

IMPROVING STUDENTS' VOCABULARY THROUGH SPOOF TEXT AT FIRST GRADE OF SMP NEGERI 1 SUNGGUMINASA

Rahmatia

SMP Negeri 1 Sungguminasa, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This study was to know the ability of students of SMP Negeri 1 Sungguminasa in mastering vocabulary by using spoof text. It was conducted at VII class of SMPN 34 Makassar academic year 2021/2022 as the subject of the study. This study is categorized as a collaborative classroom action research. The writer worked collaboratively with the English teacher in the class. The CAR was done based on Kurt Lewins' design. The writer did two cycles in which each cycle consists of planning, acting, observing, and reflecting. The data were gathered through qualitative and quantitative data. The qualitative data was gained by analyzing observation result. Then, quantitative data were obtained from the students' writing score of pretest and posttest. The finding of this study showed that there was an improvement on the students' ability in vocabulary. It can be seen from the mean of pretest score was 60.31. Then, the mean of posttest cycle 1 score was 66.38 and the mean of posttest cycle 2 score was 75.31. In addition, there were 4 students (9.5%) who passed Minimum Mastery Criterion – Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal (KKM) in the pre test. Meanwhile, in the cycle 1, there were 14 students (33.3%) who passed Minimum Mastery Criterion – Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal (KKM) and it gained which was in the posttest cycle 2 there were 37 students (88%) who passed Minimum Mastery Criterion – Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal (KKM), so the criterion of success was achieved. Related to the results of the gained data, it can be concluded that spoof text can improve students' ability in vocabulary.

Keywords: Spoof Text, Vocabulary

INTRODUCTION

English as the international language has the important position in our life because it has been obligated to learn at social stratification. English has been recognizing by community's citizen in the world, because with using it everyone from everywhere be able to know about global free trade development, everyone that come from all-corner citizen world must be can to speaking English well. So, when and where they are to recognizing with the other and have capability to communicate with the other and could to understanding another culture.

Since English has been used as the international language, almost school from everywhere must use English as the introduction language in their school with their curriculum diction. So, English has been as the state of international language. It will be important to learning subject that must learn. Although, in several country is learning English as the second language contain with our countries also but English will be learning a useful in several management of government, if we will to do cooperate with another country has been of course always using English as the native language.

Developing native of vocabulary in the country. Since English was spoken internationally, many people and students are interested in studied English. Up to now, many students who want to continue, their studies at the university, instituted or those who wants to go abroad need to study English deeply. On the other words, English is very important for the students who want to develop their knowledge. To develop knowledge of language, vocabulary will be the priority to know.

METHOD OF THE RESEARCH

In this research, the writer applied Classroom Action Research (CAR). Action research is the name given to a creasing popular movement in educational research. It is a form of self-reflective enquiry that is now being used in school based curriculum. According to Kurt (Pedoman Teknis Pelaksanaan CAR, 2003: 4) that there are four components in one cycle for doing classroom action research, they were; Planning, Action, Observation, and Reflection. The subjects in this research were all of students at class VII SMPN 1 Sungguminasa. There were 42 students consist of 13 male and 29 female. The writer used tests to asses and examines the students' vocabulary. The writer gave test in each cycle to find out the improvement of the students' vocabulary through Spooft text to improve students vocabulary. The test instrument gave to the students they were: Text about funny story and the question based of the text.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Findings

This chapter presents the result of research. In this case, it discussed the way to improve students' vocabulary by *Spooft Text* at class VII SMPN 1 Sungguminasa academic year 2021/2022.

Before Implementing the Action

There were three parts related to before implementing the action. Those were pre-observation and pre-test. Those explanations as following:

Result Pre-Observation

Pre observation was conducted to observe the process of teaching learning in writing activity before implementing the action. It was held at class VII SMPN 1 Sungguminasa academic year 2021/2022. This class consisted of 42 students in the class. The pre-observation was conducted on 17th and 19th of January 2022.

In general, during the teaching learning process in the classroom, the teacher mostly dominated the class. Hence, students only got less opportunity to be active in the class. While the teacher was explaining about the schematic structure of the spooft text, most students did not pay attention to her explanation. Next, the teacher gave students the example of spooft text and she read the text. After reading the text, she asked students whether they had difficult vocabularies or not and some students asked her while most of them especially male students were busily talking to their friends. Then, the teacher asked students to read the text together and asked two female students and two male students to read the text individually.

Next, the teacher asked several questions about the text, and there were only few students who answered the teacher's question correctly. When the teacher asked students to arrange the jumbled sentences into a good paragraph, most male students were cheating and the teacher asked them not to make noise. Write a descriptive text without asking them to make the draft first. Therefore, they were looked very confused and asked their friends what to write. It made the class's situation noisy.

Result of Pre-Test

The pretest was done before the Classroom Action Research (CAR). It was conducted on 19th of January 2022. It started at 12.10 P.M. The test was in the form of multiple-choice test.

Based on the result of pretest, the data showed that the mean score of pretests was 60.31. There were only four students who passed the Minimum Mastery Criterion – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal* (KKM) meanwhile the other 42 students below the minimum mastery criterion. The lowest achievement gained score 40. From that analyzing, it could be seen that most of the VII class students' writing ability was still very low.

Implementation of Classroom Action Research (CAR)

Cycle 1

a. Planning

In this phase, the writer and the teacher worked collaboratively to make a lesson plan for the action based on the problems faced by students in vocabulary. In this case, the writer determined the selected material and exercises into a lesson plan. Therefore, spoof text was chosen as the text to be taught for students. In the lesson plan, there was a recount text to be discussed during the teaching learning process and example of Spoof Text to be shown to students. In addition, the writer also prepared some instruments. Those were unstructured observation sheet to observe the students' and the teacher' activities in teaching learning process whether it was in line with the lesson plan had made before or not, and the posttest I. Here, the writer and the teacher decided to use the same question as the pretest. The posttest is used to collect the data and to know students' improvement scores from pretest to posttest after using Spoof Text.

b. Acting

The action of the cycle 1 was done on January 20th and 22th 2022. The teacher implemented the teaching learning process based on the lesson plan which had been made. In the first meeting of the cycle 1, the teacher explained the concept and characteristics of *Spoof Text*. She explained about its schematic structure and its linguistic features. After explaining that, the teacher asked some questions to students to make sure students had already understood about the explanation. Then she read the example of *spoof text*. After that, the teacher explained about what spoof text. After explain the spoof text, the writer give the students task. In the end of first meeting, she asked students to collect the task of the students.

In the second meeting of cycle 1, the teacher showed the students how to make sentences based on the key words and images which had been made in the previous meeting. After that, the teacher spread the posttest 1, and asked students to write a spoof text. Then the teacher asked some students to read their task.

c. Observing

In this phase, the writer tried to notice all activities in the physical classroom activity. It might be about the teacher's performance, class situation, and students' response. In doing this observation, the writer sat on the empty chair in the right corner of the class. This was done to make sure that the learning teaching process was not disturbed by the writer's presence.

Related to the teacher's performance she had taught the students in line with the lesson plan had been made. However, in the part of explaining both the schematic structure and the steps of spoof text, it probably seemed unclear because the teacher's voice was too low and her explanation was too fast. Consequently, students looked confused when they were asked to make mind-maps and it could be seen from the students' task result that student still wrote all sentences. Moreover, the writer found that the teacher mostly paid attention only to the front row's students. Therefore, the students in the back kept making noises.

Meanwhile, the class situation was still under control. It means that most of students did not pay attention to the teacher's explanation. In the first meeting, when the teacher explained about the schematic structures of spoof text, most of male students were busily talking to their classmates. They were talked about the football match. Some female students on the back rows also did not pay attention and just made scratch pictures on their books. In the other hand, most students in the front rows really paid attention to the teacher's explanation.

When the teacher showed the example of spoof text, most students seemed more enthusiastic, and they tried to listen to the explanation. But, after five minutes or so they continued to talk with their friends. The teacher often told the students not to make noise, but it seemed did not really work. While the students were make spoof text, some students looked confused and kept asking what to do. In the second meeting, the students were asked to make a composition on the posttest 1 sheet based on task they had made in the previous session. Most students seemed more enthusiastic to write the text and when the teacher went around the class to ask their difficulties, most of them said that they did not have many problems since they already mapped out their ideas into mind-maps. However, some students were still confused and they sometimes yelled "*bingung, sir!*" ("I'm confused, Pak!"). Many students did not bring their dictionary and they borrowed from their friends, it made the class was very noisy.

After teaching learning process finished, in this observing phase, it was also carried out the posttest 1 exactly on the second action of the first cycle to measure how well the students' writing ability of descriptive text that had been studied. Based on the result of the posttest 1, the data showed that the mean score of posttests was 66.38. There were 13 students who passed the Minimum Mastery Criterion – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal* (KKM) 70 (seventy). Meanwhile the other 28 students did not pass that criterion.

d. Reflecting

In this phase, the writer and the teacher discussed about the conclusion of the implementing the action. Then, they tried to modify the action to make students be better in writing spoof text and in order 70% of students in the class could pass the KKM because in the result of posttest 1 showed only 33.3% of students who passed the KKM. However, based on the result of the first cycle, the writer and the teacher felt satisfied enough because they were able to improve their vocabulary ability of spoof text, although not 70% of students passed the KKM. Besides, the students seemed to study easily.

Most of them were not too much complicated anymore in learning vocabulary using the spoof text and based on the result, their vocabulary was improved. Next, the writer and the teacher had to reflect the implementation of spoof text. Here, the writer as the observer gave her opinions and suggestions about the teaching learning process related to the last observation phase. First, the teacher still had difficulties in implementing the spoof text. In this case, the observer suggested to the teacher to walk around the class, to monitor each student and to check their worksheet. Second, the teacher's voice was too low and her explanation was too fast. Here, the writer suggested the teacher to louder her voice while teaching and to give the explanation more clearly and slowly. Third, the teacher still had difficulty in managing the class. In this case, the class was noisy because students primarily in the last rows were talking during the lesson. Hence, the writer suggested that the teacher should give more attention to all students and warn them if they do not do the tasks well.

From the reflecting phase above, the teacher and the writer must have more efforts to develop students' vocabulary ability of spoof text. It was needed to be improved again in the next cycle. This effort was done in the next lesson plan of cycle two.

Cycle 2

a. Planning

After finding the result of cycle 1, students' vocabulary ability did not reach the target in their score of posttests 1, the writer and the teacher modified the previous lesson plan based on the result of reflecting phase in the first cycle. The lesson plan which was used still related to learning spoof text. However, there were some modifications in the second cycle. Since it was found that some students were still confused in spoof text, in the second cycle, the teacher showed how to conducted four square writing method step by step and students followed each the step. It was done to ensure that students really understand how to learn spoof text.

In the second cycle, the teacher also gave more attention the students who sat on the back rows by walking around the class when students made their task. In this phase, the writer and the teacher prepared the material for the second cycle. The teacher and the writer chose a narrative text with the title "*Story of Abunawas*" Beside of that, the writer still also prepared the unstructured observation for the teacher. The writer also prepared the posttest 2 to collect the data. The theme of the posttest 2 was "*Story of Abunawas*". The students were

asked to write a description about the theme based on four square writing method they have made.

b. Acting

The action of cycle 2 was done on February 23rd and 25th 2022. In the first meeting, the teacher explained about procedural narrative text. Before she explained the schematic structure and linguistic feature, the teacher tried to attract students by telling her experience in the school. After explaining about the text, the teacher gave the students an example of the narrative text, the teacher read aloud the text and asked the students to read the text together. After that, the teacher and the students discussed the text. Then, the teacher reviewed about spoof text then demonstrated the students the way spoof text step by step and the students followed the steps

In the second meeting of cycle 2, the teacher showed the student show to make spoof text which had been made in the previous meeting. After that, the teacher spread the posttest 2 paper, and asked students to write narrative text by using spoof text they had made before. The teacher tried to give more attention to whole students by walking around the class and helped the students if they found any troubles in making the composition. In the end of the lesson, the teacher asked some students to read their compositions.

c. Observing

In the second cycle, the writer could tell that the learning process was better than the first cycle. It could be seen from the class situation which was not as noisy as the first cycle. Related to the teacher's performance, the teacher also showed some progresses in teaching. The teacher's voice was louder than the previous meeting. In the first meeting, the teacher was succeeding to attract the students' attention. The teacher gave more attention to the students, he often walked around the class to see the students' works and he asked the students whether they had problems during learn spoof text. The students also looked more enthusiastic, most of them did not look very confused anymore. The writer assumed that it was happened because the teacher showed the way step by step, therefore the students could follow the steps easily.

In the second meeting, the class situation was so much better than the previous one. The class was really under control and no longer noisy. The students also looked more enthusiastic in making the composition. Most students brought their own dictionary; therefore, they did not look busy to borrow the dictionary. The students looked busy in making the composition. They were much focused when they write. They could write easily, the writer assumed that it was because the students had already known what to write in their composition. Some male students looked confused when they write, but then the teacher came to them and helped them. In short, the class situation was so much better and fun.

Based on the result of the posttest 2 which was held on the second meeting of the cycle 2, the data showed that the mean score of posttests 2 was 75.31. There were 37 students who passed the Minimum Mastery Criterion – *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal* (KKM) 70 (seventy). Meanwhile the other 5 students did not pass that criterion.

d. Reflecting

The reflection of Classroom Action Research (CAR) was carried out after getting the posttest 2 results. The writer and the teacher felt satisfied because they could improve students' vocabulary ability of spoof text. The students could write the composition easier. It could be seen from the result of students' score improved from the pretest 1.

Furthermore, the class situation was no longer boring for the students. They looked more enthusiastic in making composition. After achieving the target of research minimally 70% students who passed the KKM, therefore the writer and the teacher decided to stop the Classroom Action Research (CAR) because it had already succeeded. Hence, the writer and the teacher did not continue to the next cycle.

Discussion

The interpretation of the data results among the pretest, the posttest of cycle 1 and the posttest of cycle 2 are as following:

In the pretest, the mean score of students on vocabulary test before carrying out Classroom Action Research (CAR) is 60.31. It is the students' writing score before the implementation of spoof text. Meanwhile, the class percentage which passes the KKM is 9.5%. It means that that there are only 4 students who can pass the KKM (70) and there are 38 students who are not able to pass the KKM.

Furthermore, the mean score in the posttest of cycle 1 is 66.38. It means that there are some students' score improvement from the previous test (pretest), that is 6.07 ($66.38 - 60.31$) or 10 % (It is not enough to reach the research target and still need to be developed). Meanwhile, the class percentage which passes the KKM in posttest 1 is 33.3%. It shows there are 14 students who pass the KKM and there are 28 students whose score still under KKM. It means that still needed more improvement because it could not achieve the target of success CAR, which is 70% (or at least 28 students) from the class percentage. That is why the writer and the teacher continue to the second cycle.

Next, the mean score in the posttest of second cycle is 75.31. It shows the improvement students' score 8.93 ($75.31 - 66.38$) from the posttest 1 in cycle 1 (66.38) or 33.3% students' improvement in the score percentage from the pretest or 9.5% students' improvement from the pretest 1. Meanwhile, the class percentage which passes the KKM is 88%. It means there are 37 students whose score pass the KKM and there are 5 students are still under the target of KKM.

This class percentage shows some improvements 88% from the pretest (9.5%) from the posttest 1 (33.3%) in the class percentage. The posttest of cycle 2 has fulfilled the target of Classroom Action Research (CAR) success, that is above 70% students could pass the KKM. Automatically, it can be said that the Classroom Action Research (CAR) is success and the cycle can be stopped.

CONCLUSION

After conducting CAR at VII class of SMP Negeri 1 Sungguminasa academic year 2021/2022, it can be concluded that Spoof Text can improve the students'

vocabulary ability. It can be proved from the following facts. First, related to the students' achievement, there were 72.5% students who passed the KKM 70 with the improvement of students' mean score from pretest to the post-test of the second cycle was 31.73%. In the pretest, there were only 3 students who passed the KKM. Meanwhile, in the post-test of cycle one there were 13 students who passed the KKM or 32.5%. Next, in the result of post-test in the cycle 2, there are 29 students or 72.5% students who passed the KKM in which their mean score of writing test derived 70.77, so it achieved the criteria of success. The last, the result of interview with the English teacher showed that the teacher gave positive responses to the implementation of spoof text in teaching since it could be an alternative technique to be used in teaching. In conclusion, this study was successful in developing the students' ability in vocabulary by using spoof text. In addition, the students were more active and participated in the teaching-learning process. Therefore, spoof text can be an alternative technique for teacher in teaching especially in vocabulary.

REFERENCE

- Famir, Muhammad. 2005. Belajar Kosa Kata Bahasa Inggris Melalui Metode Fun Game. Penelitian Tindakan Kelas. Takalar: SMP Negeri 1 Polombangkeng Utara
- Harlina. 2012. Improving Vocabulary through Degree Of Comparison at SMP Negeri 31 Makassar. Skripsi. Unpublished
- Ittaqi, D. M., & Indah, R. N. (2022). Storytelling of spoof text for the eleventh graders: advancing the beginner speaker. *Jurnal Ilmiah Bina Bahasa*, 15(1), 15-24.
- Kamil, M. L., & Hiebert E. H. 2005. Teaching and Learning Vocabulary. New York : Guilford Press.
- Lading, Rikardus. 2012. Increasing Student's Vocabulary through Idiom Expression of the Fourth Semester Students of English Educational Departement University "45" Makassar. Skripsi. Unpublished
- Pasa, A. E. (2018). The Use Of Dictogloss Technique On Students' Achievement In Writing Spoof Text At Second Grade Of Madrasah Aliyah Muhammadiyah 1 Medan (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara).
- Rahmawati, Ikra. 2012. The Effectiveness of Using Card Media to Expand Students' Achievement in Learning Vocabulary at SMP negeri 19 Makassar. Skripsi. Unpublished
- Rasyid, M. Amin. The Vocabulary Selection of Modern In Light of Teaching English to False Beginners. *Ujung Pandang : 1713PSDUP*
- Tahir, Muhammad. 1997. The Application of the Reading Method in Improving the Student Vocabulary Mastery at MAN 1 Ujung Pandang. Thesis Fakultas Tarbiyah IAIN
- Orianda, P., & Rosa, R. N. (2013). Teaching writing a spoof text by using series of pictures to senior high school students. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 1(2), 445-454.

TEFL Overseas Journal

Teaching English as a Foreign Language Journal

ISSN 2461-0240 (Print), 2828-9544 (Online)

Volume 10 Number 3 December 2022

Yulandari, E. S., & Suryadi, H. (2022). Analysis Spoof Text Production Ability of Class XI High School Students with Problem-Based Learning (PBL) Approach. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 10(1), 36-45.