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**Abstract**

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

This study aimed to investigate the significance difference on the students’ comprehending in learning vocabulary for those were taught by using Word Wizard Game for experimental class and were taught by Direct Translation method for control group. The subject of this study was the eighth grade students of SMPN 1 Ambarawa in the academic year 2016/2017. The instrument used to obtain the data were pre-test, post-test, and questionnaire. However, the writer conducted try out test to check whether the instrument was reliable and valid to be used for pre-test and post-test. The data were gathered and calculated using Ms. Excel and SPSS. The result of this study revealed that Word Wizard game could improve students’ vocabulary mastery by significant improvement of students’ achievement. The result analysis of the quantitative data shows that the mean scores of the experimental group increases from 56.00 to 76.31. The t- test of mean difference was 8,875 and t- table was 2.00. The result concludes that the working hypothesis is accepted. It means that there is a significant difference between students who were taught by using Word Wizard game and those who were taught by using Direct Translation method. In addition, the analysis of the questionnaire shows that students were interested towards Word Wizard game for reading narrative text (mean: 3.25). They recognized that the implementation of the technique for learning narrative text made them enjoy the class (agree: 62.5% and strongly agree: 37.5%). Thus, the analysis reveals that Word Wizard game effective in teaching vocabulary.
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## INTRODUCTION

#### Realizing the importance of English, the Indonesian government stipulates English as the first foreign language and sets it as a compulsory subject at junior high school, senior high school, and university and also at elementary school as a local content. As stated in school-based curriculum (Depdiknas, 2006), the aim of English teaching and learning at schools is to develop students’ English skills so as to communicate and discourse in English on certain literacy level.

#### Languages have three main components namely; sound phonological, grammatical and lexical ones. This project deals with vocabulary as lexical item. To make the teaching English vocabulary more interesting and joyful, it is important to consider teachers’ quality, students’ interest and other supporting factors. In this case, to attract students’ attention and interest in learning vocabulary teachers can use a game as a media in conducting materials. Webster (1972: 664) states that teaching aids are many varieties of devices and materials, which rely on the sense of sight to inform. If teachers using a method or technique appropriately students not only interested in following the lesson, but also the result will be satisfactory. Vocabulary is a very important thing, no matter how good the speakers in grammar. Without sufficient vocabulary the speakers cannot deliver their meaning. Meriem webster states that vocabulary is “an alphabetical list of the words used in a book, often including their translation or definition” (Webster, 1986:2560). Vocabulary is total number of words in a language with their meaning and known to a person and used in particular book. (Hornby, 1995: 1331).

#### In teaching vocabulary some teachers face some problem such as the students always use the same idiomatic expression to express different sort of things, they forget the word soon after they have looked up in the dictionary, and Most of them feel bored and do not pay attention during English course because the materials presented by the teacher are not interesting. Cohen (1998:5) states that in language learning strategies there are: strategies for identifying material, repeated contact with the material, and formally committing the material.

#### Based on the phenomena and reasons above, the writer is challenged to conduct an experimental research focusing on Word Wizard game. Klippel (1984:77) created a game called Word Wizard which adapted from Brandes and Phillips (1997). This game contributes to the development of students’ academic vocabulary mastery.

#### By conducting the study, the writer expects that teachers and schools will realize the important of students understanding and their interest in learning vocabulary using this game.

## METHODOLOGY OF THE RESEARCH

#### According to Healey (1996:1), “Research is any process by which information is systematically and carefully gathered for the purpose of answering questions, examining ideas, or testing theories”. In this research, the writer was use an experimental study because she wanted to know the effectiveness of this game. There will be the experimental group which will receive a new treatment by giving the game and the control group that treated as usual. It is in line with the statements of Gay, L.R (1981) that “The experimental group typically receives a new or novel treatment, a treatment under investigation, while the control group usually either receives a different treatment or is treated as usual. The control group is needed for comparison purposes to see if the new treatment is more effective than the usual or traditional approach, or to see if one approach is more effective than another.

#### The Encyclopedia of Educational Evaluation in Arikunto (2006: 130) states that the population of a set of element processing one or more attribute of interest. The population which the writer used to conduct the research was the eighth grade students of SMP Negeri 1 Ambarawa. There were eight classes of eighth grade. Each class consisted of 32-35 students. The sample of the study is VIII B as the control group and VIII A as the experimental group.

#### There were three main activities, pretest, treatments, and posttest. Those activities were done on fifth meetings because the limited time which given by the teacher and the material were explained before by the teacher, so the writer gave pretest, review the material briefly, explained the strategy and gave posttest. The pretest was held at the first meeting. The treatments conducted in the second, third, and fourth meetings. The last was posttest which held to measure the students’ comprehending of vocabulary mastery by reading narrative text after getting the treatments.

#### **RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

### Result of Try-Out Test

#### The analysis was to get a good instrument for investigation. The try out test was conducted before the writer do the pretest for both control group and experimental group in a meeting, the try-out test was conducted on Saturday, 6th January. The VIII C was chosen as the try out group. The try out test is in form of multiple choices items which consist of 35 questions.

#### *Validity of the Test*

#### A good test has to be valid. Validity refers to the precise measurements of the test. The validity computation is consulted with the r table of Product Moment by determining the significant level of 5% and *n* which is according to the data. If the rxy > r *table* so the instrument is valid. For α = 5% and N = 32, r *table* = 0.349. The following is the example of counting the validity of item number 1:

#### 

#### 

#### =

#### The item number 1 of the try out test was valid since its rxy = 0.396 higher than critical value (0.349).

#### After all the item numbers were analyzed, there were 27 valid items from 35 items and the rest were invalid. They were presented in the following table:

#### Table 3.1.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Number of Items | The Total Number |
| Valid | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 25 | 25 |
| Invalid | 2, 7, 8, 9, 16,18, 24, 25, 32, 36 | 10 |

#### 

#### From the distribution above, it can be concluded that the try out instrument had 25 valid items and 10 invalid items

#### *Reliability of the Test*

#### Reliability of the test shows the stability or consistency of the test scores when the test is used. The following is the computation of the reliability of the instrument. The formula is:

#### If r11 > rtable, so the instrument is reliable

#### Table 3.2.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | N | % |
| Cases | Valid | 32 | 100,0 |
| Excludeda | 0 | ,0 |
| Total | 32 | 100,0 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
| ,834 | 35 |

#### Based on the try out table, it can be gotten:

#### r11 = 0, 834

#### The result of commutating reliability of the first try out instruments was 1.042. For α = 5% with N = 32, and r *table* = 0.349. Since the result of r11 was higher than r *table,* it was concluded that the first try out instrument was reliable and could be used as the instrument to get the data.

#### *Discriminating Power*

#### According to Heaton (1975: 174) the discriminating power measured how well the test items arranged to identify the differences in the students’ competence. After the trial test was carried out, an analysis was made to find out the discriminating power of each item.

#### Table 3.3.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Upper Group | | | Lower Group | | |
| No. | Code | Score | No. | Code | Score |
| |  | | --- | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 7 | | 8 | | 9 | | 10 | | 11 | | 12 | | 13 | | 14 | | 15 | | 16 | | |  | | --- | | T-29 | | T-9 | | T-17 | | T-11 | | T-13 | | T-16 | | T-26 | | T-7 | | T-18 | | T-10 | | T-23 | | T-1 | | T-6 | | T-14 | | T-2 | | T-28 | | |  | | --- | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | |  | | --- | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 7 | | 8 | | 9 | | 10 | | 11 | | 12 | | 13 | | 14 | | 15 | | 16 | | |  | | --- | | T-25 | | T-30 | | T-3 | | T-15 | | T-4 | | T-31 | | T-19 | | T-12 | | T-22 | | T-21 | | T-5 | | T-27 | | T-32 | | T-20 | | T-24 | | T-8 | | |  | | --- | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 0 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 0 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | |
| Sum | | 16 | Sum | | 14 |

#### According to the criterions, the item number 2 is satisfactory this item was can be used. From, the computation of the discriminating power of the try out test, the result of classification can be seen in the following table:

#### Table 3.4.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Classification | Number of Item |
| Poor | 8, 9, 16,25, 25, 35 |
| Satisfactory | 2, 7, 18, 32 |
| Good | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34 |
| Excellent | - |

#### From the table above, it was found that 6 items were said to be poor, 4 items were said to be satisfactory, 25 items were said to be good, and no item was said to be excellent.

#### *Difficulty Level of the Test*

#### After computing the overall 35 items of first try out test, it was found that 23 items were classified to be easy, 17 items were classified to be medium and no item was classified to be difficult. .

#### Based on the analysis of validity, reliability, item difficulty, and item discrimination it could be considered that 25 items were applicable for this study. They were numbers 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28 29, 30, 31, 33, 34.

#### Pre-Test

#### After conducting tryout test and analyzing the data which were collected, I moved to the next step of this research. The pretest was conducted on Wednesday, January 11th 2017 for experimental group and on Monday, January 9th 2017 for control group. It was held in the first meeting. There were 32 students of VIII A as the experimental group and 32 students of VIII B as the control group joined the test. The purpose of this test was to know the initial condition of the students’ vocabulary mastery. In this test, the students were asked to answer 25 questions. The time for students doing the pre-test was 40 minutes.

#### The result of the total score of the experimental group was 1792. Then the mean of all students’ score was 56.00.The minimum score was 44 and the maximum score was 66. The standard deviation was 5.747. And the result of the total score of the control group was 1810. Then the mean of all students’ score was 56.56.The minimum score was 44 and the maximum score was 72. The standard deviation was 8.068. This following chart is the result of the pretest which was conducted in class VIII B as the control group and class VIII A as the experimental group

#### Diagram 3.1.

### Treatment of the Research

#### Then, the students were given treatments. The experimental group got a treatment by using word wizard game. On the other hand, the control group was taught by using direct translation method. The treatment for control class was conducted on Saturday, January 14th 2017, Wednesday January 16th 2017 and on Saturday, January 21th 2017. Then the treatment for experiment group was conducted on Thursday, 12th 2017, Monday January 18th 2017 and on Thursday 19th 2017. There were 32 students in control group and 32 students in experimental group who joined in this activity.

#### *First Meeting*

#### In the first meeting, the writer made a review the material briefly. Students were analyzed the definition, purposes, and generic structure of the text and analyzed the vocabulary used in the text. Then the students were conducted in group and the writer discussed and gave example about the word wizard game for experimental group and direct translation method for control group

#### *Second Meeting*

#### The next meeting, Students were stimulated by brainstormed to know more about the social function, generic structure, and specific terms of narrative text. Then, Students analyzed the vocabulary used in narrative text.

#### Students were playing Word Wizard game. The students kept only four important words and they wrote those words in a paper from the teachers. After that, the teacher asked the students to work in pairs and try to tell a story using those important words so the students in pairs got 8 words. They have to find another group so they got 64 important words.

#### *Third Meeting*

#### In the last meeting of treatment, the writer made several groups and the groups were given the passage of narrative text and the questions related to the text and analyzed the vocabulary by using word wizard game.

#### Post Test

#### The posttest was conducted on Thursday, January 23rd 2017 for control class and on Friday, January 25th 2017 for experimental class. There were 32 students of experimental group and 32 students of control group joined this test. The posttest in this study had a purpose to measure the students’ vocabulary mastery after getting treatments. The students did the posttest through the test. The process of post-test was similar with the pretest the students of both experimental and control groups were given 25 questions of multiple choices. The test spent about 40 minutes.

#### The result of the total score of the experimental class was 2442. Then the mean of all students’ score was 76.31.The minimum score was 62 and the maximum score was 88. The standard deviation was 5.282. And the result of the total score of the control class was 2158. Then the mean of all students’ score was 67, 44. The minimum score was 48 and the maximum score was 80. The standard deviation was 8,458. This following chart is the result of the pretest which was conducted in class VIII B as the control group and class VIII A as the experimental group.

#### Diagram 3.2.

#### Homogeneity of the Test

#### The homogeneity test was conducted to find out whether the groups’ were similar on their vocabulary mastery or not. Homogeneity was to know that both two classes are homogeneous. It was important because the similarity of both objects would influence the test result. If both classes are not homogenous, the treatment also cannot be conducted because both classes do not have same ability in vocabulary mastery.

#### The analysis of homogeneity could identify if the pre-test scores of both groups were homogeneous. By using SPSS 21, below was the analysis of homogeneity of pre-test scores.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
| 1,087 | 6 | 21 | ,402 |

#### Based on the analysis above, it showed that the *Significance* value was 0.402. The hypothesis was accepted if the S*ignificance* value was more than 0.05. The pre-test scores of both groups were homogeneous; since the *Significance* value was higher than 0.05.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
| 1,158 | 4 | 17 | ,364 |

#### The test of homogeneity for post-test showed that the *Significance* value was 0.364. The hypothesis was accepted; since, the *Significance* value was higher than 0.05. Thus, the post-test scores of experimental and control groups were homogeneous.

#### Normality of the Test

#### Normality was used to show if such data was normally distributed. Test of normality distribution by using SPSS 21.0 resulted *Kolmogorov-Smirnov Statistics* or *One-Sample K-STest*. The hypothesis was accepted if *Asymp. Sig.(2-tailed)* was higher than 0.05.

#### Table 3.5.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | CONTROL | EXPERIMENTAL |
| N | | 32 | 32 |
| Normal Parameters a,b | Mean | 56,00 | 56,56 |
| Std. Deviation | 5,747 | 8,068 |
| Most Extreme Differences | Absolute | ,188 | ,153 |
| Positive | ,188 | ,153 |
| Negative | -,118 | -,134 |
| Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z | | 1,061 | ,864 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | | ,211 | ,444 |

#### The pre-test scores of experimetal group were also normally distributed. It could be concluded from the value of *Asymp. Sig.(2-tailed)* of the group, which was 0.444. It was higher than 0.05. Therefore, the score of pre-test of both groups was normally distributed.

#### The following is the Normality of post-test

#### Table 3.6.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | posttest\_experimen | posttest\_control |
| N | | 32 | 32 |
| Normal Parametersa,b | Mean | 76,31 | 67,44 |
| Std. Deviation | 5,282 | 8,458 |
| Most Extreme Differences | Absolute | ,180 | ,214 |
| Positive | ,180 | ,139 |
| Negative | -,164 | -,214 |
| Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z | | 1,017 | 1,211 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | | ,252 | ,107 |
| The group’ scores were normally distributed, because the value of *Asymp. Sig.(2-tailed)* was higher than 0.05. Not to mention, the post-test scores of control group showed the similar result. Because the value of *Asymp. Sig.(2-tailed)* was 0.107; thus, the test distribution was normal. | | | |

#### Significant Difference of the Two Tests

#### After all the tests were executed, the two tests were compared. The students did the pretest and the post test well. In this research, the different questions of the pretest and posttest were used, since the purpose of this research was to analyze the significance different on pretest and posttest of the two groups.

#### The table below showed the calculation of the Paired-Samples T-Test of control group.

#### Table 3.7.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Pair 1 |
| POSTTEST-PRETEST |
| Paired DifferencesMeanStd. DeviationStd. Error Mean95% Confidence Internal of the LowerUpper | -20.3135.8391.032-22.142-18.207 |
| TDfSig. (2-tailed) | -19.67031.000 |

#### The result showed that the *mean* scores difference was -20,313. In addition, the *t-value* was -19,679 and the *Sig.(2-tailed)* was 0.00. Ha was accepted since the value of *Sig.(2-tailed)* was lower than. 0.05. Thus, the scores of post-test was higher than the pre-test.

#### The following table showed the calculation of the Paired-Samples T-Test of experimental group.

#### Table 3.8.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Pair 1 |
| POSTTEST-PRETEST |
| Paired DifferencesMeanStd. DeviationStd. Error Mean95% Confidence Internal of the LowerUpper | -10,8756,8711,215-13,352-8,398 |
| TDfSig. (2-tailed) | -8,95331.000 |

#### The result showed that the *mean* scores difference of the experimental group was -10,875. Moreover, the *t-value* was -8,953 and the *Sig.(2-tailed)* was 0.00. Ha was accepted since the value of *Sig.(2-tailed)* was lower than. 0.05. Thus, there was improvement on the post-test after the treatment by using Word Wizard game were given to the experimental group.

#### In general, almost all of the students made improvement in their vocabulary mastery after the treatment. It was proven that the students’ achievement of the posttest was higher that of the pretest.

### Questionnaire

#### The results of questionnaire obtained from 32 respondents of experimental group were as follows;

#### The first item was about “*Saya menyukai pelajaran Bahasa Inggris”.* The result showed 24 students or 75% respondents in the group like English. Moreover, 25% of students like English lesson very much. It meant that almost all of the students in the group like English lesson

#### The second item was about “*Saya menyukai metode pembelajaran Word Wizard game dalam pembelajaran narrative text”.* Twenty-two of thirty-two students in the group declared that they like the method. Unfortunately, only 3.12% of the respondents or a student answered that she/he was not like this method.

#### The third item was about “*Metode Pembelajaran Word Wizard game lebih menarik ketimbang metode pembelajaran biasa dalam pembelajaran narrative text”.* There were 93.75% or students who sagree to the statement. The rest 6.25% of the respondents were disagree.

#### The fourth item was about “*Metode pembelajaran Word Wizard game membuat pelajaran Narrative text lebih mudah dipahami”.* Most of the students were felt happy in learning Narrative text using Word Wizard game, there were twenty nine students or 90.62% who agree and 2 or 6.25% students who were chose very agree. Moreover, only a student who were not happy.

#### The fifth item was about, “ *Metode pembelajaran Word Wizard Game membuat pengajaran narrative text menjadi lebih santai”*. There were 20 students or 62.5% of overall respondents were enjoy in learning narrative text in applying Word Wizard game.

#### The sixth item was about “*Metode Pembelajaran Word Wizard game membuat konsentrasi pembelajaran narrative text menjadi lebih tinggi”.* There were 29 students or 90.62% of the respondents agreed that the implementation of the strategy did make them more concentrate in learning narrative text. In addition, the other 9.37% were disagreed.

#### The seventh item was about “*Metode pembelajaran Word Wizard game dapat membantu saya mengingat kata-kata yang biasa digunakan dalam narrative text menjadi lebih baik.”* Twenty-eight students or 87.5% of the respondents agreed with the statement.

#### The eighth question was about “*Menambah perbendaharaan kata menggunakan Word Wizard game dalam pembelajaran narrative text”.* Thirty or 93.75% students of the total respondents agreed that it was effective to learn narrative text after applying Word Wizard game method.

#### The ninth item was about “*Word Wizard game merupakan metode yang tepat untuk pembelajaran bahasa inggris sehingga saya termotivasi.”* The implementation of Word Wizard game method increased their motivation and gained 96.87% of students’ opinion.

#### The tenth item was about “*Metode Pembelajaran Word Wizard game perlu digunakan untuk materi-materi lain dalam pembelajaran bahasa inggris*”. Fourteen students that were 43.75% of the respondents agreed that Word wizard game method supposed to be used in the other kinds of text such as procedure, recount, descriptive, etc.

## CONCLUSIONS

#### The research findings from pre-test and post-test mean scores of experimental group showed that it was statistically increased from 56.00 to 76.31. Meanwhile, the scores of control group only increased from 56.56 to 67.44. On the one hand, the data were analyzed by using Independent Sample T-Test. The mean scores comparison of both groups in post-test proved that the working hypothesis (Ha) was accepted. The analysis showed that the value of Sig.(2-tailed) (0. 00) was less than the value of α = 5% = 0.05. In the other hand, the data were also investigated by using Paired-Sample T-Test. The analysis showed that both of the groups were improved after the treatments. Through the mean scores differences, the t-value of the experimental group was -8,953. Meanwhile, the t-value of the control group was -19,679. Based on the results, it can be concluded that there was a significant difference between the two groups, after being given several treatments. Thus, the analysis of significant difference revealed that Word Wizard Game was effective in teaching reading narrative texts for the subjects of this research.

#### The questionnaire with Likert-type items was delivered for students. The analysis showed that 96.88% of the students agreed that the implementation of the strategy assisted them to learn narrative text through Word Wizard game. In addition, 3.12% of them even strongly agreed towards the statement.
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