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**Abstract**

The objective of this research was to find out whether or not the implementation of number heads together (NHT) technique improve students’ English vocabulary achievement. The researcher applied a quasi experimental method with two groups, pre-test and post-test. Those are experimental group and control group. In experimental group the students were taught by NHT technique and the students in control group were taught by conventional method. In this research, there were twelve meetings. The subject of this research was the second grade students of SMP Negeri 1 Cempa in academic year 2011-2012. The sample consist of 50 students from 180 students in population. The sampling technique is convinience sampling. The data were collected through vocabulary test (pre-test and post-test). To find out the improvement of vocabulary achievement, the researcher applied t-test analysis. The result of the analysis showed that there was significant difference between pre-test and post-test. The value of the t-test (13.090) was greater than t-table 92.787) at the level of significance (p) =0.05 and degree of freedom (df) = 48. It can be concluded that implementation of NHT technique improved the students’ vocabulary achievement.
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**INTRODUCTION**

English has important role in the world. Almost all the people use english whether as officailly or as second language. In indonesia English as compulsory subject in junior high school as Corder in Gustang (2009) stated that in order to master english, the elements of language, such as grammatical structure, vocabulary and pronunciation must be teach to the students as the perequisite knowledge toward the english language use and skills because language is characterized by the elements.

Vocabulary is one of the language elements that play important role in mastering english orally or in written form. Because the ability of students to comprehend the subject, it is relatively determine by their vocabulary. It can not deny that, vocabulary is important for english skills, such as speaking, listening, reading and writing. Hammer in Abu (2010) stated that it is impossible to use those language skills without vocabulary. In other words, in learning foreign language, it is urgent to build up students’ vocabulary. Thus, they can communicate ideas, emotion, and desire. In other words English students will able to communicate.

Vocabulary is the basic thing that must be mastered by someone who learn English. It is also as foreign language for all students and the society of Indonesia. How someone expresses a language if he/she does not comprehend vocabulary of the language even less if he/she is studying foreign language. Therefore, the mastery of the vocabulary is important thing that must be had by language learner. If a student has enough English vocabulary, automatically it will support four language skills or the other way.

Vocabulary is word associated with meaning and can be use by someone in a language. Vocabulary that master by someone defines as association of all words that understood or will be use by he/she to arrange new sentences. Generally the vocabulary of someone is considering as in image of his/her intelligence or education level.

The comprehension of vocabulary is consider as important part of language learning process or the development of the ability of someone toward language that he/she master. Students are usually learning new vocabulary as part of certain lesson and adult people considers that establishment of vocabulary as an interesting and educative activity.

The English teacher have to be more creative in choosing the materials which can make the students feel interest, excite, and enjoy study about it. Many factors are able to determine the success of teaching English, such as the materials, the teacher, and the attitudes of the students toward English. Rasyid in Gustang (2009) stated that the vocal point of English language teaching in Indonesia is in the classroom because this is where contact among teacher, students, materials, and method or approaches occur.

In SMP Negeri 1 Cempa especially, the teachers teach their student by conventional method (the teacher explain the material and give the students assignment based on the book). There were no varieties ways to teach. The teachers give explanation about the material and give them assignment. And the results many students are confused with the assignment because less in vocabulary that appears because of the teacher don’t pay attention with vocabulary achievement of the students. Sometime the students are being difficult to speak and don’t know what have to said because less in vocabulary. In other side the students awkward to write composition in English and the students sometime don’t know how to read new vocabulary because they never found it and don’t know how to pronounce it. That’s all because less in vocabulary. Thus, the teacher should find the way to improve students’ vocabulary because it can help the learning process.

Vocabulary is needed for expressing meaning and used the receptive and productive skill. There are many technique and approach to improve students vocabulary achievement, like memorizing, translation method, authentic written materials, find in the dictionary, use board magazine, picture and many kinds else. Thus, the researcher choose cooperative learning to improve student vocabulary achievement. It is Number Heads Together (NHT) Technique.

NHT is one of the cooperative learning method. This cooperative learning strategy promotes discussion and both individual and group accountability. This strategy is beneficial for reviewing and integrating subject matter. Students with special needs often benefit when this strategy is used. After direct instruction of the material, the group supports each member and provides opportunities for practice, rehearsal, and discussion of content material (Teachervision:2011) and also Cooperative learning has been shown to increase student achievement, race relations, acceptance of special needs students, and self-esteem (Slavin, 1995). In a cooperative learning situation, interaction is characterized by positive goal interdependence with individual accountability. Positive goal interdependence require acceptance by group that they “ sink or swim together”. For the first time “cooperative learning is the instructional use of small group so that students work together to maximize their own and each other’s learning (Khoii and Poorafshari:2011).

This researcher tried to find out whether the implementation of NHT improve students vocabulary achievement at SMP Negeri 1 Cempa. Then, this is the study of applied linguistics and focuses on the teaching of English vocabulary achievement by implementing NHT Technique. The result of the research is expected to be a useful contribution in developing the ways in teaching English for the research in general and in order to increase students’ vocabulary in particular.

**REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

***Vocabulary***

Nunan in Garnasih (2007), it is true that vocabulary is the words itself but in terms, their meanings are different. Word is any letter sequences, which conveys the meaning in the language. In addition Hornby (1974) defines vocabulary as total number of words that make up a language and list of words with their meanings, especially one which accompanies a text took in a foreign language. In other words that vocabulary is a total number of words that have different terms and meaning of language which are used to communication in all side of humans life.

According to Harmer (1991) vocabulary can be divided into two types, first is active vocabulary refers to vocabulary that students have been will teach or learn and which they are expected to be able to use and the second is passive vocabulary refers to words which the students will recognize when they meet them but which they will probably not be able to produce. In teaching vocabulary whether active or passive vocabulary, the teacher should pay attention the eight principle in teaching vocabulary as Wallace(1989) stated that the principle of teaching vocabulary such as, we should know (1)the aims;(2) quantity;(3) need;(4) Frequent exposure and repetition;(5) meaningful presentation; (6) situation presentation;(7) presenting in context;and (8) learning vocabulary.

In other cases, Harmer (1991) provides some strategies in teaching vocabulary, they are ; (1) Reality, means that the teacher brings object into the classroom and introduces to the students;(2) Picture, teacher familiriaty focused on the object or thing, which cannot be taken into the classroom such as car, plane etc. Picture can be board drawings wall pictures and charts flashcards, etc; (3) Mime, action and gestures, sometimes picture are impossible to be used to explain the meaning of the words and grammar. Actions, in particularly are probably better explained by mime. Gestures are useful for explaining words or indicating that past is being talking about;(4) Contrast, the teacher shows the students word and ask to find out the contrast of such words;(5) Enumeration, the teacher introduces word by enumerating them with their general and specific meaning;(6) explanation, the teacher introduces a word by explaining the object and asks the students to guess what to object is and the last (7) Translation, the teacher asks the students to translate the given words into their mother tongue.

***Testing and Teaching***

Heaton, (1988) states that “ the large number of examination in the past have encouraged a tendency testing from teaching. Both testing and teaching are so clozely interrelated that is virtually imposible to work in either field without being constanly concerned with the other.

According to Massijaya (2004) states that these are several types of testing vocabulary as follows; (1) Multiple-choice, it is useful to distinguish between the following two major kinds of multiple-choice vocabulary items; (2)sets (associated words); in this case, many of the difficulties arising from the testing collocations are avoided by the testing of word sets. In such test the students’ familiarity with a range of association is measured;(3) Matching items; one of the matching items is a mixed bag of tense forms; (4) Completion technique; completion technique looks like cloze procedure, where the students are required to complete the omission letter to make words or to fill in the blank with words

***Number Heads Together (NHT)***

NHT is one of cooperative learning types which developed by Kagan. NHT is cooperative learning strategy that holds each student accountable for learning the material. Student are placed I groups and each person is given a number (from one to the maximum number in each group). The teacher poses a question and students “put their heads together “ to figure out the answer. The teacher call a specific number to respond as spokes person for the group by having students work together in a group, this strategy answered that each member knows the answer to problems or questions asked by the teacher. Because no one knows which number will be called, all team members must be prepared. (Teachervision,2011).

According to Kagan (2011), the strategy leads the class through a series of steps designed to promote learning through cooperation, active participation, and individual accountability, the steps for each randomly. Selected questionnaire;(1) Think Time, everyone thinks how to answer the questions. No talking;(2) Write time, everyone privately write his/her own answer on his/her own sheet of paper or response board; (3)Heads together,teammates put their heads together and share their answer. They reach consensus on a team answer and discuss and teach if necessary. Everyone knows the answer or knows how to solve the problem;(4)Who answer, One student on each team is selected. All selected student stands, ready to answer independently. They may no longer consult with teammate;(5) Answer question,the teacher’s how to have students’ answer the question. Here are some options, (a) Standing student all show their response boards,(b)Teacher calls on one standing students to share, (c) Students are response cards or fingers for true/false or multiple choice question.

Kagan (n.d) lists four basic principal for all structure that he has developed including NHT. The acronym is PIES;(1) Positive interdependence exists when one person gains lead to gains for another (a positive correlation among outcomes) and when no one person can reach the goal without the help of other (interdependence); (2) Individual accountability exists when each person is required to make a public performance. Those who always do not participate leave feeling that their presence at the meeting did not make a difference; (3) Equal participation, Although perfectly equal participation is never possible, in the traditional classroom there is almost never called on. This inequality of participation exists also in the traditional classroom meeting, leading to alienation those who among those who do not participate; (4)Simultaneous interaction, If we apply the simultaneity principle most people are actively engaged at the same time. For example, if the classroom interact in pairs, in the somehow, on the average each person has a half hour to make input, a half hour of active engagement versus two minutes of active engagement. Per hour is the different between feeling one has had a significant contribution to a meeting versus feeling one might as well not been there active engagement is critical; it leads to the feeling one’s ideas count, feeling part the decision process the alternative is alienation.

***Achievement***

According to the Oxford Pocket Dictionary of current English (2009). Achievement is ; (1) a thing done successfully, typically by effort, courage, or skill. (2) the process or facts of achieving something, while long man dictionary of contemporary English (n.d) stated that achievement is ; (1) something important that you succeed in doing by your own efforts (2) when you achieve something or when people achieve something.

Barkley (2011) explains that there are some goals of students’ achievement; (1) Academic, All students will obtain, understand, analyze, communicate and apply knowledge and skills to achieve success in school and life; (2) Essential life skill, All students will demonstrate the aptitude, attitude and skills to lead responsible, fulfilling, and respect full lives; (3) Responsible to community, All students will understand and model the important attributes. People must have to contribute to an effective and productive community and common goals of all. In this research, the writer focus to find out the students achievement based on their academic achievement.

Based on the description above, the research conluded that vocabulary achievement was process to understand a total numbers of words that have different terms and meaning of language which are used, applied to communicate in all side of humans’ life. . Number heads together technique was the technique which put the head of the students together and solve the problem after that the teacher called the number which given and explained about the problem and how to solved it.

**METHOD**

***Research design***

This research used a quasi experimental method with two an equivalent pretest-posttest design (Gay:2006). An experimental group used number heads together (NHT) and control group used conventional method (the original teaching method from teacher in SMP Negeri 1 Cempa). Both groups were given pretest and posttest. The pretest was done to find out the prior knowledge of students’ vocabulary while posttest was done after treatment to find out the improvement of English teaching which focus on students’ vocabulary achievement by implementing of number heads together.

***Population and Sample***

The population of this research was the second grade of SMP Neg. 1 Cempa in 2011 - 2012 academic years. It consisted of seven classes from class VIII-1 to VIII-7. Each class has different number of student from 23 until 25 students. The total population was 180 students. By using convinience sampling, the students of class VIII3and VIII4 were taken as the experimental and control class. Thus, sample consisted of 50 students.

***Instrument and Procedure of Collecting Data***

This research used vocabulary test which administered in pretest and posttest. The vocabulary test consist of 50 numbers in cloze test form. The data was collected by giving pretest and posttest. Both of classes are given pretest whether experiment and control class. After that, experiment class is taught by applying NHT and control class is taught based on present technique which use by their teacher. The treatment conducted for twelve meetings with same duration. Each meeting lasted 1 x 40 minutes. Topics that presented were different in each meeting.

***Validity and Reliability of Test***

Jabu (2008) explained several kind of validity of test; face validity, content validity, construct validity, concurrent validity, predictive validity and response validity. Gay (2006) explained that logical validity includes content validity and it is so named because validity was determined primarily though judgment by expert. This research uses face validity. In relation with reliability, Gay (2006) said that reliability is the degree which a test consistently measured whatever it measured. The computation of the reliability in this research applied Pearson Product moment correlation and Spearmen-Brown formula.

***Data analysis***

The data collected through pretest and posttest was analyzed quantitatively. It was employed inferential statistic using t-test. It was analyzed through the followinsteps; (1) scored the students’ correct answer of pretest and posttest;(2) tabulated score of the students’ test result;(3) classified the score of the students pretest and posttes into five clasification:

Table 1: The Classified of Score

No. Score Range Classification

1. 1. 96 – 100 Excellent
2. 2. 86 – 95 Very good
3. 3. 76 – 85 Good
4. 4. 66 – 75 Fairly good
5. 5. 56 – 65 Fair
6. 6. 36 – 55 Poor
7. 7. 0 – 35 Very poor

(Depdiknas in Dullah 2009)

(4) finding out the sugnificant difference between pretest and posttest. The researcher used t-test to know whether there was significant difference between the two groups before and after giving the treatment. t -test formula was including as follows;

t = 

Where:

 

SS1 = the sum of squares of experimental group

SS2 = the sum of squares of control group

n1 = total number of subjects in experimental group

n2 = total number of subjects in control group

t = test of significance

 = mean score for experimental group

 = mean score for control group

(Rahman, 2005)

**FINDINGS**

This research used face validity. The test items were showed to colleagues, advisor and teacher. There is no formula. It can compute and there was no way to express it quantitatively. While for reliability test, the writer used spilt half reliability using Pearson product moment correlation and Spearman-Brown Formula. The result of calculation using Pearson product moment correlation is 0.7. it was quite high which showed that there was a correlation between the two set scores. The result of this calculation was then an analyzed using Spearmen – Brown odd even model correlation to see the reliability of test. The result is 0.88. To interpret the test reliability (rtt) is the same or greater that 0.70, the evaluated test is highly reliable. Conversely, if the test resulted calculation (rtt) is smaller than 0.70, so it is not highly reliable. Therefore the result calculation is reliable (rtt = 0.88).

After calculating the result of students’ pretest and posttest score into percentage, they were then classified into seven levels, as follows:

***Pretest***

Table 2 : The Rate Percentage of the Experimental Group and Control group Pretest

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Classification** | **Score** | **Experimental Group** | | **Control Group** | |
| **F** | **P (%)** | **F** | **P (%)** |
| 1. | Excellent | 96-100 | - | - | - | - |
| 2. | Very Good | 86-95 | - | - | - | - |
| 3. | Good | 76-85 | - | - | - | - |
| 4. | Fairly Good | 66-75 | - | - | - | - |
| 5 | Fair | 56-65 | 9 | 36 | 7 | 28 |
| 6 | Poor | 36-55 | 11 | 44 | 12 | 48 |
| 7 | Very Poor | 0-35 | 5 | 20 | 6 | 24 |
| Total | | | 25 | 100 | 25 | 100 |

Table 2 indicates that majority of the two groups of the students are categorized as poor. It means that they are considered to be equal before the treatment.

***Mean score***

Table 3 : The Mean Score of the Students’ Pretest

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Mean Score** |
| Experimental  Control | 4.792  4.732 |

This table shows that the mean score obtained by the students in the experimental group (4.792) is higher than that of the control group (4.732). It reveals that the mean score of the pretest obtained by the students in both groups are different.

***T-Test***

In order to know whether or not the mean score of both groups is statistically different at the level of significance 0.05 with degree of freedom (df = n1+n2–2) 48, where n is number of subject, the following table shows the result of calculation.

Table 4. The t-test of the Students’ Pretest

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **t-test value** | **t-table value** |
| Pretest | 0.169 | 2.787 |

***Posttest***

Table 5 :The Rate Percentage of the Experimental Group and Control group Posttest

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Classification** | **Score** | **Experimental Group** | | **Control Group** | |
| **F** | **P (%)** | **F** | **P (%)** |
| 1. | Excellent | 96-100 | 17 | 68 | - | - |
| 2. | Very Good | 86-95 | 5 | 20 | - | - |
| 3. | Good | 76-85 | 3 | 12 | 8 | 32 |
| 4. | Fairly Good | 66-75 | - | - | 13 | 52 |
| 5 | Fair | 56-65 | - | - | 4 | 16 |
| 6 | Poor | 36-55 | - | - | - | - |
| 7 | Very Poor | 0-35 | - | - | - | - |
| Total | | | 25 | 100 | 25 | 100 |

The Table 5 shows that that vocabulary of both groups has improved, where experimental group is categorized as good and control one is categorized as fair. It means there are significant different between control and experimental group after the treatment.

***Mean score***

Table 5 : The Mean Score of the Students’ Posttest

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Mean Score** |
| Experimental  Control | 9.408  7.248 |

The table 5 above reveals that the mean score obtain by the students in the experimental group (9.408) is higher than that of the control group (7.248). It is apparent that the mean score of the posttest obtained by the students in both groups are different.

***T-Test***

In order to know whether or not the mean score of both groups is statistically different at the level of significance 0.05 with degree of freedom (df = n1+n2–2) 48, where n is number of subject, the result of calculation can be seen underneath

Table 6: The t-test of the Students’ Posttest

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **t-test value** | **t-table value** |
| Posttest | 13.090 | 2.787 |

The table 6 shows that the t-test value (13.090) is higher than t-table value (2.787). Based on the result, it is concluded that the difference of both mean score is statistically different.

**DISCUSSION**

The data showed the result of the statistical t-test showed that the t-table value (2.787) was higher than value of the t-test (0.169) at the level of significance 0.05 with degree of freedom (df = n1+n2–2) 48. This is previous data before the students were given treatment. It can be concluded that the two groups had the same prior knowledge of vocabulary or the basic of students’ vocabulary. Students’ vocabulary was not significantly different before the treatment, where the mean score of the pretest of both groups was categorized as poor (36-55), in which experimental mean score was 4.792 and control mean score was 4.736. It means that Null Hypothesis was accepted and the Alternative Hypothesis was rejected.

Based on observation which taken before the treatment, there was a problem that may cause the result of pretest of both groups was categorized as poor. The problem was most of the students had lack of vocabulary until they did not understand what they have to do with the test because they actually did not know the meaning of the words that used in the test. When they already known what they have to do, other problem appeared. Second, the students basically did not know the correct answer of each test’ questions.

This research used quasi-experimental method and gave pre-test and post-test as the instrument. It also focused on the teaching of English vocabulary by implementation of NHT in improving students’ English vocabulary achievement, especially for the second year student of SMP Negeri 1 Cempa. Before giving post-test, the researcher gave pretest and continued with treatment. There were twelve meetings in treatment and consisted with several activities for each meeting. In this case, the students were taught how to find the meaning of words and classify it in number heads together technique.

In pretest process, the researcher explained about th e procedure how the test did, the student difficult to understand because the researcher spoke full in English. So, the researcher explained about the test combined between English and Indonesia. It spent time fifteen minutes. When the test was held, the researcher needed additional time, because the test should take 40 minutes. The treatments in the experimental class, the students were given different topics in each meeting.

At the First, second and third meetings there were three topics each meeting, they are ‘Maya Gazali’, ‘The Magic Candle’, and ‘Bicycle’. On each activity the teacher gave the students instruction before moved to the next activity. Firstly, the teacher asked student to complete the paragraph (paragraph in cloze test) in NHT this section called ‘think time’, and the student found the meaning of the words and classified the words into verb, nouns and also adjective, this section the students should be write down their answer on student worksheet in NHT this section called ‘write time’. After that the students discussed with their friend in group about the answer, in NHT this section called ‘put heads together’. When the students discussed the teacher asked them spoke in English or combined English Indonesia.

Even though, it was still difficult for students but tried it little by little. Then, the teacher called one of the number (1,2,3,4, and 5) of student in each group that was given before to presented their answered, in NHT this section called ‘who answer’. After that the student who did presentation, standing up in front of their friend and teacher, then read aloud the text and also explained about their answer in blank paragraph. Students present spent time 3 minutes. In the first meeting the students’ were ashamed because they unusual stand up in front of their friend. In the second and third meetings the students have already known several vocabularies. It showed when they read the text; they had a few pronunciation mistake and good intonation.

The same process but different topics in the fourth, fifth, and sixth meetings, there were three topics, they are ‘Sarah’, ‘Travel’ and ‘ The Learning of Pisa Tower’. The seventh, eighth and ninth meetings the topics were ‘Snow White’, ‘San Fransisco’, ‘Shirley’s day off’. The Tenth, Eleventh, and Twelfth the students got topics, such as ‘The Hawaiaan Island’, ‘Elvis Presley’ and ‘Grandpa’s Birthday’. These meetings, the students knew vocabulary much than the previous meetings, and some of them spoke longer than before. In control group, the researcher gave same topics but no tratment. Teacher asked the students to complete the text by their selves after that read aloud the text.

The explanation above showed that both group made progress in vocabulary after treatments. This means that both the implementation of number heads together and teaching by conventional method were successfully in learning vocabulary. In addition, the implementation of number heads together technique changed the category of the students from poor into excellent (for experimental group). Meanwhile, the use of conventional method could change the category of the students from poor into good (for control group).

Although both groups made progress in vocabulary, the two teaching technique, the implementation of number heads together technique at the experimental group and the use of conventional method for the control group, could not be said to have the same power in increasing students’ vocabulary. It is proved from the mean score of the posttest of the both group, were the mean score posttest of experimental group (9.452) was higher than the mean score posttest of control group (7.272). It means that the experimental group treated by Number heads together got better result than those who were treated by using conventional method (control group).

Number heads together technique more got power because it supported by sharing and discussed each student. Number heads together technique was an enjoyable technique to involve the class actively by asked them for their ideas and suggestion, getting them to contribute what already known, or encouraging them to guess new words and also to stand in front of their friends to share their ideas. The students did not feel bored and difficult when they guess the words because they would help by their friends in own groups. This technique helped students to learn new words, new meaning, memorize those words easier and categories the words, but sometime some of students didn’t active in their group, some of them stood, dreamt and no voice. Then, the researcher walked around in the classroom and checked one by their answer, who didn’t have note or voice it could be less their score. After that, next meeting no one student passive in their seat, all the students active discussed.

The other side in control group, the researcher taught by conventional method which only gave the students material after that the teacher asked them to memorized it. It made the students only can memorize some words. The students would memorize more words when they feel enjoyed and interested in learning vocabulary. The more words the students know, the more they would be able to understand what they hear and read; and the better they would able to said what they want to when speaking or writing.

The result of the t-test analysis shows that the students’ vocabulary achievement of both groups after treatment is statistically different, were the t-test value (13.090) was higher than t-table value (2.) at the level of significance 0.05 with degree of freedom (df = n1+n2–2) 48.

13.090 > 2.787

It is concluded that there was a significant difference on the achievement of English vocabulary between the students who were treated by implementing NHT technique and the students who were not treated by NHT.

The description above showed that there is significance improvement by the implementing NHT Technique in vocabulary achievement. It is believed that Number heads together technique was a powerful technique that would make students more productive active and also be a useful way to improve students’ vocabulary achievement.

**CONCLUSION**

Number Heads together is a technique to improve the vocabulary achievement of the second year students’ of SMP Negeri I Cempa because there is a significant different between the progress in students’ vocabulary achievement who were taught by implementation number heads together technique and the progress in students’ vocabulary achievement who were taught by using conventional method. It is proven by the mean score of posttest of experimental group (9.408) and control group (7.248). For the level of significance (p) = 0.05 with degree of freedom (df) = 48 than t-test value = 13.090 and t-table =2.787 It shows that the value of t-test is greater than t-table (13.090 >2.787). The explanation above proved that by implementation number heads together technique can improve student vocabulary achievement.
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