

The Use of Youtube Channel Vlog 'Learning English with Bob the Canadian' To Increase Students' Vocabulary Mastery

Riski Umiwati

IAIN Syaikh Abdurrahman Siddik Bangka Belitung

Ihda Husnayaini

IAIN Syaikh Abdurrahman Siddik Bangka Belitung

Firdaus

IAIN Syaikh Abdurrahman Siddik Bangka Belitung

Article Information:

Keywords:

Vlog
Learning English
Vocabulary Mastery

ABSTRACT

This study set out to explore whether watching the English learning vlog "Bob the Canadian" made a significant difference in students' vocabulary development compared to those who didn't use it. The research looked at four main aspects of vocabulary: word form, pronunciation, meaning, and usage in descriptive texts. Using a quasi-experimental design, the study involved two seventh-grade classes with a total of 65 students, split into an experimental group and a control group. To track vocabulary progress, both groups took pre-tests and post-tests. The results, analyzed using paired and independent t-tests via SPSS version 26, showed a post-test score gap of 14.384 between the groups, with a standard error of 2.701. The significance level was 0.000—well below the 0.005 cutoff—indicating strong statistical evidence. Based on the findings, the alternative hypothesis was supported, while the null hypothesis was set aside. In short, the findings show that using the vlog helped improve students' vocabulary skills..



This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. ©2019 by author.

Correspondence:

Ihda Husnayaini
Email: ihdahusna@iainsasbabel.ac.id

INTRODUCTION

Acquiring vocabulary is an essential aspect that supports success in using English (Nation, 2005; Nunan, 1991). Without a broad vocabulary, we cannot use sentence structure and function correctly (Sedita, 2023; (US) et al., 2000). For effective communication and preparation for English in education, more attention should be given to improving vocabulary learning techniques ((US) et al., 2000). Vocabulary is one of the fundamental elements in all language learning, as a common problem in learning English is that students often struggle with practicing pronunciation, listening, and understanding words while learning the language structure. It is quite difficult for them to determine the meaning of words without sufficient vocabulary knowledge (Alqahtani, 2015; Coady & Huckin, 1997; Huckin, 1995; Nation & Webb, 2011; Nunan, 1991; Sedita, 2023). A lack of vocabulary knowledge often creates obstacles that slow down learners' progress (Surmanov & Azimova, 2020).

In the Indonesian educational landscape, English is classified as a foreign language, and many students encounter significant challenges in mastering it. These difficulties stem from a combination of interrelated factors. A major barrier is the lack of intrinsic motivation among learners, which often results from limited understanding of the practical benefits that proficiency in English can offer in terms of global opportunities, career advancement, and access to international resources. Motivation is identified as the main problem, along with the need for interactive and digital learning media to improve vocabulary acquisition (Baharudin et al., 2024). Challenges include memorization, contextual usage, retention, and motivation (Laoli et al., 2025). Pronunciation and spelling differences between English and Indonesian cause significant obstacles. Students struggle with word pronunciation, spelling, reading, and memorizing

vocabulary due to these differences (Krisnayanti & Winarta, 2021; Lutfiyah et al., 2022; Rahmawati et al., 2023). The students in Bangka are not an exception of having such problems in learning vocabulary.

In today's digital age, people can easily access a vast amount of information online. Technology serves as a valuable tool for both teaching and learning vocabulary, as it simplifies the learning process for individuals (Anam, 2024; Hetal Ascher, 2021). One effective way to do this is by using social media platforms like YouTube (Anam, 2024; TalkPal Inc., 2025). Using YouTube for teaching and learning English vocabulary is engaging, and the platform offers many videos about learning English that are accessible to everyone (OHLA, 2024; Team Scoonews, 2016). While YouTube was not originally created for educational purposes, it has recently become a popular resource for learning English (Team Scoonews, 2016). The availability of helpful resources on YouTube makes it an educational and appealing option for language learners (OHLA, 2024; Team Scoonews, 2016).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Learning, according to Connectivism, proposed by Siemens (Siemens, 2005), involves forming connections with various digital nodes and updating knowledge through continuous engagement. It is a learning theory designed for the digital age, emphasizing that knowledge is distributed across networks of people, tools, and information sources. YouTube, as one of the most widely used educational platforms, aligns closely with Connectivist principles by offering learners access to diverse multimodal content, including videos with subtitles, captions, and on-screen texts that support the development of reading comprehension. Through these features, EFL learners can strengthen their understanding of vocabulary, sentence structures, and discourse while also engaging in authentic and autonomous learning. Research supports this theoretical connection. In a study of Thai vocational students, Hayikaleng, Nair, and Krishnasamy (Hayikaleng et al., 2017) found that YouTube significantly improved students' reading comprehension skills, particularly when videos included text-based input and were followed by comprehension tasks. Similarly, Astrini, Susanti, and Nurhaliza (Astrini et al., 2024) reported that Indonesian EFL students benefited from caption-supported videos on YouTube, showing gains in reading comprehension and vocabulary retention. Ajito (Ajito, 2024) further emphasized that YouTube-based instruction encourages critical reading and learner autonomy, which are essential elements of a connectivist learning environment. These findings demonstrate that YouTube functions not only as a tool for listening and speaking but also as an effective platform for enhancing reading comprehension through learner-centered, digitally mediated interaction with authentic texts.

One of the YouTube channels for learning English is *Bob the Canadian*, a vlog (video blog) that can be used to improve vocabulary. This channel teaches English through videos that feature commonly used vocabulary in real-life contexts. *Bob the Canadian* is a very interesting channel; he creates vlogs on various topics that help learners build their basic English vocabulary. His videos are presented in a casual, routine vlog format. Bob describes public places, sights, and conversations using simple English, explaining difficult words clearly. His accent is easy to understand, and he adds subtitles to his videos to help viewers follow along. Therefore, this research seeks to explore how watching the vlog influences students' ability to understand and use English vocabulary more effectively.

METHOD

This research followed an experimental method using a quasi-experimental setup, where participants were divided into two groups—one group took part in the treatment (the experimental group), while the other group continued without it (the control group). The participants consisted of 65 seventh-grade students at a state junior high school located in Bangka, selected using the census sampling method. A census refers to a study in which all members of the population are included. Unlike sampling techniques, which select a subset of the population to represent the whole, a census involves collecting data from every individual in the population. This approach is typically used when the population size is small and manageable, or when complete accuracy is required (Fraenkel et al., 2019). For the purpose of data collection, participants were given a vocabulary-focused pre-test before the intervention and a post-test afterward to measure any changes in proficiency. A T-test was then applied to analyze the results and determine whether the differences between the experimental and control groups were statistically significant.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Results

a. Data Analysis of Prerequisite Test

1) Normality Test

A normality test was carried out to check whether there was any relationship between variable X, which serves as the outcome, and variable Y, the factor being studied, and to check if the data for both variables were normally distributed. To perform this analysis, the Kolmogorov–Smirnov (K–S) test was used. This test is commonly used to see how closely the sample data matches a normal distribution pattern.

The key to interpreting the K–S test results lies in the p-value. When the p-value comes out higher than 0.05, it indicates that the data doesn't significantly differ from what we'd expect in a normal distribution—so we can treat it as normally distributed. On the other hand, if the p-value is below 0.05, it shows that the data differs enough to be considered not normally distributed. The outcome of this normality check, which was run using SPSS software, is displayed in the table below.

Table 1. The Result of Normality Test

	Group	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Results	Pret-Test Experiment (YouTube Channel)	.147	32	.075	.944	32	.100
	Post-Test Experiment (YouTube Channel)	.127	32	.200*	.957	32	.223
	Pre-Test Control (Conventional)	.137	31	.146	.945	31	.112
	Post-Test Control (Conventional)	.136	31	.152	.951	31	.167

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

Lilliefors Significance Correction

According to the data presented in the table, the Kolmogorov–Smirnov (K–S) test was carried out to evaluate whether the data from both the experimental and control groups followed a normal distribution pattern. In the experimental group, the significance value from the pre-test was 0.075, which is above the commonly accepted threshold of 0.05. This suggests that the distribution of scores in the pre-test closely aligns with what would be expected in a normal distribution, meaning the data is considered statistically normal. Furthermore, the post-test results in the same group yielded a significance value of 0.200, which is even higher. This provides stronger evidence that the post-test data also met the normality assumption. Overall, both sets of scores from the group receiving the treatment, before and after it was applied —can be viewed as normally distributed, validating the use of parametric statistical tests for further analysis.

The control group showed a similar trend. In the control group, the pre-test produced a significance value of 0.146, while the post-test showed a value of 0.152. Since both figures are higher than the 0.05 benchmark, it suggests that the data from both testing periods followed a normal distribution. This means the students' scores before and after the learning activities were spread out in a way that aligns with the assumptions of normality, based on the results of the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test.

2) Homogeneity Test

A homogeneity test was carried out on the sample classes involved in the study to examine whether the variance between them could be considered statistically uniform. The test was designed to assess the similarity in distribution across the experimental and control groups prior to comparative analysis. For this purpose, the dataset included both pre-test and post-test scores from each group. According to standard interpretation criteria, if the resulting significance value exceeds the 0.05 threshold, the data are deemed to be homogeneous. For this study, the homogeneity test was performed with the help of SPSS version 26 software to analyze the data consistency between groups. The full results of the analysis are presented in the table below.

Table 2. The Result of Homogeneity Test Pre-test

Test of Homogeneity of Variance					
		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Results	Based on Mean	.057	1	61	.811
	Based on Median	.032	1	61	.858
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.032	1	58.201	.858
	Based on trimmed mean	.053	1	61	.818

The table provides a detailed summary of the homogeneity test results, which were conducted to examine whether the post-test scores from both the experimental and control groups shared similar variance. This analysis helps determine if the groups were comparable in terms of data consistency after the intervention.

This analysis was conducted using a significance level of 0.05 as the standard for determining whether the data sets shared similar variance. The outcome of the test showed a significance value of 0.811, which is well above the 0.05 threshold. This indicates that there is no meaningful statistical difference in the spread or consistency of scores between the two groups. In simpler terms, both the experimental and control groups demonstrated similar levels of variability in their post-test performance, confirming that the data is homogeneous and suitable for further comparative analysis.

Table 3. The Result of Homogeneity Test Post-test

Test of Homogeneity of Variance					
		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Results	Based on Mean	.332	1	61	.566
	Based on Median	.314	1	61	.578
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.314	1	58.768	.578
	Based on trimmed mean	.330	1	61	.568

From the table presented, the homogeneity test for the post-test scores in both the experimental and control groups produced a significance value of 0.566. Since this value is above the 0.05 cutoff point, it suggests that the variation in scores between the two groups is not statistically different. In simple terms, both groups showed a similar level of consistency in their post-test results, indicating that the data is evenly distributed and meets the criteria for homogeneity.

3) Hypothesis Test (t-test)

Once the normality test was completed, the next step involved running a hypothesis test to further analyze the data. In this research, hypothesis testing was carried out using a parametric approach, specifically the independent samples t-test, which was run through SPSS version 26. This method was chosen to examine and compare the average scores of the experimental and control groups, both before and after the intervention. The purpose of this analysis was to find out if there were any significant differences in how the two groups performed. A breakdown of these results are illustrated in the table provided below:

b. Pre- and Post-Test Score Review for the Experimental Group

Table 4. Paired Samples Statistics in Experimental Group

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pre-Test	33.81	32	8.291	1.466
	Post-Test	65.09	32	12.338	2.181

Referring to the table, students in the experimental group had an average score of 33.81 on the pre-test, reflecting their performance level before the learning intervention was introduced. The standard deviation was 8.291, indicating some variation in how students performed, while the standard error of 1.466 shows how precise that average score is. After the intervention, the group's average score rose significantly to 65.09, showing a notable improvement in performance. The associated standard deviation was 12.338, with a standard error of 2.181, suggesting a wider spread in scores and slightly lower precision in the mean estimate compared to the pre-test.

Table 5. Paired Samples Correlation in Experimental Group

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Pre-Test & Post-Test	32	.414	.019

Table 5 displays the outcome of the paired sample correlation analysis, revealing a correlation value of 0.414 between the experimental group's scores before and after the intervention. With a significance level of 0.019—well below the 0.05 benchmark—the result confirms a statistically meaningful link. This indicates a moderate positive relationship, meaning students who performed better on the pre-test also tended to show improved results on the post-test, reflecting a consistent trend in their learning progress.

Table 6. Paired Samples Test in Experimental Group

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
				Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Mean	Std. Dev.			
Pair 1	Pre-Test	-			-	-	-	31	.000
	Post-Test	31.281	11.674	2.064	35.490	27.072	15.158		

Looking at the paired-samples test results, the analysis showed an average score increase of 31.281 from the pre-test to the post-test. This was accompanied by a standard deviation of 11.674, indicating the extent of score variability, and a standard error of 2.064, reflecting the precision of the estimated mean difference. The computed t-value was 15.158, based on 31 degrees of freedom. Moreover, the two-tailed significance level was 0.000, which is substantially below the conventional threshold of 0.05. This outcome indicates that the observed difference in vocabulary achievement among students is statistically significant and unlikely to have occurred by chance.

c. Data Analysis of the Control Group's Pre- and Post-Test Results

Table 7. Paired Samples Statistics in Control Group

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pre-Test	31.58	31	8.401	1.509
	Post-Test	50.71	31	8.730	1.568

As indicated by the paired sample results displayed above, the control group recorded a mean score of 31.58 on the pre-test. This was accompanied by a standard deviation of 8.401, reflecting the variability of the data, and a standard error of 1.509, indicating the precision of the mean estimate. Following the instructional period, the post-test mean score rose to 50.71. The associated standard deviation was 8.730, with a standard error of 1.568, suggesting a modest increase in variability while maintaining consistent precision in the measurement.

Table 8. Paired Samples Correlation in Control Group

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Pre-Test & Post-Test	31	.581	.001

Table 8 presents the results of the paired sample correlation for the control group, showing a correlation coefficient of 0.581 between the scores before and after the lesson. The significance value was 0.001, which is far below the typical cutoff point of 0.05. This means there's a strong and statistically reliable connection between the students' pre-test and post-test performance, even though they didn't receive the experimental intervention. It suggests that their performance remained relatively consistent throughout the learning period.

Table 9. Paired Samples Test in Control Group

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair1	Pre-Test Post-Test	- 19.129	7.843	1.409	- 22.006	- 16.252	- 13.579	30	.000

The paired-samples test results, as outlined in the table, show that the control group demonstrated a mean difference of 19.129 between their pre-test and post-test scores. This difference was accompanied by a standard deviation of 7.843, suggesting the extent of variability in score changes across participants, and a standard error of the mean of 1.409, indicating the precision of the estimated mean difference. The test yielded a t-value of 13.579 with 30 degrees of freedom, and the corresponding two-tailed significance level was 0.000. Since this p-value is significantly lower than the commonly accepted limit of 0.05, the result confirms that the observed difference is statistically significant and not likely due to random variation.

d. A Comparison of Pre-Test Results Between Students in the Experimental and Control Groups

Table 10. Group Statistics Independent Samples T-Test of Students' Pre-Test

	Kelas	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Results	Pre-Test Experiment	32	33.81	8.291	1.466
	Pre-Test Control	31	31.58	8.401	1.509

The data presented in the table illustrates a comparative overview of students' pre-test performance across both the control and experimental groups. In the experimental group, students had an average pre-test score of 33.81. The spread of students' scores is reflected in a standard deviation of 8.291, indicating how much individual results differed from the group average, and the standard error of 1.466 suggests a fairly accurate estimate of the group's overall performance. Meanwhile, the control group had a slightly lower average of 31.58. Their scores showed a bit more spread, with a standard deviation of 8.401 and a standard error of 1.509, reflecting a similar level of consistency in their performance.

Table 11. Independent Samples T-Test of Students' Pre -Test

		Levene's Test for quality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	\bar{x} Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Results	Equal var. assumed	.000	.992	1.061	61	.293	2.232	2.103	-1.974	6.437
	Equal var. not assumed			1.061	60.874	.293	2.232	2.104	-1.975	6.438

Referring to the data in Table 9, the results of the independent samples t-test showed that the analysis was conducted with 61 degrees of freedom. The two-tailed p-value came out to 0.293, and the calculated t-score was 1.061, with an average score difference of 2.232 when comparing the experimental group to the control group in the pre-test phase. Since the p-value is much higher than the commonly accepted 0.05 threshold and the t-value falls short of the critical value of 2.00, From these results, it is clear that the gap in pre-test scores between the two groups does not hold any statistical significance. This suggests that both groups started out with fairly similar performance levels before the intervention.

This means that before the intervention was introduced, both groups were relatively equal in terms of their vocabulary knowledge. Therefore, any contrasts that emerged in the post-test data scores can be more confidently attributed to the treatment or learning method applied, rather than to pre-existing differences in ability.

e. An Analysis of Post-Test Results Comparing the Experimental and Control Groups

Table 12. Group Statistic Independent Samples T-Test of Students' Post-Test

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Results	Post-Test Exsperimental	32	65.09	12.338	2.181
	Post-Test Control	31	50.71	8.730	1.568

The table provides a comparative overview of post-test performance between the experimental and control groups. Students in the experimental group achieved a mean post-test score of 65.09, accompanied by a standard deviation of 12.338, indicating a relatively wider spread of scores. The standard error of the mean was calculated at 2.181, reflecting the degree of precision in the group's average score estimate. By contrast, the control group recorded a lower mean score of 50.71 on the post-test, with a standard deviation of 8.730 and a standard error of 1.568, suggesting less variability and slightly higher precision in the mean estimate.

Table 13. Independent Samples T-test in Post-test Experimental and Control Group

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Results	Equal var. assumed	6.128	.016	5.326	61	.000	14.384	2.701	8.984	19.784
	Equal var. not assumed			5.355	55.896	.000	14.384	2.686	9.003	19.765

The table presents the outcome of the statistical comparison between the two groups, which was carried out with 61 degrees of freedom. The results of the analysis showed a two-tailed p-value of 0.000 and a t-score of 5.326. On average, the experimental group outscored the control group by 14.384 points in the post-test, with a standard error of 2.701. Since the p-value is well under the 0.05 benchmark, this clearly indicates a meaningful and statistically significant gap in performance between the two groups. Moreover, the high t-value—well above the critical value of approximately 2.000—strengthens the conclusion that the experimental group's improvement wasn't random, but a result of the treatment applied during the study.

Referring to the table, the reported two-tailed significance value is 0.000. Because the p-value falls below the standard cut-off point of 0.05, the null hypothesis (H_0) is set aside in favor of the alternative hypothesis (H_a). This follows the usual guideline in statistics that a p-value under 0.05 signals a meaningful result—not just something that happened by chance, indicating enough evidence to reject the null. However, if the p-value had been higher than 0.05, we would have had to retain the null hypothesis and reject the alternative instead.

f. A Comparative Analysis of the Experimental and Control Groups

Table 14. Comparison between Experimental Group and Control Group

Group	Highest Pre-Score	Highest Post-Score	Pre- Mean	Post-Mean
Experimental	47	85	33,81	65,09
Control	44	68	31,58	50,71

To better understand the differences across the group that received the intervention and the one that did not, a comparison is outlined in the previous table. Before the intervention, the highest pre-test score in the experimental group was 47, slightly higher than the control group's top score of 44. However, the gap became more noticeable after the post-test. The highest score achieved in the experimental group was 85, showing a strong performance after the intervention. In contrast, the control group's top score was 68, which suggests a noticeable gap in achievement between the two groups.

Looking at the averages, the average score of the experimental group on the pre-test was 33.81, reflecting their initial level of understanding before the intervention was introduced. just a bit ahead of the control group's 31.58. After the intervention, that gap widened significantly—with the experimental group averaging 65.09 compared to 50.71 in the control group.

These results clearly show that students in the experimental group made greater progress. In simple terms, the intervention had a meaningful and positive impact. It can be concluded that using YouTube video vlogs as a learning tool significantly helped improve the students' vocabulary skills.

2. Discussions

To evaluate the hypothesis and compare the performance between the two groups, an independent t-test was carried out. Before any intervention took place, the experimental group had an average pre-test score of 33.81, whereas the control group followed closely behind with a slightly lower average of 31.58. After the intervention, the experimental group experienced a notable boost in performance, with their post-test average jumping to 65.09. Meanwhile, the control group's post-test average reached 50.71. These findings strongly support the acceptance of the alternative hypothesis (H_a), indicating that the difference in outcomes between the two groups was statistically significant and not due to chance.

Studies by Partyastini (Partyastini & Suprianti, 2024), Sarumpaet (Sarumpaet & Panjaitan, 2022), and Syam (Syam & Emirati, 2021) revealed that using vlogs as a learning medium successfully increased students' vocabulary mastery. These outcomes reflect similar patterns observed in those earlier studies, showing a positive impact of vlog use on students' vocabulary acquisition.

The use of digital media in learning requires careful planning and strict supervision to ensure that learning objectives are achieved effectively (Rahman & Harvina, 2023). Similar to the use of smartphones in information search strategies, the use of YouTube-based vlogs in this study also requires clear initial guidance from educators. Students need to be guided to focus their attention on relevant learning content and directed in their information search or understanding of the material through this medium. Without supervision and clear objectives, there is a risk that this medium may be used for non-learning activities, which could reduce its effectiveness. Therefore, in this study, the

intervention using the “Bob the Canadian” vlog was implemented with specific settings and supervision to ensure that students' focus remained on the targeted vocabulary aspects.

Therefore, the data clearly indicate that the implementation of vlog-based learning contributed positively to the results demonstrated by students who received the treatment. This impact is further demonstrated by the notable improvement in their average post-test scores. Consequently, this leads to the conclusion that the YouTube vlog *Learn English with Bob the Canadian* serves as an effective instructional medium for enhancing English vocabulary acquisition among high school students.

CONCLUSION

Upon examining the independent t-test results, the significance value came out to 0.000—which is clearly lower than the usual benchmark of 0.05. Since the number is that low, it gives us strong reason to reject the null hypothesis and go with the alternative instead. In other words, there's a meaningful difference in the post-test scores between the students who experienced the learning intervention and those who did not.

The data suggest that there is a noticeable and statistically significant difference between students who learned using English learning vlogs by Bob the Canadian and those who did not. This suggests that the YouTube channel vlog can be an effective tool to enhance students' vocabulary mastery.

It is recommended that English teachers incorporate this type of digital media in the classroom as a resource to improve students' EFL performance, as it is engaging and effective.

REFERENSI

- Ajito, J. A. (2024). Connectivist learning through YouTube-integrated instruction to improve EFL students' critical reading skills. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 6(1), 55–68.
- Alqahtani, M. (2015). The importance of vocabulary in language learning and how to be taught. *International Journal of Teaching and Education*, 3(3), 21–34.
- Anam, S. (2024). Exploring the Impact of Social Media Use on English Vocabulary Learning among Non-English Major University Students. *Scope: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 9(1), 1–12.
- Astrini, P. A., Susanti, R., & Nurhaliza, L. (2024). Enhancing EFL learners' reading comprehension through YouTube-based multimodal texts. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Education*, 11(2), 112–126.
- Baharudin, B., Saifullah, S., & Hasan, A. A. Z. (2024). Secondary English Language Teacher's Perceptions of Students' Difficulties in Learning Vocabulary Faced by Indonesian EFL Students. *English Education Journal*, 103–110.
- Coady, J., & Huckin, T. (1997). *Second language vocabulary acquisition: A rationale for pedagogy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2019). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (10th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Hayikaleng, N., Nair, S. M., & Krishnasamy, H. N. (2017). Using Youtube to improve EFL reading comprehension among vocational. *Proceedings of the ICECRS*, 1(1), 391–398.
- Hetal Ascher. (2021, August 5). *3 Tech Tools for Teaching Vocabulary*. TESOL International Association.
- Huckin, T. (1995). *Second language reading and vocabulary learning*.
- Krisnayanti, N. P. A., & Winarta, I. B. G. N. (2021). The problems of learning English vocabulary in Harapan Senior High School. *Journal of Language and Applied Linguistics*, 2(2), 201–207.
- Laoli, A., Giawa, N. H., Zebua, D. P. J., & Namo, E. F. J. (2025). Strategies and Challenges of English Education Students in Vocabulary Mastery. *Eltin Journal: Journal of English Language Teaching in Indonesia*, 13(1), 157–170.
- Lutfiyah, N., Nuraeningsih, N., & Rusiana, R. (2022). The obstacles in learning vocabulary of EFL students. *Prominent: Journal of English Studies*, 5(2), 114–125.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2005). Teaching and learning vocabulary. In *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 581–595). Routledge.
- Nation, I. S. P., & Webb, S. A. (2011). *Researching and analyzing vocabulary*. Heinle, Cengage Learning Boston, MA.
- Nunan, D. (1991). Language teaching methodology. *A Textbook for Teachers*.
- OHLA. (2024, August 16). *10 Best YouTube Channels for English Learning*. OHLA English Language School.
- Partyastini, I. D. A. D., & Suprianti, G. A. P. (2024). Leveraging the Activity of Watching Video Vlogs: Its Effects on Students' Vocabulary Mastery Grade VII. *Lingua Scientia*, 12–18.
- Rahman, P. K., & Harvina, K. (2023). Implementation of Smartphone Media on Information Search Strategy in PAI Learning Class XI SMA Negeri 1 Pangkalpinang. *LENTERNAL: Learning and Teaching Journal*, 4(1), 58–65.

- Rahmawati, N., Hidayatillah, N. S., & Amelia, R. (2023). An Analysis of Students' Difficulties in Vocabulary Mastery: A Case Study at English Club of SMAN 7 Kota Serang. *Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Pendidikan (JKIP)*, 4(1), 9–19.
- Sarumpaet, K. V., & Panjaitan, N. B. (2022). The Effectiveness of Using Vidio Vlog on Students Vocabulary Mastery for Grade 8 Junior High School Students' at SMP Advent Sei Bamban. *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan*, 8(5), 395–401.
- Sedita, J. (2023). *Vocabulary Instruction for English Language Learners*.
- Siemens, G. (2005). Connectivism: A learning theory for the digital age. *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning*. *Online]* Retrieved from: *Http://Www. Idtl. Org/Journal/Jam_05/Article01. Html*.
- Surmanov, S., & Azimova, M. (2020). *Analysis of difficulties in vocabulary acquisition*. Article in *The Journal of Legal Studies*, 6 (1), 144–155.
- Syam, N. I., & Emirati, E. (2021). Applying Vlog in Teaching Vocabulary. *Exposure: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris*, 10(1), 1–10.
- TalkPal Inc. (2025). *Social Media's Role in Language Learning*.
- Team Scoonews. (2016, October 27). *Using YouTube for education can be an amazing resource and revolutionary support mechanism*. Scoonews.
- (US), N. R. P., Health, N. I. of C., & (US), H. D. (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction: Reports of the subgroups*. National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National