

ENRICHING VOCABULARY THROUGH SOCIAL INTERACTION MODEL

Memperkaya Kosakata Melalui Model Interaksi Sosial

St. Maryam Hamid

English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
Muhammadiyah University of Makassar

ABSTRACT

The objective of this research was to find out the significant of the students' achievement before and after learning vocabulary through Social Interaction Method at the eight class of SMP Guppi Samata Gowa. This research employed pre-experimental method with one group pretest and posttest design. There were two variables, namely dependent variable was the students' vocabulary achievement and independent variable was the application of Social Interaction Model in teaching vocabulary. The population was the students at the eighth grade of SMP Guppi Samata Gowa. The sample of the research consisted of 50 students which were taken by using cluster total sampling, 25 students were taken as experimental class and 25 students were taken as controlled class. The instrument was vocabulary test in multiple choice test. The multiple choice test consists of 10 items that consist of five choices. The findings of the research were students vocabulary used pre-test and post test. The result of the data indicated that there was a significant difference between students' post-test in experimental class and controlled class. The mean score of posttest (61.6) in experimental class was greater than the mean score of posttest (56) in controlled class and the standard deviation of posttest (8.94) in experimental class was greater than the standard deviation of posttest in controlled class (6.29). From t-test, the researcher found that the value of t-test (2.553) was greater than t-table (2.021) at the level of significance 0.05 with degree of freedom (df) = 48.

Keyword: *vocabulary, social interaction model*

The important of vocabulary as one of supporting English skills, that should be learnt for the second language learners is described by Lado (1988:79). He states that someone who understands all grammar of English without understanding the meaning of the language cannot maintain the conversation using such language. On the contrary, one who understands all vocabularies without understanding the grammar of English will understand the use of the language.

In teaching vocabulary, sometimes a teacher finds so many difficulties to improve the students' vocabulary. That is why, many English teachers try to build up the students' vocabulary by using various teaching strategies. A Teacher



should find an effective strategy to teach English vocabulary. Appropriate Instructions are needed to increase the effectiveness of communication between teachers and students in teaching and learning process. Furthermore, an appropriate instruction can stimulate the students' motivation and interest to the lesson.

The students must be supported by good condition and situation in learning vocabulary. A current study has found that learning vocabulary is not permanently done in the classroom, but also it can be done outside of classroom or in open area. Studying vocabulary in open area will stimulate the learners to be more enjoy full in the learning process because environment supports them.

Social interaction model have been proved by David, Johnson and his friends (1994) by emphasizing two assumption : (1) Social problems can be identified and find their solution with a same dealing by social process and involving many kinds of group society, (2) A democracy social process needs to be improved in repairing the system of society of social life.

1. The Concept of Social Interaction Model

a. Social Interaction Model.

Anselin (2006: 193) defines that Social Interaction Model is a study of how interaction among individuals can lead to collective behavior and aggregate patterns. This is a new type of learning vocabulary, it extends to help intermediate to advance students produce language, in other words to encode their ideas.

Social Interaction models are instructional methods used by teachers in the classroom to facilitate group work. It is a student centred teaching approaches that allows students to interact with each other in a structured on task manner. In this strategy, students take on the role as a facilitator of content by helping their peers construct meaning.

Social Interaction Model stresses the relationship of the individual to the other persons and to the society. The students are allowed to question, reflect, reconsider, get help and support, and participate in group discussion. The three most common strategies include group project, group discussion, and cooperative learning. These interactions normally occur face-to-face but are not limited to this



type of interaction with the assistance of online tools and technologies. The stages of instruction using the social interaction models begin with an introduction lead by the instructor. The learners than break into groups, and the instructor continues to monitor and assess teams and their work. Finally, the teams conclude with their results/findings. (Thirumurugan 2011:3)

Social interactions refer to particular forms of externalities, in which the actions of a reference group affect an individual's preferences. The reference group depends on the context and is typically an individual's family, neighbors, friends or peers. Social interactions are sometimes called non-market interactions to emphasize the fact that these interactions are not regulated by the price mechanism. (Scheinkman 2006:1). Social interactions models have implications for the sorting of people and activities across space. As Schelling 1971: 143 demonstrated, when individuals can choose locations, the presence of these interactions may result on segregation across space, even in situations where the typical individual would be content to live in an integrated neighborhood, provided his group does not form too small a minority. Cities exist because of agglomeration economies which are likely to come from non-market complementarities. In dynamic settings, social interactions can produce s-shaped curves which help to explain the observed time series patterns of phenomena as disparate as telephone adoption and women in the workplace.

2. Steps to implementing Social Interaction Model

- 1) Introduction of concept by facilitator
- 2) Students group into teams.
- 3) Students negotiate, compromise, and explain concepts to another while facilitator monitors.
- 4) Students assess their work.
- 5) Students present findings.

3. Advantages of Social Interaction Model

- 1) These models are student cantered so they engage a higher level of thinking.
- 2) Student cantered it promotes meaningful learning.



- 3) It can be beneficial to students that work well in a cooperative setting, and can be used to promote leadership, team work and problem solving skills.
- 4) This strategy is most beneficial to students that work well in a cooperative environment rather than a competitive one.
- 5) Some students are able to learn more efficiently and be more motivated when working together with their peers rather than by themselves.
- 6) Students work together in groups they learn to use leadership as well as problem solving skills. They also learn to work together as a team to produce a desired outcome.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research employed an experimental research, which contains experimental class (Opened Class) and control class (Closed Class) which aims to find out whether or not use of Social interaction model in teaching vocabulary is effective or not to increase the students' vocabulary mastery.

In doing experimental research, the writer used pre-test and post-test. The comparison between the pretest and post-test score determines the success of the treatment. The design below:

Class	Pretest	Treatment	Posttest
E	O1	X1	O2
C	O1	X2	O2

Notation: **E** = experimental class
C = controlled class
O1 = pre- test
O2 = post- test
X = Treatment, (Gay, 1981:296).

A. Population and Sample

The population of this research were all of the second year students of SMP GUPPI Samata Gowa that register in academic year 2012/2013. The number of population was 50 students. The research took the second year students of SMP GUPPI SAMATA GOWA as population. The research used cluster total sampling. The sample were class VIII A as experimental group, consist 25



students and the students of VIII B as control class of 25 students. The sample consists of 50 students.

B. Research Instrument

To find out the students' vocabulary achievement, the research used vocabulary test in multiple choice test. The multiple choice test consists of 10 items that consist of five choices, and the students must choose one correct answer.

C. Procedure of the Data Collection

The research used some procedure in collecting the data, such in the following:

1. Pre- test

The pre-test was given to the students before treatments. The pre-test was given to know the students' prior knowledge of vocabulary mastery before given treatment. In this case, the students were given questions in Multiple Choices form, such as matching test and picture test. This test was spent 80 (2x40) minutes.

2. Treatment

After given the pre-test, the treatment was conducted on students. The writer handles the class for 8 meetings.

a. Experimental Class

The procedures of doing treatments for experimental class as follows:

1) The first meeting:

The writer was introduced of Social Interaction Model to the students. In this case writer explain the main focused of using Social Interaction Model in continue by presentation that was focused on the words "DRAW" and "CUT"

2) The second meeting:

The writer was distributed a material paper a presentation it. The writer presentation was focused on the words "FALL" and "LISTEN".

3) The third meeting:

The writer was distributed a material paper and presents it. The writer presentation was focused on the words "LOOK FOR" and "RUN".



4) The fourth meeting :

The writer was distributed a material paper. The writer presentation was focused on the words “STEAL” and “THROW”.

The procedures of the treatments are equal to next meeting, but the vocabularies are different. In each meeting, the writer was used time allocation about 2x40 minutes.

b. Controlled Class

In the procedure of doing treatment for the control class, the writer handles the class for four meetings. Then, the writer gave the students without using social interaction model and has the same material with experimental class.

3. Post- test

After the treatment, the post-test was conducted to find out the students' vocabulary mastery. It was used to check the result of treatments. It is very useful to know whether or not the Social Interaction Model is effective to increase the students' vocabulary mastery and it intended to know whether or not there was any significant change to the students' vocabulary mastery improvement.

D. Technique of Data Analysis

The data that collect was analyzed through the following steps:

1. Tabulating the score of the students formula into the following classification

No	Rate of Score	Categories
1	9.6-10	Excellent
2	8.6-9.5	Very good
3	7.6-8.5	Good
4	6.6-7.5	Fairly good
5	5.6-6.5	Fair
6	3.6-5.5	Poor
7	0.0-3.5	Very poor

(Depdiknas, 1985:6).

2. To know the test score of the students' vocabulary through Social Interaction , the writer used the following formula:

$$\text{Score} = \frac{\text{students'correct answer}}{\text{the number of items}} \times 10, \text{ (Depdiknas, 1985:8).}$$



3. Computing the frequency and the rate percentage of the students' scores.

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100\%$$

Where: P = percentage
F = frequency
N = the total number of students, (Nasir, 1988: 446).

4. Calculating the mean score of the students

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$

Where: \bar{X} = mean score
 $\sum X$ = total row score
N = the total number of students, (Gay, 1981:298) .

5. To know the significant differences between the score of the pre-test and the post test the writer calculated the value of t test by used the following formula:

$$t = \frac{\bar{D}}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum D^2 - \left(\frac{\sum D}{N}\right)^2}{N(N-1)}}$$

Where:

t = Test of significant differences
D = the differences between two scores compared
 \bar{D} = the mean of different scores
 $\sum D$ = the sum of D scores
 $(\sum D)^2$ = the square of D scores
N = the total number of students, (Gay, 2006: 355).

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

A. FINDING

1. The Classification of Students' Pretest and Posttest Scores in Experimental Class

Table 1: The rate percentage of score experimental class in pretest

No	Score	Classifying	Frequency	Percentage
1	9.6-10	Excellent	-	-
2	8.6-9.5	Very Good	-	-
3	7.6 – 8.5	Good	-	-
4	6.6-7.5	Fairly good	-	-
5	5.6-6.5	Fairly	9	36%
6	3.6-5.5	poor	16	64%
7	0-3.5	Very poor	-	-
Total			25	100%



Table 1 above shows the rate percentage of score of experimental class in pretest from 25 students, there were 9 (36%) students got fair score, 16 (64%) students got poor score, none of the student got excellent, very good, good, fairly good and very poor.

Table 2: The rate percentage of score experimental class in posttest

No	Score	Classifying	Frequency	Percentage
1	9.6-10	Excellent	-	-
2	8.6-9.5	Very Good	-	-
3	7.6 – 8.5	Good	1	4%
4	6.6-7.5	Fairly good	5	20%
5	5.6-6.5	Fairly	12	48%
6	3.6-5.5	poor	7	28%
7	0-3.5	Very poor	-	-
Total			25	100%

While, the rate percentage of score of experimental class in posttest from 25 students as table 2 above shows, there were 1 students (4%) got good score, 5 students (20%) got fairly good score, 12 students (48%) got fairly score, 7 students (28%) got poor score and none of the students got for the other classification.

Based on the result above, it can be conclude that the rate percentage in posttest was greater than the rate percentage in pretest.

2. The Classification of Students' Pretest and Posttest Scores in Control Class

Table 3: The rate percentage of score controlled class in pretest

No	Score	Classifying	Frequency	Percentage
1	9.6-10	Excellent	-	-
2	8.6-9.5	Very Good	-	-
3	7.6 – 8.5	Good	-	-
4	6.6-7.5	Fairly good	-	-
5	5.6-	Fairly	6	24%



	6.5			
6	3.6-5.5	poor	19	76%
7	0-3.5	Very poor	-	-
Total			25	100%

Table 3 above shows the rate percentage of score of controlled class in pretest from 25 students, none of the student got excellent, very good, good, and fairly good score. There were 6 students (24%) got fairly, 19 students (76%) got poor score.

Table 4: The rate percentage of score controlled class in posttest

No	Score	Classifying	Frequency	Percentage
1	9.6-10	Excellent	-	-
2	8.6-9.5	Very Good	-	-
3	7.6 – 8.5	Good	-	-
4	6.6-7.5	Fairly good	1	4%
5	5.6-6.5	Fairly	9	36%
6	3.6-5.5	poor	15	60%
7	0-3.5	Very poor	-	-
Total			25	100%

While, the rate percentage of score of controlled class in posttest from 25 students as table 4 above shows, there were 1 students (4%) got fairly good score, 9 students (36%) got fairly score, 15 students (60%) got poor score, none of the students got for the other classification.

Based on the result above, it can be conclude that the rate percentage in posttest was greater than the rate percentage in pretest.

3. The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Experimental Class and Controlled Class

After calculating the result of the students score, the mean score and standard deviation of both classes be presented in the following table:



Table 5: The mean score and standard deviation of experimental class and controlled class in posttest

Variable	Experimental class		Control class	
	Pre test	Post test	Pre test	Post test
Noun	42.8	61.2	52.4	55.6
Verb	51.6	62	50.8	56.4
$\Sigma\bar{x}$	47.2	61.6	51.6	6.29

The table above shows that, the mean score of experimental class in post test was (61.6) and the standard deviation of experimental class was (8.94), while the mean score of controlled class in posttest was (56) and its standard deviation was (6.29). It means that, the mean score of controlled class was lower than mean score of experimental class.

4. Test of Significance

T-test value is used to know whether there is or not significant difference between experimental and controlled class in learning vocabulary at the level of significance 0,05 with degree of freedom (df) = N+N-2 where N= number of students (40); $df = 25+25-2 = 48$, t-test statistical analysis for independent sample is employed. The following table shows the result of the t-test classification:

Table 6: T-Test of the Students' Vocabulary

Variable	T-Test Value	T-Table Value
Posttest	2.553	2.021

The table above shows that t-test value was great than t-table. The result of the test shows there was significant difference between t-table and t-test ($2.021 < 2.553$), it means that, t-table was smaller than t-test.

The result of the t-test statistical analysis shows that there was significant difference between the experimental class who got treatment by using Social Interaction Models and controlled class who got treatment by using verbal explanation, even though different both of them was not enough high. The statement was proved by the t-test value (2.553) which higher than t-table value (2.021), at the level significance 0,05 with degree of freedom (df) = N+N-2 where N= number of students (40); $df = 25+25-2 = 48$.



B. Discussion

The mean score of the students in table 1 shows that the students' vocabulary skill based on the post test of the controlled class is 6.29. It can be concluded that the students' vocabulary were classified as fair. While the students' vocabulary skill based on post test of the experimental class is 8.94. It can be concluded that the students' vocabulary skill of the experimental class were classified as fair, too.

Experimental class from 25 students, there were 1 (4%) students got good score, there were 12 (48%) students got fairly score, there were 5 (20%) students got fairly good score and there were 7 (28%) students got poor.

While, the rate percentage of score of controlled class in posttest from 25 students as table 2 above shows, there were 0 (0%) students got very good score, 0 (0%) students got good score, 1 (4%) students got fairly good score, 9 students (36%) got fairly and 15 (60%) students got poor and none of them got very poor score.

From all of the data in this research, it is shown that all data found and discussed in this chapter refer to the acceptance of the alternative hypothesis. It means that the use of Social Interaction Models was effective to improve the students' vocabulary mastery of SMP Guppi Samata Gowa. This result was also supported by the statement of Anselin (2006) that Social Interaction Models study how interaction among individuals can lead to collective behavior and aggregate patterns. In other words, to encode their ideals also it would tell them which word is right in which subject and object go with particular verbs and what are the phrases or collocation that words are normally used in students wanted to expand their vocabulary, and to improve their ability to express their concept.

One of the most important innovations is grouping together of individual word, meaning, same idea, concept, or semantics area. Of course, it will help the user to choose the appropriate word or phrase for their context.

The Social Interaction Models will certainly serve you as the most reliable guide in your efficient and effective command of English. Furthermore Ikegami (1998) states that all the entries show us a wealth of natural examples and clear



definitions. The wealth of examples will give you a really good chance of getting the right choice. Finally (Winataputra, 2005:6) stated that Social Interaction can help students improve a variety of his ability dimension which very needed in learning process.

It can be conclude that, using Social Interaction Models in improving the students' vocabulary mastery was effective in intermediate and advanced students even though it was not higher different significantly.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion

Relating to the research findings and discussion in the previous chapter, the conclusions are presented in the following:

1. The data shows that the students' vocabulary mastery before and after the treatments are significantly difference. It was found the students' posttest 79.7 was higher than the students' pre-test 52. It is proved that the use of Social Interaction Models in teaching vocabulary to contribute the effectiveness of encoding the students' idea.
2. Using Social Interaction Models can improve the students' vocabulary ability and it is can be seen through their increasing score from pre-test to post-test. It is proved with the statistical analysis that t-test value was 2.553 greater than t-table value 2.021.

B. Suggestion

Considering the conclusion previously, the researcher puts forward some suggestions as follows:

1. The using of Social Interaction Models can improve the students' vocabulary skills. Therefore, the English teacher is recommended to teach them by combining the Social Interaction Models with the other English material.
2. In teaching vocabulary, Social Interaction Models should be taken as one of alternative materials (Supplement Material) that giving much knowledge to the students of SMP Guppi Samata Gowa.
3. Lectures should be creative to manage the material for teaching of vocabulary such as by using Social Interaction Models.



- Lecture should give enough opportunity to the students to practice and express their ideas through various techniques, one of them is Social Interaction Models because it is easy to be presented and it is also enjoyable for the students in learning.

REFERENCES

- Bean, readence and Baldwin. 2001. *Vocabulary Self-Collection Strategy*.(Online) http://www.litandlearn.lpb.org/strategies/strat_4vss.pdf accessed, on Augustus, 22th, 2012.
- Beare, Kenneth. 1997. *How to improve your vocabulary*. Retrieved on 10 nd ocktober (2009) from About. Com/ od/Englishvocabulary/ht/htvocab.htm.
- British National Corpus, 2003. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. Oxford University of Chicago and London.
- Brown, H. Douglas. 1994. *Teaching by Principle. An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogic*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Depdikbud. 1985. *Garis- garis besar Pengajaran Bahasa Inggris*. Jakarta: Departement Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Gairns, R.,and Redman, S. 1986. *Working with Words. A Guide to teaching and learning vocabulary*. Cambridge University press.
- Gay,L. R. 1981.*educational research competencies for Analysis and application*. Columbus: Merrill Publishing Company.
- Geer, David. 2000. *How to improve your vocabulary* .retrieved on 23th June (2009) from <http://www.wordacker.com/en/article/howtoimprovevocabulary>
- Good. 1973. *The dictionary of Education*. New York: garwhil Book Company.
- Halliday. M.A.K and Ruqaiya Hasan. 1985. *Language, text, and Context: Aspects of language in a social semiotic perspective*. Australia. Deakin University.
- Harmer, Jeremy. 1991. *The Practice of English Language Teaching (New Edition)*. Longman London and New York
- Haggard, M.R. 1986. "The Vocabulary Self-Collection Strategy: Using Students Interest and World Knowledge to Enhance Vocabulary Growth." *Journal of Reading* Vol.29,N7.(online)//davidabauman.com/sciwriting/vocabself.pdf accessed, Date: June, 22th, 2011.



Hornby, A.S. 1986. *Oxford advance learner's dictionary of current English* London: Oxford University Press.

Palmer .F. R. 1986. *Semantics*. Australia. Cambridge University press.

Rapp, Ruddel Martha. 2055. *Teaching Content Reading and Writing*. Sonoma State University.

Schelling, T. 1971: "Dynamic Models of Segregation," *Journal of Mathematical Sociology*.

Webster, Noah. 1983. *Webster Twenty Century of English Language*. New York: Simon and sthucher.

Wesley, Addiison Longman. 1998. *Longman Language Activator "The World's First Production Dictionary"*. England Longman Corpus Network.

