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Abstract
Vocabulary is a core component of languages and the basic for how the learners speak, listen, read and write. Vocabulary mastery is the ability to use the words in conducting the communication and understandable the meaning of the words or phrases in English. 36 students of class XI-MIPA1 of SMA Negeri 3 Gunungsitoli faced problem in learning vocabulary particularly to obtain and absorb the meaning of new words. To solve the problem, the researcher implemented Guessing Game which the main procedure was asked the students to guess the new word from the explanation of the word itself. To achieve the purpose, the researcher conducted CAR Method and it was applied into two cycles. Each cycle consisted of some phases such as planning, action, observation, and reflection. The instruments used by the researcher to collect the data were observation sheet, field notes and evaluation sheet. In Cycle I, it showed that some of the students were still unable to comprehend the text. However, the students’ ability in mastering vocabulary was increased in Cycle II where the average of the students’ value was 90.33. Therefore, based on the average for the students’ value in the two cycles, it can be categorized in very good level. Hence, Guessing Game can increase the students’ ability in mastering vocabulary.
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INTRODUCTION
In learning English there are four basic skills that should be mastered by students. They are listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Those skills are related and supporting each other. The students are expected to master those skills by learning them interactively. To master all the skills, the students should master some integrated competencies such us vocabulary because the vocabulary is the key or core of all the skills. Vocabulary really helps the students to share thoughts and feelings with others more effectively. However, based on the researcher’s observation in XI-MIPA1 of SMA Negeri
3 Gunungsitoli, the researcher found students’ problem; most of the students are less in mastering vocabulary in writing skill therefore they cannot write the text based on the topic clearly, accurately, and detail. The problem appears because of many factors such as: First, the students’ participation is fewer in learning process. Second, the teaching-learning activities not fun for the students. Third, the students’ vocabularies are limited. Fourth, it is difficult for the students to learn and get meaning of new words.

Related with the problems above, Hanson and Jennifer (2011:5) argue that vocabulary refers to words we use to communicate in oral and print language. Vocabulary is all the words that a person knows or uses; all the words in a language; list of words with their meanings. Supporting this concept, Diamond & Gutlohn in Ferreira (2007:11) suggest that vocabulary is the knowledge of words and their meanings. Or in other words, without establishing a strong vocabulary base first, comprehension and use of a language will not be achieved. In addition, the students should be able to recognize words, and know their meaning as well.

According to Hanson et.al (2011), Vocabulary is a challenge for learners, partly because of the size of the task, and partly because of the variety of vocabulary types to be learned, including single words, phrases, collocations, and strategic vocabulary, as well as grammatical patterning, idioms, and fixed expressions. Additionally, Bishop, Yoop and Yoop (2009:5) add that vocabulary is a good predictor of academic success. This positive input is also supported by Richards and Renandya (2002:255) who suggest that vocabulary is a core component of language proficiency and provides much of the basic for how well learners speak, listen, read, and write”. On the other hand, mastering vocabulary also has a significant for the students to be mastered in four skills (Wren, 1990) As stated by William (1994:14), “Developing the students’ language skills in listening, speaking, reading and writing the learners must master vocabulary”. The knowledge of vocabulary is very significant for understanding the language itself. Mastering vocabulary well, the four skills in that language will be understood.

Concerning with the problem above, the researcher assumed that the new style of teaching is essential. It was a sure also the teaching vocabulary with usual method only makes the students got bored and then lost motivation to learning. Hence, the researcher applied the Guessing Game as the solution for the problem. According to Dunlap (2013:4), “Guessing Game is a game in which the object is to guess some kind of information, such as word, a phrase, a title, or the location of an object”. Guessing Game is useful to develop the students’ ability in mastering vocabulary. Interactive Technologies in Language Teaching (ITILT) (2011:32) states “Guessing Game in teaching vocabulary was effective and brings a good effect on vocabulary achievement of the students”. Furthermore, Dunlap (2013:4) says “Guessing Game makes the students to be more memorizing the words which have introduced. Guessing Game will improve the students’ motivation in learning English and will improve their vocabularies”.

According to Elliott et al (2013:86), there are some steps to apply Guessing Game as follows.
1. Teacher provides a box that contain of some words that relate to the material.
2. Teacher makes several groups of the students.
3. The leader of each group takes the word and describes it to his or her group.
4. Let the members of group guess the words.

In addition, Wilskfuyzi (2004:17) states there are some steps to apply Guessing Game, as follows.

1. Four students are asked to come to the front of the classroom. One of them is selected to draw a slip from a box which contains words related to many different categories.
2. The student who has drawn a slip from a box which contains words related to many different categories.
3. The other members of the class try to guess the word on the slip which has been drawn from the box. They take turns asking first about the category, “is it word for food? For furniture? For transportation?” the four students who have seen the slip take turns answering “No, it isn’t” until the right category has been guessed.
4. After the correct category has been discovered (transportation, for instance) members of the class continue to ask Yes/No question: “Is the word bus? Is it taxi? Is it train?”
5. The one whose guess is correct may draw a slip from the box the next time the game is played.

Based on the theories above, the researcher modifies these procedures in teaching vocabulary in the classroom, as follows.

1. The researcher distributes the text to the students.
2. The researcher asks the students to read the text carefully.
3. The researcher asks the students to identify the new words from the text in a piece of paper and collect to the researcher.
4. The researcher chooses 10 words from the students’ papers that contains of words related to many different categories especially about things, and write each words on the cards.
5. The researcher makes several groups of students.
6. To explore the students’ mind, the researcher asks the students to think all of things around them to build their prior knowledge.
7. The researcher asks the leader of each group to take a card that contains one word from the box.
8. The leader of group tries to describe the word from the card by giving the definition or the characteristics of the word to the member of his or her group.
9. The members of groups try to guess the word by using Yes/No question form. To makes it easy, they ask first about the category.
10. The leader of group answering “No, it isn’t” if the category is false or “yes, it is” if the category is true, until the true category guessed.
11. After the correct category has been guessed, member of group continue to ask all of things about the category, until the right answer guessed.
12. The researcher repeats the procedure until the students guess all of the words in the box.
13. The researcher shows 10 new words that have guessed by them previously with each meaning.
14. The researcher asks them to write the words and its meaning on their book.
15. The researcher shows the words randomly and the students says the meaning (close book) until they mastering meaning of 10 new words.
16. The students practice to make a simple sentence of 10 new words.

METHOD
To conduct this research, the researcher used Classroom Action Research (CAR) as research method. This research included four stages of activities; they are panning, implementing, observing, and reflecting of the action (Kemmis & Taggart in Koshy, 2005) The subject of this research was 36 students of class XI-MIPA1 of SMA Negeri 3 Gunungsitoli. Classroom Action Research was begins with interaction about classroom experience, issues, or challenges that require the students be active in the classroom. In this research, researcher applied Shared Reading to improve the students' ability in reading comprehension. The data was gained from the observation sheets and primarily the students’ worksheets (multiple choice test). Furthermore, the researcher used a formula to decide the students’ value as suggested by Djiwandono (2008:46) below:

\[
\text{Value} = \frac{\text{Obtained score}}{\text{Maximum score}} \times 100
\]

By using the formula, the researcher expected the students to be aware in choosing the right answer. So, the researcher evaluated the students’ evaluation sheet by scoring the right answer 1 (one) in each question and the wrong answer 0 (zero) too. As the conclusion, The percentages of the students’ achievement level in reading comprehension considered the Minimum Competence Criterion which decided in XI-MIPA1 of SMA Negeri 3 Gunungsitoli for reading comprehension skill.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION
Cycle I
1. Meeting
At the first meeting, the researcher aligned together with the teacher collaborator entered the classroom. The English teacher-collaborator gave the chance to the researcher to start the activities based on the procedures in lesson plan. The researcher greeted the students and all of students gave responses. After that, the researcher introduced herself to the students and asked their condition. Then, the researcher checked the students’ attendance list. Before the researcher began explaining the material to the students, the researcher motivated the students to learn English so they were spirit to study. Then, the researcher introduced the material about descriptive text to the students. Before the researcher continued explaining the material to the students, the researcher asked the students’ prior knowledge related to the topic. After that, the students gave their opinion. Furthermore, the researcher explained
the definition of descriptive text, generic structures and language features to the students. At the midst of teaching-learning activities, the researcher drill the students to implemented the procedures of Guessing Game using the text that already distributed by the researcher before. Most of the students still not enthusiast following the teaching-learning process. In the observation, the researcher obtained the data about the students. During the teaching-learning process, the researcher and the observer had made an observation about the students’ activities in the classroom. Based on the researcher’s and the observer’s observation, the researcher and the observer found that most of the students were fewer enthusiasts in following the lesson. Based on the result of been done and did not do the activities during implementing the action in the classroom. The students who had done the activities were 16 students (53.3%) and the students who did not do the activities were 14 students (46.6%). Furthermore, in the first meeting of Cycle I the researcher’s activities had done were 25 activities of 32 activities (78%) and there were 7 activities had not done of 32 activities (21.8%).

Hence, in the first meeting, the researcher found some weaknesses happened in the classroom, as follows.
1. Some of the students could not pronounce vocabularies.
2. Most of the students could not identify the generic structure and language features of descriptive text.
3. Most of the students did not master descriptive text vocabularies.
4. Most of the students were difficult to get meaning of new words.
5. Most of the students could not do the steps of procedure of Guessing Game.

However, there were some students’ strengths found by the researcher during the teaching-learning process, as follows.
1. Most of the students could pronounce vocabularies correctly.
2. Some of the students could identify the generic structure and language features of descriptive text.
3. Some of the students had mastered descriptive text vocabularies.
4. Some of the students could get the meaning of new words.
5. Some of the students could do the procedure of Guessing Game.

Since there were some weaknesses during the lesson in the first meeting, the researcher made a consideration to improve for the next meeting as follows.
1. The researcher suggested the students to find out how to pronounce the words in dictionary.
2. The researcher would explain more the generic structures and language features of descriptive text.
3. The researcher would teach the students about descriptive text vocabularies.
4. The researcher suggested the students to learn the new words from the dictionary.
5. The researcher suggested the students to learn more how to followed the procedure of Guessing Game.
2. Meeting

In the second meeting, the researcher conducted the research in the classroom and continued the first meeting activities. The researcher entered the classroom together with English teacher-collaborator and greeted the students. Then, the researcher checked the students’ attendance list. Before continuing for the next activities, the researcher reviewed and reminded the last material by giving some questions to the students orally to seek the students’ ability in understanding the previous meeting. Then, the students responded the researcher’s questions. The next, the researcher did were re-explained the material to the students. The next activities that the researcher did were continued in the next steps of Guessing Game that were; the researcher showed all unknown words and the meaning of words to the students and asked them to read it aloud. After that, the researcher showed one by one unknown word to the students and the students said the meaning of the word. The researcher did the activities repeatedly until the students know the meaning of words. Furthermore, the researcher gave the evaluation sheet to the students. The researcher asked the students to match the words with the correct answer based on their comprehension of the text. After the students finished their task, the researcher asked the students to collect their tasks to the researcher. At last, the researcher gave a conclusion about the material and closed the meeting by greeting the students.

The observation was done by English teacher-collaborator during the teaching-learning process. The English teacher-collaborator observed all the researcher’s and students’ activities in the classroom. The data that the English teacher-collaborator had gotten about the students’ activities had been done and undone. The students who had done activities were 20 (66.6 %) students. The students who did not do activities there were 10 (33.3 %) students. Based on the result of the observation, in the second meeting of Cycle I the researcher’s activities had done were 22 activities of 27 activities (81.4%) and there were 4 activities had not done of 27 activities (15%).

In the second meeting, the students could achieve the requirement of the research. This situation happened because there were some weaknesses found by the researcher in the classroom, as follows.

1. Some of the students could not pronounce vocabularies.
2. Most of the students did not master descriptive text vocabularies.
3. Most of the students were difficult to get meaning of new words.
4. Most of the students could not do the steps of procedure of Guessing Game.

However, there were some students’ strengths found by the researcher during the teaching-learning process, as follows.

1. Most of the students could pronounce vocabularies correctly.
2. Some of the students had mastered descriptive text vocabularies.
3. Some of the students could get the meaning of new words.
4. Some of the students could do the procedure of Guessing Game.
Based on the explanation above, the researcher concluded that the students’ ability in mastering vocabulary by using Guessing Game was still unable to increase the students’ ability in the cycle I. It was indicated by looking at the Minimum Competence Criterion (MCC) of the English subject at the eighth grade which was 70 could not be achieved by the students. Therefore, the researcher decided to continue to the next cycle by doing some improvements, it could be seen on the next page:

1. The researcher suggested the students to find detail how to pronounce the words in dictionary.
2. The researcher taught the students about descriptive text vocabularies.
3. The researcher suggested the students to learn the new words from the dictionary.
4. The researcher suggested the students to learn and practice more how to follow the procedure of Guessing Game.

**Cycle II**

1. **Meeting**

At the first meeting of this second cycle, the researcher along with the teacher collaborator entered the classroom. As usual, the English teacher-collaborator gave the chance to the researcher to start the activities based on the procedures in lesson plan. The researcher greeted the students and all of students gave responses. After that, the researcher checked the students’ attendance list. Before the researcher continued explaining the material to the students, the researcher motivated the students to learn English so they were spirit to study. Then, the researcher continued to explain the material about descriptive text to the students. Before the researcher continued explaining the material to the students, the researcher asked the students’ prior knowledge related to the topic. After that, the students gave their opinion as they know. Furthermore, the researcher gives compliment about the students’ opinion to make them aware about the material. At the midst of teaching-learning activities, the researcher drill the students to implemented the procedure of Guessing Game using the text that already distributed by the researcher before. Firstly, the researcher asked the students to make several group. And then, the researcher asked the students to read the text and classified new words from the text. After that, the researcher chooses 10 words that has related with the descriptive vocabulary from the students’ unknown words and wrote the words on the cards. Then, the researcher begun to drill the students to implement the procedure of Guessing Game by asked each of the group’s leader to describe and explain the unknown word to their member until they could guessed what the word. The researcher and the students repeated the activities until the 10 words could be guess by the students. Next, the researcher gave the opportunities to the students to ask some their difficulties in understanding the teaching material. In the post teaching-learning activities, the researcher concluded the teaching material. Then the researcher ended the meeting by greeting the students.

Based on the result of the observation, the researcher obtained the data about the students who had been done and did not do the activities during implementing the action in the classroom. The students who had done the activities were 26 students (86.6%) and the students who did not do the activities were 4 students (13.3%). Furthermore, in the first meeting of Cycle II the researcher’s
activities had done were 29 activities of 31 activities (93.5%) and there were 2 activities had not done of 26 activities (6.4%).

In the first meeting, the students could not get the requirement of this research purpose. This situation happened because there were some weaknesses found by the researcher in the classroom, as follows.
1. Some of the students could not pronounce vocabularies.
2. Some of the students did not master descriptive text vocabularies.
3. Some of the students were difficult to get meaning of new words.

However, there were some students’ strengths found by the researcher during the teaching-learning process, as follows.
1. Most of the students could pronounce vocabularies correctly.
2. Most of the students had mastered descriptive text vocabularies.
3. Most of the students could get the meaning of new words.

Since there were some weaknesses during the lesson in the first meeting, the researcher made a consideration to improve for the next meeting. There were:
1. The researcher suggested the students to find detail how to pronounce the words in dictionary.
2. The researcher taught the students about descriptive text vocabularies.
3. The researcher suggested the students to learn the new words from the dictionary.

2. Meeting

In the second meeting, the researcher conducted the research in the classroom and continued the first meeting activities. The researcher entered the classroom together with English teacher-collaborator and greeted the students. Then, the researcher checked the students’ attendance list. Before continuing for the next activities, the researcher reviewed and reminded the last material by giving some questions to the students orally to seek the students’ ability in understanding the previous meeting. Then, the students responded the researcher’s questions. The next activities that the researcher did were continued in the next steps of Guessing Game that were; the researcher showed all unknown words and the meaning of words to the students and asked them to read it aloud. After that, the researcher showed one by one unknown word to the students and the students said the meaning of the word. The researcher did the activities repeatedly until the students know the meaning of words. Furthermore, the researcher gave the evaluation sheet to the students. The researcher asked the students to match the words with the correct answer based on their comprehension of the text. After the students finished their task, the researcher asked the students to collect their tasks to the researcher. During the teaching and learning process, the researcher and the teacher-collaborator had made the observation about the students’ activities in following the teaching and learning process. The teacher-collaborator also had made the observation about the researcher’s activities during the teaching process. The researcher found that there was no more weakness of the students in teaching and learning process. Based on the English teacher-collaborator’s observation, there were 28 students (93.3%) done all activities.
From the explanation above, the result as follows: The students’ ability in mastering vocabulary in Cycle I showed that there were 2 students (7%) who got the value classified in “Very Good” level. There were 2 students (7%) who got the value classified in “Good” level. There were 6 students (30%) who got the value classified in “Enough” level. There were 16 students (53%) who got the value classified in “Less” level, and there were 4 students (13%) who got the value classified in “Fail” level. The students’ high value in the second meeting of Cycle I was 90 and the lowest value was 20. Then, the average of the students’ value was 52.33. Moreover, in Cycle II showed that there were 22 students (73%) who got the value classified in “Very Good” level. There were 8 students (27%) who got the value classified in “Good” level. There was not student (0%) who got the value classified in “Enough” “Less” and “Fail” level. The students’ high value in the second meeting of Cycle II was 100 and the lowest value was 80. Then, the average of the students’ value was 90.33. Thus, the students’ ability in mastering vocabulary for all cycles can be described in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Second meeting</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>4 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>16 53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enough</td>
<td>6 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>2 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>2 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>8 27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>22 73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the data analysis and the formulation of the problem and purposes the researcher concludes that:

In Cycle I, the result of observation every meeting of each cycles showed that in the first meeting in Cycle I there were 53.3% activities that had been done and there were 86.6% activities that had been done in the second meeting. Moreover the students’ value in Cycle I, the higher value was 90 and the lowest score was 20 and the average of the students’ value was 52.33, there were about 70% students did not pass on MCC (70). In Cycle II showed that, the students’ achievement in the first meeting showed there were 86.6% activities that the students done and in the second meeting there were 100% activities that the students done. Furthermore, the highest value in Cycle II was 100 and the lowest value was 80 while the average was 90.33. In Cycle II all the students had passed of MCC (70).

It can be concluded that the students’ problems were solved Guessing Game and can increase the students’ mastering vocabulary at class XI-MIPA1 of SMA Negeri 3 Gunungsitoli in 2021/2022. So, the students could be successful in teaching-learning process especially in learning vocabulary.
REFERENCES
Bishop, Yoop and Yoop (2009) Vocabulary Instruction for Academic Success, Shell Education, U.S.A.
Dunlap, Delia (2013) Games and Icebreakers; For the ESL Classroom, English Language Fellow; U.S
Department of State Nouakchott, Mauritania.
Elliott et al (2013) Teaching Students Who Are Gifted And Talented, Newfoundland and Labrador
Department of Education.
Hanson, Susan and Jennifer (2011) Teaching Vocabulary Explicitly, U.S Department of Education
Science (IES), U.S.A.
Richards and Renandya (2002) Methodology in Language Teaching; an Anthology of Current Practice,
Cambridge University Press.
Wilskfuyzi, C. Peter (2004) Active Learning Methodologies, PDST Professional Development
Service for Teacher; Active learning Methodologies, U.S.