

USING TALKING STICK METHOD TO IMPROVE VOCABULARY MASTERY OF THE EIGHTH GRADE STUDENTS OF MTS ANNAJAH PETALING

Hartati

hartati62@gmail.com

English Language Education Study Program

State College of Islamic Studies

Syaikh Abdurrahman Siddik Bangka Belitung

Abstract : The objectives of this research was to find out whether or not there was a significant difference in vocabulary mastery between the students who were taught by using Talking Stick method and those who were not. The focus of investigation was limited to word classes consisting of noun, adjective and verb in descriptive texts with the topic of the material was animal, people, thing, and places. This research applied a quantitative method with a quasi-experimental group design. The experimental group students were taught by using Talking Stick method, while the control group students were not taught by using Talking Stick method. The samples were 74 eighth grade students of MTs Annajah Petaling in academic year 2015/2016. The data were obtained through test, observation and documentation. The result of the test was analyzed statistically by using paired sample t-test.. Based on the results of the analysis, there was a significance difference in vocabulary mastery between students who were taught by using Talking Stick method and the students who were not taught by using Talking Stick method; it was shown by the mean of post-test of experimental group (67.70) which was higher than control group (65.54). It is concluded that Talking Stick method was one of the alternatives that teachers of English can use to improve students' vocabulary mastery.

Keywords: *vocabulary mastery, talking stick method, descriptive text, eight graders*

Learning a foreign language is an integrated process that the learner should study the four language skills in English namely listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Each of them is important and has a relation to each other. However, students cannot master those four skills without vocabulary. As Manurung (2003) states, the ability of speaking, listening, reading, and writing English depend on the mastery of vocabulary and grammar. The linguist David Wilkins also stated that 'without grammar very little can be conveyed, without vocabulary nothing can be conveyed'. People cannot express their opinion and ideas in English either in spoken or written form without knowing English vocabulary. So, vocabulary plays

an important role in a language and also one important aspect for students in learning a foreign language.

Vocabulary is a basic for improving English achievement. Students must be able to use a lot of vocabulary of English, if they want to be a successful in learning English language. Nunan (1991) argues that acquisition of an adequate vocabulary is essential for successful second language. Without an extensive vocabulary and strategies for acquiring new vocabulary, learners often achieve less than their potential and may be discouraged from making use of language learning opportunities around them such as listening to the radio, listening to native speakers, using the language in different context,

reading, or watching television. Students who have a lot of vocabularies are easier in learning process. Moreover, to be successful in improving vocabulary, the students have to know the other elements such as grammar, pronunciation and spelling. As a result, vocabulary is quite important for learning English.

Based on the preliminary observation that the researcher has done in MTs Annajah Petaling, the English teacher stated that most of eight grade students did not understand English because the lack of vocabulary. When the researcher observed teaching and learning activity of English in the classroom, the teacher used conventional method. The teacher gives the students an exercise and asked them to read and translate the text, for example in reading texts. Moreover, the researcher also asked some students about the difficulties of learning English and most of them said they did not understand the question meaning and the vocabulary itself. The researcher also conducted vocabulary testing in this school. There are thirty three students got score between 40 until 50, and for the rest got a 60 and 80 from 37 students. Then, the passing score (KKM) for English subject especially at MTs Annajah Petaling was 70. Most of students did not achieve the minimum criteria of passing score (KKM). This result showed that students might have some problems in English subject, one of them is vocabulary. Thus, the researcher found that one of factors that affecting the success of teaching vocabulary that was the method of teaching.

Considering the problem above, the researcher conducted the cooperative learning in order to help students to improve their vocabulary mastery. Cooperative learning is an approach through cooperative activities involving pairs and small groups of learners in classroom. In addition, cooperative strategies are used to promote learning in both the academic and social areas. In this case, the researcher used one of the

cooperative learning named Talking Stick method.

Talking stick method is one of cooperative learning model was developed as a result of the research by Slavin (1995). In learning process, talking stick method can stimulate the students to be brave to express their opinion. Each individual is free to talk about whatever is on his mind, so there is no necessary flow of discussion about a particular topic. The teacher can explain the material and give the opportunity to the students to discuss and comprehend the material in a group. After that, ask the question from one to another student. Duthie suggested that Talking Stick method could be used for shy students who know the answer but are reluctant to put up their hands, but their body language indicated that they know about the questions. So, by using Talking Stick method could optimize student's participation in the classroom.

The objectives of the study was to find out whether or not there was a significant difference in vocabulary mastery between students who were taught by using talking stick method and students who were taught without using talking stick method.

METHODOLOGY

This study used quantitative method with quasi-experimental design. There were two groups in this study, they are experimental group and control group, but no random assignment of subjects. Both of them would receive pre-test and post. The population of this research were all the students of eight grade at MTs Annajah Petaling from 8A to 8B of MTs Annajah Petaling in academic year 2015/2016 with a total number of 74 students. In selecting sample, the researcher used census sampling. Census sampling is a technique of sampling when all the population is used as a sample. Then for the sample, the researcher takes 8A as the experimental group since they had lower score and 8B as the control group.

To collect the data, The researcher had three kinds of techniques for collecting the data consist of test, observation and documentation. For the test, the researcher gave the test to the students of control and experimental group consisting of pre-test and post-test. The researcher used open observation. It means that there was an interaction between the researcher and the respondents. There were four indicators of observation in this research namely, attendance, attention, activeness, and cooperation. Then, for documentation in this study used syllabus, lesson plan, English book for the material, student's score, student's attendance list and photos.

In this study, for getting the validity of test instrument, the researcher gave try-out to other students in the different school with the same level. The try out of the test was conducted at eight grade students of MTs Negeri Pangkalpinang which the

sample 34 students. The instrument test contained 50 items of multiple choices. Then, the data was processed by using Pearson Correlation Product Moment formula of Microsoft Office Excel 2007. The result of validity test showed that from 50 questions there were only 20 questions were valid. For $\alpha = 5\%$ and r-table of critical value for two tailed significance of 34 students was 0.338, t-table (2.03). The reliability of the test used Kuder-Ricardson 21 (KR-21) as formula to find out the reliability. The researcher computed its reliability by using *Statistical Package for Social Science* (SPSS-16) with Cronbach's Alpha Formula. From the calculation, the result of Cronbach's Alpha was 0,779. These result higher than r table Spearman Rho Correlation $(32;0,05) = 0.338$. It means that the instrument is reliable and could be used for pretest and posttest.

FINDINGS

The pre-test and pos-test were administrated to the eight grade students of MTs Annajah Petaling in academic year 2015/2016. The score of the pre-test and pos-test are presented as follows: The lowest score in pre-test was 15 and highest

score was 65 and the mean was 34.3243. Meanwhile, in the post-test, the lowest score was 45 and the highest score was 90 and the mean was 67.7027. Table 1 shows the score distribution in the experimental group (Math Tutor, 2015).

Table 1
Score Distribution in the Experimental Group

Score	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
100-90	0	0%	1	2.70%
89-80	0	0%	7	18.91%
79-70	0	0%	10	27.02%
69-60	2	5.40%	14	37.83%
59-0	35	94.60%	5	13.51%
Total	37	100%	37	100%

Table 1 shows that in the pre-test, 35 students (94.60%) got the scores between 0 to

59; 2 (5.40%) of students got the scores between 60 to 69; none of students got the score between 80 to 89 and the score of 90 to 100. Meanwhile, in the post-test, 5 students (13.51%) got the scores between 0 to 59; 14 (37.83%) of students got the

scores between 60 to 69; 10 (27.02 %) of students got the scores between 70 to 79; 7 (18.91%) of students got the scores between 80 to 89; and 1(2.70%) of students got the scores between 90 to 100.

Based on the students' score distribution table, it can be seen that there was improvement of students' score in vocabulary mastery after using Talking

Stick method. Before having the treatment, students' lowest score was 15 and students' highest score was 65, while after having the treatment, students' lowest score was 45 and the students highest score was 90.

Table 2 shows the score distribution in the control group.

Table 2
Score Distribution in the Control Group

Score	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
100-90	0	0%	1	2.70%
89-80	0	0%	8	21.62%
79-70	1	2.70%	5	13.51%
69-60	2	5.40%	13	35.13%
59-0	34	91.89%	10	27.02%
Total	37	100%	37	100%

Table 2 shows that in the pre-test, 34 (91.89%) of students got the scores between 0 -59; 2 (5.40%) of students got the scores between 60- 69; 1 (2.70%) got the scores between 70 -79; none of students got the score between 80 to 89 and the score of 90 to 100.

The results of post-test showed that 10 students (27.02%) got the scores between 0-59; 13 (35.13%) of students got the scores between 60 -69; 5 (13.51%) of students got the scores between 70 -79; 8 (21.62%) of students got the scores between 80-89; and 1(2.70%) of students got the scores between 90 -100.

Based on the students' score distribution table, it can be seen that there was improvement of students' score after teaching and learning vocabulary. Before teaching and learning process, students' lowest score was 15 and students' highest score was 70, while after having teaching and learning vocabulary, students' lowest

score was 35 and students highest score was 90.

In this study, the result of the pre-test and the post-test of experimental group and control groups were analyzed by using independent samples test analysis to know whether there was a significant difference between experimental group and control group. The analysis was calculated by using SPSS 16 (Statistical Package for Social Science) program.

The analysis consists of: (1) the difference analysis students' pre-test between experimental group and control group, (2) the difference analysis students' post-test between experimental group and control group.

The result of paired sample t-test of pretest between experimental group and control group can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3
Pre-Tests of Experimental and Control Groups

	Class	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Score	Exp	37	34.3243	12.25664	2.01498
	Control	37	35.4054	11.92444	1.96037

Table 4
Independent Samples Test

Score		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Score	Equal variances assumed	.178	.674	.385	72	.702	-1.08108	2.81126	6.68522	4.52306
	Equal variances not assumed			.385	71.946	.702	-1.08108	2.81126	6.68529	4.52313

Based on the independent samples statistics in table 3, the mean of pre-test in the experimental group was 34.32, the standard deviation was 12.26, and the standard error was 2.014. Meanwhile, the mean of pre-test in the control was 35.40, the standard deviation was 11.92, and the standard error was 1.9603. Based on the independent sample test in table 4, it was

found that the mean between pre-test in experimental and control group was 1.081, standard error was 2.811, t-count (3.85) was higher than t-table (2.03). Then, significant (2-tailed) was (0.702). Since it was lower than computation with level significant (0,05), it means that there was significant different between pretest in experimental group and control group.

Table 5
Post-Tests of Experimental and Control Groups

	Category	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Score	Exp	37	67.70	10.775	1.771
	Control	37	65.54	12.736	2.094

Table 6
Independent Sample Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances				t-test for Equality of Means		95% Interval Difference	Confidence of the	
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Score	Equal variances assumed	.293	.590	788	72	.433	2.162	2.743	3.305	7.629
	Equal variances not assumed			788	70.77	.433	2.162	2.743	3.308	7.632

Based on the independent samples statistics presented in Table 5, the mean of pos-test in the experimental group was 67.70, the standard deviation was 10.775, and the standard error was 1.771. Meanwhile, the mean of pos-test in the control was 65.54, the standard deviation was 12.736, and the standard error was 2.094.

Based on the result of the independent sample test presented in Table 6, it was

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

After conducting the research entitled improving vocabulary mastery to the eight grade students of MTs Annajah Petaling. The researcher concluded the result of statistical analysis of the test during the experiment, it can be concluded that the teaching of vocabulary using Talking Stick method helps students in improving their vocabulary mastery.

The result of the tests showed the students who were taught by using Talking Stick method got better score on their post-tests than their pre-tests. It can be seen from the mean score (67.70) of the post-test in experimental group which was higher than the mean score (34.32) of the pre-test in experimental group.

found that the mean between pos-test in experimental and control group was 2.162, standard error was 2.743, t-count (788) was higher than t-table (2.03). Then, significant (2-tailed) was (0.433). Since it was lower than computation with level significant (0.05), it means that there was significant different between pretest in experimental group and control group.

Next, the result of comparative analysis of independent sample t-test showed that there was a significant difference in their post-test score between students who were taught by using Talking Stick method and the students who were taught without using Talking Stick method. It could be seen from the mean score (67.70) of post-test in experimental group which was higher than the mean score (65.54) of the post-test in control group. Thus, it can be inferred that the null hypothesis was rejected and the research hypothesis was accepted.

Based on the results of this study, there are some suggestions for the teachers of English, for the school and the students. Firstly, a teacher of English should be creative and innovative in using

appropriate methods in teaching. One of the appropriate methods is Talking Stick in teaching and learning process, because it can improve the students' vocabulary mastery. The researcher also suggests that this method can enrich the teaching and learning process because it can be an alternative method. It also has effectiveness in improving speaking skill by answering the teachers' questions

directly. Secondly, for the school it can be schools' curriculum method in supporting the successful teaching and learning English. Thirdly, for the students, the researcher suggests that they should practice English as much as possible either in listening, reading, speaking or writing in order to improve their achievement in learning English better.

REFERENCES

- Caine, G. & Renate N. C. (2010). *Strengthening and Enriching Your Professional Learning Community*. New York: ASCD Publications.
- Duthie, J. A. (2012). *A Handbook for History Teachers*, New York: University Press of America.
- Hill, S. 2008. *Developing Early literacy*. Hongkong: Eleanor Curtain Publishing.
- Math Tutor. (2015). *How to calculate percentage distribution*. Retrieved from <http://math.tutorcircle.com/probability-and-statistics/how-to-calculate-percentage-distribution-from-frequency-distribution.html> on July 02nd, 2015.
- Manurung, H. (2003). *Mastering English Competence*. Jakarta: Great Media.
- Nunan, D. (1991). *Language Teaching Methodology: A Textbook for Teacher*. Great Britain: Prentice Hall.
- Nunan, D. and Kathleen, M. B. (2009). *Exploring Second Language Classroom Research*. Boston: Cengage Learning.
- Richards, J. C. & Willy, A. R. (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Thornbury, S. (2002). *How to Teach Vocabulary*. New York: Longman.

About the Author

Hartati is a graduate from English Language Education Study Program, State College of Islamic Studies, Syaikh Abdurrahman Siddik, Bangka-Belitung.