

Turnitin Dr. Amrullah, M.Pd. C4

by Amrullah C4

Submission date: 14-Apr-2022 09:57AM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1810263627

File name: 04 Dr. Amrullah, M.Pd. C4.pdf (759.2K)

Word count: 2939

Character count: 15328

1 THE EFFECTIVENESS OF USING CROSSWORD PUZZLE TO IMPROVE STUDENTS' VOCABULARY MASTERY

by

Agustina Ekayanti, Amrullah, Lalu Thohir
Universitas Mataram
e-mail: tinamercy95@gmail.com

1 ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to get empirical evidence about the use of Crossword Puzzle in improving students' vocabulary mastery. The method used in this study was quantitative method. This study was an experimental study with pre and posttest group design which involved 45 seventh grade students at SMPN 2 Pringgasela. The findings of this study showed that there was a significant improvement of students' vocabulary mastery after being taught by using Crossword Puzzle in which t-test score at the significant degree of 95% was higher than t-table. Thus, it can be stated that the use of Crossword Puzzle was effective in improving the students' vocabulary mastery.

Keywords: *Crossword Puzzle, Vocabulary Mastery*

INTRODUCTION

Vocabulary is very important in learning foreign language especially English. The more vocabulary we have the more easily we understand the meaning of the language in spoken or written language. Furthermore, we can easily utter what is in our mind to people we speak with. On the contrary, if we have less vocabulary, we will have difficulty in understanding the meaning of the language and to express our opinions to others. As stated by McCarthy (1990:8) "No matter how well the students learn grammar, no matter successfully the sound of the L2 are mastered, without words to express a wide range of meanings, communication in an L2 just cannot happen in any meaningful way". This means that vocabulary is a very important thing in learning L2 or foreign language because it has a very important role in language.

As a matter of fact, it was assumed that teaching English in this case vocabulary, especially in 7th grade students at junior high school needs to be considered. Based on the preliminary research conducted at SMPN 2

Pringgasela on 24th October 2018 especially at the 7th grade students, the problems in teaching-learning English is the lack of vocabulary mastery.

There are some ways that can be used to solve the problems such as wordwall, flashcard, songs, and there are other vocabulary game that has been use by some researchers. Considering of what is being faced in this school, the researcher decided to use Crossword puzzle to overcome the problems. Thus, this study is to know whether crossword puzzle is effective to improve students' vocabulary mastery at the 7th grade students of SMPN 2 Pringgasela.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Definition of Vocabulary

Vocabulary is the collection of words that construct a language. Brown (2001:377) stated that words are basic building block of language. It means words are the first thing that must be a language has. Without words, the other aspect of language will not exist.

Definition of vocabulary mastery

Mastering a word means mastering the aspects of word knowledge (Utami 2014: 17). Thornbury (2002 :16) summarize that word knowledge include, the meanings, the spoken form, the written form, the grammatical behavior, the word derivation, the collocations of the words, the register of the word - spoken and written, the connotation or associations of the word, and word frequency.

Definition of crossword puzzle

Dhan (2008:55) defines a crossword puzzle as a puzzle with sets of squares to be filled in with words/numbers, one letter/ number to each square. A crossword puzzle usually rectangular, divided into blank (white) and cancelled (black, shaded, or crosshatched) squares. This diagram is accompanied by two lists of number definitions or clues, one for horizontal and the other for vertical words, the numbers corresponding to identical numbers on the diagram.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study adopted quantitative method with the experimental design. The population of this study is all students of grade VII in SMPN 2 Pringasela in academic year 2018/2019 which consist of 70 students comprising three classes: VII-A with 25 students, VII-B with 22 students and VII-C with 23 students. Two classes were chosen as the sample, VII-B as control group and VII-C as the experimental group.

The data were collected through pre-test and post-test. The pre-test and post-test consist of 25 questions of multiple choices. The collected data from the pre- and posttest were analyzed and processed by using calculation of *t-test* formula with the help of SPSS.

In addition, Alternative Hypothesis (H_a) and the Null Hypothesis (H_0) were proposed. If the $t_{test} (t_o) > t_{table} (t_t)$ in significant degree of 0.05, the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted and the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected and if the $t_{test} (t_o) < t_{table} (t_t)$ in significant degree of 0.05, the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is rejected and the null hypothesis (H_0) is accepted. Meanwhile, the degree of freedom (df) = $(N1+N2)-2 = (23+22)-2 = 43$. It must be consulted with t-table of df. If df is 43, the value of the significance level 5% is 1.681.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Pre-Test Score

The experimental class highest pre-test score is 84 while the lowest pre-test score is 20. On the other hand, the control class highest pre-test score is 88 and the lowest score is 16. Moreover, the experimental class' average/mean score is 48.70, the mode is 56 and the median is 52.00. On the other hand, the control class' average/mean score is 55.45, the mode is 56 and the median is 56.

Post-Test Score

The experimental class highest post-test score is 92 while the lowest post-test score is 56. On the other hand, the control class highest score is 88 and the lowest post-test score is 56. Moreover, the average/mean score of the experimental class is 79.65, the mode is 80.00 and the median is 80.00. On the other hand the average/mean score control class is 74.00, the mode is 80.00 and the median is 76.00.

Gain Score

That highest gain score from the experimental class is 68 and the lowest gain score is 4. While the highest gain score from the control class is 60 and the lowest gain score is 0. This calculation result indicates that most of the students from both experimental class and control class performed better in the post-test than the pre-test. But, some students from the control group performed worst in their post-test than their pre-test.

Normality Test

According to the table 1, the “df” of the experimental class is 23 and the

control class is 22, it means the sample of each class is less than 50. Therefore the appropriate technique that will be used is Shapiro-Wilk. Furthermore, it can be seen that the “sig” score from experimental class is 0,315, while the “sig” score for the control class is 0,990. It means the “sig” score of experimental class and control class is bigger than 0,05, hence, as the basis for decision making in the Shapiro-Wilk normality test above. It can be concluded that the learning outcomes data for both classes are normally distributed.

Table1. Normality Test of Pre-Test Score Table

	Kode	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
pretest_score	experimental class	.149	23	.200*	.952	23	.315
	control class	.104	22	.200*	.987	22	.990

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

Table 2. Normality Test of Post-Test Score Table

Tests of Normality							
	Kode	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
posttest score	experimental class	.211	23	.009	.922	23	.072
	control class	.185	22	.049	.925	22	.096

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

According to the table 2 above, it can be seen that the “sig” score from experimental class is 0.072, while the “sig” score for the control class is 0.096. It means the “sig” score of experimental class and control class is bigger than 0.05, hence, as the basis for decision making in the Shapiro-Wilk normality test above. It can be concluded that the

learning outcomes data for both classes are normally distributed.

Homogeneity Test

From the result of homogeneity test in table 3, it can be seen that the degree of significance is 0.944 which is bigger than 0.05. Therefore, it can be said that

both groups in the pre-test are homogenous. Further, from the result of homogeneity test in table 4, it can be seen that the degree of significance is 0.944 which is bigger than 0.05. Therefore, it can be said that both groups in the pre-test are homogenous.

Table 3. The Homogeneity of the Pre-test

Pre-test score			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.005	1	43	.944

Table 4. The Homogeneity of Post-test

Posttest score			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.451	1	43	.505

The Analysis of the Data

7

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	Gain	F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
	Equal variances assumed	.050	.824	2.645	43	.011	12.41107	4.69288	2.94698	21.87516
	Equal variances not assumed			2.644	42.857	.011	12.41107	4.69418	2.94344	21.87870

From the result of the statistical calculation above, it can be seen that the value t_0 or t_{test} is 2.645 and the degree of freedom is 43. The value of significant 5% or t_{table} of df 43 with $\alpha = 0.05$ is 1.681.

Hypothesis Testing

According to the statistical calculation above, the value of t_0 is 2.645 and the degree of freedom is 43 with 5% degree of significance used by the researcher. Based on the significance, it can be seen that on $df=43$ in significant 5% the value of t_{table} is 1.681 by comparing the result of t_{table} and t_0 , the degree of significance of 5%, $t_0 < t_{table} = 2.645 < 1.681$. According to

the result it can be concluded that the Null Hypothesis (H_0) is rejected and Alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted.

DISCUSSION

The research finding above shows that in the post-test, the students from experimental class performed better than students from control class. This interpretation is based on the comparison of experimental class and control class students' average score, mode and median. Afterward, the experimental class students' gain score illustrates that the average gain score for experimental class is higher than the gain score from control class.

From the result of statistical calculation, it was obtained the t-observation (t_0) is 2.645; meanwhile the

t-table (t_t) of df (43) in significance 5% is 1.681. It means t-observation (t_o) is higher than the t-table (t_t), so the Alternative Hypothesis (H_a) is accepted and the Null Hypothesis (H_o) is rejected. Therefore, it can be inferred that crossword puzzle is effective in improving students' vocabulary mastery.

In addition, it can also be concluded that crossword puzzle helps the teachers of SMP N 2 Pringgasela in increasing his creativity in teaching vocabulary and in making an interesting learning process to achieve the objectives. It was found that the students seemed interested in learning English especially vocabulary, it is because crossword puzzle is a word game that make an enjoyable learning process and the students divided into 5 groups which consist of 5 or 6 people each group, so they do not feel the tension in learning. The students followed the learning process well, it means that they were responsible in mastery the materials and they were capable of sharing and explaining the materials to their group and in front of the class.

It simply illustrates that the students who are taught by using crossword puzzle have a better improvement in mastering vocabulary than those who were taught by another strategy seemed to enjoy the learning process less and some even felt sleepy.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Conclusion

There are many games and media that become a tool for teaching and learning activity such as: flash card, word wall, etc. One of the strategies that can be used is crossword puzzle. Crossword puzzle is a word game with sets of squares to be filled in with words/numbers, one letter/ number to each square. We should fill the squares by guessing based on clues given. This

crossword puzzle can be an effective strategy in learning English especially vocabulary because it makes the learning process enjoyable for the students so that the learning objective can be achieved.

The data analysis result showed that the *t-test* in the significance degree (α) of 5% is $t_o > t_{table}$ ($2.645 < 1.681$). Therefore the Null Hypothesis (H_o) is rejected and the Alternative Hypothesis (H_a) is accepted. In addition, it can be seen from the comparison between the gained score average of experimental class and the gain score average of the control class on the table 4.3, the gain score average in experimental class is 30.96, it is higher than the average gain score for the control group that is 18.55. It means crossword puzzle is effective in improving students' vocabulary mastery. Therefore, it can be conclude that the answer of the research question was proven that there is effectiveness of crossword puzzle on students' vocabulary mastery at seventh grade of SMP N 2 Pringgasela in academic year 2018/2019.

Suggestion

Based on the findings of this study, it is suggested that the English teachers should be creative in developing the teaching and learning strategies and activities in classroom to make the class alive and enjoyable so the students don't get bored, one of those strategies is the use of crossword puzzles. There are some advantages of using crossword puzzle, such as students are more active in coordinating hand, eye, and speed of thinking simultaneously. However, this study is not without weaknesses in which the crossword puzzle can cause a little difficulty for the students who have a low of level ability and participation in subjects. Therefore, it is suggested that the next researchers develop the study in using this strategy or other strategies in

teaching vocabulary to make the students interested in learning and understand the material more easily.

REFERENCES

- Arikunto, S. 2006. *Prosedur Penelitian*. Jakarta. Rineka Cipta.
- Brown, H. D. 2001. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy, Second Edition*. New York. A Pearson Educational Company
- Burston J. 2005 *Theoretical Foundations of Crossword Puzzle Usage in Foreign Language Vocabulary Acquisition*. ResearchGate.
- C.T. Linse and D.Nunan, *Practical English Language Teaching: Young Learners*. New York, McGraw-Hill ESL/ELT, 2005.
- Danasasmitha, W. 2009. *Pentingnya Strategi dan Metode Pembelajaran dalam Kegiatan Belajar Mengajar*. Bandung, Thesis FBS
- Depdiknas. 2003. *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia No. 20. In 2003 about National Education System*. Jakarta: Depdiknas
- Dhand, H. 2008. *Techniques of Teaching*. New Delhi. APH Publishing Corporation.
- Fitriyani, E. 2016. *The Effectiveness of Crossword in Learning Vocabulary (A Quasy-Experimental Study at seventh Grade Students of MTs. Muhammadiyah ICiputat*. Jakarta, Thesis FBS
- Hanson, Susan., Jennifer, Pandua.2011. *Teaching Vocabulary Explicitly*. Pacific Resources for Education and Learning. London: Oxford University.
- Hatch, E. and Brown, C. 1995. *Vocabulary, Semantic, and Language Education*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hidayati, N. R. *The Use of Charge Game to Teach Vocabulary (An Experimental Study of the Seventh Graders of MTs.Miftahul Khoirot Branjang in the Academic year of 2014/2015)*. Journal of English Language Teaching 5 Vol.1, 2016.
- Hornby, A. S. (1995). *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Johnson, A. P. 2008. *Teaching Reading and Writing: A Guidebook for Tutoring and Remediating Students*. New York. Rowman & Littlefield Education
- Lee, W. R. 1979. *Language Teaching Games and Contents*. Hongkong. Oxford University Press.
- Mahant, H. 2018. *What Are The Different Types of Crossword Puzzles?*. Taken from <http://www.wealthwords.com/blog.what-are-the-different-types-of-crossword-puzzles/> (taken on 30-12-2018)

- McCarten, J. 2007. *Teaching Vocabulary Lessons from the Corpus Lessons for the Classroom*. New York. Cambridge University Press
- McCarthy, M. 1990. *Vocabulary*. New York. Oxford University Press
- Mollica, A. 2008. *Recreational Linguistics: Crossword Puzzles and Second-Language Teaching*. Toronto. Department of Language Studies, University of Toronto Mississauga.
- Nation, I. S. P. 2001. *Leraning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rcampus.iRubric: *Vocabulary Assessment Rubric*. Taken from <http://www.rcampus.cpm/ribricshowc.cfm?sp=yes&code=B8A699&> (taken on 30-12-2018)
- Salen, K., Zimmerman, E. 2003. *Rules of Play: Game Design Fundamentals*. MIT Press.
- Sari, S, K. 2017. *The Effectiveness of Crossword Puzzle Game Towards Students' Vocabulary Mastery (A Quasy-Experimental Study at Second Grade of SMP Puspita Bangsa Ciputat*. Jakarta, Thesis FBS
- Sugiyono. 2009. *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan*. Bandung: CV. Alfabeta.
- Sukmadinata, Nana, S. 2008. *Metode penelitian Pendidikan*. Bandung: PT. Remaja Insan Madani.
- Thornbury, S. 2002. *How to Teach Vocabulary*. London. Pearson Education Limited.
- Utami, Y. S. 2014. *Improving students' vocabulary mastery using crossword puzzles for grade vii of smp n 2 srandakan in the academic year of 2013/2014*. Yogyakarta, Thesis FBS
- Vossoughi, H. 2009. *Using Word-Search-puzzle Game for Improving Vocabulary Knowledge of Iranian EFL Learners*. Iran: Islamic Azad University.
- Wallace, M. J. 1982. *Teaching vocabulary*. London: Heinemann Education Book.
- Wright, A, et.al, 2006. *Games for Language Learning*. Third Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ORIGINALITY REPORT

17%

SIMILARITY INDEX

16%

INTERNET SOURCES

12%

PUBLICATIONS

%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	lisdaya.unram.ac.id Internet Source	5%
2	repository.ar-raniry.ac.id Internet Source	2%
3	un-pub.eu Internet Source	2%
4	Rizki Pebriana, Disman Disman. "EFFECT OF PROBLEM BASED LEARNING TO CRITICAL THINKING SKILLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS IN SOCIAL STUDIES", PrimaryEdu - Journal of Primary Education, 2017 Publication	2%
5	lib.unnes.ac.id Internet Source	2%
6	www.coursehero.com Internet Source	2%
7	karanganbm.blogspot.com Internet Source	2%

Exclude quotes On

Exclude matches < 2%

Exclude bibliography On