

# IMPROVING STUDENTS' VOCABULARY MASTERY THROUGH STUDENT TEAM ACHIEVEMENT DIVISION (STAD) METHOD

Elsa Dyaryke Chelcea<sup>1</sup>,Yeni Mardiyana Devanti<sup>2</sup>,Widya Oktarini<sup>3</sup>

English Education Program

Muhammadiyah University of Jember

Email: [Elsachelcea865@gmail.com](mailto:Elsachelcea865@gmail.com)

## ABSTRACT

This research aimed to improve students' vocabulary mastery through Student Team Achievement Division (STAD) method at SMPN 4 Tanggul of the eighth grade students' who are through STAD. The design of the research was classroom action research. The eighth grade students' of SMPN 4 Tanggul in the 2018 / 2019 academic year. The design of this research is classroom action research. The research subject is VIII E class consisting of 30 students'. In this research, the problem is "How can the implementation of STAD improve students' vocabulary mastery of eighth grade at SMPN 4 Tanggul?. How can the implementation of STAD improve students' active participation of eighth grade at SMPN 4 Tanggul?." The data are collected using the test, the instrument used is test items. In order to analyze the data students' vocabulary score, percentage formula is used. The researcher applied the Milton theory to giving requires feedback and re-testing, learning with groups make students enjoy to increase students' interest in learning together with their groups. The researcher followed Palmer's steps for implementing STAD, which students expected had an increase in the students' vocabulary mastery. Those caused the result of cycle two achieved the criteria of success. Student Team Achievement Division improve students' vocabulary mastery in two cycle from the percentage of students' scored  $\geq 65$  (E = 70%) in Cycle 1 to (E = 71%) in Cycle 2. It means that, It can be concluded that Student Team Achievement Division is able to improve the students' vocabulary mastery.

**Keywords :** STAD Method, Vocabulary Mastery

## **Introduction**

Underscoring the importance of vocabulary acquisition, Schmitt (2000, p. 55) emphasizes that “lexical knowledge is central to communicative competence and to the acquisition of a second language. Nation (2001, p. 232) summarises that a well balanced vocabulary part of a language learning course makes use of both ways of learning vocabulary. How the results of the same learning environment and conditions provides different learning results with different learners, is a question of learner characteristics.

Thornbury (2007, p. 23) says that “learning is remembering” and by knowing how the mind works when learning vocabulary, the teacher is able to provide his students opportunities to boost the vocabulary learning process. Milton’s (2009, p. 250) words: “A combination of good classroom practice and well-directed effort outside class can begin to explain how learners acquire very large vocabularies of thousands of words, so they can achieve functional fluency”. Based on the observation, there is one class at SMPN 4 Tanggul, that students have difficulties in vocabulary mastery it can be seen from the vocabulary score. The average score is 60 and the target score from the researcher is 65.

The researcher giving the test in preliminary study because of the interview with English teacher and based on the English score. The result in preliminary study there were 15 students’ who got  $\geq 65$  and 15 students’ who got  $\leq 65$  and it concludes that only 50% achieve the standard score, while other 50% fail. Students' interest in memorizing vocabulary also makes vocabulary low, so students find is difficult to understand English and speak or interpret a sentence

Based on the problem identified and solution discussed above, the researcher is entitled the classroom action research title " Improving Vocabulary Mastery Through Student Team Achievement Division (STAD)". The student a little bit which following of learning guidance it make the students feel very difficulty to learn English. Many student dislike learn English it make students indolent to learn vocabulary and have a little bit vocabulary.

## **Literature Review**

Vocabulary is central to English language teaching because without sufficient vocabulary students cannot understand others or express their own ideas. Wilkins (1972, p. 111–112.) emphasizes that “while without grammar very little can be conveyed, without vocabulary

nothing can be conveyed”. This point reflects my experience with different languages; even without grammar, with some useful words and expressions, I can often manage to communicate. Lewis (1993, p. 89) argues that, “lexis is the core or heart of language”. Particularly as students develop greater fluency and expression in English, it is significant for them to acquire more productive vocabulary knowledge and to develop their own personal vocabulary learning strategies.

### **Student Team Achievement Division (STAD)**

Cooperative learning model of STAD type according to Slavin (2010, p. 143) STAD is the simplest method of cooperative learning and the best method for the beginning for new teacher using cooperative approach. In addition, STAD learning method is a learning that involves the recognition of teams where students are divided into several heterogeneous groups based on the level of achievement or level of learning ability. Students use Student Team Achievement Division (STAD) learning method because this method can be used to instill the student tolerance character itself. Through the implementation of cooperative learning model STAD type, teacher can apply character education in the subject matter. The improvement of character education can be tucked into the teaching and learning process in the classroom.

### **Method**

The kinds of the research are Classroom Action Research (CAR) There are some definitions of Classroom Action Research. Cochran-Smith & Lytle, (1993, p. 51) states that, action research or classroom research can be defined as the “systematic, intentional inquiry by teachers”. The collected data in the form of the students’ test score are analyzed class room action research. If the result of the test in the cycle I is not achieved it must continue to the cycle II.

Based on the research design, the action of the research are implemented in four stages, which are explained by Kemmis and Mc Taggart (in Arikunto 2013,p.131). They are as follows :

- A. Preliminary Study
- B. Planning
- C. Acting
- D. Observing

## E. Reflecting

From the observation, the researcher got the students' weakness in vocabulary mastery and not interested in learning. From the interview the researcher got information that the students' lack in the score. In the class, the students were noisy because the students did not understand English and were lazy to pay attention to the teacher. The average score of vocabulary is 60 and the target score this study from the researcher is 65. There were 15 students' who got  $\geq 65$  and 15 students' who got  $\leq 65$  and it concludes that only 50% achieve the standard score, while other 50% fail.

### 1. The Result of Reliability

$$r_{xy} = 0,69$$

$$r_{xy} = 0,7$$

### 2. Spearman Brown

$$r_{11} = 0,82$$

## Result and Discussion

### Result of Cycle 1

The Result of the Observation Checklist Cycle 1

**Table The average result of the students' participation in the cycle 1.**

No	Meeting	Percentage	
		Active	Passive
1	Meeting 1	43.33%	56.66%
2	Meeting 2	50%	50%
3	<b>Average</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>50%</b>

Based on the table of the result in the cycle 1 in the first meeting there were 13 of 30 students' (43.33%) were active in the class and there were 17 of 30 students' (56.66%) were passive in the class. Meanwhile the second meeting there were 15 of 30 students' (50%) were

active in the class and there were 15 of 30 students' (50%) were passive in the class. The average result of the observation checklist in cycle 1 was 50 % students' were active in the class and 50% students' were passive in the class.

### The Result of the Vocabulary Test of Cycle 1

The test was conducted on May 13<sup>th</sup>, 2019 at 09.20 – 10.00. The test was administered at the last of the meeting in cycle 1.

Data Result	Score
Students' who get score $\geq$ 65	56.66%
Students' who get score $\leq$ 65	43.3%
The average score	70

Based on the table, the result show that 12 of 30 students' (43.3%) who score less than 65. The students' score are 48, 50, 52, 56, 60, and 64. The students' who get score more than 65 (43.3%). The students' are 68, 72, 76, 84, and 88 and the average score is 70, the target score from the researcher 65. Students who have achieved a target score of 65 have achieved in cycle 1, therefore it is necessary to hold cycle 2 to find out the results in cycle 2 to be able to find out whether using the STAD method can still be increased or not. The researcher should continue the action to cycle 2.

### Result of Cycle 2

#### The Result of the Observation Checklist Cycle 2

**Table The average result of the students' participation in the cycle 2.**

No	Meeting	Percentage	
		Active	Passive
1	Meeting 1	77%	23.3%
2	Meeting 2	60%	40%
3	<b>Average</b>	<b>68.5%</b>	<b>31.65%</b>

Based on the table of the result in the cycle 1 in the first meeting there were 23 of 30 students' (77%) were active in the class and there were 7 of 30 students' (23.3%) were passive in the class. Meanwhile the second meeting there were 18 of 30 students' (60%) were active in the

class and there were 12 of 30 students' (40%) were passive in the class. The average result of the observation checklist in cycle 1 was 50 % students' were active in the class and 50% students' were passive in the class.

### **The Result of the Vocabulary Test in Cycle 2**

The vocabulary test in cycle 2 was conducted on May 17<sup>th</sup>, 2019 at 07.30 until 09.00. The test was administered at the last of meeting in cycle 2.

**Table The result of the students' test in cycle 2**

Data Result	Score
Students' who get score $\geq 65$	70%
Students' who get score $\leq 65$	30 %
The average score	71

Based on the table, the result show that of 30 students' (30%) who score less than 65. The students' score are 44, 56, 60, and 64. The students' who get score more than 65 (70%). The students' are 68, 72, 76, 84, 88, 92 and the average score is 71. The target score of the average score of the students' that need to be achieved was 65. This it could be said that implementation in cycle 2 can be improve the students' vocabulary mastery especially using content words that are noun, verb, adjective and recount text.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **A. Improving Students Vocabulary Mastery Through Student Team Achievement Division Method.**

According the research that the students' vocabulary mastery cannot be achieved the target score. In the cycle 1, students' who did not fulfill the criteria of success was 65% who get score  $\geq 65$  the result of the vocabulary test in the first cycle showed that 56% students' who got  $\geq 65$  reached the score. The students' vocabulary mastery towards cycle 1 & cycle 2, the researcher hopes there will be an increase in cycle 2. In the cycle 2 the students' there is an increase to 70% who get a score of  $\geq 65$ . Based on the result vocabulary test, it shows that the

students' vocabulary mastery increase at first 56% become to 70% . It provided that Student Team Achievement Division method can improve the students' vocabulary mastery.

Based on the result of the observation checklist and vocabulary test in the second cycle, it was concluded that using Student Team Achievement Division method can improve the students' vocabulary mastery. Meanwhile in STAD method can improving a good to teach through vocabulary mastery. So it can help the student easily to understand the material of vocabulary mastery.

### **B. Improving the Students' Participation by using Student Team Achievement Division method.**

To know whether the students' vocabulary mastery material is understood by the students', that's important to observe the students' active participation in teaching and learning process. The observation checklist of the result active participation the average percentage of active participation in the cycle 1 was only 50%. The researcher continued in the next cycle 2, based on observation in the cycle 2 the average score active participation of the students was 68.5%. The students' active participation fulfilled the criteria success.

### **Conclusion**

- a. Based on the result of the researcher, Student Team Achievement Division can improve the eighth grade students' vocabulary mastery at SMPN 4 Tanggul in the 2018 / 2019 academic year by doing the test in group.
- b. Based on the result of the researcher, Student Team Achievement Division is to improve the eighth E students' active participation at SMPN 4 Tanggul in the 2018 / 2019 academic year by giving reward.

### **Suggestion**

The result of the research shows the readers that Student Team Achievement Division can improve the students' vocabulary mastery and active participation. According the result some suggestions are given to the English teacher, the students and the researcher. By considering the result above, some suggestions are purposed to the following people.

a) The English Teacher

The result is useful as information or to be an input to use the Student Team Achievement Division method in teaching English and make students' more interesting in learning English especially about vocabulary mastery.

b) The Students

The treatment gives useful to increase their knowledge of vocabulary and students' can get many new vocabularies. The treatment have a positive impact to the students' is helps students' easy to remember vocabulary and hope the students' can practice it to more remember.

c) The Researcher

The result is useful as a reference for the conduct of the research about the Student Team Achievement Division method. Based on the result, this strategy needs more time to be applied in teaching vocabulary but if the researcher uses it perfectly, it will succeed in some time. STAD method makes it easy for students' to learn more to enjoy together with their group.

## REFERENCES

- Arikunto, S. (2010). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*, Jakarta: Penerbit Rineka
- Cohran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S.L. (1993). *Inside outside: Teacher research and knowledge*. New York. Teacher College Press.
- Lewis, M. (1993). *The lexical approach: The state of ELT and a way forward*. Hove, UK: Language Teaching Publications.
- Milton, J. (2009). *Second Language Acquisition, No. 4: Measuring Second Language Vocabulary Acquisition*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmitt, N. (2000). *Vocabulary in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Slavin, Robert E. (2010). *Cooperative Learning Teori, Riset dan praktik*.  
Terjemahan Narulita Yusron. Bandung : Nusa media.
- Thornbury, S. (2007). *How to teach vocabulary*. (5 th edition). Harlow: Longman.
- Wilkins, D. (1972). "Linguistics in language teaching. London: Edward Arnold. Wong, W. & Van Patten, B. (2003). The evidence is in: drills are out". *Foreign Language Annals*. 36, 403-424