

Enriching Students' Vocabularies through Pictionary Games in Small Group Discussions

Novi Dwi Yuliani¹ Niska Kamalia² Lisnani Ulfah³

^{1,2,3}The Faculty of Teacher's Training and Education, Universitas Nahdlatul Ulama Kalimantan Selatan

Email: novideye24@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Received

17/09/23

Revised

19/12/23

Accepted

14/01/24

Keywords:

Discussion;

Pictionary; Small

Group.

Vocabulary.

ABSTRACT

This experimental research intends to investigate the impact of small group discussion techniques using Pictionary games on students' vocabulary achievement targeting 7th grade students of MTsN 1 Banjar. The methodology of the study is designed to be quantitatively conducted by applying the pre-test and post-test. A total of 62 7th graders were the subjects of the study. Samples were taken using intentional sampling techniques, involving two classes with 31 students each. These classes are assigned to experimental and control classes. Before starting treatment, a pre-test was administered to check the student's basic vocabulary comprehension. Data collection was from the test applied before and after the experimental treatment. After calculation, considering the value of 30.38, which is greater than 0, it can be stated that the small group discussion technique is effective in learning vocabulary. The t-observation value (up to 30.38) is higher than the t-table (table = 1.699), demonstrating whether the Small Group Discussion is significantly effective for enriching vocabulary compared to using other techniques that are usually implemented by the teacher at MTsN 1 Banjar, South Kalimantan.

How to cite: Yuliani, N. D., Kamalia, N., Ulfah, L. (2024). Enriching Students' Vocabularies through Pictionary Games in Small Group Discussion. *English Teaching and Linguistics Journal*, 5(1), 57-66.

I. INTRODUCTION

The lack of vocabulary comprehension is the main problem in improving English learning. The foundation for mastering all English skills is learning vocabulary. Combination of letters in the words formed by a group of user-created vocabulary.

One solution to overcome this problem is to use Small Group Discussions. Hornby (2000) stated that a group is the number of things or people that are connected in a certain way or together in the same place. Most experts also agree that a group is several things people when it is made by more than two people who interact with each other (Tubbs, 2007). Based on the previous statement, it can be concluded that a group is some people made up of two people or more who interact with each other and are influenced by each other in a group with or without a leader who is assigned in such a way.

The researchers also use a visual game called 'Pictionary' to support the implementation of the Small Group Discussion activity. The use of visual means in the teaching of vocabulary facilitates the understanding of an object to be transmitted, memorization, and interest in learning vocabulary. Visual media that can be used are pictures, posters, cartoons, and another example of visual media can be a means of learning and teaching vocabulary. Using visual media, it is expected can increase the interest in the vocabulary learning process.

Literature Review

Vocabulary

Penny (1991: 60) in Julita (2011) stated vocabulary can be interpreted as the words that are being taught in a foreign language. In other words, vocabulary is a set of letters that are formed words that are used in a foreign language.

Vocabulary is the main key to improving all English skills. Mastering the vocabulary is somewhat difficult, it is not as easy as your hand requires process of mastering the vocabulary. Many factors influence students' difficulties in mastering vocabulary.

- First, it is quite hard for students to comprehend and memorize the vocabulary. Many students find it tough to speak due to their limited vocabulary.
- Second, less media that is used is always based on methods of expression without involving the media. Students are not getting interested and have difficulties understanding the vocabulary.
- Third, learning stiff or serious English makes students feel pressured or doubt to develop vocabulary skills.
- Fourth, students' memorization of vocabulary. They forget vocabulary that has been taught easily.

Pictionary Game

The Pictionary game was created by Robert Angel with graphic design by Gary Everson and first published in 1985 by Angel Games, Inc. The Pictionary game is a word-guessing game played in pairs. According to Hinebaugh (2009: 188-193) the game Pictionary can be used as an excellent teaching tool to improve communication and creativity in thinking; is well suited to reinforce ideas on the subject matter for visual learners; can develop and reinforce facts, forms and concepts; the rules of the Pictionary game will focus on the development of creative and reasonable thinking; Players must not only think creatively but also must be able to create images that can effectively communicate their ideas to all members; And it is perfect for improving grammar and vocabulary skills. Through this game, we can analyze the vocabulary achievements of the students they have and describe the vocabulary teaching process in this game.

Small Group Discussion

According to Syaiful Bahri Djamarah (2009), The Small Group Discussion method is a way of presenting the subject matter, where students are faced with a problem that can be in the form of statements or questions that are problematic to be discussed and solved together (Djamarah, 2009). The following are the methods/types of small group discussion learning:

a. Jigsaw

The jigsaw learning model is a cooperative learning model in which students learn in small groups of 4-6 students heterogeneously. In this jigsaw learning, there is an origin group and an expert group.

b. STAD (Student Team Achievement Division)

Student Team Achievement Division (STAD) is a type of cooperative that emphasizes the existence of activities and discussions between students to motivate each other and help in mastering the subject matter to achieve maximum achievement.

c. TGT (Team game Tournament)

This type of TGT cooperative learning model is carried out by placing students into study groups with games on each tournament table. The game will use cards containing the question and the answer key.

d. GI (Group Investigation)

Group Investigation (GI) is a complex cooperative learning model. This learning model combines the principles of cooperative learning and constructivism-based learning as well as the democratic learning process.

e. Number Head Together

The NHT-type cooperative learning model (Number Head Together) is a development of the TGT-type cooperative model. A special feature is group learning through the completion of tasks by dividing ideas with each other. Each group must ensure that its members understand and master the task so that all students understand the concepts simultaneously.

f. TPS (Think Pair Share)

This type of learning model was developed by Frank T. Lyman (1981) and allows each member of the student couple to be able to contemplate a question asked. Students and their groups were asked to discuss what had been thought. After the discussion is over, the teacher then collects responses or answers to questions asked from the whole class.

II. METHODS

This experimental research specifically used a Quasi-Experimental Design. A quasi-experimental design is a research method that is divided into two groups: experimental and control class. The experimental class received treatment using a Pictionary game in small group discussion and the control class was being taught the whole class teaching method.

The techniques and data collection used in this study are pre-test, treatment, and post-test. The method of SGD Think Pair Share learning (TPS) is used in this study, the research target is two grades seventh (7B) and (7D), class (B) is not given treatment while class (D) is given treatment.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

During this experiment, the researcher provided students with the material to reclassify lessons with vocabulary as the focus of comprehension. The researchers applied the Pictionary game in small group discussion during the treatment to the experimental class, while did not use this method in the control class.

The Data of Control Class

Table 1

Pre-Test and Post-Test Score of Control Class

STUDENTS (Y)	PRETEST	POSTTEST	GAIN SCORE
Nailah Azkiya	30	70	40
Lilis Ashfiya	30	60	30
M Fauzan	50	50	0
Nor Nasyifa	20	40	20
Gina Faizah	10	0	-10
M Rafa Fadhillah	30	40	10
Niswatul Jannah	10	40	30
Syintia Melda	30	80	50
Syafira Ananda Putri	50	90	40
Fitri Aulia	50	50	0
Nagata Lovrico Al-Qaiz	50	40	-10
Agustina	40	40	0
Cahya Isnani Mulya Sari	60	50	-10
Almira Zayyani A.	60	50	-10
Akif Mahfuzni Rahman	40	30	-10
Fahri Rijal	90	70	-20

Arie Yusuf Amir	40	40	0
Jisika Auvaria Rahmah	40	20	-20
M. Aufa Rafif	70	80	10
Aisha Rahim	40	40	0
Husnul Khatimah	20	50	30
M Ilham	50	60	10
Rina Nor Aini	20	40	20
Anna Assyifa	20	30	10
Zafirah	10	40	30
M Yusuf	50	0	-50
M. Nizam R.	50	0	-50
Kesya Permata Nabila	30	40	10
M. Rafif Erianto J.	90	80	-10
M. Zikrie	80	50	-30
M. Rizki Habibie	0	50	50
$\sum n = 31$	$\sum Y_0 = 1260$	$\sum Y_1 = 1420$	$\sum Y_2 = 160$
SUM	1260	1420	160
AVERAGE	40.64	45.80	5.16
MAX	90	90	
MIN	0	0	

$$M \text{ pre-test} = \frac{\sum Y_0}{N} = \frac{1260}{31} = 40.64$$

$$M \text{ post-test} = \frac{\sum Y_1}{N} = \frac{1420}{31} = 45.80$$

$$M \text{ gain} = \frac{\sum Y_2}{N} = \frac{160}{31} = 5.16$$

The lowest pre-test score was 0 and the highest pre-test score was 90 with an average score of 40.64. Data shown in the post-test is the lowest was 0 and the final highest was 90 with an average score of 45.60. It can be observed that the control class score gained 5.16 points.

The Data of Experimental Class

Table 2

Pre-test and Post-test Score of Experimental Class

STUDENTS (Y)	PRETEST	POSTTEST	GAIN SCORE
M. Hariri Ihsan	40	70	30
Soraya Azizah	20	100	80
Asyraf	20	90	70
M Dafa	40	100	60
Hayla Hanifa	10	100	90
Stifa Alliga	10	100	90
Nor Yasmina	0	60	60
Nor Haliza	0	40	40
Diah Astiyani	10	40	30
Riska Maulida	0	80	80
Paridah	10	30	20
Shaufi Atthariq	0	40	40

Alya Bilqis Fitriani	10	0	-10
M. Amrul Kamal	10	60	50
Nur Talita Dzakira	10	100	90
Nayla FZ	30	100	70
Alfiannor Rahman	30	100	70
Nor Safa	20	100	80
Ahmad Maulidi Nor	30	100	70
M. Rizki Maulana	30	100	70
Sabila Viona	10	100	90
Alif	30	100	70
Satya Lucky Pratama	40	100	60
Syarif Hidayatullah	50	100	50
Maida Safitri	10	100	90
Evita Sari	0	20	20
Nur Andini Putri	0	60	60
M. Rafi Hanenza	10	100	90
Sri Indayani	20	100	80
Noor Indah Fitria	0	80	80
Istiqomah	10	80	70
$\sum n = 31$	$\sum Y_0 = 510$	$\sum Y_1 = 2450$	$\sum Y_2 = 1940$
SUM	510	2450	1940
AVERAGE	16.45	79.03	62.58
MAX	50	100	
MIN	0	0	

$$M \text{ pre-test} = \frac{\sum Y_0}{N} = \frac{510}{31} = 16.45$$

$$M \text{ post-test} = \frac{\sum Y_1}{N} = \frac{2450}{31} = 79.03$$

$$M \text{ gain} = \frac{\sum Y_2}{N} = \frac{1940}{31} = 62.58$$

The lowest was 0 and then the highest score was 50 with the average of 16.45. Then the data in the post-test showed the lowest post-test score was 0 and the highest post test score was 100 with the average of score is 79.03. It served that control class gained score about 62.58 points.

DATA ANALYSIS AND HYPOTHESIS TESTING

After the data is collected, a preliminary analysis is first carried out to see if the data meets the requirements for testing the t-test hypothesis. The preliminary analysis consisted of two tests, namely normality and homogeneity, which were performed with SPSS 25 with a significance level of 0.05. The data can be said to be normally distributed and homogeneous if the Sig is shown to be greater than 0.05.

Pre-test and Post-test Analysis Normality

Table 3
Normality of Pre-test and Post-test Using Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wil Test

Tests of Normality							
	Class	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Result	Pre-test Experiment	.255	31	.000	.885	31	.003
	Post-test Experiment (SGDM)	.313	31	.000	.754	31	.000
	Pre-test Control	.146	31	.090	.956	31	.222
	Post-test Control	.204	31	.002	.927	31	.036

Interpretation of Normality

1. Based on the results presented above, it is concluded that the value of significance (Sig.) of the pretest and posttest both in the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro Wilk test <0.05 , it can be stated that the distribution of the data is not normal.
2. While the data of the pretest and posttest control class using the Shapiro-Wilk test is >0.05 , it can be concluded that the research data has a normal distribution. In the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, the pretest of the control class > 0.05 (normal) and posttest < 0.05 (not normal).

Test of Homogeneity
Table 4
Pre-test Homogeneity
Test of Homogeneity of Variance

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Result	Based on Mean	3.686	1	60	.060
	Based on Median	.652	1	60	.423
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.652	1	47.039	.424
	Based on trimmed mean	2.846	1	60	.097

Homogeneity Test Interpretation :

- The data is HOMOGEN, If the value of significance (sig) is based on Mean >0.05
- Based on the data above, the sig. >0.05 , it can be stated that the data is HOMOGEN.

DATA ANALYSIS

By testing the hypothesis, the researcher can see whether the use of a pictorial game in the Small Group Discussion technique produces a stance effect for the students. The researchers used the T-test formula as a data analysis technique. The T-test was used to determine the effectiveness of using small group discussion techniques and to determine the difference in student scores in experimental and control classes, explained below for the hypothesis analysis

$$t_o = \frac{M_x - M_y}{SE M_x - SE M_y}$$

M_x = Variable X's Mean

M_y = Variable Y's Mean

SE = Standard of Error

X = Class of Control

Y = Class of Experiment

N = Number of Students

t_o = t observation

Before calculating the T-test, there are presented procedures to be taken as explained below:

- a. Determining the Mean of Variable X, with the formula:

$$M_x = \frac{\sum X}{N_1}$$

$$M_x = \frac{1940}{31} = 62.58$$

- b. Determining the Mean of Variable Y, with the formula:

$$M_y = \frac{\sum X}{N_2}$$

$$M_y = \frac{160}{31} = 5.16$$

- c. Determining the Standard Deviation Score of Variable X, with the formula:

$$SD_x = \sqrt{\frac{\sum X^2}{N_1}}$$

$$SD_x = \sqrt{\frac{62.58^2}{31}} = \sqrt{126.33} = 11.23$$

- d. Determining the Standard Deviation Score of Variable Y, with the formula:

$$SDy = \sqrt{\frac{\sum Y^2}{N_2}}$$

$$SDy = \sqrt{\frac{5.16^2}{31}} = \sqrt{0.85} = 0.92$$

- e. Determining the Standard Error Mean of Variable X, with formula:

$$SE Mx = \frac{SDx}{\sqrt{N_1 - 1}}$$

$$SE Mx = \frac{11.23}{\sqrt{31 - 1}} = \frac{11.23}{5.47} = 2.05$$

- f. Determining the Standard Error Mean of Variable Y, with the formula :

$$SE MY = \frac{SDY}{\sqrt{N_2 - 1}}$$

$$SE MY = \frac{0.92}{\sqrt{31 - 1}} = \frac{0.92}{5.47} = 0.16$$

- g. Determining the Standard Error of Different Mean Variable X and Mean of Variable Y, with the formula:

$$SE Mx - My = \sqrt{(SEmx)^2 + (SEmy)^2}$$

$$SE Mx - My = \sqrt{2.05^2 + 0.16^2} = \sqrt{4.20 + 0.02} = \sqrt{4.22} = 2.05$$

- h. Determining to, with the formula:

$$to = \frac{Mx - My}{SE Mx - SE My}$$

$$to = \frac{62.58 - 5.16}{2.05 - 0.16} = \frac{57.42}{1.89} = 30.38$$

- i. Determining the Degree of Freedom (df), with the formula:

$$Df = N_1 + N_2 - 2$$

$$Df = (31 + 31) - 2 = 62 - 2 = 60$$

DISCUSSION

HYPOTHESES TESTING

In this research, the researchers want to find empirical evidence of whether the use of the Pictionary game in Small Group Discussion is truly effective in teaching Vocabulary Comprehension. To achieve this goal, the researchers propose two hypotheses to test:

Ho: There is no significant difference in Vocabulary comprehension between students taught using the Pictionary game in small group discussions and students taught without the Pictionary game in small group discussions in seventh grade at MTsN 1 Banjar.

Ha: There is a significant difference in vocabulary comprehension between students taught using the Pictionary game in small group discussion and students taught without the Pictionary game in small group discussion method in seventh grade at MTsN 1 Banjar.

From the T-test the analytical data above produces the following statements, namely: H_a : control class and experimental class There are significant differences in vocabulary comprehension learning outcomes between students taught with small group discussion methods using media in the form of pictionary games with students without small group discussion methods in seventh grade MTsN 1 Banjar.

IV. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Based on the results of data analysis, there were clear significant differences between the results of students' vocabulary comprehension of the experimental class and the control class. The experimental class that taught reading using small group discussion techniques in teaching retelling of texts had a higher score (62.58) than the control class (5.16).

That means the results of this study indicated that the use of the Pictionary game in the Small Group Discussion Technique is significantly effective. From this study, the researchers concluded that the use of the Pictionary game in the Small Group Discussion Technique (cooperative learning) is significantly effective in learning and enriching vocabulary.

In addition, by observing the results of the formula test, the hypothesis test showed that observed (to) > T-table (t) = 30.38 > 1.699. That means the results of this study indicate that the Small Group Discussion Technique is effective. From this study, the researchers decided to conclude that the Small Group Discussion (cooperative learning) using the Pictionary Game method is effective in learning vocabulary.

REFERENCES

- Ahmadi, A., Prasetya, J.T. (2015). *Strategi Belajar Mengajar*. Bandung: CV. Pustaka Setia.
- Amri, Sofan. (2013). *Pengembangan & Model Pembelajaran Dalam Kurikulum 2013*. Jakarta: Prestasi Pustaka.
- Dadahri, W. (2012). *Implementasi strategi pembelajaran small group discussion pada mata pelajaran IPS kelas IV MI Al Falah Jatirokeh Songgom Brebes (SI)*, Institut Agama Islam Negeri Walisongo, Semarang.
- Edmunds, S & Brown, G. (2013). *Effective small group learning, Dundee: Association for Medical Education in Europe*.
- Fathin Rannisa Elly. *Junior high school/MTsN grade 7 semester books I*. CV Grahadi, surakarta - 57134
- Gunn, V. (2007). *Approaches to Small Group Learning and Teaching University of Glasgow*.
- Ginting, Abdurrahman. (2014). *Esensi praktis belajar pembelajaran*. Bandung: Humaniora.
- Hamiyah, N., Jauhar, M. (2014). *Strategi Belajar Mengajar di Kelas*. Jakarta: Prestasi Pustakaraya.
- Hamdayama, Jumanta. (2016). *Metodologi Pengajaran*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Hamiyah, N., Jauhar, M. (2014). *Strategi Belajar-Mengajar di Kelas*. Jakarta: Prestasi Pustaka Publisher
- Hasnah, Y., Ginting, P., Supiatman, L., Kharisma, A. J., & Siahaan, H. S. (2024). How Do Locally Produced EFL Textbooks Endorse Critical Thinking Skills in Indonesia? A Content Analysis. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 15(1), 190-200.
-
- Enriching Students' Vocabularies through Pictionary Games in Small Group Discussion. (Novi Dwi Yuliani)

- Iskandarwassid dan Sunendar, D. (2011). *Strategi pembelajaran bahasa*. Bandung: Rosdakarya.
- Kharisma, A. J., Ginting, P., Hasnah, Y., & Utomo, M. I. (2023). LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE PORTRAYED IN INDONESIAN EFL TEXTBOOKS: A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY. *Jurnal As-Salam*, 7(2), 195-214.
- Komalasari, Kokom. (2017). *Pembelajaran kontekstual: konsep dan aplikasi*. Bandung: Refika Aditama.
- Melvin L. Silberman. (2009). *Active Learning*. Bandung: Nusamedia.
- Ngalimun (2016). *Strategi model pembelajaran*. Yogyakarta: Aswaja Presindo.
- Rusman. (2018). *Model-model pembelajaran (Mengembangkan Profesionalisme Guru)*. Jakarta : Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Saefuddin, A. & Berdiati, I. (2014). *Pembelajaran Efektif*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Sani, R.A. (2019). *Inovasi Pembelajaran*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Sanjaya, Wina (2016). *Strategi Pembelajaran Berorientasi Standar Proses Pendidikan (Cetakan ke 12)*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media.
- Shirtha El Rusyda, Ujang Suparman, Sudirman. 2014. Teaching Vocabulary Through Pictionary Game to First Grade Students of SMP Al-Kautsar.
- Sukmadinata, N.S. & Syaodih, E. (2012). *Kurikulum dan Pembelajaran Kompetensi*. Bandung: PT Refika Aditama.
- Suprihatiningrum, Jamil (2013). *Strategi Pembelajaran*. Yogyakarta: Ar-ruzz Media.
- Sutikno, Sobry. (2014). *Metode & model-model pembelajaran*. Lombok: Holistica.
- Uno, Hamzah B. (2011). *Perencanaan Pembelajaran*. Jakarta; Bumi Aksara.
- Thornbury, Scott. (2002). *How to Teach Vocabulary*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Trianto (2015). *Model Pembelajaran Terpadu*. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara.
- Utomo, D.P. (2020). *Mengembangkan model pembelajaran*. Yogyakarta: Bildung.