moreover, to strengthen the data, further calculation is conducted.

4.1.2 Data Computation

Here is further computation of the data distribution. After the results of pre-test and post-test of experimental group and control group were collected, I computed the deviation scores of both groups. They are presented in the table as follows.

No.	X1	X2	Dx	dx^2	Y1	Y2	Dy	dy^2
1.	45	67	22	484	41	52	11	121
2.	50	68	18	324	37	41	4	16
3.	32	37	5	25	50	63	13	169
4.	70	83	13	169	42	57	15	225
5.	45	60	15	225	40	40	0	0
6.	50	63	13	169	55	60	5	25
7.	40	55	15	225	48	43	-5	25
8.	35	60	25	625	43	52	9	81
9.	45	43	-2	4	29	35	6	36
10.	31	40	9	81	60	70	10	100
11.	40	50	10	100	53	67	14	196
12.	49	66	17	289	48	50	2	4
13.	44	60	16	256	53	60	7	49
14.	53	70	17	289	51	55	4	16
15.	48	55	7	49	40	37	-3	9
16.	52	65	13	169	55	62	7	49
17.	58	70	12	144	41	49	8	64

18.	43	50	7	49	49	53	4	16
19.	47	66	19	361	61	73	12	144
20.	52	63	11	121	43	49	6	36
21.	65	80	15	225	47	42	-5	25
22.	52	68	16	256	41	48	7	49
23.	56	63	7	49	33	28	-5	25
24.	47	68	21	441	61	61	0	0
25.	40	53	13	169	56	60	4	16
SumΣ	1189	1523	Σdx=334	Σdx ² =529 8	1177	1307	Σdy=13 0	Σdy ² =149 6
Mean	47.5 6	60.9 2	Mdx13.3 6	211.92	47.0 8	52.2 8	Mdy5.2	59.84

As presented in the table, there were some students who got high deviation scores. The highest deviation scores of experimental group and control group were 25 and 15. It shows that the students' scores increased in about 25 point for experimental group and 15 point for control group increased from the previous score. Meanwhile, the lowest deviation score reached from the experimental group was -2 and from control group was -5. Then, the deviation score of experimental group was 334 and the square deviation was 5298. In the other side, the deviation score of control group was 130 and the square deviation was 1496.

After calculating the mean score of the experimental and control group, the square deviation calculates by using the formula below:

- The square deviation of experimental group :

$$\Sigma X^2 = \Sigma dx^2 - \frac{(\Sigma dx)^2}{N} = 5298 - \frac{(334)^2}{25}$$

$$= 5298 - \frac{111556}{25}$$

$$= 5298 - 4462.24$$

$$= 835.76$$

- The square deviation of control group :

$$\Sigma Y^2 = \Sigma dy^2 - \frac{(\Sigma dy)^2}{N_y} = 1496 - \frac{(130)^2}{25}$$

$$= 1496 - \frac{16900}{25}$$

$$= 1496 - 676$$

$$= 820$$

Then, I did a further analysis by using t-test to confirm whether the "What's Missing?" Game had significant effect or not. The value of t-test computed as follow.

$$\begin{aligned} t\text{-test} &= \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\Sigma X^2 + \Sigma Y^2}{N_x + N_y - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{N_x} + \frac{1}{N_y}\right)}} \\ &= \frac{13.36 - 5.2}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{5298 + 1496}{25 + 25 - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{25} + \frac{1}{25}\right)}} \\ &= \frac{8.16}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{6794}{48}\right)\left(\frac{2}{25}\right)}} \\ &= \frac{8.16}{\sqrt{\frac{13588}{1200}}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{8.16}{\sqrt{11.32}} \\
&= \frac{8.16}{3.36} \\
&= 2.42
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, the degree of freedom (df) was determined. It was reached by using the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned}
df &= N_x + N_y - 2 \\
&= 25 + 25 - 2 \\
&= 48
\end{aligned}$$

4.2 Discussion

According to the data, the use of “What’s Missing?” Game gave an improvement to the students’ vocabulary mastery. The pretest score of experimental group was 47.56 and 60.92 in post-test, while in control group got 47.08 in pre-test and 52.28 in post-test. Moreover, to know whether the game has significant effect or not, the score of t-test have to compare with the t-table score. Based on the result of the data computation, the score of t-test is 4.94 and the degree of freedom (df) is 48. This research, two tailed test was taken with the confidence level .05 (95%) and .01 (99%). Thus, the comparison between the value of t-test and t-table can be seen in the table below.

The Comparison between t-test and t-table

t-test	t-table		
	Degree of freedom (df)	.05 (95%)	.01 (99%)
2.42	48	2.01	2.68

The table illustrates that the result of t-test at confidence level .05 (95%) is higher than t-table and it is lower than t-table at confidence

level.01 (99%). It means that there is significant effect of "What's Missing Game at confidence level .05 (95%), while at confidence level.01 (99%) is not giving a significant effect. It means that H_0 is rejected and "What's Missing? Game" is effective to develop students' vocabulary mastery.

V. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

5.1 Conclusion

Based on data analysis and the result of the research that had been previously conducted, it can be concluded that the use of "What's Missing? Game in teaching vocabulary at second grade student of SMPN 1 Lopok Sumbawa in Academic Year 2016/2017 is **effective**. It is provided by the following facts:

1. The experimental group reached higher post-test than the control group had. The post-test mean score of experimental group was 60.92, while the post-test mean score of control group was 52.28.
2. Based on the analysis, the score of t-test (2.42) was higher than t-table (2.10) by using two tailed test with confidence level .05 (95%).

REFERENCE

- Arikunto, S. 2010. *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktek Edisi Revisi 2010*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Aryani, G. A. M. 2010. *Improving Students' Vocabulary through Word Games: An Experimental Study at Seventh Year Students of SMPN 1 Batulayar Academic Year 2010/2011*. Mataram: Universitas Mataram.
- Barnes, Arnette., Hines, J., Weldon, J. 1996: *Have Fun With Vocabulary*. Penguin Books Ltd.
- Broughton, Goefreg et Al., 1980: *Teaching English as Foreign Language*. University of London Institute of Education.
- Cole, P.G., Chan, L. 1994: *Teaching Principle and Practice*. Australia:

Prentice Hall Ltd.

- Denning, K., Brett, K., Lebben, W, R. 1995: *English Vocabulary Elements*. Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Hadfield, Jill. 1998: *Elementary Vocabulary Games*. Pearson Education, Inc.
- Hiebert, Elfrida, H., Kamil, Michael, L. 2005: *Teaching and Learning Vocabulary. Bringing Research to Practice*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.
- Lehr, F., Osborn, J., et Al,. 2004: *Focus On Vocabulary*. Pacific Resources for Education and Learning.
- Lestari, D. 2013 . *The Effects of Using Pictures in Teaching English Vocabulary: an Experimental Study at SMPN 3 Mataram Academic Year 2012/2013*. Mataram: Universitas Mataram
- Ludewig, Alexis., Swan, Ami. 2007: *101 Great Classroom Games*. The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- McCharty, M., O'Dell Felicity. 1999: *English Vocabulary in Use*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, David. 1991: *Language Teaching Methodology*. Prentice Hall Ltd.
- Owens, Jr, R. 2012: *Language Development*. Canada: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Pietarinen, Ahti-Vieikko. 2006: *Signs of Logic Peircean Themes on The Philosophy Of Language, Games, And Communication*. Netherland: Springer.
- Ruddel, Martha, Rapp. 2005: *Teaching Content Reading and Writing*. Sonoma State University.
- Ruddel, Robbert, B., Ruddel, Martha, R. 1995: *Teaching Children to Read and Write*. University of California & Sonoma State University.
- Somarya, D. 2012. *Improving Students Vocabulary by Using Pictures: An Experimental Study at 7th Grade Student of SMPN 1 Lingsar in Academic Year 2011/2012*. Mataram: Universitas Mataram.
- Suter, J. 2004. *Building Vocabulary Skills and Strategies*. United States of America: Saddleback Educational Publishing.

Thornby, Scott. 2007: *How to Teach Vocabulary*. Malaysia: Pearson Education Limited.

Usman, Yanuar. 2012. *Improving Students' Vocabulary Using Flashcard: An Experimental Study of Second Grade Of SMPN 1 Kediri Academic Year 2012/2013*. Mataram: Universitas Mataram.

Watcyn, Jones, P. 1993: *Vocabulary Games and Activities for Teacher*. Penguin Books Ltd.

Willis, Judy. 2008: *Teaching the Brain To Read. Strategies for Improving Fluency, Vocabulary and Comprehension*. Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Yusra, K. 2009: *Research in English Language Teaching*. Mataram: Universitas Mataram.