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#### Abstract

The aim of this research is to analyze the improvement of students' vocabulary by using team assisted individually (TAI) and cooperative integrated Reading and composition (CIRC) method. The researcher carried out at the eight grade of SMP N 1 Dolok Pardeamean. This research used the quantitative approach with an experimental design by using the one-group design by cluster sampling technique for choosing 30 students and every student would give the pre-test and post-test for data collection. The technique of collecting the data is by using the statistic application called SPSS 21.0 version. Based on the result of the hypothesis testing that the $T$-counted is greater than $T$-table (Tcounted $=9,543>$ Ttable $=1,699)$. This means that the null hypothesis $(H o)$ is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted it can be conclude that the TAI and CIRC method is effective for improving students' vocabulary, as evidenced by the rejection of the null hypothesis and acceptance of the alternative hypothesis based on statistical analysis. The conclusion of this research is that the used of the TAI and CIRC is effective because it involves collaborative reading, discussion, and writing activities that help learners engage with and internalize new words and concepts.
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## I. INTRODUCTION

Learning is very important for students because obvious. It is taught as foreign language in Indonesia. It becomes one of the compulsory subject at school. In learning English language, there are many problems that must be face, especially in learning vocabulary. Many students are very difficult to understand and memorize the vocabulary.

Actually, most of the students in Indonesia still have lack of vocabulary when the materials are difficult for students, teacher has to make them interest, live, and fun. Therefore, learning through the total physical response is a way to create enjoyable which helps students to learn a subject easily.

Vocabulary is not syllabus list of words that teacher prepare for their learners to memorize a learning by heart. Memorizing may be good and useful as a temporary technique for test but not for learning a foreign language. Languae students need to learn vocabulary of the target languge in another way. The memorize some words in nowadays from the other texts in English, many tricks make the students boring and they can not memorize and understand with better. English is an important language in communication because the using of English has rapidly increased. In the school elementary, English is a subject must be learned and understood. As a basic to learn of this subject, so the students must be have many vocabularies, so that can speak English and understand.

Actually, in learning of English, there are many ways to increase or improve the mastering vocabulary in the beginning by using story, listening the music, watching and listening television, and also sing a song or some songs with the function to improvr mastering of vocabulary. The researcher as the teacher training of teaching faculty in University of Simalungun concern on this problem, because of the less on the vocabulary mastery. Because language need vocabulary as in the Oxford Dictionary, 1938: language is a vocabulary and a way of using prevalent in one or more countries; language is a method of expression.

The researcher want to implement the other method in teaching and learning process in Indonesia. The method is by using TAI and CIRC game in implementation the vocabulary and improve students' ability in speakiing English. The way of students, will play the role of game beside of learning it, also in applicate it in teaching and learning process, also in the real situation/social. That is why, the researcher choose the title of the study "Improving the Students' Vocabulary by Using TAI and CIRC Method".

## II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

People have attempted to learn second languages from at least the time of the romans and perhaps before. In this period of more than two thousands years, there have been numerous different approaches to language learning, each with a different perspective on vocabulary. At times vocabulary has been given pride of place in teaching methodologies and at other times neglected. In order to help you better understand the current state of vocabulary studies as discussed in subsequent chapters, this chapter will first briefly review some of the historical influences that have shaped the field as we know it to day.

Records of second language learning extend back at least to the second century, where roman children studied greek. In early schools, students learned to read by first mastering the alphabeth, then progressing through sylables, words, and connected discourse some of the texts gave students lexical help by providing vocabulary that was either alphabetized or grouped under various topic areas. We can only assume that lexis was considered important at this point in time, as the art of rhetoric was highly prized, and would have been imposible without a highly developed vocabulary.

## III. THE METHOD OF RESEARCH

This research consist of the field research.The field reserach is to applying the cooperative Learning in school and make the test for the result of the data. This research is conducted by using experimental design. In conducting the experimental research, the researcher dividing two steps, First, pre test where the rseacher teaches about Vocabulary with the give a text way and in the last researcher given a test to found out the result of the step. And the Second, Post test where the researcher teaches vocabulary with gives a text and using TAI and CIRC techniques, and in the last researcher givedn a test to get the post test result. From the both of step, the researcher analysis the result of the test, and know what is the TAI and CIRC gives a good effect or not.

## IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH

## Research Result

## The Description of Data

The writer analysis the data using the previously selected formula. To collect data to be analysis, writer conducted a pre-test and pos-test. The results are arranged in colum. In the research, writer gave treatment using Youtube. During meeting, students are given a detailed explanation of the method, with the hope that the result of the pos-test give an overview of the result by using Youtube as an English Language Medium.

## The Data And Data Analysis of Research

After conducting the research, the writer obtained two kinds of data; the score of pre-test and the score of post-test. Pre-test was given before the treatment and post-test was given after the treatment.

## Frecuency

In this table we can see how many students reach the same score.
Table 1. Frequency of Pre-test
Pre-test Experimental

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Perce |  |
| Valid | 30 | 3 | 9,1 | 9,1 |
|  | 40 | 13 | 39,4 | 39,4 |
|  | 50 | 7 | 21,2 | 21,2 |
|  | 60 | 10 | 30,3 | 30,3 |
|  | Total | 33 | 100,0 | 100,0 |

As can be seen in the table above, there are 3 students getting a score of 30 with a presentation of $9.1 \%, 13$ students getting a score of 40 with a presentation of $39.4 \%, 7$ students getting a score of 50 with a presentation of $21.2 \%, 10$ students getting a score of 60 with a presentation of $30.3 \%$,

## Statistic Table

In this table we can see a lot of data. We can measure and check the students' writing skill in procedure text through Youtube as an English Language Teaching Medium

Table 2. Statistics of Pre-Test

| Statistics |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pre-test Experimental |  |  |
| $\mathbf{N}$ | Valid | 33 |
|  | Missing | 0 |
| Mean | 47,27 |  |
| Median | 50,00 |  |
| Std. Deviation | 10,085 |  |
| Variance | 101,705 |  |
| Range | 30 |  |
| Minimum | 30 |  |
| Maximum | 60 |  |
| Sum | 1560 |  |

Based on Table 2, which shows the statistics of the pre-test, the score above the mean of the total pre-test score is 47,27 , the median of the pre-test is 50.00 , the standard deviation is 10.085 , the variance is 101,705 , the range is 30 , the minimum score is 30 , the maximum score is 60 , and the sum is 1560 .

## Test of Normality

Test of normality aims to determine whether the distribution of responses has a normal distribution or not. Test of normality was using Kolmogorov Smirnov Formula.

Table 3. One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

|  |  | Pre-test Experimental |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| N |  | 33 |
| Normal Parameters ${ }^{\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}}$ | Mean | 47,27 |
|  | Std. Deviation | 10,085 |
| Most Extreme Differences | Absolute | , 249 |
|  | Positive | , 249 |
|  | Negative | ,- 200 |
| Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z |  | 1,433 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) |  | , 033 |

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.

The table above is stating that a normality test was conducted on the experimental class and the Asymp.Sig.(2-tailed) value was found to be 0,033 . This value is compared to the significance level of 0.05 and it is determined that the significance value $=0,033>0,05$. Therefore, it is concluded that the average is normally distributed or homogeneous. Essentially, the test found no evidence to suggest that the data deviates significantly from a normal distribution.

## The Data of Post-Test in Experimental Class

In this post-test, after applying the treatments. The reseacher gave the post-test to the students to measure the students' writing skill. The students' score are shown in the table below.

## The Data Analysis of Post-test in Expermental Class <br> Frequency

In this table we can see how many students reach the same score.
Table 4. Post-test Experimental

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | 50 | 3 | 9,1 | 9,1 | 9,1 |
|  | 60 | 12 | 36,4 | 36,4 | 45,5 |
|  | 70 | 7 | 21,2 | 21,2 | 66,7 |
|  | 80 | 11 | 33,3 | 33,3 | 100,0 |
|  | Total | 33 | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

The table shows that there are 1 students who got the score of 70 with a percentage of $3.4 \%, 4$ students who got the score of 75 which is about $13.8 \%, 7$ students who got the score of 80 which is approximately $24.1 \%, 6$ students who got the score of 85 with a percentage of about $20.7 \%, 1$ student who got score 86 with percentage $3.4 \%, 7$ students got the score 90 with percentage $24.1 \%, 1$ student got the score 92 which is about $3.4 \%$, and 2 students got the score 95 with percentage $6.9 \%$.

## Statistic Table

In this table we can see a lot of data. We can measure and check the students' writing skill in procedure text through Youtube as an English Language Teaching Medium.

Table 5. Post-test Experimental

| Statistics |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  | Valid | 33 |
|  | Missing | 0 |
| Mean | 67,88 |  |
| Median | 70,00 |  |
| Std. Deviation | 10,234 |  |
| Variance | 104,735 |  |
| Range | 30 |  |
| Minimum | 50 |  |
| Maximum | 80 |  |
| Sum | 2240 |  |

Based on Table 5 which shows the statistics of the post-test, the score above the mean of the total pre-test score is 67.88 , the median of the pre-test is 70.00 , the standard deviation is 10.234 , the variance is 104.735 , the range is 30 , the minimum score is 50 , the maximum score is 80 , and the sum is 2240 .

## The Test Normality

Test of normality aims to determine whether the distribution of responses has a normal distribution or not. Test of normality was using Kolmogorov Smirnov Formul.

Table 6. One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

|  |  | Post-test Experimental |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N |  | 33 |
| Normal Parameters ${ }^{\text {a,b }}$ | Mean | 67,88 |
|  | Std. Deviation | 10,234 |
| Most Extreme Differences | Absolute | ,234 |
|  | Positive | ,234 |
|  | Negative | -,215 |
| Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z |  | 1,343 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) |  | ,054 |
| a. Test distribution is Normal. |  |  |
| b. Calculated from data. |  |  |

The table above is stating that normality test was conducted on the experimental class and the Asymp.Sig.(2-tailed) value was found to be 0,054 . This value is compared to the significance level of 0.05 and it is determined that the significance value $=0,054>0,05$. Therefore, it is concluded that the average is normally distributed or homogeneous. Essentially, the test found no evidence to suggest that the data deviates significantly from a normal distribution.

## Test of Homogeniety

If the significance is less than 0.05 (Sig. (2-tailed) <0.05), the variants differ significantly (not homogeneous). If the significance is greater than 0.05 (Sig. ( 2 -tailed) $>0.05$ ), the variants are significantly similar (homogeneous).

Table. 7 Test of Homogeneity of Variances
Post-test Experimental


Based on the output test table of homogeneity of variances above, it is known that the significance value (Sig.) of the X OTKP 1 class result variable is 0.923 . Because the significance value is $0.923>0.05$, as the basis for decision-making in the homogeneity test above, it can be concluded that the variance of the data results from the pretest and post-test is the same or homogeneous.

Table 8. Post-test Experimental

|  | Sum of Squares |  |  |  |  |  | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Between Groups | 7006,061 | 1 | 7006,061 | 67,875 | , 000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Within Groups | 6606,061 | 64 | 103,220 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 13612,121 | 65 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The pre-test and post-test data sources obtained consisting of 66 cases with one variable. Using this data source, we can obtain F-table results by subtracting the number of variables (1) from the number of cases (66), resulting in 65 . The $\mathrm{F}_{\text {table }}$ value for this degree of freedom is 3,99 . The $\mathrm{F}_{\text {counted }}$ value is 67,875 . Therefore, we can conclude that $\mathrm{F}_{\text {counted }}=67,875>\mathrm{F}_{\text {table }}=3,99$, indicating that the use of YouTube media is effective in improving students' writing ability in procedure text.

## Test of Hypothesis

To analyze the data on learning outcomes, statistical analysis is performed using the T-Test formula in pairs (Paired Sample T-Test). The results of the calculation of the paired $t$-test hypothesis test (paired sample t-test) for the experimental class using SPSS 21 are as follows:

Table 9. Paired Samples Statistics

|  |  | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pair 1 | Posttest | 67,88 | 33 | 10,234 | 1,782 |
|  | Pretest | 47,27 | 33 | 10,085 | 1,756 |

The paired sample statistic given is the mean difference between the post-test and pre-test scores. The post-test has a mean score of 67,88 out of 33 participants, with a standard deviation of 10,234 and a standard error mean of 1,782 . The pre-test, on the other hand, has a mean score of 47,27 out of the same 33 participants, with a standard deviation of 10,082 and a standard error mean of 1,756 . These statistics suggest that there is a significant difference between the post-test and pre-test scores of the students.

Table 10. Paired Samples Correlations

|  |  | $\mathbf{N}$ | Correlation | Sig. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pair 1 | Posttest \& Pretest | 33 | , 972 | , 000 |

The paired sample correlation between the post-test and pre-test measures for pair 1 is very strong with a value of 0,972 . This means that the two measures are highly related and increase or decrease consistently together. Additionally, the significance level of 0,000 indicates that the likelihood of getting such a strong correlation by chance is extremely unlikely, providing further support for the strong relationship between the post-test and pre-test measures. The sample size for this pair is 33 .

Table 11
Paired Samples Test

|  |  | Paired Differences |  |  |  |  | T | df | Sig. (2tailed) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean | Std. <br> Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95\% Confidence Interval of the Difference |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Lower |  |  | Upper |  |  |  |
| Pair 1 | Posttest - Pretest |  | 20,606 | 2,423 | ,422 | 19,747 | 21,465 | 48,853 | 32 | ,000 |

The paired sample $t$-test was conducted to test the hypothesis about students' writing skill using the YouTube as an English Language Medium. Based on the results obtained, the T-counted is 48,853.

The $\mathrm{T}_{\text {table }}$, obtained from the statistical table by looking at the degrees of freedom (df) which is 32 , is 1,693. Since T-counted is greater than T-table ( $\mathrm{T}_{\text {counted }}=48,853>\mathrm{T}_{\text {table }}=1,693$ ), it means that the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in students' writin skill in procedure text using the YouTube as an English language medium

## Research Discussion

The data analysis above presents the findings of a study of using YouTube as a media of teaching English, especially in writing abilty. The study was conducted with a population of 235 students, and a sample of 33 students was selected for the study. The researcher selected one class as the experimental group, and pre-test and post-test assessments were conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of youtube in improving English writing ability. In the pre-test assessment, the students' scores were distributed across different ranges. In the pre-test assessment, the students' scores were distributed across different ranges. Three students scored 30 , representing $9.1 \%$ of the total, while 13 students scored 40 , accounting for $39.4 \%$. Additionally, seven students scored $50(21.2 \%$ of the total), and ten students scored $60(30.3 \%)$. The overall mean score for the pre-test was 47.27 , with a median score of 50 . The standard deviation was 10.085 , the variance was 101,705 , and the range of scores was 30 . The minimum score obtained was 30 , while the maximum score was 60 . The sum of all the scores amounted to 1560 . The statistical analysis indicated that the pre-test scores followed a normal distribution, as the Asymp.Sig. (2-tailed) value (0.033) was compared to the significance level of 0.05 and found to be greater, supporting the conclusion of normality.

Moving on to the post-test results, the distribution of scores varied once again. One student achieved a score of 70 , representing $3.4 \%$ of the total, while four students scored $75(13.8 \%)$. Additionally, seven students obtained a score of 80 ( $24.1 \%$ ), and six students scored 85 ( $20.7 \%$ ). One student achieved a score of $86(3.4 \%)$, while seven students scored $90(24.1 \%)$. Furthermore, one student received a score of $92(3.4 \%)$, and two students scored $95(6.9 \%)$. The post-test statistics revealed a mean score of 67.88 , a median score of 70 , a standard deviation of 10.234 , a variance of 104,735 , and a range of 30 . The minimum score observed was 50 , while the maximum score was 80 . The sum of all the post-test scores equaled 2240 . A normality test conducted on the experimental class yielded an Asymp.Sig. (2-tailed) value of 0.054 .

Comparing this value to the significance level of 0.05 , it was determined that the significance value ( 0.054 ) was greater than 0.05 , leading to the conclusion that the average scores were normally distributed. The F-table value for this degree of freedom is 3.99 . The F-counted value is 67.875 . Therefore, we can conclude that F -counted $=67.875>$ F-table $=3.99$, indicating that the use of YouTube media is effective in improving students' writing ability in procedure text. The paired sample t-test was conducted to test the hypothesis about students' writing skill using YouTube as an English Language Medium. Based on the results obtained, the T-counted is 48.853. The T-table obtained from the statistical table by looking at the degrees of freedom (df), which is 32 , is 1.693 . Since T-counted is greater than T-table ( T -counted $=48.853>$ T-table $=1.693$ ), it means that the null hypothesis $(\mathrm{Ho})$ is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis $(\mathrm{Ha})$ is accepted. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in students' writing skill in procedure text using YouTube as an English language medium.

The utilization of YouTube as an English language medium has proved to be an effective approach in developing students' skill in writing procedure texts. A research study was carried out for a period of one month, during which students were requested to compose procedural texts both before and after viewing YouTube videos as part of their classroom instruction. Following this, their writing was evaluated using a rubric that assessed clarity, coherence, and accuracy. The outcomes demonstrate that the difference in writing skill between prior to and following the use of YouTube is notable and statistically significant, ruling out the possibility of mere chance. The data presents a significant enhancement in students' writing skills after watching instructional videos on YouTube. However, the sample size used in the research was small and other factors influencing the students' writing skills were not taken into account. It can be concluded that incorporating YouTube as part of the classroom instruction can augment students' writing abilities in regards to procedure texts. This method can be utilized by teachers by selecting relevant videos that model clear procedural writing and providing opportunities for students to write their own in response to the videos.

## V. CONCLUSION

Based on the result of the hypothesis testing that the T-counted is greater than T-table (Tcounted $=9,543>$ Ttable $=1,699)$. This means that the null hypothesis $(\mathrm{Ho})$ is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted it can be conclude that the TAI and CIRC method is effective for improving students' vocabulary, as evidenced by the rejection of the null hypothesis and acceptance of the alternative hypothesis based on statistical analysis. Teachers can enhance the effectiveness of this method by selecting appropriate texts, incorporating pre-reading activities, and promoting the use of word-learning strategies. By utilizing collaboration, engagement, and targeted support, teachers can help students develop valuable language skills.
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