THE EFFECT OF USING COOPERATIVE SCRIPT TECHNIQUE TOWARD STUDENTS' SPEAKING ABILITY AT THE SECOND YEAR OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL OF DARUL HIKMAH ISLAMIC BOARDING SCHOOL PEKANBARU

By

AHMAD SAKTI ALHAMIDI HASIBUAN
NIM. 10614003426

FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING
STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF SULTAN SYARIF KASIM RIAU
PEKANBARU
1433 H/2011 M

THE EFFECT OF USING COOPERATIVE SCRIPT TECHNIQUE TOWARD STUDENTS' SPEAKING ABILITY AT THE SECOND YEAR OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL OF DARUL HIKMAH ISLAMIC BOARDING SCHOOL PEKANBARU

A thesis

Submitted in Partial Satisfaction of Requirement

For the Bachelor Degree in Education

(S.Pd)

By

AHMAD SAKTI ALHAMIDI HASIBUAN

NIM. 10614003426

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH EDUCATION

FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING

STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF SULTAN SYARIF KASIM RIAU

PEKANBARU

1433 H/2011 M

SUPERVISOR APPROVAL

The thesis entitled "*The Effect of Using Cooperative Script Technique toward Students' Speaking Ability at the Second Year of Junior high School of Darul Hikmah Islamic Boarding School Pekanbaru*" is written by Ahmad Sakti Alhamidi Hasibuan, NIM. 10614003426. It is accepted and approved to be examined in the meeting of the final examination of undergraduate degree at Faculty of Education and Teacher Training of State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau.

Pekanbaru, <u>Muharram 14, 1433 H</u>
Desember 10, 2011 M

Approved by

The Chairperson of English   Supervisor
Education Department

Dr. Hj. Zulhidah, M.Pd.   Rizki Amelia, M.Pd.

EXAMINER APPROVAL

The thesis entitled "*The Effect of Using Cooperative Script Technique toward Students' Speaking Ability at the Second Year of Junior high School of Darul Hikmah Islamic Boarding School Pekanbaru*" is written by Ahmad Sakti Alhamidi Hasibuan, NIM. 10614003426. It has been approved and examined by the examination committee of undergraduate degree at Faculty of Education and Teacher Training of State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau on Rabiul Awal 04, 1433 H/ January 27, 2012 M as one of requirements for the Undergraduate Degree (S.Pd.) in English Education.

Pekanbaru, Rabiul Awal 04, 1433 H
January 27, 2012 M

Examination Committee

Chairperson   Secretary

Drs. Hartono, M.Pd.   Dr. Hj. Zulhidah, M.Pd.
Examiner I   Examiner II

Drs. H. Kalayo Hasibuan, M.Ed -TESOL.   Yasir Amri, S.Pd.I.,M.Pd.

Dean
Faculty of Education and Teacher Training

Dr. Hj. Helmiati, M.Ag.
NIP. 197002221997032001

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Praise to be God, Allah almighty, the Lord of universe, by His guidance and blessing, the writer can finish and complete this academic requirement. Then, the writer says peace be upon to Prophet Muhammad SAW.

In finishing this thesis, the writer has obtained significant helps, suggestions, encouragements, motivation, supports, and conveniences from many sides. Therefore, the researches would like to express his thankfulness in depth to:

1. Prof. Dr. H. M. Nazir. The Rector of State Islamic University of Suska Riau.
2. Dr. Hj. Helmiati, M.Ag. The dean of Education and Teacher Training Faculty of State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau.
3. Dr. Hj. Zulhidah, M. Pd. the Chairperson Department of English Education and her Secretary Dedi Wahyudi, M. Pd, for their guidance and help given to researcher to complete this thesis.
4. Mrs. Rizki Amelia, M.Pd. gratefully thank for her correction, suggestion, support, advice, and guidance in completing this thesis.
5. The examiner Teams, Drs. Hartono, M.Pd (the examiner's chairperson), Dr. Hj. Zulhidah, M. Pd (secretary), Drs. H. Kalayo Hasibuan, M.Ed TESOL (examiner I), Yasir Amri, S.PdI, M.Pd (examiner II) who have given many contributions and useful knowledge in accomplishing this thesis.
6. All lectures, the headmaster, and the English teacher of Junior high School of Darul Hikmah Islamic Boarding School Pekanbaru who have given the writer information and knowledge.
7. Special thanks to Mr. Drs. Kalayo Hasibuan, M.Ed-TESOL for his guidance and support. (May Allah always gives you all the best)
8. Burhanuddin Hasibuan and Asni Nasution The writer's beloved parents, profoundly love, affection and grateful for all their invaluable loves and affections to the writer. They are light of the writer's life.

They always educate, guide, and give moral and material provisions to the writer in order he can finish his study at State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau.

9. Susilawati Hsb, Ummi Syahida Yanti Hasibuan, Salmi Sri Ningsih Hasibuan, M. Tuah Al Amin Hasibuan, and Rahma Holilah Hasibuan the writer sisters and brother (thank you for your support and your patient, I love you all) and also both of his brothers in-law (Madalun Lubis and Hendra Nst) the writer Nephew and nieces M. Isnain Lubis, M. Iskandar Lubis, fadilah Lubis, Najwa Assifa Lubis, Putri Nst, Revina Nst, and Pinta Pria Nst. You all have to be a nice boy and girls, okay.

10. Robi Kurniawan, S.Pd for being the writer's best friend (let's reach the success together, and Rosidi Lubis, S.Pd, for his aids in completing this thesis. And the writer also thanks to Uswatun Hani Astuti for her love and patient (let's reach the bright futures and be a good Doctor).

11. All friends that I can't mention one by one.

Finally, the writer realized that this paper is not perfect yet; therefore comments, critics, and suggestion will be very much appreciated.

Pekanbaru, January 27, 2012 M
The Writer

Ahmad Sakti Alhamidi Hasibuan
NIM. 10614003426

ABSTRACT

Ahmad Sakti A Hsb (2011): "The Effect of Using Cooperative Script Technique toward Students' Speaking Ability at the Second Year of Junior High School of Darul Hikmah Islamic Boarding School Pekanbaru".

Students' difficulties to express their ideas have become a serious problem in English learning process, especially in speaking ability. Actually, there are many students get problems in learning speaking such as a feeling of difficulty to catch the main point when the teacher speaks, feeling of difficulty to understand part of speech, the students motivation to speak, and having a lack of vocabulary.

To help the students figure out their problems in learning speaking, the writer offered a learning technique type "Cooperative Script" by doing a research entitles "The Effect of Using Cooperative Script Technique toward Students' Speaking Ability at the Second Year of Junior High School of Darul Hikmah Islamic Boarding School Pekanbaru". This research is a kind of experimental research type quasi experiment non equivalent control group design. It means the sample of the research were two classes. One of them was an experimental group and the other was a control group.

The population of this research was all students of the second grade of junior high school of Darul Hikmah of Islamic Boarding School Pekanbaru. The writer took two classes randomly as the sample of this research. To collect the data, the writer gave them tests (Pre-test and Post-test). To analyze the collected data, the writer used statistical formula manually. The formula used in this research was sample T-test quoted from Hartono's book as follows:

$$to \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{SD_x}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{SD_y}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2}}$$

After analyzing the data on the post-test, the writer found that the students' mean score of experimental group was 52.04 and the mean score of control group was 40.13. By comparing the students' speaking ability scores between those who were taught by using cooperative script technique and those who were taught by usingconventional strategy by using the formula above. The writer found that there was a significant effect of using Cooperative Script technique into students' speaking ability. In the other word, the null hypothesis (Ho) was rejected, while the alternative hypothesis (Ha) was accepted. It can be proved by comparing the result of T-test (observed) and T-table. It could be read that $2.00 < 7.63 > 2.65$. So, it indicated that $t_{observed}$ was higher than that of $t\text{-}_{table}$ in significance of 5% and 1%.

ABSTRAK

Ahmad Sakti A Hsb (2011): Pengaruh Penerapan Teknik Kooperatif Script terhadap kemampuan Berbicara Siswa Kelas Dua Sekolah Menengah Pertama Pondok Pesantren Darul Hikmah Pekanbaru.

Kesulitan-kesulitan siswa dalam mengungkapkan ide mereka telah menjadi masalah yang serius dalam proses belajar bahasa Inggris. Khususnya dalam kemampuan berbicara. Sebenarnya, banyak terdapat masalah siswa dalam belajar Berbicara seperti merasa sulit untuk menangkap ide pokok ketika guru berbicara, merasa sulit untuk memahami jenis-jenis kata, siswa tidak berani berbicara dan mempunyai kosa kata yang sangat terbatas.

Untuk membantu siswa mengatasi permasalahan mereka dalam belajar berbicara penulis menawarkan sebuah teknik belajar jenis cooperative script dengan melakukan sebuah penelitian ilmiah dengan judul "Pengaruh Penerapan Teknik Kooperatif Script terhadap kemampuan Berbicara Siswa Kelas Dua Sekolah Menengah Pertama Pondok Pesantren Darul Hikmah". Penelitian ini adalah penelitian experimen jenis quasi experimen non-equivalent control group design. Maksudnya adalah sampel penelitian ini terdiri dari dua kelas yaitu kelompok eksperimen dan kelompok control.

Populasi penelitian ini adalah semua siswa kelas dua sekolah menengah pertama pesantren Darul Hikmah Pekanbaru. Penulis mengambil dua kelas secara acak sebagai sampel penelitian ini. Untuk mengumpulkan data, penulis memberikan test (pre-test dan post-test) yang sama kepada siswa. Sedangkan, untuk menganalisa data yang telah dikumpulkan, penulis menggunakan rumus statistic secara manual. Rumus yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah sampel t-test yang dikutip dari buku Hartono sebagai berikut:

$$ to\ \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{SD_x}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{SD_y}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2}} $$

Setelah menganalisa data pada post tes, penulis menemukan bahwa nilai rata-rata siswa pada kelompok eksperimen adalah 52.04 dan nilai rata-rata kelompok control adalah 40.13. dengan membandingkan nilai kemampuan berbicara siswa antara yang diajarkan dengan menerapkan Teknik kooperatif script dan yang diajarkan dengan strategi tradisional dengan menggunakan rumus di atas. Penulis menemukan bahwa ada pengaruh yang signifikan dari penerapan kooperatif script terhadap kemampuan berbicara siswa. Dengan kata lain hipotesis null (Ho) ditolak, sedangkan hipotesis alternatif (Ha) diterima. Hal ini dapat dibuktikan dengan membandingkan hasil dari T-test dan T table. Hal ini dapat dibaca bahwa 2.00 <7.63>2.65. maka hal ini menunjukkan bahwa T yang dicari lebih besar dari T table pada signifikan 5% dan 1%.

LIST OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER III: THE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

CHAPTER IV: DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

REFERENCES

APPENDIX

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDIX

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Problem

In English, there are four skills that should be mastered, they are listening, speaking, reading, and writing[1]. Speaking skill becomes very important in the educational field, students need to be exercised and trained in order to have a good speaking skill.

Furthermore, speaking is also something essential in language instruction and much more than the ability to read, write, or comprehend oral language.[2] For students, the success of their study of English depends on the greater part of their ability to speak. If their speaking skill is poor, they are very likely to fail in their study or at least they will have difficulty in making progress. On the other hand, if they have a good ability in speaking, they will have a better chance to succeed in their study. Jesperson said that the essence of language is human activity--activity on the part of one person to make himself understood by others, and activity on part of that other to understand what was on the mind of the first.[3] So, it strengthens the idea that speaking is important. Because we should note that is implicit in Jesperson's

---

[1] Syafii S, M. *From Paragraphs to a Research Report: A Writing of English for Academic Purposes*. Unpublished text book. (Pekanbaru: LBSI, 2007) p. 107

[2] Hasibuan, K et al. *Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL)*. (Pekanbaru:Alaf Riau Graha UNRI Press, 2007), p. 101

[3] Marianne Celce. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. (Newbury: House Publishers inc, 1979), p. 83

definition is that persons involved in this activity must be speaking the same language. Otherwise, the activity might not be successful.

In Indonesia, English is studied in almost every level of education. One of the levels of education is Junior high school. So, in this level, speaking is learned which is included on the English text book. One of the Junior high schools in Pekanbaru is Junior High School of Darul Hikmah Islamic Boarding School. It is located on Subrantas street , the distric of Tampan.

In teaching and learning process,English is taught based on School Based Curriculum (KTSP) which said that the standard competence of English is to make students know how to express the meaning in a transactional and an interpersonal conversation to interact in a neighborhood. But, the speaking ability in this school, especially for the second year students is still far from the expectation. It can be seen from the criteria of minimum achievement (KKM) of junior high school is that 60.So, from 120 total numbers of students, there are only 30 students who achieve the criteria of minimum achievement (KKM). The teacher of Junior High School of Darul Hikmah Islamic Boarding School said that she has taught her students with some teaching teachniques in order to improve students' ability to comprehend speaking. One of the teachniques that has already been used is Numbered Head Together (NHT) technique. But, as far as the writer observed, students still get difficulties in studying English, especially in comprehending speaking course. Based on the English teacher of Junior High School of Darul Hikmah Islamic Boarding School explanation, the main problems of the second year of Junior High School of

Darul hikmah Islamic Boarding School in speaking ability are in some symptoms below:

1. Some students are diffucult to catch the main point when the teacher speaks.

2. Some students cannot understand the parts of communication (Verb, Adjective, and noun,etc).

3. Some students do not dare to speak

4. Some students have lack of vocabularies.

Besides, the Numbered Head Together (NHT) technique, there are many ways that the teacher can use in order to improve student's speaking ability one of them is that using Cooperative Script Technique. Cooperative Script Technique is a method of cooperative learning where students work in pairs and take turns verbally in summarizing the parts of the material studied.[4]

After doing the observation, the writer is interested in conducting a research entitled: "The Effect of Using Cooperative Script Technique toward the Students' Speaking Ability at the Second Year of Junior High School of Darul Hikmah Islamic Boarding School Pekanbaru"

---

[4] Suyatno. *Menjelajah Pembelajaran Inovatif* (Sidoarjo: Masmedia Buana Pustaka, 2009), p. 75

B. Definition of the Terms

In order to avoid misunderstanding and misinterpretation about the title of this research, it would be better for the writer to define a number of terms used in this research.

1. Effect

   The effect is change that somebody/something causes in somebody/something else; result[5]. In this research, the effect is the result of teaching speaking by using Cooperative Script Technique at the second year of Junior High School of Darul Hikmah Islamic Boarding School Pekanbaru.

2. Cooperative Script Technique

   Cooperative Script Technique is a technique of cooperative learning where students work in pairs and take turns verbally in summarizing the parts of the material studied.[6] In this research, cooperative script is a technique used to teach students of at the second year of Junior High School of Darul Hikmah Islamic Boarding School Pekanbaru in teaching process when the research was done.

3. Speaking Ability

   Speaking is the single most important aspect of learning a second or foreign language, and success is measured in terms of the ability to

---

[5] Hornby, A,S. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. (London: Oxford University Press, 1995) p. 138
   [6] Suyatno*,Loc.Cit*

carry out a conversation in the language[7]. Meaning that, speaking can be defined as a tool of communication in learning language. when someone can't speak English after having a learning process, it seems that the learning process is failed. Means that speaking ability of student is the one that very essential in the process of learning English as a foreign or second language.

In addition, speaking is desire and purpose-driven, in order words, we want to communicative something to achieve a particular end[8]. While, ability is capacity or power to do something physically or mentally.[9] So, speaking ability is the ability of the students in expressing their ideas to communicate with others. In this research, speaking ability is the students' score after doing this research.

C.   The Reason of Choosing the Title

1. The writer wants to investigate the students' speaking ability by using Cooperative Script technique at Junior High School of Darul Hikmah Isalmic boarding School Pekanbaru.

---

[7] David Nunan, *Language Teaching Methodology*: *a Textbook for Teachers*, (New York: Prentice Hall, 1991), p. 39

[8] Kaslim Nasruddin, *The Correlation between Grammar Mastery and Speaking Ability of the Second Year Student at MAN Kampar Air Tiris,* (Pekanbaru UIN SUSKA: Unpublished Thesis. 2004), p.5

[9] Jumri, *The Contribution of Problem Solving Activity Applied by Students toward Their Speaking Ability of the Second Semester Students of English Educational Department of Education and Teacher Training*, (Pekanbaru UIN SUSKA: Unpublished Thesis, 2006), p.6

2. The writer is able to carry out this research regarding the time, finance and the writer's knowledge.

3. The topic of this research is relevant to the writer as one of the students of the English education department.

4. As far the writer is concerned, this research has never been investigated by any researcher yet.

D. The Problem

Based on the background above, the writer found that there are many students encountering problems in learning speaking.

1. Identification of the Problem

Based on the background and phenomena that the writer found from the preliminary study, the writer identifies some problems of this research as follows:

a. Why do the students not understand English speaking taught by the teacher?

b. Why do the students keep silent when the teacher asks them to speak directly?

c. Why do the students have lack of vocabularies?

d. Why do the students not feel embarrassed with their mistakes?

e. Why do the students not have ideas when they want to speak English?

2. Limitation of the Problem

The scope of the problem is quite large; it is needed to be limited. In this research, the writer takes the Second year students of Junior High School of Darul hikmah Islamic Boarding School Pekanbaru. In this research, the writer focuses on the effect of using cooperative script technique toward students' speaking ability at the Second Year of Junior High School of Darul Hikmah Islamic Boarding School pekanbaru.

3. .Formulation of the Problem

The problem of this research can be formulated as follows:

a. How is the students' speaking ability before using cooperative script technique at the second year of Junior High School of Darul Hikmah Islamic Boarding School Pekanbaru?

b. How is the students' speaking ability after using cooperative script technique at the second year of Junior High School of Darul Hikmah Islamic Boarding School Pekanbaru?

c. Is there any significant effect of using cooperative script technique toward students' speaking ability at the Second Year Student of Junior High School of Darul Hikmah Islamic Boarding School Pekanbaru?

B. The Objective and the Significance of the Research

1. The Objective of the Research

a. To find out students' speaking ability before of using Cooperative Script technique at the second year of Junior High School of Darul Hikmah Islamic Boarding School Pekanbaru.

b. To find out students' speaking ability after using Cooperative Script technique at the second year of Junior High School of Darul Hikmah Islamic Boarding School Pekanbaru.

c. To find out the significant effect of using Cooperative Script technique toward students' speaking ability at the second year of Junior High School of Darul Hikmah Islamic Boarding School Pekanbaru.

2. The Significance of the Research

a. To gratify the condition for obtaining the Undergraduate Degree at English Education Department of Education and Teacher Training Faculty of UIN SUSKA RIAU.

b. To provide some information about the students speaking ability by using Cooperative Script technique at the second year of Junior High School of Darul Hikmah Islamic Boarding School Pekanbaru.

d. To develop the writer's insight and knowledge about Cooperative Script Technique.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A. Theoretical Framework

1. The Nature of Speaking

Speaking is very important for those who learn English as a foreign language or second language. Many language learners regard speaking ability as the measurement of knowing language[1]. By speaking, someone can communicate and share information with each other and can express his or her ideas. Speaking is very crucial in communicating and sharing information and is also a very crucial art of the second language learning and teaching. In addition, speaking is to express the needs_request, information, service, etc.[2] The speakers say words to the listener not only to express what in her mind but also to express what he needs whether information or service. Most people might spend their everyday life in communicating with other.

According to M. Solahudin, speaking is, "An ability to speak English and it can be understood by others".[3] In order to express his or her needs, ideas, feelings and thoughts in a real communication, one must be able to ask as well as answer.

---

[1] Hasibuan K. et al, *Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL)*. (Pekanbaru:Alaf Riau Graha UNRI Press, 2007), p. 101

[2] http://www.scribd.com/doc/22057958/The-Improvement-Ofstudent%E2%80%99S-Speaking-Skill-Through-Guessing-Games-Technique. Retrieved on 21, July 2011, 2.54 pm.

[3] M. Solahudin, *Kiat-Kiat Praktis Belajar Speaking*. (Diva Press, 2008), p. 16

Therefore, based on my opinion about speaking, someone needs language to communicate with other in order that the message conveyed in source language to the language receptor can be achieved. To succeed in communicating language, when someone speaks with other, he or she should consider about the same language. Otherwise, the communication could not succeed if they do not consider about language.

2. Students' Speaking Ability

Generally, there are four language skills in mastering English namely listening, speaking, reading and writing that must be mastered by students. Speaking is a basic competence because it gives many advantages in learning English. It can increase students' pronunciation, grammatical structure and vocabulary. Speaking plays an important role in having four language skills. Using speaking, we can express our ideas to communicate with other people. Speaking skill is taught to students to make them capable in communicating by using English correctly. The elements are needed in teaching learning process, especially in teaching speaking skill. So that the students are capable and confident in speaking.

There are many problems in learning speaking, especially in the classroom. The first, the students always do mistakes in grammars and pronunciation aspects. Basically, they only speak English. They do not pay attention to the sentence structures and correct pronunciations. The second, the students are afraid of making mistakes in speaking English. It indicates that the students have limited vocabularies.

The last, the teacher dominates in teaching the students by using Indonesian. So it cannot increase students' speaking ability.

Speaking also need to be mastered by the students because it holds a very prominent role. Besides, it is one of the communicative means relating to role in social relationships and social expectations. Mastering the arts of speaking is the single most important aspect of learning a second or foreign language, and success is measured in terms of ability to carry out the conversation in the language[4]. Its mean, the ability to speak is very important, because the goal of language learning is to make the students able to use the language in communication. Language has a social function in which communication appears through interactions of one another such as expressing ideas and responding opinions.

3. The Factors Influencing Students' Speaking Ability

Speaking a language is difficult for junior high school students because the effective oral communication requires the ability to use the language appropriately in social interactions. There are some elements of studying speaking that need to be mastered, namely grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation (stress, intonation, and pitch), fluency, and gesture. The elements are needed to measure the capability of the students in speaking using appropriate technique. Because the complexities of the speaking elements, like grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, fluency, hence a lot of students get many problems. Based on Adam's explanation that student's speaking

---

[4]Hasibuan K, et al. *Ibid.*, p. 39

ability is influenced by accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.[5] Meanwhile, Arif Hidayat also states that there are some factors which influence students' speaking ability such as the teacher, the students, the materials, the technique, time allocation, and facilities available[6].

So, from the teacher's point of view, the success of speaking learning and teaching process depends on his/her ability in speaking English such as the mastery of pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, and also his/her competence in using target the language to communicate. One who is good at those factors will be able to teach the speaking skill well. A teacher is a model for the students. Most of the learners imitate what the teacher does.

Therefore, a good teacher will be a good model in a class. On the other hand, without having the competence, a teacher will be a bad model for his/her students. From the point of view of the students, it can be said that the successful process of the teaching learning of speaking correlates with the needs of the students. Based on their needs the teacher will determine certain activities that the students are going to do in learning and teaching process.

Besides the students' needs, the characteristics of the learners will also influence the process of teaching speaking. For example, the students who are active will be able to speak more fluently than those who are not. It may be caused by the

---

[5] Hughes Arthur, *Testing for Language Teachers.*(London : Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 131

[6] Hidayat Arif, Improving *Students' Speaking Ability through Communicative Activities*. (Surakarta:Unpublished Thesis, 2009), p.16

active students have many opportunities in practicing speaking in the target language. The materials to be taught also influence the success of learning and teaching speaking. It is difficult for the students to understand the materials that are not found in their real life. It will be easier for the students to discuss the problem that they face in their daily life. They will express them by involving their mind and feelings so that there will be a natural communication. The students will be more encouraged to learn if the materials are interesting. The materials should be adjusted with level of the students. For the first grade of students for example, it seems to be effective to give simple materials.

The technique used in teaching and learning speaking should be based on the student's needs and the objective of the language learning. In addition, the teacher should select the proper activities done in the classroom. The activities in learning and teaching process are absolutely needed. They specify what learners and the teacher will actually do in the classroom. The process of learning and teaching of English speaking is also influenced by the time allocation and the facilities available in the class. By providing sufficient time and facilities needed, the school can have the learning and teaching process of English speaking will be more successful. To improve the students' English speaking skill, those above factors, i.e. the teacher, the students, the materials, the technique, time allocation and facilities available, should deal with other English language skills.

The speaking skill is closely related to the listening. Successful listening as the receptive skill leads to the successful speaking which is considered as the productive skill. It is impossible to conduct communication in teaching and learning process by doing speaking activities only. But, to master all aspects above is not easy. It needs to be practiced. That is why the teacher should have a technique to figure it out.

4. The Nature of Cooperative Script

Cooperation is working together to reach the goals.[7] Within cooperative activities, students get outcomes that are beneficial to themselves and beneficial to all other group members. Cooperative Script is a method of Cooperative learning where students work in pairs and take turns verbally in summarizing the part of material studied.[8]

Meanwhile, Dansereau at.al also state that cooperative script is cooperation in making a manuscript with pairs repeating verbally in interpreting the materials studied.[9]

---

[7] Johnson. *The Nature of Cooperative learning*. (Bloomington:AECT, 2001), p. 1

[8] Suyatno,. *Menjelajah Pembelajaran Inovatif,*(Sidoarjo:Masmedia Buana Pustaka, 2009), p. 75

[9]Fuadah, Farchatul. *The effect of using Cooperative Script method toward students' achievement of Fiqih Lesson at senior high school Maryam Surabaya*, (Surabaya IAIN Sunan Ampel: unpublished Thesis, 2010) p. 19

The steps of Cooperative Script Technique can be seen below:

1. The teacher divides the students into a pair.

2. The teacher gives a text or material to the students to be read and makes summary.

3. The teacher and students decide who will perform as a speaker and who will be a listener.

4. The speaker reads his/her summary completely by input main ideas from the summary.

5. While the listeners: 1). Listening/ correcting/determining main ideas which are incompletely;

6. exchanging the role, the previous speaker is changed to be a listener

7. both of the teacher and students make a conclusion

8. Closing.[10]

Some advantages of using Cooperative Script Technique, they are:

1. Cooperate with others can help students to do their difficult task.

2. Helping students to memorize text missing.

3. Improving students understanding the lesson.

4. Giving students opportunity to correct such misunderstanding.

5. Helping students to connect the main ideas to the real life.

6. Encouraging them to have confidence to explore their ideas.[11]

---

[10] Suyatno, *Op. Cit.*, p. 117
[11] *Ibid*

Danserau and Spurlin quoted by Hadi also maintain that Cooperative Script Technique can improve students' achievement and encourage them to have an opportunity to study a lesson which they do not study yet.[12]

5. **Cooperative Script as a Technique in Improving Students' Speaking Ability**

Speaking is a crucial part of the second language teaching and learning. For many years, teaching speaking has been undervalued and English teachers have just continued to teach speaking as a repetition of drills or memorization of dialogues only.

However, today's world requires that the goal of teaching speaking should improve students' communicative skills. In addition, for students, the success of their study of English depends on the greater part of their ability to speak. If their speaking skill is poor, they are very likely to fail in their study or at least they will have difficulties in making progress. On the other hand, if they have a good ability in speaking, they will have a better chance to succeed in their study. So, in order to make students' English Speaking ability much better, the teacher should have a sufficient technique that can improve it. One of the techniques that the teacher can use is that Cooperative Script technique

According to Dansereau at.al, cooperative script is cooperation in making a manuscript with pairs repeating verbally in interpreting the materials studied.[13]

---

[12] Hadi. *Manfaat Pembelajaran Cooperative Script*.(Surabaya: Unpublisehed Thesis, 2007), p. 1

[13] Fuadah Farchatul. *Op. Cit,* p. 19

While, Slavin RE states Cooperative Script is a learning technique where the students work in pairs and perform as a speaker or listener alternately in interpreting the material which has been studied.[14] So, the Cooperative Script technique is a learning technique that needs cooperation between two people or more, as a speaker and listener. In this technique, there is an agreement between a teacher and students about collaboration rules. The problem is solved together and will be concluded together. The teacher's role is as a facilitator that guides students to reach the goal of studying. In addition, Kalayo at al also say that the teacher can help students improve their speaking ability by making scripts for different situation so that the students will feel easier to practice their English.[15]

Based on the experts' explanations of above. The writer finally realized that cooperative script technique needs to be conduct in a learning process of students of the second year of Darul Hikmah Islamic Boarding school Pekanbaru in order to improve their speaking ability.

B. Relevant Research

As matter of fact, there are some previous researchers regarding with the effect of using Cooperative Script technique. One of which was conducted by Dwi Maria Ulfah entitles the effect of using Cooperative Script method Toward Students' Understanding in Islamic Studies at Junior High School Muhammadiyah 4 Giri

---

[14] *Ibid*
[15] Hasibuan, K et al, *Op.Cit* , p. 105

Gresik. She found out that the students do not have brief when they wanted to show their ideas in studying Islamic Studies. Therefore, the teacher should have the method to improve the students' Understanding in Islamic Studies. So that, by using Cooperative Script method in teaching Islamic studies, she found out that there was a significant effect to the students' achievement. It can be seen from the degree of which the writer found out that 2. 00< 4.932 > 2.65. It indicated that t $_{observed}$ is higher than t-$_{table}$ in significance of 5% and 1%. In other words, H$_o$ is rejected and H$_a$ is accepted.[16]

The almost similar research was also conducted by Farchatul Fuadah entitles the effect of using Cooperative Script Method Toward Students' Achievement of Fiqih Lesson at Senior High School Maryam Surabaya. After doing this research, he got the conclusion that the implementation of Cooperative Script in studying Fiqih at senior high school Maryam Surabaya is categorized good based on the result of counting rxy = 0.738 compared with r table db = 20 – 2 = 18 it got 5% = 0.468 and1% = 0.590.because score rxy is greater than r table. So, Ha is accepted and Ho is rejected.[17]

Based on two researchers above, the writer is also interested in carrying out the research entitled "The Effect of the Using of Cooperative Script Technique Toward Students' Speaking Ability at Junior High School of Darul Hikmah Islamic

---

[16] Dwi Maria Ulfah, *The Effect of Using Cooperative Script Method Toward Students' Understanding in Islamic Studies at Junior High School Muhammadiyah 4 Giri Gresik,* (Surabaya IAIN Sunan Ampel: unpublished Thesis, 2004) p. 7
[17] Fuadah Farchatul , *Op. Cit.,* p. 123

Boarding School Pekanbaru". The problems which were not discussed yet in the previous researchers are discussed in this research. This research is an experimental study in which the writer applied Cooperative Script toward Students' Speaking Ability.

C. The Operational Concept

To clarify the theories used in this research, the operational concept is used to avoid misunderstanding and misinterpretation. It is an important element in a scientific study because the concepts are still operated in an abstract form of the research planning which must be interpreted into particular words in order to be easily measured empirically. In analyzing the effect of using Cooperative Script technique toward students' speaking ability, the writer uses several indicators as a guidanceed to conduct this research. There are two variables in this research. They are X, namely; Cooperative Script technique, and Y, namely; students' speaking ability. X is the independent variable and Y is the dependent variable.

The Cooperative Script technique can be seen in the following indicators:

1. The teacher divides the students into a pair.

2. The teacher gives a text or material to the students to be read and summarized.

3. The teacher and students decide who will act as a speaker and who will be a listener.

4. The speaker reads his/her summary completely by input main ideas from the summary.

5. While the listeners: 1). Listening/ correcting/determining main ideas which are incompletely;

6. Exchanging the role, the previous speaker is changed to be a listener

7. Both of the teacher and students make a conclusion

8. Closing.[18]

The students' speaking ability can be seen in the following indicators:

1. The students can speak English with suitable grammar

2. The students can speak English with good pronunciation

3. The students can speak English with appropriate words

4. The students can speak English fluently

5. The students are able to express their ideas to others by comprehending spoken language.[19]

D. The Assumptions and the Hypothesis

1. The Assumptions

In this research, the writer assumes that the students in the experimental and the control classes have different results. The experimental have better ability in oral communication.

---

[18] Suyatno, Op.Cit., p. 117
[19] H. Douglas Brown, *Language Assesment: Principle and Classroom Practice,* (London: Prentice Hall inc, 2003), p. 142

2. **The Hypothesis**

Ho: there is no significant effect of using Cooperative Script technique toward students' speaking ability.

Ha: there is a significant effect of using Cooperative Script technique toward students' speaking ability

CHAPTER III

THE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Research Design

This research was a kind of true experimental research type Posttest-only Control Design. It was a research which aimed to search whether there is or no effect of treatment which has been done to the experimental subject with random assignment.[1]

In this research, the writer used two classes to be samples, namely experimental and control groups. The experimental group were taught by particular treatments (cooperative script technique) to improve student' speaking ability. While control group were only given a pre-test and post-test without particular treatments as given to experimental group.[2] These groups used different tecniques, but both experimental and control groups were treated with the same test.Since the lesson plan was made for 8 meetings. So, the treatment was also given 8 times as many as lesson plan designed.

---

[1] Sugiyono. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif, dan R & D.* (Bandung: Alfabeta, 2008), p. 76
[2] Ibid.

Table III. 1
RESEARCH TYPE

GROUP	PRE-TEST	TREATMENT	POST-TEST
B	T1		T2
C	T1	X	T2

Explanation:

B   : Experimental group

C   : Control Group

T1 : Pre-test for experimental group and control group

    : Receiving particular treatment

X   : without particular treatment

T2 : Post-test for experimental group and control group[3]

After giving particular treatments to the experimental group by using Cooperative Script Technique, the score between experimental and control group were analyzed by statistical formula. It has an aim to know whether there was or no effect of variable X to variable Y. While the effect was known by giving the test (Pre-test and Post-test).

B. The Location and the Time of the Research

The location of this research was at Junior High School of Darul Hikmah Islamic Boarding School Pekanbaru. It was conducted in September to October 2011.

---

[3] Sugiyono. *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan* (Bandung: Alfabeta, 2008), p. 25

C. The Subject and Object of the Research

The subject of this research was the Second Year students of Junior High School of Darul Hikmah Islamic Boarding School Pekanbaru and the object of this research were students' speaking ability at the Second Year of Junior High School of Darul Hikmah Islamic Boarding School Pekanbaru.

D. The Population and Sample of the Research

1. The Population

The population in this research was the second year student of Junior High School of Darul Hikmah Islamic Boarding School Pekanbaru, consisted of four classes. There were 30 students in each class, from VIII B. 1 until VIII B. 4. The total population was 120 respondents. However, the writer limited the population only two classes of the second year. In order to make it clearer, see the table below:

Table III. 2
THE POPULATION OF THE SECOND YEAR STUDENTS
OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL OF DARUL HIKMAH
ISLAMIC BOARDING SCHOOL PEKANBARU

NO	CLASS	MALE	TOTAL
1	VIII B1	30	30
2	VIII B2	30	30
3	VIII B3	30	30
4	VIII B4	30	30
	TOTAL	120	120

2. The Sample

Because the number of population is large, so, to make the writer easier, the writer used quota sample. Quota sample is choosing some of the populations to be sample of the research based on the researcher's selection. The essential one is the number of samples can be refresentative correctly.[4]

In this research, the writer chose class VIII B2 and VIII B3 to be the sample of this research, because the number was enough to be the big sample. Hartono said that if the sample consists of 30 or more, it is called the big sample.[5] By choosing randomly, class VIII B2 became an experimental group and class VIII B3 was a control group. The experimental group consisted of 30 students. While, the control group consisted of 30 Students too. So, 60 students were representative enough to be sample of the research.

E. The Techniques of Data Collection

In this research, the writer collected the data by using:

1. Observation

Observation was the way to organize and control student's behavior, movement and interaction among the teacher or writer. In this research, the writer applied a participant observation. The English teacher directly observed the process of teaching and learning in the classroom.

---

[4] Suharsimi Arikunto, *Prosedur Penelition suatu Pendekatan Praktik*, (Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta, 2006), p. 141
[5] Hartono, *Statistik untuk Penelitian*, (Yogyakarta:Pustaka Pelajar , 2008), p. 207-208

2. Test

The test was divided into two ways; pre-test was given before the treatment and post-test was given after doing the treatments. Hughes says that speaking test must consist of five components; they are accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension.[6]

Meanwhile, Harris also states that speaking test should consist of five components to be rated, namely: pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension.[7] The rating is as follows:

1. Pronunciation

TABLE III. 3
PRONUNCIATION

Score	Requirement
5	Have few traces of foreign accent.
4	Always intelligible, though one is conscious of definite accent.
3	Pronunciation problems necessitate concentrated listening and occasionally lead to misunderstanding.
2	Very hard to understand because of pronunciation problem. Most frequently be asked to repeat.
1	Pronunciation problems so severe as to make speech virtually unintelligible.

---

[6] Hughes Arthur, *Testing for Language Teachers,*(London: Cambridge University Press), p. 111

[7]Harris, David P, *Testing English as Second Language*, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969), p. 79

2. Grammar

TABLE III. 4
GRAMMAR

Score	Requirement
5	Making few (if any) noticeable errors of grammar of word order.
4	Occasionally makes grammatical and/or word-order errors which do not, however, obscure meaning.
3	Making frequently errors of grammar and word-order which occasionally obscure meaning.
2	Grammar and word-order errors make comprehension difficult. Must often rephrase sentences and/or restrict him to basic pattern.
1	Errors in grammar and word-order are so severe as to make speech virtually unintelligible.

3. Vocabulary

TABLE III. 5
VOCABULARY

Score	Requirement
5	Using of vocabulary and idioms is virtually that of a native speaker.
4	Sometimes using inappropriate term/or must rephrase ideas because of lexical inadequacies.
3	Frequently using the wrong words, conversation somewhat limited because of inadequate vocabulary.
2	Misusing of words and very limited vocabulary which make comprehension quite difficult.
1	Vocabulary limitation is so extreme as to make conversation virtually impossible.

4. Fluency

TABLE III. 6
FLUENCY

Score	Requirement
5	Speech as fluent and effortless as that of a native speaker.
4	Speed of speech seems to be slightly affected by language problems.
3	Speed and fluency are as rather strongly affected by language problems.
2	Usually hesitant; often forced into silence by language limitations.
1	Speech is so halting and fragmentary as to make conversation virtually impossible.

5. Comprehension

TABLE III. 7
COMPREHENSION

Score	Requirement
5	Appear to understand every without difficulty.
4	Understands nearly everything at normal speed, although occasional repetition may be necessary.
3	Understand most of what is said at slower-than-normal speed with repetitions.
2	Have great difficulty following what is said. Can comprehend only "social conversation" spoken slowly and with frequent repetitions.
1	Cannot be said to understand even simple conversation English.

Based on the two statements above, the writer scored students' speaking ability by using Harris's idea. To measure students' speaking ability, the writer related the indicator above to the following accumulation.

TABLE III. 8
CATEGORY AND SCORE OF SPEAKING

Category	Score
5	17 – 20
4	13 – 16
3	9 – 12
2	5 – 8
1	1 – 4

To collect the data, speaking result was evaluated by concerning five components and each component has score of level. Each component has 20, the highest score and the total of the components is 100.

Through accumulating of all patterns above, the writer took the total score from conversion table without using the level. Then, the writer scaled the scores as follows:[8]

Table III. 9
The Scale of Students Speaking Ability

Score	Categories
80-100	Excellent
60-79	Very good
40-59	Good
20-39	Enough
Less than 20	Bad

---

[8] *Ibid*

F. The Technique of Data Analysis

In this research, the data were analyzed by using statistical method. The writer used score of post-test of the experimental group and control group. The writer analyzed the data by using t-test to know whether the result of the research is statistically significant or not.

The data were analyzed by using formula bellow:

$$to \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{SD_x}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{SD_y}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2}}$$

Where:

To = Table Observation

M_x = Mean score of Experimental Class

M_y = Mean Score of Control class

SD_x = Standard Deviation of Experiment class

SD_y = Standard Deviation of Control class

N = Number of students/Sample

CHAPTER IV

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

A. The Presentation of the Data

The data of the research were taken from the students' speaking scores on pre-test and post-test of both classes: experimental and control classes. The experimental class was taught by cooperative script technique, while control class was taught by a conventional strategy. Yet, in the data analysis, the writer only analyzed the post-test result because it influenced more the research findings rather than the pre-test. Post-test was given to the students in both classes after treatment was complete during eight meetings. Data of post-test were the students' scores on speaking ability through oral presentation which was recorded by the writer. The test results were evaluated by both of the raters.

Besides the test, the writer also observed the Use of Cooperative Script Technique toward the Students' Speaking Ability at the Second Year of Junior High School of Darul Hikmah Islamic Boarding School Pekanbaru. The function of observation in this research was only to describe the condition of classroom participant itself. The observation was conducted by the English teacher. The writer treated experimental class eight meetings by using cooperative script and all meetings were observed by the English teacher. The data observed can be seen as follows:

Table IV. 1
THE RECAPITULATION OF THE OBSERVATION

No	Item Observed	Observation Times								Total			
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Yes	%	No	%
1	The teacher divides the students into a pair.									8	100%	0	0%
2	The teacher gives a text or material to the students to be read and makes summary.									8	100%	0	0%
3	The teacher and students decide who will perform as a speaker and who will be a listener									7	87.5%	1	12.5%
4	The speaker reads his/her summary completely by input main ideas from the summary.									7	87.5%	1	12.5%
5	While the listeners: 1). Listening/ correcting/determining main ideas which incompletely;									8	100%	0	0%
6	exchanging the role, the previous speaker is changed to be a listener									6	75%	2	25%
7	both of the teacher and students make a conclusion									8	100%	0	0%
8	Closing.									6	75%	2	25%
	TOTAL									**58**	**90.63**	**6**	**9.37%**

The table above indicated that the writer implemented cooperative script 8 steps on 8 meetings. In the first, second, fifth, and seventh steps, the writer did 8 times or 100%. It means that the writer applied the first item well. In the third and fourth steps, the writer did it 7 times or 12.5%. it indicated that the writer practiced it very well. In the sixth and eighth steps, the writer did it 6 times or 75%. It means that the writer also implemented items number 6 and 8 well.

Based on the recapitulation of the data observed above, it can be concluded that the implementation of cooperative script technique was 90.63%. It means that it is categorized very good.

The more important thing in this research was not only the implementation result of observation of cooperative script in the experimental class, but also the result of testes after taught by cooperative script technique in experimental class and conventional strategy in control class. The collective data can be seen in the following explanation.

1. The Students' Speaking Ability on Pre-test

a. Experimental class

The students' speaking ability before giving the new treatment to the experimental class was found that the total scores evaluated by rater 1 was 1464, and the mean score was 48.80. While the total scores inspected by rater 2 was 952 and the mean score was 31.73. It was gotten from the same recorded CD. At the same time, by summing up the score of rater 1 and 2 and then divided into 2, the writer found its total score. The total score gotten by experimental class on pre-test was 1208 and the mean score was 40.26. It can be seen in the following table:

Table IV. 2
STUDENTS' SPEAKING ABILITY IN EXPERIMENTAL CLASS

Students' Code	Rater I	Rater II	Final Score
S-1	52	24	38
S-2	48	28	38
S-3	48	24	36
S-4	44	20	32
S-5	48	40	44
S-6	48	20	34
S-7	40	48	44
S-8	56	28	42
S-9	44	24	34
S-10	56	20	38
S-11	52	20	36
S-12	44	52	48
S-13	48	56	52
S-14	48	48	48
S-15	40	28	34
S-16	56	48	52
S-17	40	20	30
S-18	48	24	36
S-19	40	20	30
S-20	56	28	42
S-21	52	20	36
S-22	56	20	38
S-23	52	28	40
S-24	48	20	34
S-25	52	24	38
S-26	52	20	36
S-27	52	44	48
S-28	56	44	50
S-29	44	68	56
S-30	44	44	44
Total	**1464**	**952**	**1208**
Mean	**48.80**	**31.73**	**40.26**

b. **Control Class**

Speaking ability of the students in conventional group can be seen in the following table:

Table IV. 3
STUDENTS' SPEAKING ABILITY IN CONTROL CLASS

Students' Code	Rater I	Rater II	Final Score
S-1	48	20	34
S-2	40	28	34
S-3	52	24	38
S-4	56	20	38
S-5	44	24	34
S-6	40	48	44
S-7	48	24	36
S-8	48	28	38
S-9	44	24	34
S-10	48	40	44
S-11	40	24	32
S-12	56	40	48
S-13	44	48	46
S-14	56	28	42
S-15	44	48	46
S-16	56	28	42
S-17	48	24	36
S-18	48	20	34
S-19	48	20	34
S-20	56	20	38
S-21	44	40	42
S-22	44	24	34
S-23	48	20	34
S-24	48	28	38
S-25	44	40	42
S-26	52	40	46
S-27	52	20	36
S-28	40	20	30
S-29	44	20	32
S-30	44	48	46
Total	**1424**	**880**	**1152**
Mean	**47.46**	**29.33**	**38.04**

Based on the data on the table above, the writer found that the total score evaluated by rater 1 was 1424, and the mean score was 47.46. While the total score inspected by rater 2 was 880 and the mean score was 29.33. then, by

summing up the score of rater 1 and 2 divided 2, the writer found that the total

score gotten of control class on pre-test was 1152 and the mean score was 38.04.

c. The Classification of Students' Speaking Ability on Pre-test

Table IV. 4
THE CLASSIFICATION OF EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUP
IN SPEAKING ABILITY ON PRE-TEST

Students' Code	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Score	Classification	Score	Classification
S- 1	38	Enough	34	Enough
S- 2	38	Enough	34	Enough
S- 3	36	Enough	38	Enough
S- 4	32	Enough	38	Enough
S- 5	44	Good	34	Enough
S- 6	34	Enough	44	Good
S- 7	44	Good	36	Enough
S- 8	42	Good	38	Enough
S- 9	34	Enough	34	Enough
S- 10	38	Enough	44	Good
S- 11	36	Enough	32	Enough
S- 12	48	Good	48	Good
S- 13	52	Good	46	Good
S- 14	48	Good	42	Good
S- 15	34	Enough	46	Good
S- 16	52	Good	42	Good
S- 17	30	Enough	36	Enough
S- 18	36	Enough	34	Enough
S- 19	30	Enough	34	Enough
S- 20	42	Good	38	Enough
S- 21	36	Enough	42	Good
S- 22	38	Enough	34	Enough
S- 23	40	Good	34	Enough
S- 24	34	Enough	38	Enough
S- 25	38	Enough	42	Good
S- 26	36	Enough	46	Good
S- 27	48	Good	36	Enough
S- 28	50	Good	30	Enough
S- 29	56	Good	32	Enough
S- 30	44	Good	46	Good
Total	**1208**		**1152**	
Mean	**40.26**		**38.04**	

To make the data above clearer; the writer classified the students' speaking ability score of both classes in the table IV.4 above.

By looking at the Classifications of Experimental and Control Classes of Students' speaking ability on Pre-Test on the table above, the writer found that the amount of experimental group who achieved "Good" classification was 13 students and 17 students got "Enough" Classification. In addition, No student getting "Excellent, Very Good, and Bad Classifications".

Besides, the amount of control class who achieved "Good" classification in pre-test was 11 students and 19 students got "Enough" Classification. Nobody getting "Excellent, Very Good, and Bad Classifications". By comparing the classification of Speaking ability in Experimental and control classes above, the writer found that students who got "Good" classification in Experimental class was more than the control class.

2. The Students' Speaking Ability on Post-test

a. Students' Speaking ability in Experimental Class

Students' speaking ability in experimental group can be seen in the following table, the data were analyzed to answer the formulation of the research question and prove the hypothesis of this research.

Table IV. 5
STUDENTS' SPEAKING ABILITY IN EXPERIMENTAL CLASS

Students' Code	Rater I	Rater II	Final Score
S-1	60	56	58
S-2	60	44	52
S-3	64	28	46
S-4	64	44	54
S-5	56	44	50
S-6	68	44	56
S-7	64	52	58
S-8	56	48	52
S-9	60	40	50
S-10	60	28	44
S-11	68	56	62
S-12	64	68	66
S-13	56	60	58
S-14	56	44	50
S-15	56	44	50
S-16	68	52	60
S-17	64	28	46
S-18	56	28	42
S-19	64	20	42
S-20	60	52	56
S-21	56	44	50
S-22	56	48	52
S-23	60	40	50
S-24	64	40	52
S-25	56	24	40
S-26	60	28	44
S-27	60	48	54
S-28	64	60	62
S-29	56	68	62
S-30	64	44	54
Total	**1820**	**1324**	**1572**
Mean	**60.67**	**44.13**	**52.04**

The post-test data on the table above indicated that the total score evaluated by rater 1 was 1820, and the mean score was 60.67. While the total score evaluated by rater 2 was 1324 and the mean score was 44.13. Then, by

summing up the score of rater 1 and 2, the writer found that the total score of experimental class on post-test was 1572 and the mean score was 52.04.

b. Students' Speaking Ability in Control Class

<div align="center">

Table IV. 6
STUDENTS' SPEAKING ABILITY IN CONTROL CLASS

</div>

Students' Code	Rater I	Rater II	Final Score
S-1	52	28	40
S-2	52	40	46
S-3	56	20	38
S-4	56	28	42
S-5	48	20	34
S-6	44	24	34
S-7	56	20	38
S-8	56	24	40
S-9	56	20	38
S-10	48	40	44
S-11	56	20	38
S-12	56	60	58
S-13	48	20	34
S-14	60	24	42
S-15	48	24	36
S-16	56	24	40
S-17	56	28	42
S-18	52	20	36
S-19	52	20	36
S-20	56	20	38
S-21	48	48	48
S-22	52	24	38
S-23	52	28	40
S-24	48	24	36
S-25	48	28	38
S-26	52	44	48
S-27	56	20	38
S-28	56	20	38
S-29	52	20	36
S-30	52	48	50
Total	**1580**	**828**	**1204**
Mean	**52.67**	**27.06**	**40.13**

The students' score in speaking ability of control class were proposed one by one in the table above.

The post-test data on the table above explained that the total score evaluated by rater 1 was 1580, and the mean score was 52.67. While the total score evaluated by rater 2 was 828 and the mean score was 27.06. Its scores were gotten from the same recorded CD. Then, by summing up the score of rater 1 and 2 and the result was divided into 2, the writer found its total score. The total score gotten by control class on post-test was 1204 and the mean score was 40.13.

c. **The Classification of Students' Speaking Ability on Post-test**

To analyze the data easier; the writer classified the score of students' speaking ability of both classes on post-test. By detailing the Classification of Experimental and Control Classes of Students' speaking ability on the Post-Test on the table below, the writer found that the amount of experimental group who achieved "Very Good" classification was 5 students and 25 students got "Good" Classification. Then, nobody got "Excellent, enough, and Bad" Classifications in this post-test.

Besides, the amount of control class who achieved "Good" classification in post-test was 13 students and 17 students got "Enough" Classification. There was no student got "Excellent, Very Good, and Bad Classifications". By comparing the classification of speaking ability in Experimental and control classes above, the writer found that students who got "Very Good" classification were only in Experimental class, and the others got "Good" classification. The result of experimental class on post-test was higher than control class, because

nobody got very good classification in the control class, all of them only got good

and enough classifications. It can be seen in the following table:

Table IV. 7
THE CLASSIFICATION OF EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUP
IN SPEAKING ABILITY ON POST-TEST

Students' Code	Experiment Group		Control Group	
	Score	Classification	Score	Classification
S- 1	58	Good	40	Good
S- 2	52	Good	46	Good
S- 3	46	Good	38	Enough
S- 4	54	Good	42	Good
S- 5	50	Good	34	Enough
S- 6	56	Good	34	Enough
S- 7	58	Good	38	Enough
S- 8	52	Good	40	Good
S- 9	50	Good	38	Enough
S- 10	44	Good	44	Good
S- 11	62	Very Good	38	Enough
S- 12	66	Very Good	58	Good
S- 13	58	Good	34	Enough
S- 14	50	Good	42	Good
S- 15	50	Good	36	Enough
S- 16	60	Very Good	40	Good
S- 17	46	Good	42	Good
S- 18	42	Good	36	Enough
S- 19	42	Good	36	Enough
S- 20	56	Good	38	Enough
S- 21	50	Good	48	Good
S- 22	52	Good	38	Enough
S- 23	50	Good	40	Good
S- 24	52	Good	36	Enough
S- 25	40	Good	38	Enough
S- 26	44	Good	48	Good
S- 27	54	Good	38	Enough
S- 28	62	Very good	38	Enough
S- 29	62	Very good	36	Enough
S- 30	54	Good	50	Good
Total	**1572**		**1204**	
Mean	**52.04**		**40.13**	

d. The Description of Students' Speaking Ability of Experimental and Control group on Post-test

As the additional information of the data above, the writer also proposed the frequency and percentage among students who were taught by using Cooperative Script technique and who were taught by using a conventional strategy into speaking ability in English subject. It can be seen in the following table:

Table IV. 8
THE FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE BETWEEN
EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS IN SPEAKING ABILITY

No	Classification	Experimental Group		Control Group	
		F	P	F	P
1	Excellent	0	0%	0	0%
2	Very good	5	17%	0	0%
3	Good	25	83%	13	43%
4	Enough	0	0%	17	57%
5	Bad	0	0%	0	0%
	Total	**N = 30**	**100%**	**N = 30**	**100%**

Based on the data on the table above, the writer found that there were 5 students or 17% of experimental group achieved very good classification and 25 students or 83% of them got good classification and there was no student or 0% of them got Excellent, Enough, and Bad classifications. In contrast, there were 13 students or 43% of control group achieved good classification, 27 students or 57% of them got enough classification and there was none of them who got excellent, very good, and bad classifications. So, the highest frequency and percentage

achieved by experimental group was "Good" classification. Then, the highest frequency and percentage achieved by control group on post-test was "Enough" classification.

B. The Data Analysis

To answer the formulation of this research questions consisting of three formulations, here the writer served them completely, they were as follows:

1. How is the students' speaking ability before using cooperative script technique at the Second Year of Junior High School of Darul Hikmah Islamic Boarding School Pekanbaru?

2. How is the students' speaking ability after using cooperative script technique at the Second Year of Junior High School of Darul Hikmah Islamic Boarding School Pekanbaru?

3. Is there any significant effect of using cooperative script technique toward students' speaking ability at the Second Year of Junior High School of Darul Hikmah Islamic Boarding School Pekanbaru?

The writer analyzed the data manually and categorized them into five levels; they are excellent, very good, good, enough, and bad classifications.

1. The Score of Experimental and Control Groups on the Pre-Test (before Giving Treatment for Experimental Group)

The description of the students' speaking ability on the pre-test of class experimental and control groups can be seen in the table below:

Table IV. 9
THE DESCRIPTION OF STUDENTS' SCORE ON PRE-TEST

Score (x)	Frequency (f)	Fx	Percentage	Classification
Experimental Group (Variable X)
30	2	60	6.67%	Enough
32	1	32	3.33%	Enough
34	4	136	13.33%	Enough
36	5	180	16.67%	Enough
38	5	190	16.67%	Enough
40	1	40	3.33%	Good
42	2	84	6.67%	Good
44	3	132	10%	Good
48	3	144	10%	Good
50	1	50	3.33%	Good
52	2	104	6.67%	Good
56	1	56	3.33%	Good
Total	N = 30	1208	100%	
Mean		40.26		

Score (x)	Frequency (f)	fx	Percentage	Classification
Control Group (Variable Y)
30	1	30	3.33%	Enough
32	2	64	6.67%	Enough
34	8	272	26.67%	Enough
36	3	108	10%	Enough
38	5	190	16.67	Enough
42	4	168	13.33%	Good
44	2	88	6.67%	Good
46	4	184	13.33%	Good
48	1	48	3.33%	Good
Total	N=30	1152	100 %	
Mean		38.04		

Based on the description of the data above, the writer found that there were 17 or 57% students of experimental group who achieved "Enough" classification and 13 or 43% students who got "Good" classification. There was no student achieved Excellent, very good, and bad classifications. The mean score was 40.26. In contrast, there were 19 or 63% students of control group who achieved "Enough" classification, 11 or 37% students who achieved "Good" classification

and nobody got excellent, very good, and bad classifications. The mean score of its group was 38.04. By looking at both experimental and control groups mean scores in the table above, the writer concluded that experimental group's score classically higher than the control group on the pre-test.

2. The Score of Experimental and Control Groups on the Post-Test (after Giving Treatment to Experimental Group)

<div align="center">

Table IV. 10
THE DESCRIPTION OF STUDENTS' SCORE ON POST-TEST

</div>

Experimental Group (Variable X)				
Score (x)	Frequency (f)	fx	Percentage	Classification
40	1	40	3.33%	Good
42	2	84	6.67%	Good
44	2	88	6.67%	Good
46	2	52	6.67%	Good
50	6	300	20%	Good
52	4	208	13.33%	Good
54	3	162	10%	Good
56	2	112	6.67%	Good
58	3	174	10%	Good
60	1	60	3.33%	Very Good
62	3	186	10%	Very Good
66	1	66	3.33%	Very Good
Total	N=30	1572	100%	
Mean		52.04		
Control Group (Variable Y)				
Score (x)	Frequency (f)	fx	Percentage	Classification
34	3	102	10%	Enough
36	5	180	16.67%	Enough
38	9	342	30%	Enough
40	4	160	13.33%	Good
42	3	126	10%	Good
44	1	44	3.33%	Good
46	1	46	3.33%	Good
48	2	96	6.67%	Good
50	1	50	3.33%	Good
58	1	58	3.33%	Good
Total	N= 30	1204	100%	
Mean		40.13		

The description of the students' speaking ability on the post-test on experimental and control groups can be seen in table above. Based on the table above, the writer found that there were 25 or 83% students of experimental group who achieved "Good" classification and 5 or 17% students who got "Very Good" classification. There was no student achieved Excellent, Enough, and bad classification. The mean score of them was 52.04. In the mean score, there were 17 or 57% students of control group who achieved "Enough" classification and 13 or 43% students who achieved "Good" classification and nobody got excellent, very good, and bad classifications. The mean score of this group was 40.13.

By comparing the data above, the writer concluded that the experimental group's score on the post-test was higher than the control group, because 25 students or 83% of experimental group achieved high classification, and 5 students or 17% got Very Good Classification. Besides, the mean score achieved by students was higher than the control group. While in control group, there were 17 students or 57% got "Enough" classification and only 13 students or 43% got "Good" classification. Nobody got very good classification in the control group on the post-test.

3. The Effect of Using Cooperative Script Technique toward Students' Speaking Ability

To prove whether there is or no significant effect of Cooperative Script toward students' speaking ability, the writer analyzed the post-test data by comparing the scores of both experimental and control groups manually by T-test formula. The t-test formula was adopted from Hartono's book, the formula is as follow:

$$\frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{SD_x}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{SD_y}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2}}$$

Explanation:

To	= Table Observation
M_x	= Mean score of Experimental Class
M_y	= Mean Score of Control class
SD_x	= Standard Deviation of Experiment class
SD_y	= Standard Deviation of Control class
N	= Number of students/Sample

To get the mean score and standard deviation of the score of both classes,

it was analyzed by using the table below:

Table IV. 11
MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF THE SCORE

Students' Code	Experimental Class (X)	Control Class (Y)	X	Y	x^2	y^2
S-1	58	40	5.96	-0.13	35.5216	0.0169
S-2	52	46	-0.04	5.87	0.0016	34.4569
S-3	46	38	-6.04	-4.13	36.4816	17.0569
S-4	54	42	1.96	1.87	3.8416	3.4969
S-5	50	34	-2.04	-6.13	4.1616	37.5769
S-6	56	34	3.96	-6.13	15.6816	37.5769
S-7	58	38	5.96	-2.13	35.5216	4.5369
S-8	52	40	-0.04	-0.13	0.0016	0.0169
S-9	50	38	-2.04	-2.13	4.1616	4.5369
S-10	44	44	-8.04	3.87	64.6416	14.9769
S-11	62	38	9.96	-2.13	99.2016	4.5369
S-12	66	58	13.96	17.87	194.8816	319.3369
S-13	58	34	5.96	-6.13	35.5216	37.5769
S-14	50	42	-2.04	1.87	4.1616	3.4969
S-15	50	36	-2.04	-4.13	4.1616	17.0569
S-16	60	40	7.96	-0.13	63.3616	0.0 169
S-17	46	42	-6.04	1.87	36.4816	3.4969
S-18	42	36	-10.04	-4.13	100.8016	17.0569
S-19	42	36	-10.04	-4.13	100.8016	17.0569
S-20	56	38	3.96	-2.13	15.6816	4.5369
S-21	50	48	-2.04	7.87	4.1616	61.9369
S-22	52	38	-0.04	-2.13	0.0016	4.5369
S-23	50	40	-2.04	-0.13	4.1616	0.0169
S-24	52	36	-0.04	-4.13	0.0016	17.0569
S-25	40	38	-12.04	-2.13	144.9616	4.5369
S-26	44	48	-8.04	7.87	64.6416	61.9369
S-27	54	38	1.96	-2.13	3.8416	4.5369
S-28	62	38	9.96	-2.13	99.2016	4.5369
S-29	62	36	9.96	-4.13	99.2016	17.0569
S-30	54	50	1.96	9.87	3.8416	97.4169
Total	**X= 1572**	**Y= 1204**	**X= 0**	**Y= 0**	**x^2= 1279.088**	**y^2= 851.987**

Based on the table above, mean of the score is:

$$Mx = \frac{X}{N}$$

$$= \frac{1572}{30}$$

$$= 52.04$$

$$My = \frac{y}{N}$$

$$= \frac{1204}{30}$$

$$= 40.13$$

Standard deviation of the score is:

$$SDx = \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma X2}{N}}$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{1279.088}{30}}$$

$$= \sqrt{12.64}$$

$$= 6.53$$

$$SDy = \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma y2}{N}}$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{851.987}{30}}$$

$$= \sqrt{28.399}$$

$$= 5.34$$

After finding the mean and the standard deviation of both scores, the writer analyzed them by using T-test formula below:

$$\text{To} = \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{SD_x}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{SD_y}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2}}$$

$$= \frac{52.04 - 40.13}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{6.53}{\sqrt{30-1}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{5.34}{\sqrt{30-1}}\right)^2}}$$

$$= \frac{11.91}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{6.53}{\sqrt{29}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{5.34}{\sqrt{29}}\right)^2}}$$

$$= \frac{11.91}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{6.53}{5.39}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{5.34}{5.39}\right)^2}}$$

$$= \frac{11.91}{\sqrt{(1.21)^2 + (0.99)^2}}$$

$$= \frac{11.91}{\sqrt{(1.4641) + (0.9801)}}$$

$$= \frac{11.91}{\sqrt{2.4442}}$$

$$= \frac{11.91}{1.56}$$

$$= 7.63$$

C. Testing Hypothesis

From the calculation of the data above, it can be seen that t_o was 7.63 the t table was compared by getting degree of freedom (DF). Degree of Freedom can be found by using formula below:

$$DF = (N1 + N2) - 2$$
$$= (30 + 30) - 2$$
$$= 60 - 2$$
$$= 58$$

The degree of freedom was 58. After looking at t-table, 58 could not be found. In this case, the writer took DF 60 as the number which was the nearest to 58. The degree of freedom 60 in the significance of 5% and 1% are 2.00 and 2.65.

By looking at the degree of freedom above, the writer found that $2.00 < 7.63 > 2.65$. It indicated that $t_{observed}$ was higher than t_{table} in the significance of 5% and 1%. In other words, H_o was rejected and H_a was accepted. It means that there was a significant effect of Using Cooperative Script Technique toward Students' Speaking Ability at the Second Year of Junior High School of Darul Hikmah Islamic Boarding School Pekanbaru.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion

By observing all the data analysis in chapter IV above, the writer made some conclusions, as follows:

1. The students' speaking ability in experimental group was higher than control group on the pre-test. It can be seen from mean score of both groups. The mean score of experimental group was 40.26, while the mean score of control group was 38.04.

2. The students' speaking ability score which was taught by using Cooperative Script Technique was higher than control group on post-test. It can be proved by looking at the mean score of both of those groups. The mean score of experimental group was 52.04 and the mean score of control group was 40.13**.** Besides, the experimental group got higher level classification and more than that of control group. In contrast, the control group got lower level of classification than that of experimental group.

3. The hypothesis H_o (Hypothesis Null) was rejected and H_a (Hypothesis Alternative) was accepted. In other words, there was a significant effect on speaking ability between students who were taught by using Cooperative Script and students who were taught by using conventional strategy at the Second Year Students of Junior High School of Darul Hikmah Islamic Boarding School Pekanbaru. It can be seen from the result of data calculation.

4. The coefficient of t-test was 7.63. The writer found that $2.00 < 7.63 > 2.65$. It indicated that $t_{observed}$ was higher than that of t_{table} in significance of 5% and 1%.

B. Suggestions

Based on the research findings above, the writer would like to give some suggestions to:

1. **The Teacher**

    a. The teacher should be creative in selecting the technique that can be used in teaching speaking in order to get better result of students' speaking ability. The teacher should also have the ability to guide the students; in order that the students have big motivations in learning English, especially in speaking ability.

    b. The English teacher should realize that Cooperative Script is one of the good learning techniques. It can be implemented in the while's activity of learning process to increase the students' speaking ability.

2. **The Students**

    Do not be afraid of making mistakes when you want to speak, just show up your ability in speaking English. Practice your speaking in order to get better achievement in English lesson.

3. **Other Researchers**

    The findings of this research are subject matters which can be developed largely and deeply by adding other variables or to enlarge the samples.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Celce, Marianne. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, Newbury House Publishers,inc. 1979.

Fajri Satrio W. "Pengaruh Penerapan Model Pembelajaran Cooperative Script terhadap Kemampuan Pemecahan Masalah Ditinjau dari Keaktifan Siswa", Surakarta:unpublised Thesis, 2009

Fuadah, Farchatul. "The Effect of Using Cooperative Script Method Toward students' Achievement of Fiqih Lesson at Senior High School Maryam Surabaya", Surabaya IAIN Sunan Ampel: unpublished Thesis. 2010.

Hadi. *Manfaat Pembelajaran Cooperative Script*. Surabaya:unpublisehed. 2007.

Harris, David P, *Testing English as Second Language*. New York: McGraw hill Book Company. 1969.

H. Douglas Brown, *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practice,* London: Prentice Hall Inc. 2003.

Hartono. *Statistik untuk Penelitian*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar. 2008.

Hasibuan K. et al. *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*. Pekanbaru: Alaf Riau Graha Unri Press. 2007.

Hornby, A,S. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*, Oxford University Press, London, 1995.

Hughes, Arthur. *Testing for Language Teachers*. London: Cambridge University Press. 2003.

Jumri. "The Contribution of Problem Solving Activity Applied by Students toward Their Speaking Ability of the Second Semester Students of English Educational Department of Education and Teacher Training", Pekanbaru UIN SUSKA: Unpublished Thesis., 2006.

Johnson. *The Nature of Cooperative Learning*. Bloomington:AECT. 2001.

Kaslim, Nasruddin. "The Correlation between Grammar Mastery and Speaking Ability of the Second Year Students at MAN Kampar Air Tiris", Pekanbaru UIN SUSKA: Unpublished Thesis. 2004.

Nunan, David. *Language Teaching Methodology*: *a Textbook for Teachers*, New York: Prentice Hall. 1991.

Setiawati. "Penigkatan Kemampuan Berbicara Bahasa Inggris Siswa dengan Menggunakan Cooperative Script di kelas XI-SMAN 3 Jakarta", Jakarta: Unpublished Proposal. 2007.

Solahudin,M. *Kiat-Kiat Praktis Belajar Speaking*. Yogyakarta: Diva Press. 2008.

Suyatno. *Menjelajah Pembelajaran Inovatif*. Sidoarjo: Masmedia Buana Pustaka. 2009.

Suharsimi ,Arikunto, *Prosedur Penerlitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta. 2006.

Sugiyono. *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan (Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R & D),* Bandung: Alfabeta. 2010.

Sugiyono. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R & D,* Bandung: Alfabeta. 2008.

Syafii S, M. *From Paragraphs to a Research Report. A Writing of English for Academic Purposes*. Pekanbaru: LBSI. 2007.

Ulfah, Dwi Maria, "The Effect of Using Cooperative Script Method toward Students' Understanding in Islamic Studies at Junior High School Muhammadiyah 4 Giri Gresik", Surabaya IAIN Sunan Ampel: unpublished Thesis. 2004.

Www.scribd.com/doc/22057958/The-Iimprovementofstudent%E2%80%99S-Speaking-Skill-Through guessing-Games-Technique Retrieved on 21, July 2011, 2. 54 pm.