THE USE OF DESERT ISLAND ACTIVITY TO IMPROVE STUDENTS' VOCABULARY

Thessa Entoh[1], Mister G. Maru[2], Maikel Sanger[3]
English Education Department, Faculty of Language and Arts
Universitas Negeri Manado, Tondano, Indonesia
Email: thesaentoh88@gmail.com

Abstract : This study intends to investigate the effectiveness of desert island activity in improving students' vocabulary. In conducting this research, the authors used quantitative research through post-test only with the experimental group and the control group. This research was conducted at SMPN 2 Tondano. The subject of the research is the 8th grade students at SMPN 2 Tondano. The findings show that the use of the desert island activity is very effective in improving students' English vocabulary skills. It further supports that choosing the right game and educating greatly influences the output of each learner. Therefore, the importance of the desert island activity in the process of learning English vocabulary for students, especially for the conditions of students in Indonesia with various learning styles, one of which is the Minahasa Regency, which has inadequate network access, can make the desert island activity a good reference to be recommended to students.

Keywords : *Vocabulary Mastery, Desert Island Activity, English Language Teaching*

INTRODUCTION

English is regarded as the universal language because it is one of the world's languages. It is one of the most widely spoken languages in the world, influencing every industry (Crystal, 2018; Ilyosovna, 2020; Rao, 2019). It is thought to be important for science and technology development and application, as well as for strengthening international relations and cooperation. As a result, mastering the English language is essential. In addition, language is a means of communication that is used to convey feelings, ideas, and information to others (Riordan, 2017). It plays a crucial role in the activities that people engage in on a daily basis. In keeping with this idea, Lado and Roberts (1963) explain, "language is a system of arbitrary vocal symbols used for human communication."

Not only did English become the fundamental language, but learning it required four essential skills, which could be broken down into productive and receptive skills. In this instance, these skills complement one another and cannot be separated. Basic language skills like structure, vocabulary, pronunciation, and spelling are the foundation for these four language skills (Rao, 2019). As one of the factors that determine whether English instruction is successful or unsuccessful, English teachers play a crucial role (Getie, 2020., Zulfikar, et al, 2019., Bai & Wang, 2023). Students and teachers ought to work well together. According to Liando (2015), "Student's motivation and teacher's behaviors were indeed related." In the process of teaching and learning, students and teachers played two significant roles. Because the students are getting ready to learn in an easy and useful way, teachers of English need to be able to use a variety of methods. According to Liando, (2015), "Being friendly and nice were more preferred than making the course more interesting or giving lots of homework." Teachers must also be as pleasant as possible during the learning process.

Learning a new language requires a strong vocabulary. It connects the four skills of speaking, listening, reading, and writing in one way; Moreover, it is one of the most important aspects of English learning (Albiladi, et al, 2018., Farooq, et al, 2020). Learners must acquire vocabulary knowledge, but reading requires vocabulary knowledge. In Indonesia, English is considered a foreign language (EFL) because students rarely use it for communication or interaction with others in their immediate social context (White, 2006). This is the case even in the school setting, where students learn English as a subject. Instead, students tend to use Indonesian or their local language to communicate with one another inside and outside of the classroom. According to Maru *et al* (2020), "two common strategies of teaching and learning vocabularies that have been acknowledged by a number of researchers: intentional vocabulary learning and incidental vocabulary learning have shown the evidences of enhancing learners' vocabularies knowledge. Meanwhile, according to Maru *et al* (2021), "the teachers provide some materials for the English class, but sometimes their teaching style bores the students and makes them believe that the class is not interesting."

The writer of this study focuses on vocabulary as one of the parts of the English language. According to Allen (1997), "Vocabulary is an important factor in teaching words, sound system, structure, and other essential area of language learning.", the significance of vocabulary in teaching a foreign language is clearly stated. As a result, the author comes to the conclusion that studying vocabulary as a component of language is important. The ability to communicate effectively is hampered by a lack of vocabulary, which is a crucial component in getting someone to speak up. According to Maru *et al* (2022), it provides an alternative to teaching techniques that empowers students to be more active learners.

The author discovered, based on preliminary studies of teaching English at SMP N 2 Tondano, that most students lacked vocabulary. At the same time, some of them were uninterested in the information because they believed that learning English was so difficult. As a result, the activity for improving students' vocabulary achievement is the desert island game. According to Maru *et al* (2021), since English is not Indonesian national language and the most of English teachers lack of ability in using media in teaching vocabulary, the students' mastery of English is not sufficient. The daily words and vocabulary are required for the desert island activity. Because students are also familiar with this activity game, the author used the desert island game to solve the problem above. The author discovered, based on preliminary studies of teaching English at SMP N 2 Tondano, that most students lacked vocabulary. At the same time, some of them were uninterested in the information because they believed that learning English was so difficult. As a result, the activity for improving students' vocabulary achievement is the desert island game. The daily words and vocabulary are required for the desert island activity. Because students are also familiar with this activity game, the author used the desert island game to solve the problem above.

The author will employ a number of tools related to island activity, such as activities that are commonplace when people visit an island for leisure, in the course of teaching Desert Island to enhance students' vocabulary achievement. It is a good choice activity to encourage teamwork among students. As a result, the desert island game might be a good way to get kids interested in the lesson. They also have a lot of characteristics that make it easier to understand the picture because desert island activity was originally developed as a visual aid. Teaching with

games can encourage students to take risks, foster social and emotional learning, and increase student participation. In addition, techniques are used to help and encourage many students to maintain their interest and work through the desert island characteristic, as well as to assist the instructor in establishing a context that makes the vocabulary relevant and useful. Words may be more easily remembered if they are fun to say. For younger students and teens, Desert Island is a simple, no-prep first-class icebreaker. It could be used in a standard test or as a test sheet.

RESEARCH METHOD

In doing this research the writer used quantitative research through post-test only with the experimental group and control group. Post-test was given to the students to find out students' level of vocabularies mastery. The experimental class is taught in test after treatment and the control class is taught by conventional method. So, there were two tests: T1 is the Experimental Group and T2 is Control group. X is symbolized for the Treatment. The following is the presentation of the design:

Experimental group	Treatment	Control group
T1	X	T2

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

After conducting existing research, this section contains the findings from the research which is the accumulated value of the pre-test and post-test activities that have been carried out on students as participants before and after the treatment that has been given.

Table 1. Data Matrix of the Experimental Group and Control Group

Subject	X_1 Post-test	Subject	X_2 Post-test
01	75	01	70
02	80	02	70
03	90	03	70
04	85	04	65
05	95	05	80
06	90	06	70
07	100	07	60
08	100	08	70
09	95	09	70
10	80	10	70
11	85	11	75
12	75	12	80
13	85	13	80
14	100	14	65
15	90	15	65
16	80	16	75
17	100	17	70
18	100	18	75
19	85	19	80
20	80	20	70
21	100	21	75
	1870		**1505**

Based on the table above, it was found that the increase in gain experienced by the average student from the pre-test and post-test scores was 18, which was accompanied by internal and external factors experienced by students both in their English learning experience and student's own way of learning. There are several things that are highlighted in this table, the first is that there are 5 students who produce the lowest gain, namely 5 where the difference between the pre-test scores and the post-test scores is only 5 improvements, this has also become a recommendation or input to researchers. as well as subject teachers to find out more clearly the learning achievement factors of these 5 participants. While there is 1 student who shows a very high gain, namely gain 40 and 1 student with gain 35. There are 2 differences in gain from the results of this study which can provide an illustration that not all students have the same learning preferences, even though the majority of students have shown higher gains. high with an average gain of 18 from pre-test to post-test scores.

The presentation frequency distribution of the post-test (X1) and the pre-test (X2) scores was shown below:

Table 2. Frequency Distribution of the Experimental Group

Value X_1	F_1	F_1%	CF	CF_1%
100	IIIII I	28.57	21	100
95	II	9.52	15	71.43
90	III	14.29	13	61.91
85	IIII	19.05	10	47.62
80	IIII	19.05	6	28.57
75	II	9.52	2	9.52

In the presentation on table 2, it could be clearly seen that the highest score was 100 (one hundred) gained by 6 (six) students or in percentage 28.57%, 2 (two) students obtained 95 (ninety-five) or 9.52%, 3 (three) students obtained 90 (ninety) or 14.29%, 4 (four) students obtained 85 (eighty-five) or 19.05%, and 4 (four) students obtained 80 (eighty) or 19.05%, 2 (two) students obtained 75 (seventy-five) or 9.52% as the lowest score.

Table 3. Frequency Distribution of Control Group

Value X_2	F_2	F_2%	CF	CF_2%
80	IIII	19.05	21	100
75	IIII	19.05	17	80.95
70	IIII IIIII	42.86	13	61.9
65	III	14.28	4	19.04
60	I	4.76	1	4.76

The presentation on table 3 above, it could be clearly seen that the highest score was 80 (eighty) gained by 4 (four) students or in percentage 19.05%, 4 (four) obtained 75 (seventy-five) or 19.05%, 9 (nine) students obtained 70 (seventy) or 42.86%, 3 (three) students obtained 65 (sixty-five) or 14.28%, 1 (one) student obtained 60 (sixty) or 4.76% as the lowest score.

Table 4. Variance of Experimental Group

SUBJECT	X	$\bar{X}_1$	$X_1 - \bar{X}_1$	$(X_1 - \bar{X}_1)^2$
1	75	89,05	-14,05	197,4025
2	80	89,05	-9,05	81,9025
3	90	89,05	0,95	0,9025
4	85	89,05	-4,05	16,4025
5	95	89,05	5,95	35,4025
6	90	89,05	0,95	0,9025
7	100	89,05	10,95	119,9025
8	100	89,05	10,95	119,9025
9	95	89,05	5,95	35,4025
10	80	89,05	-9,05	81,9025
11	85	89,05	-4,05	16,4025
12	75	89,05	-14,05	197,4025
13	85	89,05	-4,05	16,4025
14	100	89,05	10,95	119,9025
15	90	89,05	0,95	0,9025
16	80	89,05	-9,05	81,9025
17	100	89,05	10,95	119,9025
18	100	89,05	10,95	119,9025
19	85	89,05	-4,05	16,4025
20	80	89,05	-9,05	81,9025
21	100	89,05	10,95	119,9025
∑	1870			1580,953

Based on the post-test variance table above, it is explained that the overall average score of students in the post-test results made is 89.05 which shows that they 'improved' this section is determined from the results of the answers to the post-test questions given after treatment regarding game applications Desert Island for their mastery of English vocabulary, the questions made are references to the material that has been given so that students also easily match the questions with the material that has been previously studied.

Table 5. Variance of Pre-test

SUBJECT	X_2	$\bar{X}_2$	$X_2 - \bar{X}_2$	$(X_2 - \bar{X}_2)^2$
1	70	71,7	-1,7	2,89
2	70	71,7	-1,7	2,89
3	70	71,7	-1,7	2,89

4	65	71,7	-6,7	44,89
5	80	71,7	8,3	68,89
6	70	71,7	-1,7	2,89
7	60	71,7	-11,7	136,89
8	70	71,7	-1,7	2,89
9	70	71,7	-1,7	2,89
10	70	71,7	-1,7	2,89
11	75	71,7	3,3	10,89
12	80	71,7	8,3	68,89
13	80	71,7	8,3	68,89
14	65	71,7	-6,7	44,89
15	65	71,7	-6,7	44,89
16	75	71,7	3,3	10,89
17	70	71,7	-1,7	2,89
18	75	71,7	3,3	10,89
19	80	71,7	8,3	68,89
20	70	71,7	-1,7	2,89
21	75	71,7	3,3	10,89
Σ	**1505**			**616,69**

Based on the table of variance pre-test above, it is explained that the overall average score of students in the results of the pre-test made is 71.7 which shows that they are 'constant'. the authentic value is truly obtained when previously students were only presented with conventional material without involving games because study hours were dominated by distance learning activities due to the prevention of Covid-19. It is still said to be constant because it does not reach the KKM the value determined by the teacher is >75. In this study, the post-test result was expected to have the higher score than the pre-test result. In order to test whether there was a significant difference in achievement between these two test. The analysis t-observed was higher than t-critical, or 5.98>2.021, this study's null hypothesis was rejected, as demonstrated by the criteria and data computation. It indicated that students' English proficiency varied significantly between those who participated in the desert island activity and those who did not. The null hypothesis, which is a typical arithmetic theory that asserts that there is no statistical relationship or significance between two sets of observed data and measured phenomena, was the subject of this analysis, which was conducted by Haldar (2018).

The comprehensive data analysis revealed the following specific data. There were 442 students who took part in the test, of which 21 were in the experimental group and 21 were in the control group. The following is how the author determined the significance of treatment success: Students who received scores between 70 and 100 indicated that the treatment was successful, while those who received scores below 65 failed. The KKM Curriculum 2013 for junior high schools serves as the basis for this analysis's benchmark; it is considered to have passed when it receives a score of 70 out of 100.

The author discovered that the post-test achievement was superior to the post-test achievement. Six students received the highest post-test score of 100, or 28.57 percent; two students received 95, or 9.52 percent; three students received 90, or 14.29 percent; four students received 85, or 19.05 percent; four students received 80, or 19.05 percent; and two students received 75, or 9.52 percent, as the lowest score. While four students scored 80 (eighty), representing a percentage of 19.05 percent, four students scored 75 (seventy-five), representing a percentage of 42.86%, nine students scored 70 (seventy), representing 42.86%, three students scored 65 (sixty-five), representing 14.28%, and one student scored 60 (sixty), representing 4.76 percent as the lowest score on the pre-test. It is based on an analysis of the percentage formula, which states that we must divide the value by the total value and then multiply the result by 100 to get the percentage.

The mean score (X 1 = 89.05) and standard deviation (S12 = 93.5) of the post-test were also higher than those of the pre-test, where the mean score (X 2 = 71.7) and standard deviation (S22 = 75.25)

were lower. This indicated that the experimental group's post-test result was superior to the control group's. The appyling desert island activity to improve students' vocabulary mastery was effective, according to the findings of the research. The difference between this research and the current research is that the research method used by the researcher is quantitative and the subject is students, while the research by Mrs. Ensa is qualitative and focuses on the teacher as the subject. The criteria and the data computation proved that in this study the null hyphothesis was rejected because *t*-observed was higher than the *t*-critical or 5.98> 2.021. It meant that there was a significant difference in students' English achievement between the students who were taught vocabularies through desert island activity and those who were not. The result of the data analysis comprehensively showed the following accurate fact. There were fourty-two students taking part in the test, in which twenty-one students were in experimental group and twenty-one students were in control group. The writer determined the value of the success of treatment as follow. Students who obtained scores in the 65-100 indicated successful the treatment, otherwise those who get score under 65 failed.

After analysing the data, the writer found out that the achievement of the post-test was better than that of the post-test. In post-test the highest score was 100 (one hundred) gained by 6 (six) students or in percentage 28.57%, 2 (two) students obtained 95 (ninety-five) or 9.52%, 3 (three) students obtained 90 (ninety) or 14.29%, 4 (four) students obtained 85 (eighty-five) or 19.05%, and 4 (four) students obtained 80 (eighty) or 19.05%, 2 (two) students obtained 75 (seventy-five) or 9.52% as the lowest score. Whereas, the highest score at the pre-test was 80 (eighty) gained by 4 (four) students or in percentage 19.05%, 4 (four) obtained 75 (seventy-five) or 19.05%, 9 (nine) students

obtained 70 (seventy) or 42.86%, 3 (three) students obtained 65 (sixty-five) or 14.28%, 1 (one) student obtained 60 (sixty) or 4.76% as the lowest score.

Based on data above, the post-test had a higher score than the pre-test The Mean score ($\bar{X}_1$ = 89.05) and Standard Deviation (S_1^2 = 93.5) were the higher than pre-test in which the mean score ($\bar{X}_2$ = 71.7) and Standard Deviation (S_2^2 = 75.25) in pre-test. It meant that the result of post-test in experimental group was better than the control group. Based on the result of research, appyling desert island activity to improve students'vocabulary mastery was effective. Since the research question was already covered in chapter 1, Through both the pre-test and the post-test, the issue was resolved. The following was the hypothesis developed: Improve students' vocabulary through the desert island activity.

CONCLUSION

After conducting research, it can be concluded that the use of desert island activity is very effective in improving a student's English vocabulary skills, not only that, it also further supports that the selection of appropriate and educational games greatly affects the output of each learner, of course, by taking into account demographic factors and the background of each student in order to increasingly provide games that match their interests. Therefore, the importance of desert island activity in the learning process of students' English vocabulary, especially for the condition of students in the Indonesia with various learning styles, one of which is the Minahasa Regency, which is motivated by inadequate network access, can make desert island activity as a good reference to be recommended to teachers. English to be used in the teaching and learning process of English to students in a very interesting way.

REFERENCES

Allen, E. & Valette, R. (1997). *Classroom techniques: Foreign language and*

English as A second language. Waveland press.

Albiladi, W. S., Abdeen, F. H., & Lincoln, F. (2018). Learning English through movies: Adult English language learners' perceptions. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 8*(12), 1567-1574.

Bai, B., & Wang, J. (2023). The role of growth mindset, self-efficacy and intrinsic value in self-regulated learning and English language learning achievements. *Language teaching research, 27*(1), 207-228.

Crystal, D. (2018). *The language revolution*. John Wiley & Sons.

Farooq, M. S., Uzair-Ul-Hassan, M., & Wahid, S. (2020). Opinion of second language learners about writing difficulties in English language. *South Asian Studies, 27*(1).

Suoth, G., Maru, G., & Rorimpandey, R. (2021). The use of pictionary games in improving students vocabulary mastery in SMP Negeri 8 Satap Tondano. In *SoCul: International Journal of Research in Social Cultural Issues* 1(6).

Haldar, S. K. (2018). *Mineral Exploration (Second Edition).* Cambridge Publishing.

Ilyosovna, N. A. (2020). The importance of English language. *International Journal on Orange Technologies, 2*(1), 22-24.

Liando, N. (2015). Students' vs teachers' perspectives on best teacher characteristics in EFL classroom. *TEFLIN Journal, 21(2),* 118-136. http://dx.doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal .v2li2/118-136

Liando, N. V., Pajow, C., & Maru, M. G. (2021, July). Extensive Listening and Its Relation Towards Vocabulary Knowledge. In *5th Asian Education Symposium 2020 (AES 2020)* (pp. 348-353). Atlantis Press.

Maru, M. G., Mokal, J. M., Saroinsong, H. Y., Mogea, T., & Liando, N. (2022). Students' Perception Toward E-Learning Experience On Writing Skill During Covid-19 Pandemic. *Syntax Literate; Jurnal Ilmiah Indonesia*, 7(5), 5861-5884..

Rao, P. S. (2019). The role of English as a global language. *Research Journal of English, 4(*1), 65-79.

Rao, P. S. (2019). The importance of teaching language skills to the second or foreign language learners of english: A comprehensive study. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, *9*(4), 6-19.

Riordan, M. A. (2017). Emojis as tools for emotion work: Communicating affect in text messages. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *36*(5), 549-567.

Sembel, N., Pelenkahu, N., & Maru, G. (2021). The use of English subtitle in movie to improve students' movies vocabulary. In *SoCul: International Journal of Research in Social Cultural Issues* 1(6).

Roberts & Lado (1963). *Language and discrimination: A study of communication in multi-ethnic workplaces.* London: Longman.

White, C. (2006). Language learning strategies in independent language learning: An overview. In Hurd, S., & Lewis. T (Eds.), *Language learning strategies in independent settings*. 3-24. North York: Multilingual matters.

Zulfikar, T., Dahliana, S., & Sari, R. A. (2019). An Exploration of English Students' Attitude towards English Learning. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal, 2*(1), 1-12.