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#### Abstract

Abstrak

Ambar Sulistyaningsih (2013) : Pengaruh Penggunaan Strategi Specialized Roles in Discussion terhadap Pemahaman Membaca Siswa Kelas Dua di SMAN I Seberida Kabupaten INHU.

Berdasarkan KTSP, membaca adalah salah satu kemampuan dalam menguasai Bahasa Inggris yang harus diajarkan dan dipelajari pada tingkat SMA. SMAN I Seberida merupakan salah satu pengguna kurikulum tersebut sebagai proses dalam belajar mengajar. Setelah melakukan studi pendahuluan di SMAN I Seberida, sebagian siswa pada kelas dua masih memiliki kendala dalam memahami sebuah text yang ditunjukkan dengan kurangnya penguasaan kosakata dan pemahaman terhadap isi text. Dengan demikian, peneliti tertarik untuk melakukan penelitian dengan judul pengaruh penggunaan Strategi Specialized Roles in Discussion terhadap kemampuan siswa dalam Pemahaman membaca kelas dua SMAN I Seberida Kabupaten INHU.

Jenis penelitian ini adalah penelitian kuasi. Focus utama dalam penelitian ini adalah untuk mencari perbedaan yang signifikan pada kemampuan Pemahaman membaca siswa kelas dua SMAN I Seberida antara siswa yang diajarkan dengan Strategi Speciaized Roes in Discussion dan yang di ajarkan dengan conventional strategi. Subjek dalam penelitian ini adalah siswa SMAN I kelas dua. Pada penelitian ini, peneliti mengambil 2 kelas; kelas eksperimen dan kontrol dari 6 kelas yang terdiri dari 62 siswa sebagai sampel dari sejumlah populasi 178 secara acak berdasarkan kelas. Dalam pengumpulan data, peneliti menggunakan tes. Tes yang digunakan adalah pilihan ganda. Dalam penganalisisan data, peneliti menggunakan SPSS 17.

Akhirnya, peneliti menemukan bahwa angka signifikan $0.002<0.5$. Berdasarkan hasil signifikansi tersebut, $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}$ diterima dan $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ di tolak. Selain itu, dapat pula dibuktikan dari nilai rata-rata post-test kemampun membaca siswa pada kelas experimen adalah 66.45, sedangkan nilai rata-rata post-test pada kelas kontrol adalah 60.39. Jadi, ada perbedaan penigkatan yang signifikan kemapuan siswa dalam pemahaman membaca antara siswa yang di ajar dengan Strategi Specialized Roles in Discussion dan siswa yang diajarkan secara Convensional Strategi. Perbedaan pada mean tersebut menunjukkan bahwa penggunaan strategi Specialized Roles in Discussion lebih bagus daripada Conventional Strategi.


#### Abstract

Ambar Sulistyaningsih (2013) : "The Effect of Using Specialized Roles in Discussion Strategy toward Reading Comprehension of the Second Year Students at SMAN I Seberida Indragiri Hulu Regency."

Based on school based curriculum (KTSP), reading is one of the skills in English that must be taught and learned in senior high school. SMAN I Seberida is one of the schools that uses it as a guide in teaching learning process. After doing preliminary observation at SMAN I Seberida, some of the students of the second year still had problems in comprehending the text. The writer interpret that they had lack comprehension because they had lack of vocabulary and are not able to identify the content of the text. Thus, the researcher is interested to conduct the research entitled The Effect of Using Specialized Roles in Discussion Strategy Toward Reading Comprehension of The Second Year Students at SMAN I Seberida Indragiri Hulu Regency.

The type research was quasi-experimental research. The main focus of this research was to find out a significant effect of the use of Specialized Roles in Discussions strategy in reading comprehension narrative text at the second grade of State Senior High School I Seberida INHU regency. The subject of this research was the second year students of SMAN I Seberida. In this research, the researcher took two classes; experimental and control class from the six classes. It means 62 students as the sample from 178 students of population by using cluster sampling based on group. In collecting the data, the researcher used test. The test used was multiple choice test. In analyzing the data, the researcher used SPSS17.

Finally, the result of data analysis was that $0.002<0.05$. Based on the significance result above, $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}$ is accepted and $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{o}}$ is rejected. Besides, it can be proved from mean score of students' reading comprehension of post-test at experimental class was 66.45 , while students' reading comprehension of post-test at control class was 60.39. In conclusion, there is a significant effect of improvement of students' reading comprehension between students who were taught by using Specialized Roles in Discussion Strategy and who were taught by using Conventional Strategy. so, the difference on mean indicates that the use Specialized Roles in Discussion Strategy is better than Conventional Strategy.


## الملخّص

 علي مهارة القر اعة لدى الطلبة الصف الثاني

بـالمدرسة العالية الحكو مية I سيبيريدَا لمنطقة إنهو "
بناء علىي (KTSP)، القراءة هي إحدى المـهارة في اللغة الانكليز بـة الذي لابد من
 سيبيريدَا هي إحدى المدارس التي استخدمت ذاللك المنهج ليكون أسس في تدريس و

تعليم. بعد قامت الباحثة بـالمر اقبة القبلبة في تلك المدرسة، بعض الطلبة الصف الثناني لهم صعوبة في قر اعة النصّ. اعتقدت الباحثة بمثل هذا لأنّ نظرت الباحثة أنّ لهم الضعيفة في حفظ المفردات و فهم النصّ.

هذا البحث هو البحث التجريبي. أهمّ البحث في هذا البحث هو لمعرفة فرق ذو معني بين مـهارة القر اءة لدى الطلبة الصف الثناني باالمدرسة العالية الحكو مية I سيبيريدَا الني علمت بإستخدام إسنير اتيجية Specialized Roles in Discussion و مهارة القر اعة لدى الطلبة الصف الثاني بـالمدرسة العالية الحكوميـة I سيبيريدَا التي علمت بإسنخدام إسنير اتيجية Conventional. أفر اد هذا البحث هي الطلبة الصف الثاني بالمدرسة العالية الحكو مية I. أخذت الباحثة الفصلين في هذا البحث؛ الفصل التجربيي و الفصل المر اقبي من 6 الفصول و فها 62 طلبة و هم يكونون عينة البحث من 178 مجتمع البحث بطريقة عثو ائي. الطريقة في جمع البيانات هي الإختبار؛ و الإختبار المستخدم هو اخنيار شخص المعيّن. و في تحليل البيانات، استخدمت الباحثة 17 SPSS.

أخبر ا، وجدت الباحثة أنّ درجة ذو معني هي بمعدّل 0.5>0.002. من تلك
 test أن مهارة القر اعة لدي الطلبة في الفصل التجريبي وصلت إلي 66.45، أمّا مـهارة القر اءة لدي الطلبة في الفصل المر اقبي وصلت إلي 60.39 إذن هنالك فرق ذو معني بين مـهارة القر اءة لدى الطلبة الصف الثثاني باالمدرسة العالية الحكو مية I سيبيريدَا التي علمت بإسنخدام إسنتير اتيجية Specialized Roles in Discussion و مـهارة القر اعة لدى الطلبة الصف الثناني بالمدرسة العالية الحكومبة I سيبيربدَا التي علمت بإستخدام

# إستبر اتيجية Conventional. الفرق في تلك النتيجة يدلّ علي أن إستخدام إستير اتيجية .Conventional أحسن من إستبر اتيجيـة Specialized Roles in Discussion 
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## CHAPTER I <br> INTRODUCTION

## A. Background of the Problem

In State Senior High School level, one of the most important elements to be acquired in teaching and learning English is reading. Kalayo Hasibuan said that learners are expected to be able to use English to survival purpose and to communicate for daily needs such as to read newspaper and manual. It Means that, the students are pursued to master all aspects of English skill, especially for reading ${ }^{1}$.

There are several important aspects in reading. Reading cannot be done without having phonetic skill, fluency skill, and comprehension especially for English students readers or even researcher. In arrow of this idea, The National Reading Panel (2000) in Ellen, Nency Hulan, and Vicky Layne (2011) point out that "five key areas must be addressed by the reading instruction in classrooms: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary" ${ }^{2}$.

Reading is one of the skills that should be acquired by the students, especially in senior high school level. In order to accomplish the need of reading, School Based Curriculum 2009 (KTSP) for the second year students of the standard competence of learning English especially for reading refers

[^0]to the capability of reading and comprehending meaning of the text accurately, fluently, and contextually in the text form; narrative, spoof and hortatory exposition text ${ }^{3}$. In this research, the writer focuses on the narrative text. In narrative text, the students should be able to identify word meaning of the text, identify the complication of the text, identify the event of the text, identify the rhetorical of the text, and identify the communicative purpose ${ }^{4}$. While the passing score in SMAN I SEBERIDA is 60 . In fact, they cannot comprehend of reading text.

Based on writer's preliminarily study on SMAN I Seberida, the teacher teaches students especially for reading in narrative text by using conventional Strategy. Teacher explains about the definition, purpose, and example of narrative text, then makes a question and answer section. After that, teacher asks them to read and comprehend a narrative text. The last, teacher will ask students to answer the question available in their textbook. Based on the description above, ideally students should be able to comprehend a text especially for narrative text. But, in fact the teacher found some students still have difficulties in reading, especially for narrative text. The problem faced by the students will be outlined in the following symptoms:
a. Some of the students are not able to identify word meaning of the text,

3 Departemen Pendidikan Nasional. MODEL Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan(KTSP) SMA dan MA. (Solo: PT. Tiga Serangkai, 2006
${ }^{4}$ Team of Curriculum SMAN I Seberida. Syllabus SMA N 1 Seberida 2009. Unpublished.
b. Some of the students are not able to identify the complication of the text,
c. Some of the students are not able to identify event of the text,
d. Some of the students are not able to identify rhetorical of the text,
e. Some of the students are not able to identify the communicative purpose of the text

Generally, the problem faced by the students is caused by some factors such as the facility in the school is not complete; the strategy used by teacher is not interesting and the students' interest in learning English is low. There is actually a good strategy as a solution of their problems; it is called Specialized Roles in Discussions strategy. Specialized Roles in Discussions is a cooperative learning strategy for managing discussion in small groups within particular disciplines areas. Crawford states that " This strategy teaches students to play an active role in the discussion, learn all of the material under discussion, accept responsibility for their classmates' learning, and practice one aspect of comprehension of the topic at a time" ${ }^{5}$.

Based on the problems stated above, the writer is interested in carrying out a research entitled "The Effect of Using Specialized Roles in Discussion Strategy toward Reading Comprehension of the Second Year Students at SMAN I Seberida Indragiri Hulu Regency".

## B. The Definition of Terms

${ }^{5}$ Alan Crawford, et al. Teaching and Learning Strategies for the Thinking Classroom. New York: Open Society Institute, 2005. P. 66

## 1. Effect

Effect is a change that something causes in else ${ }^{6}$. In this research effectiveness refers to the teacher effort in teaching effectively. In this research, the effect means the alteration of students' reading comprehension between students who are taught by Specialized Roles in Discussion strategy and those who are not taught by Specialized Roles in Discussion strategy at the second year students' of SMAN I Seberida Indragiri Hulu Regency.

## 2. Specialized Roles in Discussion Strategy

Specialized Roles in Discussion is a strategy for managing discussion in small groups within particular discipline areas. The strategy teaches students to play an active role in the discussion, learn all of the material under discussion, accept responsibility for their classmates' learning, and practice one aspect of comprehension of the topic at a time ${ }^{7}$.

## 3. Strategy

Strategy is a plan that is intended to achieve a particular purpose, Hornby (2000) ${ }^{8}$. In here, the strategy means plan that is designed to achieve the goals of teaching and learning process especially in reading comprehension by using Specialized Roles in Discussion strategy.
4. Reading Comprehension

Westwood says that Reading comprehension can be defined as an active thinking process through which a reader intentionally constructs

[^1]meaning to form a deeper understanding of concept and information presented in a text ${ }^{9}$. Here, the writer wants to explore Specialized Roles in Discussion strategy to help in understanding and getting information from the text.

## C. The Problem

## 1. The Identification of the Problem

Based on the problems mentioned above and supported by the phenomena, it is clear that some of the second year students at SMAN I Seberida still encounter many problems in learning English especially in reading for further explanation these problems are explained in some points as follows:
a. Why are some of the students unable to identify word meaning of the text?
b. Why are some of the students unable to identify the complication of the text?
c. Why are some of the students unable to identify the event of the text?

[^2]d. Why are some of the students unable to identify the rhetorical of the text?
e. Why are some of the students unable to identify the communicative purpose of the text?

## 2. The Limitation of the Problem

Based on the identification of the problem above, this research only focuses on the effect of Specialized Roles in Discussion Strategy toward reading comprehension of the second year students at State Senior High School I Seberida Indragiri Hulu regency. It is also limited to the narrative text type.

## 3. The Formulation of the Problem

According to the limitation of the problem above, this research problem is formulated in the following questions:
a. How is the students' reading comprehension in narrative text before using Specialized Roles in Discussions Strategy at the second grade of State Senior High School I Seberida INHU regency?
b. How is the students' reading comprehension in narrative text after taught by using Specialized Roles in Discussions Strategy at the second grade of State Senior High School I Seberida INHU regency?
c. Is there any significant effect of the use of Specialized Roles in Discussions strategy in reading comprehension narrative text at the second grade of State Senior High School I Seberida INHU regency?

## D. The Objectives and the Significance of the Research

## 1. The Objectives of the Research

Based on the research questions above, the objective of this research can be stated as follows:
a. To obtain the information about students' reading comprehension in narrative text by using Specialized Roles in Discussions strategy.
b. To elicit the data about the students' reading comprehension in narrative text without using Specialized Roles in Discussions strategy.
c. To find out the effect of using Specialized Roles in Discussions strategy toward reading comprehension in narrative text of the second year students at SMAN I Seberida INHU regency.

## 2. The Significance of the Research

The research activity is significantly carried out for the following needs, they are :
a. This research is hopefully contributing to the writer as a researcher in term of learning to conduct a research as a novice researcher.
b. These research findings are also expected to give the positive contributions and information pertaining to the process of teaching and
learning English especially in reading comprehension to the students and the teachers at the second year of SMAN I Seberida Indragiri Hulu regency.
c. These research findings are also expected to contribute the development of teaching and learning English theoretically or practically as a foreign language and for those who are concerned very much in the field of language teaching and learning.

## CHAPTER II

## REVIEWING OF RELATED LITERATURE

## A. Review of Related Theory

## 1. The Nature of Reading

Judi Moreillon argued that Reading is making meaning from print and from visual information ,it is an active process that requires a great deal of practice and skill ${ }^{1}$.It means that to get language of the language must be able to sound out the printed words and also comprehend what we read.

Furthermore, Brown said that the process of reading should focus on bottom-up and top down for processing separate latter, word and phrases. Then, the reader must develop appropriate content and schemata (background knowledge) and also cultural experience to carry out the interpretation effectively ${ }^{2}$.As long as we know that the reading process is an activity to read text or passage and we have already known that in text itself there are letter, word, phrases and sentences and also paragraph. Therefore, we need to recognize each of them in gaining information. Moreover, pertaining to the brown's opinion that the personal experience and schemata also have a big role in understanding a text in reading process because the schemata or background knowledge will be effecting to the interpretation of readers' understanding.

[^3]To successful reading of the students, the students have to understand the text. It is important to apply reading skill to the students' success. Birch said that there are 3 ways to build an interactive reading ${ }^{3}$ :
a. The different processing strategies, both top and bottom, along with the knowledge base, interact with each other to accomplish the reading.
b. The reader's mind interacts with the written text so that the reader can understand the massage.
c. The readers interacts indirectly with the writer of the text across time and space because it is the writer who is communicating information to the reader, but it is the reader who must gap the information from the writer.

In short, reading is not just an active process but interactive process. Students are suggested to think as interactive as possible.

In addition, Brown stated that the good reader can identify what the text is talking about, making conclusion and taking information from the text. There are four basic types of reading performance, they are ${ }^{4}$ :

## a. Perceptive

Perceptive reading task involving to attendant the components of larger stretches of discourse such as; letter, word, punctuation, and other grapheme symbols or bottom up processing is implied.

[^4]b. Selective

This category, the students can give brief respond from the text that are intended as well, in other words, a combination of bottom-up and top-down processing in teaching learning.
c. Interactive

This is type of reading that stretches of language of several paragraphs to one page or more in which the reader must, in psycholinguistic sense, interact with the text.
d. Extensive

In this type the reader read more then one page of text. The text can be article, essays, journals, technical reports, short stories and also book. Commonly, extensive reading is done outside the classroom.

In conclusion, to the reader in order to get new information. Reading activity is important because it includes massage communicated and to understand something that is not found from oral communication.

## 2. Reading Comprehension

As one of the basic skills of English, reading is often under estimated by the student. They tend to treat it as a supplementary skill. Reading is about understanding written text. It is a complex activity that involves both perception and thought ${ }^{5}$. Learning a foreign language is long and complex undertaking ${ }^{6}$. It means that we must have high motivation and

[^5]work hard to achieve it. Reading can be easier to do if we do it as a pleasure activity. It means that we must have high motivation and work hard to achieve it. Reading can be easier if we do it as a pleasure activity.

Comprehension is the process of deriving meaning from connected text. It involves word knowledge (vocabulary) as well as thinking and reasoning. Therefore, comprehension is not a passive process, but an active one ${ }^{7}$. It means the reader actively engages with the text to contract meaning. This active engagement includes making use of prior knowledge. Moreover, that statement is supported by Grellet "reading comprehension involves understanding of words, seeing the relationship among words and concept, organizing the author's purpose and making judgment in evaluation" ${ }^{8}$.

In addition, Jhonson says that "comprehension is an activity where the reader must be able to interpret and alter what he reads in accordance with his or her prior knowledge about the text ${ }^{9}$. It means that primary activity of reading is to comprehend what the text is about. Many readers cannot be able to catch the idea or what the writer talks about, because they do not know the exact meaning of the words that the writer uses. That is why, reading comprehension section always gives along with vocabulary section.

[^6]
## 3. Teaching Reading Comprehension

The aim of teaching reading is to develop the students' ability so that they can read and understanding the text effectively and efficiently. According to Johnson there are some conditions that should be created by teachers for learning reading ${ }^{10}$ :
a. a space every day for sustained, silent reading.

Just like learning to play a musical instrument, children who are learning to read get better at it by practicing.
b. Allow children to make choices about reading material

Choice is important in helping readers grow. Reading is more pleasurable when we are able choices about what we read.
c. Connect reading pleasure to reading practice.

A simple behaviorist principle is that if we find something to be enjoyable (a positive reinforcement), we are more likely to do that thing again. In the same way, if the act of reading is linked to instruction that students find unpleasant or disagreeable, they will be less inclined to engage in future reading behavior.
d. Keep your reading program simple.

They are three most effective literacy instructional devices ever invented are very simple things: good books, paper with lines on it and

[^7]pencils. The only other thing to add to this list is a teacher who understands children, learning ,and literacy.
e. Keep instruction simple.

Good teachers make things seem as simple as possible.

## f. Make reading like real life.

The kind of reading and writing we have children do in school should be very much like the kind that adults do in real-life situations. In my adult life I read for pleasure or to understand ideas and information. I write to organize my thoughts, to express ideas, and to convey important information to others.

## g. Include talk and other forms of social interaction.

Talking and social interaction enhances learning of any kind. Children need to talk to each other about what they are reading and share their ideas and insights with others. In this way, the stories come to life, students gain insight and ideas from others, and language learning is enhanced.

Based on the steps of teaching reading above, the researcher concludes that the teacher needs to build the good atmosphere to learn reading. It relates to how the teachers teach reading to the students such as strategy to teach reading and choose the appropriate text in order the students can catch the point each text. Then the students can share their ideas to others. It means sharing information each others. The researcher
convinces that specialized Roles in Discussion strategy is the appropriate strategy to teach reading.

In addition, Harmer says that there are some principles in teaching reading that will be appeared in the following points ${ }^{11}$ :

1. Reading is not a passive skill

Reading is an incredibly active occupation. To do it successfully, we have to understand what the words mean, see the pictures the words are printing, understand the arguments, and work out if we agree with them.
2. Students need to be engaged with what they are reading

Students who are not engaged with the reading text, will not actively interested in what they are doing. There are less likely to benefit from it.
3. Students should be encouraged to respond the content of a reading text, not just to the language.

We must give students chance to respond the massage in some way. It is important that they should be allowed to express their feelings about the topic provoking personal engagement with it and the language.
4. Prediction is major factor in reading

The book cover, the headline, the word processed page sometimes will make our brain start predicting what we are going to read. Teachers should give students hints, so that they can predict what is coming too. It make them better and more engaged readers.

[^8]5. Match the task to the topic

Once a decision has been taken about what reading text is that the students are going to read, we need to choose good reading tasks.
6. Good teachers exploit reading text to the full

Any reading text is full of sentences, words, ideas, descriptions, etc. It doesn't make sense just to get students to read it. Good teachers integrate the reading text into interesting class sequences, use the topic for discussion and further tasks, use the language for study and later activation.

In teaching reading as well as teaching other skill such as listening, speaking, and writing the teacher should assess students' reading comprehension. To assess students reading comprehension the teacher need indicators. The indicator also as the guidance for teacher and students what aspects should be reach. Based on Wetphal opinion there are some indicators of reading comprehension ${ }^{12}$ :
a. The student are able to find factual information
b. The student are able to identify main idea
c. The student are able to identify supporting idea
d. The student are able to locate the meaning of vocabulary in context.
e. The student are able to make inference from the reading text Then, the syllabus of SMAN I Seberida also have indicators for reading comprehension:

[^9]a. The students are able to identify word meaning of narrative text,
b. The students are able to identify the complication of narrative text,
c. The students are able to identify the event of narrative text,
d. The students are able to identify the rhetorical of narrative text,
e. The students are able to identify the communicative purpose of narrative text.

The writer realize that both indicators above are too much to be implied in this research. Therefore, in this research writer use the indicators of reading comprehension from the syllabus of SMAN I Seberida.

## 4. Narrative Text

Th.M.Sudarwati said that narrative text is tells a story, it reviews events that have happened. It includes fables, memoirs, and adventure story. The purpose is to entertain the reader with a story that deals with complications or problematic events which lead to a crisis and in turn finds a resolution. Then, the generic structure of this text are:
a. Orientation

Sets the scene : where and when the story happened, introduces the participants of the story: who and what is involved in the story.
b. Complication

Tells the beginning of the problem which leads to the crisis climax of the main participants.
c. Resolution

The problem (the crisis) is resolved, either in a happy ending or in a sad (tragic) ending.
d. Re-orientation

This is a closing remark to the story and it is optional. It is consist of a moral lesson, advice or teaching from the writer.

Furthermore, the language features are ${ }^{13}$ :
a. Nouns: travelers, bundles, tree, etc.
b. Pronouns: they, their, it, etc
c. Noun phrases: the dusty and rough road, a big old tree, etc.
d. Time connectives conjunctions: one day, a week later, then, etc.
e. Adverbs and adverbial phrases: angrily, in horror, etc
f. Materials processes (actions verbs): arrived, ate, went,etc.
g. Verbal processes (saying verbs): asked.

## 5. Specialized Roles in Discussion Strategy

According to Kalayo Hasibuan, reading comprehension results when the reader knows which skills and strategies are appropriate for the type of text and understand how to apply them to accomplish the reading

[^10]purpose. ${ }^{14}$ Based on that statement ,the writer suggested a strategy which is called Specialized Roles in Discussion.

Specialized Roles in Discussions is a strategy for managing discussion in small groups within particular discipline area. The strategy has every one discussing the same topic or text. By playing a different role, each student takes a different perspective on the discussion. Because the role are chosen to highlight aspects of comprehension, the strategy enables students to learn those aspects deliberately through active practice. Later, when they study on their own they will combine the different roles into a comprehensive ability to make sense of a topic.

Rationale : A literary text can be considered in different ways, and this strategy allows students to practice those ways. When the strategy is applied to other disciplines, it highlights different ways to think about topics in those disciplines. The strategy teaches students to play an active role in the discussion, learn all of the material under discussion, accept responsibility for their classmates' learning, and practice one aspect of comprehension of the topic at a time.

Group size : Specialized Roles in Discussion is done in groups of four or five students. There may be any number of groups in a classroom.

Resources : If a text is to be read, there needs to be a copy to read aloud, or enough copies for the students to read themselves. If the desk can be moved. They can be arranged in clusters for the groups. If the students sit

[^11]on benches, the students can turn around to work with a cluster of students around a bench top.

Time Required : The activity takes 15 to 40 minutes to carry out.
Based on explanation above, the writer concludes that the Specialized Roles in Discussion strategy can help students in reading comprehension because the result of reading is students' fully understand about content of the text .

To make clear about this strategy, Alan Crawford explained the steps of the Specialized Roles in Discussion.

Step 1: Before this activity begins, the text will have been or the material will have been presented. Also, the teacher will choose a number of roles corresponding to the number of students in the home group. Here are some potential roles for use in a literature class:

Quotation Finder. This student's job is to pick a few special sections of the text that the group would like to hear read aloud.

Investigator. This student's job is to provide background information on any topic related to the text.

Connector. This student's job is to find connections between the text and the world outside.

Question Asker. This student's job is to write down (in advance of the discussion) question for the group to talk about-questions he or she would like to discuss with the others.

Word finder. This student's job is to find interesting, puzzling, important, or new words to bring to the group's attention and discuss. Character interpreter. This student's job is to think carefully about the characters and to discuss with the other students what the characters are like.

Illustrator. This student's job is to draw pictures of important characters, setting, or many actions, so that the other students discuss the pictures.

Travel Tracer. When characters move from place to place in a text, this student's job is to keep track of their movements.

Step 2: The students are assigned to home groups of four or five members.
Step 3: Within each group, the students count off. One through four or five. Each number is given one of the roles from the set chosen by you.

Step 4: As you would if you were using the jigsaw technique, send the students to expert groups to plan ways to teach the material from each role. For example, send all the students who will be quotation finders together to decide which quotations to share, and how they will have their home groups discuss them. Give them five to eight minutes to work in expert groups.

Step 5: Call the students back to their home groups. In their groups, give each student a fixed amount of time-three to five minutes-to lead their own part of the discussion.

Tips : Five suggestions will make the use of these roles more successful :
a. The first is to teach the roles to the whole class, one at a time. You may read or tell a story, then introduce one of the roles-for example, the connector. You may then call attention to a connection between something in the text and something in real life. Then you will invite several students to do likewise. Over several days, many of the roles can be introduced in this way, before students use them in a group discussions.
b. Students should be encouraged to ask questions from their roles, rather than to say what they know. For example, the character interpreter might invite the other students to construct a character map or a character web about a character, and only venture his own ideas after the other students have shared their own.
c. Choose only the most useful roles for a particular discussion. Sometimes four or five roles are sufficient.
d. Rotate students through the roles. Each student should play many roles over the course of several discussions; the accumulated experience of playing many of these roles adds dimensions to each student's awareness of literature.
e. Be careful not to stress the roles more than the rich discussion of the literary work. Having students carry out the roles is a means to the end of sharing their insights about a work. Once the conversation is under way, you should feel free to suspend the roles and let the conversation proceed.

Reflections: Specialized Roles in a Discussion is an engaging strategy to use. You must watch the groups carefully, though, to make sure
the discussions are carried out deeply and at some length. Otherwise, students may simply say what they know and be done with their role, the activity will go too quickly, the other students will not fully understand, and you will end up with some groups finished well before others. As with the other cooperative learning methods, once the students learn to carry out the activity they will be able to do it efficiently. ${ }^{15}$

Advantages : The advantages of Specialized Roles in Discussion Strategy are to make students more active and attractive to read, because teacher is obligated to prepare the reading text that is interesting, and to discuss it clearly, so the students get the correct comprehension from the text its self.

## B. Relevant Research

According to Syafii, relevant research is required to observe some previous researches conducted by other researcher in which they are relevant to our researches it self ${ }^{16}$. Besides, we have to analyze what the point that was focused on, inform the designs, finding and conclusion of the previous research, that of :

Della Rosela helds a research helds a research entitled " The Effect of Jigsaw Technique toward Reading Comprehension of the Second

[^12]Year Students at SMAN 2 Pekanbaru" ${ }^{17}$. In this research was categorized successful because there was significant increase in experimental class treated by Jigsaw technique. In this research applied discussion in small group same as Specialized Roles in Discussion strategy, but the differences are nothing roles and there was no special genre while on this research Specialized Roles in Discussion strategy have roles for managing the discussion to help students in comprehending the text, especially narrative text.

Sri Wastuti helds a research entitled "The Effect of Collaborative Strategy toward the Second Year Students' Reading Comprehension Achievement at SLTP Negeri 20 Pekanbaru. The present study intended to investigate the effects of collaborative strategy on reading comprehension. The finding revealed that better comprehension can be gained through collaborative strategy. Basically, Wastuti's research is almost the same with this strategy. Both of these strategy are explore the strategy of discussion in small group ${ }^{18}$.

## C. Operational Concept

Syafi'i mentioned that all related theoretical frameworks can be operated in the operational concept ${ }^{19}$. In this operational concept, the writer would like to explain briefly about variable of this research it self. There

[^13]were two variables that have been used. The first was the Specialized Roles in Discussion Strategy in teaching reading narrative text (in experimental class) which is known as Independent variable or variable X . The second was students' reading comprehension (reading narrative text) which is known as Dependent variable or variable Y.

1. The teaching procedures of experimental class treated by using Specialized Roles in Discussion strategy are as follow ${ }^{20}$ :
a. The teacher gives a number of roles corresponding and presenting the text to the students .
b. The teacher asks students to read the text and work in the home group
c. The teacher asks the students to join expert group to plan ways to explain the material from each role.
d. The teacher asks students back to their home groups, and discuss what has been read.

## 2. The indicators of students' Reading Comprehension

To find out the students' ability in reading comprehension of second year students of SMAN I Seberida INHU regency, the researcher determines some indicators for reading comprehension as in the following:
a. Students are able to identify word meaning of narrative text,
b. Students are able to identify the complication of narrative text
c. Students are able to identify the event of narrative text,

[^14]d. Students are able to identify the rhetorical of narrative text,
e. Students are able to identify the communicative purpose of narrative text.

## D. The Assumption and Hypotheses

## 1. The Assumption

In this research, the writer assumes that both the students in experimental and control class have different result. The students who are being taught by using Specialized Roles in Discussion strategy will have good comprehension.

## 2. Hypotheses of this research are:

b. $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}$ : There is significant effect of the use of Specialized Roles in Discussion strategy toward reading comprehension at the second year students of SMAN I Seberida Indragiri Hulu Regency.
a. $H_{o}$ : There is no significant effect of the use of Specialized Roles in Discussion strategy toward reading comprehension at the second year students of SMAN I Seberida Indragiri Hulu Regency.

## CHAPTER III

## THE METHOD OF RESEARCH

## A. The Research Design

This research was an experimental research. The experimental research is the only type of the research that can test hypotheses to establish cause-and-effect relationship ${ }^{1}$. Since the students at the school have been grouped into some classes, then the researcher could not create new participant groups for this experiment. So, the researcher used quasiexperiment. Creswell states that quasi-experiment is experimental situations in which the researcher assigns, but not randomly, participants to groups because the experimenter cannot artificially create groups for the experiment ${ }^{2}$.

Moreover, there were two variables in this research. The first was independent variable and the second one was dependent variable. The use of Specialized Roles in Discussion strategy was independent variabel symbolized by " X " and the students' reading comprehension was dependent variable symbolized by "Y". Then, in conducting this research, there were two classes involved. The first was an experimental class. The second one was an control class.

[^15]Furthermore, the researcher applied pre-test and post-test to this quasi-experimental design. Creswell explains that a pre-test provides a measure on some attribute or characteristic that will be assessed for participants in an experiment before they receive a treatment. Meanwhile, a post-test is a measure on some attribute or characteristic that will be assessed for participants in an experiment after a treatment. Thus, in the beginning the students of two classes were given pre-test. In the middle, they were treated but by giving different treatment. For experimental class, the students were treated with Specialized Roles in Discussion strategy. In other hand, the students of control class were treated with Conventional Strategy. At the end, they were given post-test. In short, the research design can be illustrated as follows ${ }^{3}$ :

| Pre-and Post-test Designs |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Control <br> Class Pre-test Convention <br> al Strategy <br> Post-test   <br> Experiment <br> al Class Pre-test Specialized <br> Roles in <br> Discussion <br> Strategy Post-test |  |  |  |

Table III.1: Research Design

## B. The Location and Time of the Research

[^16]The research has been conducted at the second year students of SMAN I Seberida INHU Regency. There were eight meetings in the class. The research has been done for a month, started from May to June 2012.

## C. The Subject and Object of the Research

The subject of this study was the second year students of SMAN I Seberida. And the object of this study was the use of Specialized Roles in Discussions Strategy toward the students' reading comprehension.

## D. The Population and Sample of the Research

The population of this research was the second year students of SMAN I Seberida. They consisted of six classes and the total number of the students was 178 . Based on the limitation of the research, the writer took only two classes as the sample of this research. Based on Arikunto in Nurul said that sampling is choosing some of research subject as the representative of the population therefore, it produced sample that represented the population ${ }^{4}$. In this research, the researcher took science department ; XI IPA a was the experimental class that consisted of 31 students ( 3 males and 28 females), and XI IPA $b$ was as that control class that also consisted of 31 students ( 10 males and 21 females)

Then, the writer used Cluster sampling technique. It was done by selecting group (not individual) because all members of selected group have

[^17]similar characteristics ${ }^{5}$. The specification of the population can be seen on the table bellow:

## Table III. 2

The Population of the Second Year Students of SMAN I Seberida ${ }^{6}$

| No | Classes | Population |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male | Female |  |
| 1 | XI IPA a | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{2 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 1}$ |
| 2 | XI IPA b | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 1}$ |
| 3 | XI IPA c | 11 | 18 | 29 |
| 4 | XI IPS a | 19 | 11 | 30 |
| 5 | XI IPS b | 14 | 13 | 27 |
| 6 | XI IPS c | 18 | 12 | 30 |
|  | Total |  |  | 178 |

## E. The Technique of Collecting Data

To obtain the data needed in this research, the writer used technique as follows:

1. Test

There were two kinds of tests in this research; they are pre-test and post- test.; each of test consist of 25 items. The test would be done twice, before and after treatment intended to obtain students' reading

[^18]comprehension. In this research the writer used multiple choice techniques to measure the students' reading comprehension as objectively as possible.
a. Pre Test

At the beginning every participant both experimental and controlled group took pre-test in order to find out if they were the same level at the starting point.

## b. Post Test

The same test was administered for experimental and control group at the end of course. It was aimed to see if they were different .

## F. The Validity and Reliability of the Test

Every test, whether it is a short, informal classroom test or a public examination should be as valid as the test constructor can make it, the test must aim to provide a true measure of the particular skill that it is intended to measure. It means the test is valid or not if the test has been tested and it can be measured. Hughes (2005) supported that validity can be found by analyzing content validity and also face validity ${ }^{7}$. Validation is done to make sure that the test that will be tested really can measure what should be measured

Before the writer took the data from both students of the experimental and control class from both students of the experimental and control class, the writer needed to know whether the test was valid or not, and

[^19]the test was reliable or not. Tries out were done twice, the first try out was for pre-pre test and the second was for pre-posttest. It was done because the data should be presented accurately.

## 1. Validity

An instrument is valid if it is able to measure what must be measured. In validity of instrument of the test, it can be seen by the difficulties of the test. On the other hand, the test is not too easy and the test is not too difficult. The standard of value used was $\geq 30$ and $\leq 70^{8}$.

The items that could not fulfill the standard value were replaced. The facility value under 0.30 is considered difficult and above 0.70 is considered easy.

The level difficulty was used to show how easy and difficult an item was. It was calculated by using the formula:

$$
\mathrm{P}=\frac{\mathrm{B}}{\mathrm{JS}}
$$

Where :
P = Difficulty level
B = the number of correct answer
JS = the number of student

## 2. Reliability

The good quality of instrument is determined by the instrument of reliability. On the other hand, if the instrument is reliable, it has a good

[^20]quality. Anas Sudijono said that if $\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{ii}} \leq 0.70$, it means that the test reliability is low or unreliable and if $>0.70$ it means that the test reliability is high or reliable. Knowing the instrument is reliable or not, the writer used the formula K-R 20 as follows ${ }^{9}$ :
\[

$$
\begin{gathered}
r_{i i}=\left(\frac{n}{n-1}\right)\left(\frac{s t^{2}-\sum p_{i q_{i}}}{s t^{2}}\right) \\
\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{t}}^{2}=\frac{\sum \mathrm{Xt}^{2}}{\mathrm{~N}}
\end{gathered}
$$
\]

Where:
$\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{ii}}$ : Reliability of instrument
n : Total of question
$\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{t}}{ }^{2} \quad$ : Variance total
$\mathrm{Xt}^{2} \quad$ : Total number of correct answer
N : Total respondent
There were 2 types of tests in this research, they were pre-test and post-test. The reability analysis of these test can be seen below:

## Reliability of Pre test

Based on the data, the writer got;
n $: 25$
$\sum \mathrm{Xt}^{2}: 555$
$\mathrm{N} \quad: 30$
$\Sigma$ Piqi : 6.09

[^21]\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{t}}^{2} & =\frac{\sum \mathrm{Xt}^{2}}{\mathrm{~N}} \\
& =\frac{5.87}{30} \\
& =18.5 \\
r_{i i} & =\left(\frac{n}{n-1}\right)\left(\frac{s t^{2}-\sum p_{i q_{i}}}{S t^{2}}\right) \\
& =\left(\frac{25}{25-1}\right)\left(\frac{20.09-6.09}{20.09}\right) \\
& =(1.041666667)(0.69686411) \\
& =0.72590035
\end{aligned}
$$
\]

Based on the statistical analysis above, the score of reliability of the test is 0.72 . So, it can be analyzed that $\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{ii}}=0.72$ is higher than 0.70 . It means that the instrument test is reliable.

## Reliability of post test

Based on the data, the writer got;
n : 25
$\sum \mathrm{Xt}^{2}: 602.7$
$\mathrm{N} \quad: 30$
$\Sigma$ Piqi : 5.87
$\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{t}}{ }^{2}=\frac{\sum \mathrm{Xt}^{2}}{\mathrm{~N}}$
$=\frac{602.7}{30}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =18.5 \\
r_{i i} & =\left(\frac{n}{n-1}\right)\left(\frac{s t^{2}-\sum p_{i q_{i}}}{s t^{2}}\right) \\
& =\left(\frac{25}{25-1}\right)\left(\frac{18.5-5.87}{18.5}\right) \\
& =(1.041666667)(12.60 .68) \\
& =0.71
\end{aligned}
$$

Based on the statistical analysis above, the score of reliability of the test is 0.71 . So, it can be analyzed that $\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{ii}}=0.71$ is higher than 0.70 . It means that the instrument test is reliable.

## G .The Data Analysis Technique

In order to find out whether there was a significant effect of the use of Specialized Roles in Discussion Strategy the data were analyzed statistically. In analyzing the data, the researcher used SPSS Version 17.0 to calculate the data. The result of t-test analyzing could be seen on the SPSS output. The significant level chosen in analyzing the score $t_{0}(t-o b s e r e d)$ was $5 \%$ or 0.05 .

Ha was accepted if : to $>\mathrm{tt}$
Or if probabilities $<0.05$
It means there was a significant effect those taught by using Specialized Roles in Discussion Strategy and those were not.

Ho was accepted if: to<tt

Or If probabilities $>0.05$
It means there was a significant effect those taught by Specialized Roles in Discussion Strategy and those were not ${ }^{10}$.

## H. Research Procedure

1. Procedures for experiment group

In experiment group there are three procedures of conducting the research:
a. Pre test : Researcher gave a pre test to the students before the students were taught by using Specialized Roles in Discussions strategy. It was used to measure the students' reading comprehension especially in narrative text before they were taught by using Specialized Roles in Discussions strategy.
b. Treatment : In treatment, the students were taught by using Specialized Roles in Discussions strategy. Teacher explained to the students about narrative text, and taught them to comprehend the text by using Specialized Roles in Discussions strategy. Then, the students were asked by the teacher to do an exercise.
c. Post test : Post test was a test that was given to the students after they were taught by using Specialized Roles in Discussions strategy. It was used to know whether the students can easily comprehend the

[^22]text especially for narrative text by using Specialized Roles in Discussion strategy or not. The result was compared with pre test to get the effectiveness of the strategy and to know the students' reading comprehension in narrative text after being taught by using Specialized Roles in Discussion strategy.
2. Procedures for control group
a. Pre test : Pre test was given by the teacher before the students were taught by Conventional strategy. It was used to know the students' ability before being taught by using conventional strategy.
b. Teaching by conventional strategy: In Conventional strategy, the students were asked to read a narrative text by the teacher, then teacher helped them to find the unfamiliar word, then the teacher asked them to do the assignment.
c. Post Test : Post test was given to the students after they were taught by using conventional strategy. It was used to know whether the students were able to comprehend narrative text well by using conventional strategy or not.

## CHAPTER IV

## DATA PRESENTATION AND DATA ANALYSIS

## A. The Description of the Data

The aim of this research is to obtain the significant difference of students' speaking ability between those students who were taught by using summary ball technique and those who were not.

The first data of this research were from the test when the researcher as the teacher implemented summary ball technique in order to know to what extend the technique procedures was implemented; that was summary ball technique. The researcher taught within 8 (eight) meeting that consisted of two meetings in a week. It was done from April $24^{\text {h }}$ to may $24^{\text {th }}$ of 2012 including pre-test and posttest.

The second data were obtained through the score of the improvement of students' speaking ability from pre-test to post-test for both experimental and control class. In given test; pre-test and post-test, the students were asked to speak spontaneously without any specific preparation by giving certain topic that had been explained by the teacher. The sequence of students' speaking was obtained about 3 (three) minutes. The speaking test was deal with narrative text. It was the topic that being taught at the time and was evaluated by concerning five components of students' speaking ability; accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. Each component had its score.

## B. The Data Presentation

There were two kinds of data in this research. They were the data of how the summary ball technique was implemented and students' speaking ability.

## 1. The Implementation of Summary Ball Technique

As mentioned above, the data of this research were obtained from Pre-test and Post-test. The data were collected through the following procedures:
a. The students were given pre-test. They were asked to do oral presentation of narrative text before being taught by using summary ball technique.
b. After several meetings, the students were given post-test. They were asked to do an oral presentation after being taught by using summary ball technique.
c. The students' speaking was recorded by the researcher and was backed up into CD. Then, it was collected to evaluate the appropriate of accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension.
d. The researcher used two raters to score the students' speaking ability.
e. The researcher collected and summed up raters' score to get each student's score.

Pertaining on the items of implementation of summary ball technique above, it can be presented by the following table data that show the implementation of summary ball technique generally from the beginning of taking the data until the end completed by its percentage.

## 2. The Effect of Using Summary Ball Technique towards Students' Speaking Ability

The data of this speaking test were the scores of the students' improvement from pre-test to post-test for both experimental and control class. The data were collected through the following procedures:

1. The researcher asked the students either experimental or control class to speak orally in the spur of the moment (spontaneously speaking).
2. The students' speaking performance was recorded and evaluated by using Hughes's theory. They are accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension.
3. The students' speaking results were evaluated by two raters.
4. The researcher added the scores from the raters and divided it.

Actually, the numbers of students either experimental or control class were 31 students each, but in this case, there were only 30 students for experimental class and 30 students for control class who always came and followed learning activities. In this case, there were five other students; two students from experimental class and control class for the rest, who did not get enough treatment even some of them never had it at all. It was caused by many reasons, they were sick, absent, unmotivated; went outside when studying English began, and stopped studying, but those factors did not influence the validity of the data because there were the same data from the beginning until the end. So, the data
were only taken from the students who always come to school and followed the treatment given. To make clearer, the students' speaking test result could be seen in the following tables:

TABLE IV. 1
THE STUDENTS' SCORE OF PRE-TEST OF EXPERIMENTAL
CLASS IN TERMS OF USING ACCENT, GRAMMAR, VOCABULARY, FLUENCY AND COMPREHENSION

| No | Name | Speaking skills |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | T |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Accent |  |  |  | Grammar |  |  |  | Vocab |  |  |  | Fluency |  |  |  | Compr |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | RATER |  | T | S | RATER |  | T | S | RATER |  | T | S | RATER |  | T | S | RATER |  | T | S |  |
|  |  | R1 | R2 |  |  | R1 | R2 |  |  | R1 | R2 |  |  | R1 | R2 |  |  | R1 | R2 |  |  |  |
| 1 | s1 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 50 |
| 2 | s2 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 40 |
| 3 | s3 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 50 |
| 4 | s4 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 42 |
| 5 | s5 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 54 |
| 6 | s6 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 44 |
| 7 | s7 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 50 |
| 8 | s8 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 50 |
| 9 | s9 | 2 | 1 | 60 | 30 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 40 |
| 10 | s10 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 54 |
| 11 | s11 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 42 |
| 12 | s12 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 56 |
| 13 | s13 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 44 |
| 14 | s14 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 50 |
| 15 | s15 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 42 |
| 16 | s16 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 50 |
| 17 | s17 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 56 |
| 18 | s18 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 40 |
| 19 | s19 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 58 |
| 20 | s20 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 52 |
| 21 | s21 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 48 |
| 22 | s22 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 52 |
| 23 | s23 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 48 |
| 24 | s24 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 50 |
| 25 | s25 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 48 |
| 26 | s26 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 48 |
| 27 | s27 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 54 |
| 28 | S28 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 54 |
| 29 | s29 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 52 |
| 30 | s30 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 50 |
| Mean |  |  |  |  | 45.67 |  |  |  | 48.67 |  |  |  | 47.67 |  |  |  | 51.00 |  |  |  | 51.67 | 48.93 |

Based on the table of speaking components of students' score at experimental class, it could be seen that the students' speaking ability in each component was various proven by each mean of each component; accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension. Among the five components that had been mentioned, the lowest mean score was accent; (45.67) and the highest mean score was comprehension: (51.67), While students' grammar; 48.67 and fluency was 51 , and vocabulary ; 47.67. Thus, indicated that the students had low ability in using those components that had important role in spoken English. However, the total of mean score of students' speaking ability at experiment pretest was 48.93

## 1. Description of Students' Pre-test Scores

The results of students' pre-test score are presented in the following table:

TABLE IV. 2
THE DESCRIPTION OF FREQUENCY OF STUDENTS' PRE-TEST SCORES OF EXPERIMENTAL CLASS

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | 40 | 3 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
|  | 42 | 3 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 20.0 |
|  | 44 | 2 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 26.7 |
|  | 48 | 4 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 40.0 |
|  | 50 | 8 | 26.7 | 26.7 | 66.7 |
|  | 52 | 3 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 76.7 |
|  | 54 | 4 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 90.0 |
|  | 56 | 2 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 96.7 |
|  | 58 | 1 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 30 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Referring to the table above, it shows that there were 3 students who got score 40 ( $10 \%$ ), 3 students who got 42 (10\%), 2 students who got 44 (6.7\%), 4 students who got 48 (30\%), 8 students who got 50 (26.7\%), 3 students who got 52 ( $10 \%$ ), 4 students who got 54 (13.3\%), 2 students who got 56 (6.7\%)

Based on table above, it can be seen that the total number of students was 30 students. The highest score was 58 and the lowest score was 40 . The highest frequency was 8 at the score of 50 . While, the statistical analysis of this data is at the following table:

TABLE IV. 3 STATISTIC

|  | PRE_EXPERIME |
| :---: | :---: |
| N Valid | 30 |
| Missing | 0 |
| Mean | 48.93 |
| Median | 50.00 |
| Mode | 50 |
| Std. Deviation | 5.112 |
| Variance | 26.133 |
| Minimum | 40 |
| Maximum | 58 |
| Sum | 1468 |

The Description of Students' pre-test of control class at the Second Year of Islamic Junior High School of Pondok Pesantren Darun Nahdhah Thawalib Bangkinang

## TABLE IV. 4

THE STUDENTS' SCORE OF PRE-TEST OF CONTROL CLASS IN TERMS OF ACCENT, GRAMMAR, VOCABULARY, FLUENCY AND COMPREHENSION

| No | Name | Speaking Skills |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | T |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Accent |  |  |  | Grammar |  |  |  | Vocab |  |  |  | Fluency |  |  |  | Comprehension |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | RATER |  | T | S | RATER |  | T | S | RATER |  | T | S | RATER |  | T | S | RATER |  | T | S |  |
|  |  | R1 | R2 |  |  | R1 | R2 |  |  | R1 | R2 |  |  | R1 | R2 |  |  | R1 | R2 |  |  |  |
| 1 | s1 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 40 |
| 2 | s2 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 44 |
| 3 | s3 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 50 |
| 4 | s4 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 39 |
| 5 | s5 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 46 |
| 6 | s6 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 44 |
| 7 | s7 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 50 |
| 8 | s8 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 50 |
| 9 | s9 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 52 |
| 10 | s10 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 50 |
| 11 | s11 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 44 |
| 12 | s12 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 56 |
| 13 | s13 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 48 |
| 14 | s14 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 56 |
| 15 | s15 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 44 |
| 16 | s16 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 56 |
| 17 | s17 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 48 |
| 18 | s18 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 4 | 140 | 70 | 56 |
| 19 | s19 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 48 |
| 20 | s20 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 4 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 4 | 140 | 70 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 56 |
| 21 | s21 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 50 |
| 22 | s22 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 46 |
| 23 | s23 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 50 |
| 24 | s24 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 44 |
| 25 | s25 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 1 | 2 | 60 | 30 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 46 |
| 26 | s26 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 48 |
| 27 | s27 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 50 |
| 28 | s28 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 52 |
| 29 | s29 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 60 |
| 30 | s30 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 54 |
| Mean |  |  |  |  | 47.33 |  |  |  | 46.77 |  |  |  | 48.33 |  |  |  | 51.00 |  |  |  | 53 | 49.23 |

Based on the table of speaking components of students' speaking ability at control class above, it can be seen that the students' speaking ability in each component was various proven by each mean of each component; accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension. Among the five components that has been mentioned, the lowest mean score was grammar; 46.77, and the highest mean score was comprehension; 53, While students' accent was; 47,33, vocabulary was; 48.33 and fluency was; 51 . So these indicate that the students have low ability in using those components that had important role in spoken English. However the total of mean score of students' speaking ability at experiment pre-test was 49.23 .

The Description of students' pre-test of Control Class at the Second Year students of Pondok Pesantren Daarun Nahdhah Thawalib Bangkinang :

TABLE IV. 5
THE DESCRIPTION OF FREQUENCY OF STUDENTS' PRE-TEST SCORES OF CONTROL CLASS

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | 39 | 1 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 |
|  | 40 | 1 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 6.7 |
|  | 44 | 5 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 23.3 |
|  | 46 | 3 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 33.3 |
|  | 48 | 4 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 46.7 |
|  | 50 | 7 | 23.3 | 23.3 | 70.0 |
|  | 52 | 2 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 76.7 |
|  | 54 | 1 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 80.0 |
|  | 56 | 5 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 96.7 |
|  | 60 | 1 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 30 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Based on the table above, it can be seen that there were 1 student who got 39 (3.3\%), 1 student who got 40 (3.3\%), 5 students who got 44 (16.7\%), 3
students who got 46 (10\%), 4 students who got 48 (13.13\%), 7 students who got $50(23.3 \%), 2$ students who got 52 (6.7\%), 1 students who got 54 (3.3\%), 5 students who got 56 ( $16.7 \%$ ), 1 student who got 60 (3.3\%).

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the total number of students was 30 students. The highest score was 52 , and the lowest score was 33 . The highest frequency was 13 at score of 44 . While the statistical analysis of this data is as the following table:

TABLE IV. 6
STATISTICS

|  | PRE_CONTROL |
| :---: | :---: |
| N Valid | 30 |
| Missing | 0 |
| Mean | 49.23 |
| Median | 50.00 |
| Mode | 50 |
| Std. Deviation | 5.090 |
| Variance | 25.909 |
| Minimum | 39 |
| Maximum | 60 |
| Sum | 1477 |

TABLE IV. 7
THE STUDENTS' SCORE OF POST-TEST OF EXPERIMENTAL CLASS IN TERMS OF ACCENT, GRAMMAR, VOCABULARY, FLUENCY AND COMPREHENSION

| No | Name | Speaking Skills |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | T |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Accent |  |  |  | Grammar |  |  |  | Vocab |  |  |  | Fluency |  |  |  | Comprehension |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | RATER |  | T | S | RATER |  | T | S | RATER |  | T | S | RATER |  | T | S | RATER |  | T | S |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathbf{R} \\ \mathbf{1} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | R2 |  |  | R1 | R2 |  |  | R1 | R2 |  |  | R1 | R2 |  |  | R1 | R2 |  |  |  |
| 1 | s1 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 56 |
| 2 | s2 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 60 |
| 3 | s3 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 54 |
| 4 | s4 | 4 | 3 | 140 | 70 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 60 |
| 5 | s5 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 4 | 3 | 140 | 70 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 58 |
| 6 | s6 | 3 | 4 | 140 | 70 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 60 |
| 7 | s7 | 3 | 4 | 140 | 70 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 58 |
| 8 | s8 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 4 | 3 | 140 | 70 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 62 |
| 9 | s9 | 3 | 4 | 140 | 70 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 4 | 140 | 70 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 4 | 3 | 140 | 70 | 66 |
| 10 | s10 | 4 | 3 | 140 | 70 | 3 | 4 | 140 | 70 | 3 | 4 | 140 | 70 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 4 | 4 | 160 | 80 | 70 |
| 11 | s11 | 4 | 4 | 160 | 80 | 4 | 3 | 140 | 70 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 4 | 140 | 70 | 3 | 4 | 140 | 70 | 70 |
| 12 | s12 | 3 | 4 | 140 | 70 | 3 | 4 | 140 | 70 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 4 | 4 | 160 | 80 | 68 |
| 13 | s13 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 4 | 140 | 70 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 60 |
| 14 | s14 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 60 |
| 15 | s15 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 4 | 3 | 140 | 70 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 62 |
| 16 | s16 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 4 | 140 | 70 | 58 |
| 17 | s17 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 4 | 4 | 160 | 80 | 60 |
| 18 | s18 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 4 | 3 | 140 | 70 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 58 |
| 19 | s19 | 3 | 4 | 140 | 70 | 3 | 4 | 140 | 70 | 4 | 3 | 140 | 70 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 4 | 4 | 160 | 80 | 70 |
| 20 | s20 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 4 | 140 | 70 | 4 | 3 | 140 | 70 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 64 |
| 21 | s21 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 4 | 2 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 4 | 140 | 70 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 58 |
| 22 | s22 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 52 |
| 23 | s23 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 58 |
| 24 | s24 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 4 | 3 | 140 | 70 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 56 |
| 25 | s25 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 58 |
| 26 | s26 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 4 | 3 | 140 | 70 | 58 |
| 27 | s27 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 58 |
| 28 | s28 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 58 |
| 29 | s29 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 4 | 140 | 70 | 58 |
| 30 | s30 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 4 | 140 | 70 | 62 |
| Mean |  | 61.67 |  |  |  | 59.00 |  |  |  | 57.67 |  |  |  | 59.67 |  |  |  | 63.67 |  |  |  | 60.33 |

Based on the table of speaking components of students' speaking ability at experimental class above, it can be seen that the students' speaking ability in each component was various proven by each mean of each component; accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension. Among the five components that has been mentioned, the lowest mean score was vocabulary; 57.67 and the highest mean score was comprehension; 63.67 while students' accent was 61.67 , grammar was 59 and fluency was 59.67 . So, these indicate that the students have low ability in using those components that had important role in spoken English. However the total of mean score of students' speaking ability at experiment postest is 60.33 .

## 2. Description of Students' Post-test Scores

The following table is the data of students' post-test score.

TABLE IV. 8
THE DESCRIPTION OF FREQUENCY OF STUDENTS' POSTTEST SCORES OF EXPERIMENTAL CLASS

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | 52 | 1 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 |
|  | 54 | 1 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 6.7 |
|  | 56 | 2 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 13.3 |
|  | 58 | 11 | 36.7 | 36.7 | 50.0 |
|  | 60 | 6 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 70.0 |
|  | 62 | 3 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 80.0 |
|  | 64 | 1 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 83.3 |
|  | 66 | 1 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 86.7 |
|  | 68 | 1 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 90.0 |
|  | 70 | 3 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 30 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Based on the table above, it can be seen that there were 1 student who got 52 (3.3\%), 1 student who got 54 (3.3\%), 2 students who got 56 (6.7\%), 11
students got 58 (36.7\%), 6 students who got $60(20 \%), 3$ students who got 62 ( $10 \%$ ), 1 students who got 64 (3.3\%), 1 students who got 66 (6.7\%), 1 students got 68 (3.3\%, 3 students got 70 ( $10 \%$ ).

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the total number of students was 30 students. The highest score was 70 , and the lowest score was 52 . The highest frequency was 11 at score of 58 . While, the statistical analysis of this data is as the following table:

TABLE IV. 9
STATISTICS

|  | POST_EXPERI MENT |
| :---: | :---: |
| $N \quad$ Valid | 30 |
| Missing | 0 |
| Mean | 60.33 |
| Median | 59.00 |
| Mode | 58 |
| Std. Deviation | 4.551 |
| Variance | 20.713 |
| Minimum | 52 |
| Maximum | 70 |
| Sum | 1810 |

TABLE IV. 10
THE STUDENTS' SCORE OF POST-TEST CONTROL CLASS IN TERMS OF ACCENT, GRAMMAR, VOCABULARY, FLUENCY AND COMPREHENSION

| Name | Speaking Skills |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | T |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Accent |  |  |  | Grammar |  |  |  | Vocabulary |  |  |  | Fluency |  |  |  | Comprehension |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rater |  | T | S | rater |  | T | S | rater |  | T | S | Rater |  | T | S | rater |  | T | S |  |
|  | R1 | R2 |  |  | R1 | R2 |  |  | R1 | R2 |  |  | R1 | R2 |  |  | R1 | R2 |  |  |  |
| s1 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 52 |
| s2 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 54 |
| s3 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 54 |
| s4 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 54 |
| s5 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 52 |
| s6 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 50 |
| s7 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 4 | 140 | 70 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 54 |
| s8 | 3 | 4 | 140 | 70 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 52 |
| s9 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 54 |
| s10 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 4 | 3 | 140 | 70 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 4 | 3 | 140 | 70 | 62 |
| s11 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 56 |
| s12 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 4 | 140 | 70 | 56 |
| s13 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 52 |
| s14 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 4 | 140 | 70 | 52 |
| s15 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 52 |
| s16 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 54 |
| s17 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 52 |
| s18 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 4 | 3 | 140 | 70 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 58 |
| s19 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 4 | 3 | 140 | 70 | 50 |
| s20 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 4 | 3 | 140 | 70 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 60 |
| s21 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 4 | 3 | 140 | 70 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 52 |
| s22 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 52 |
| s23 | 3 | 4 | 140 | 70 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 4 | 120 | 60 | 54 |
| s24 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 50 |
| s25 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 50 |
| s26 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 54 |
| s27 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 52 |
| s28 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 2 | 80 | 40 | 54 |
| s29 | 4 | 3 | 140 | 70 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 4 | 4 | 160 | 80 | 66 |
| s30 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 60 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 50 | 56 |
| Mean |  |  |  | 53.33 |  |  |  | 52.33 |  |  |  | 52.33 |  |  |  | 56 |  |  |  | 56 | 54.00 |

Based on the table of speaking components of students' speaking ability at control class above, it could be seen that the students' speaking ability in each component was various proven by each mean of each component; accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension. Among the five components
that had been mentioned, the lowest mean score were grammar and vocabulary; 52.33 and the highest mean score were fluency and comprehension; 56, and students' accent was; 53. 33 Thus, these indicated that the students had low ability in using those components that had important role in spoken English. However the total of mean score of students' speaking ability at control class in post-test was 54.00

TABLE IV. 11
THE DESCRIPTION OF FREQUENCY OF STUDENTS' POST-TEST SCORES OF CONTROL CLASS

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | 50 | 4 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 13.3 |
|  | 52 | 10 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 46.7 |
|  | 54 | 9 | 30.0 | 30.0 | 76.7 |
|  | 56 | 3 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 86.7 |
|  | 58 | 1 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 90.0 |
|  | 60 | 1 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 93.3 |
|  | 62 | 1 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 96.7 |
|  | 66 | 1 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 30 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Based on the table above, it can be seen that there were 4 students who got 50 ( $13.3 \%$ ), 10 students who got 52 (33.3\%), 9 students who got 54 (30\%), 3 students who got $56(10 \%), 1$ student who got $58(3.3 \%), 1$ students who got 60 (3.3\%), 1 student who got 62 (3.3\%).

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the total number of students was 30 students. The highest score was 62 , and the lowest score was 50 . The highest frequency was 10 at score of 52 . While the statistical analysis of this data is at the following table:

TABLE IV. 12
STATISTICS

|  | POST_CONTRO <br> L |
| :---: | :---: |
| N Valid | 30 |
| Missing | 0 |
| Mean | 54.00 |
| Median | 54.00 |
| Mode | 52 |
| Std. Deviation | 3.601 |
| Variance | 12.966 |
| Minimum | 50 |
| Maximum | 66 |
| Sum | 1620 |

Generally, the statistical description of data can be seen in the following table description:

TABLE IV. 13
STATISTICS

|  | PRE_EXPERIM ENT | PRE_CONTROL | POST_EXPERI MENT | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { POST_CONTRO } \\ \text { L } \end{gathered}\right.$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N Valid | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| Missing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mean | 48.93 | 49.23 | 60.33 | 54.00 |
| Median | 50.00 | 50.00 | 59.00 | 54.00 |
| Mode | 50 | 50 | 58 | 52 |
| Std. Deviation | 5.112 | 5.090 | 4.551 | 3.601 |
| Variance | 26.133 | 25.909 | 20.713 | 12.966 |
| Minimum | 40 | 39 | 52 | 50 |
| Maximum | 58 | 60 | 70 | 66 |
| Sum | 1468 | 1477 | 1810 | 1620 |

Based on the statistical description at the table above, it showed the detail description of all the data. It could be seen the different mean, standard error of mean, median, mode, standard. deviation and other data of both experimental and control class.

## 3. The Reliability and the Validity of the Test

The test used for testing students' speaking ability had to have reliability and validity. According to Gay, reliability is the degree to which a test consistently measures whatever it is measuring. ${ }^{1}$ It was reflected in obtaining how far the test or instrumental test that was able to measure the same subject on different occasions that indicated the similar results. In short, the characteristic of reliability was sometimes termed consistency. In this research, to know the reliability of the speaking test, the researcher used inter rater reliability because the researcher has two raters in order to assessing the students' speaking ability. Gay said that inter judge reliability can be obtained by having two (more) judges independently score to be compared to the score of both judges. Then, the scores of the rater 1 correlated with the scores of the rater 2 . The higher correlation, the higher the inter judge reliability. The following table will describe the correlation between score of rater 1 and the score of the rater 2 by using Pearson Product Moment Correlation formula through SPSS 16 Version:

[^23]TABLE IV. 14

## CORRELATION

|  |  | RATER1 | Rater2 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| RATER1 | Pearson Correlation | 1 | $.660 * *$ |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 30 | 30 |
| Rater2 | Pearson Correlation | $.660^{* *}$ | 1 |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

From the data output above, it could be seen that r calculation was correlated to r table, $\mathrm{df}=558$. The researcher took $\mathrm{df}=60$ to be correlated either at level $5 \%$ or at level $1 \%$ because $\mathrm{df}=58$ was not found from the r table. At level of $5 \%$, r table was 0.250 . While at level of $1 \% \mathrm{r}$ table was 0.325 . Thus, the $\mathrm{r}_{\text {calculated }}>$ $\mathrm{r}_{\text {table }}$ either at level $5 \%$ or at level $1 \%$. Furthermore, the researcher concluded that there was significance correlation between score of rater 1 and rater 2 . In the other words, the writing test was reliable. The reliability of writing test was high.

To determine the validity of the test, the researcher used content validity. The materials of the test had been taught at the second year students of Islamic Junior High School Pondok Pesantren Darun Nahdhah Thawalib Bangkinang. It was familiar materials and near to the students' daily life. It was appropriate to the
students' knowledge, insight and experience. Moreover, the material was provided on students' hand book and other related resources.

The data analysis presented the statistical result followed by the discussion about the effect of using summary ball technique toward students' speaking ability at the second year of Islamic Junior High School of Pondok Pesantren Darun Nahdhah Thawalib Bangkinang . The data were divided into two classes; experimental and control scores. The researcher used independent sample T-Test from SPSS. 16 version to analyze the effect of using summary ball technique toward speaking ability at the second year of Islamic Junior High School of PP.Darun Nahdhah Thawalib Bangkinang

## C. The data Analysis

1. The Analysis of Pre-test of Experimental and Control Classes

TABLE IV. 15
THE STUDENTS'SPEAKING SCORE OF PRE-TEST AT EXPERIMENT AND CONTROL CLASS

| NO | NAME | Experiment | Control |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | S1 | 50 | 40 |
| 2 | S2 | 40 | 44 |
| 3 | S3 | 50 | 50 |
| 4 | S4 | 42 | 39 |
| 5 | S5 | 54 | 46 |
| 6 | S6 | 44 | 44 |
| 7 | S7 | 50 | 50 |
| 8 | S8 | 50 | 50 |
| 9 | S9 | 40 | 52 |
| 10 | S10 | 54 | 50 |
| 11 | S11 | 42 | 44 |
| 12 | S12 | 56 | 56 |
| 13 | S13 | 44 | 48 |
| 14 | S14 | 50 | 56 |
| 15 | S15 | 42 | 44 |
| 16 | S16 | 50 | 56 |
| 17 | S17 | 56 | 48 |
| 18 | S18 | 40 | 56 |
| 19 | S19 | 58 | 48 |
| 20 | S20 | 52 | 56 |
| 21 | S21 | 48 | 50 |
| 22 | S22 | 52 | 46 |
| 23 | S23 | 48 | 50 |
| 24 | S24 | 50 | 44 |
| 25 | S25 | 48 | 46 |
| 26 | S26 | 48 | 48 |
| 27 | S27 | 54 | 50 |
| 28 | S28 | 54 | 52 |
| 29 | S29 | 52 | 60 |
| 30 | S30 | 50 | 54 |
| Mean |  | 48.93 | 49.23 |



The table above described about the comparison between the students' speaking scores in pre-test of experimental class and control class. The mean score of experimental class was 48.93 , While the mean score of control class was 49.23 Thus, it indicated that the students' speaking ability at experimental and control class were almost simmilar. It means that there was no significance difference on students' speaking ability both experimental class and control class. By knowing the students' basic speaking ability at experimental class and control class, it was easy to measure and to identify the improvement of students' speaking ability after giving treatment or the difference between classes that had been taught by using summary ball technique and without using it.
2. The Analysis Post-test of Experimental and Control Class

TABLE IV. 16
THE STUDENTS' SPEAKING SCORE OF POST-TEST AT EXPERIMENT AND CONTROL CLASS

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NO | NAME | Experiment | Control |
| 1 | S1 | 56 | 52 |
| 2 | S2 | 60 | 54 |
| 3 | S3 | 54 | 54 |
| 4 | S4 | 60 | 54 |
| 5 | S5 | 58 | 52 |
| 6 | S6 | 60 | 50 |
| 7 | S7 | 58 | 54 |
| 8 | S8 | 62 | 52 |
| 9 | S9 | 66 | 54 |
| 10 | S10 | 70 | 62 |
| 11 | S11 | 70 | 56 |
| 12 | S12 | 68 | 56 |
| 13 | S13 | 60 | 52 |
| 14 | S14 | 60 | 52 |
| 15 | S15 | 62 | 52 |
| 16 | S16 | 58 | 54 |
| 17 | S17 | 60 | 52 |
| 18 | S18 | 58 | 58 |
| 19 | S19 | 70 | 50 |
| 20 | S20 | 64 | 60 |
| 21 | S21 | 58 | 52 |
| 22 | S22 | 52 | 52 |
| 23 | S23 | 58 | 54 |
| 24 | S24 | 56 | 50 |
| 25 | S25 | 58 | 50 |
| 26 | S26 | 58 | 54 |
| 27 | S27 | 58 | 52 |
| 28 | S28 | 58 | 54 |
| 29 | S29 | 58 | 66 |
| 30 | S30 | 62 | 56 |
| Mean | $\mathbf{6 0 . 3 3}$ | 54.00 |  |
|  |  |  |  |



The table above described about the comparison between students' speaking scores of both experimental class and control class after giving treatment. The mean of score of experimental class was 60.33 , While the mean score of control class was 54.00 . Both of the classes had their improvement from pre-test score, but the improvement was different; students' speaking ability at experimental was higher than control class. It means that there was a better improvement at the experimental class compared to control class that had been given treatment.
3. The Analysis Improvement of Speaking Ability of Experiment Class

TABLE IV. 17
THE STUDENTS' SPEAKING SCORES
AT PRE-TEST TO POST-TEST AT EXPERIMENTAL CLASS

| No | Name | Pre test | Post test | Gain | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | S1 | 50 | 56 | 6 | 12 |
| 2 | S2 | 40 | 60 | 20 | 50 |
| 3 | S3 | 50 | 54 | 4 | 8 |
| 4 | S4 | 42 | 60 | 18 | 43 |
| 5 | S5 | 54 | 58 | 4 | 7 |
| 6 | S6 | 44 | 60 | 16 | 36 |
| 7 | S7 | 50 | 58 | 8 | 16 |
| 8 | S8 | 50 | 62 | 12 | 24 |
| 9 | S9 | 40 | 66 | 26 | 65 |
| 10 | S10 | 54 | 70 | 16 | 30 |
| 11 | S11 | 42 | 70 | 28 | 67 |
| 12 | S12 | 56 | 68 | 12 | 21 |
| 13 | S13 | 44 | 60 | 16 | 36 |
| 14 | S14 | 50 | 60 | 10 | 20 |
| 15 | S15 | 42 | 62 | 20 | 48 |
| 16 | S16 | 50 | 58 | 8 | 16 |
| 17 | S17 | 56 | 60 | 4 | 7 |
| 18 | S18 | 40 | 58 | 18 | 45 |
| 19 | S19 | 58 | 70 | 12 | 21 |
| 20 | S20 | 52 | 64 | 12 | 23 |
| 21 | S21 | 48 | 58 | 10 | 21 |
| 22 | S22 | 52 | 52 | 0 | 0 |
| 23 | S23 | 48 | 58 | 10 | 21 |
| 24 | S24 | 50 | 56 | 6 | 12 |
| 25 | S25 | 48 | 58 | 10 | 21 |
| 26 | S26 | 48 | 58 | 10 | 21 |
| 27 | S27 | 54 | 58 | 4 | 7 |
| 28 | S28 | 54 | 58 | 4 | 7 |
| 29 | S29 | 52 | 58 | 6 | 12 |
| 30 | S30 | 50 | 62 | 12 | 24 |
| MEAN |  | 48.93 | 60.33 | 11.40 | 24.70 |



The table above described about the differences between students' speaking scores before and after giving treatment at experimental class. Before giving a treatment, the students' speaking mean score was about 48.93. it was known by taking pre-test at the beginning. While, after giving treatment, the mean score of students' speaking ability improved. To be 60.33 . The improvement of each student was various, there were drastically improvement and not even any improvement ( $0 \%$ ). Yet generally, the improvement could be seen at mean score.

## 4. The Analysis of Improvement of Speaking Ability of Control Class

TABLE IV. 18
THE STUDENTS' SPEAKING SCORE AT PRE-TEST TO POST-TEST CONTROL CLASS

| No | Name | Pre test | Post test | Gain | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | S-1 | 40 | 52 | 12 | 12 |
| 2 | S-2 | 44 | 54 | 10 | 10 |
| 3 | S-3 | 50 | 54 | 4 | 4 |
| 4 | S-4 | 39 | 54 | 15 | 15 |
| 5 | S-5 | 46 | 52 | 6 | 6 |
| 6 | S-6 | 44 | 50 | 6 | 6 |
| 7 | S-7 | 50 | 54 | 4 | 4 |
| 8 | S-8 | 50 | 52 | 2 | 2 |
| 9 | S-9 | 52 | 54 | 2 | 2 |
| 10 | S-10 | 50 | 62 | 12 | 12 |
| 11 | S-11 | 44 | 56 | 12 | 12 |
| 12 | S-12 | 56 | 56 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | S-13 | 48 | 52 | 4 | 4 |
| 14 | S-14 | 56 | 52 | -4 | -4 |
| 15 | S-15 | 44 | 52 | 8 | 8 |
| 16 | S-16 | 56 | 54 | -2 | -2 |
| 17 | S-17 | 48 | 52 | 4 | 4 |
| 18 | S-18 | 56 | 58 | 2 | 2 |
| 19 | S-19 | 48 | 50 | 2 | 2 |
| 20 | S-20 | 56 | 60 | 4 | 4 |
| 21 | S-21 | 50 | 52 | 2 | 2 |
| 22 | S-22 | 46 | 52 | 6 | 6 |
| 23 | S-23 | 50 | 54 | 4 | 4 |
| 24 | S-24 | 44 | 50 | 6 | 6 |
| 25 | S-25 | 46 | 50 | 4 | 4 |
| 26 | S-26 | 48 | 54 | 6 | 6 |
| 27 | S-27 | 50 | 52 | 2 | 2 |
| 28 | S-28 | 52 | 54 | 2 | 2 |
| 29 | S-29 | 60 | 66 | 6 | 6 |
| 30 | S-30 | 54 | 56 | 2 | 2 |
| Mean |  | 49.23 | 54.00 | 4.77 | 10.45 |



The table above described about the differences between the students' speaking scores before and after research at control class. Firstly, the students' speaking mean score was about 49.23 , It was known by taking pre-test at the beginning. While after giving post-test, the mean score of students' speaking ability was 54 Thus, in this control class, there was no better improvement of students' speaking ability.

## 5. The Analysis of Different Improvement between Experimental class and control class

From the analysis at table 17 and 18 above, it could be seen that there was a different improvement of students' speaking ability at Experimental and Control Class. It showed that the different mean score improvement at the experimental class was 60.33 by percentage $24.70 \%$ While at control class, it was 54.00 by percentage $10.45 \%$.

Based on the percentage of influence found for both classes, it was clear that the percentage of influence improvement of summary ball technique on students' speaking ability in experimental class was higher than control class. It means that the technique used by the teacher in teaching speaking skill was one of the factors that gave the influence towards students' speaking ability. It could be proven from the influence of improvement of summary ball technique itself was $24.70 \%$, while three phase technique just influenced $10.45 \%$.

After knowing about the percentage different improvement from both of the classes, to know clearly, then the researcher would analyze it by using independent sample t - test at the last discussion.

## 6. The Analysis of Mean and Standard Deviation

TABLE IV. 19
MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION

|  | Experimental Class |  | Control Class |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pre-test | Post-test | Pre-test | Post-test |
| Mean | 48.93 | 60.33 | 49.23 | 54.00 |
| Std. deviation | 5.112 | 4.551 | 5.090 | 3.601 |

a. Pre-test

1. Mean and Standard Deviation of Pre-test of Experimental Class

Based on the table above, it could be seen that the mean (Mx) of Pretest of experimental class was 48.93, and Standard Deviation (SD) of Pre-test of experimental class was 5.112

## 2. Mean and Standard Deviation of Pre-test of Control Class

Based on the table above, it could be seen that the mean (Mx) of Pretest of control class was 49.23, and Standard Deviation (SD) of Pre-test of control class was 5.090
b. Post-test

## 1. Mean and Standard Deviation post-test of Experimental Class

Based on the table above, it could be seen that the mean (Mx) of Post-test of experimental class was 60.33 , and Standard Deviation (SD) of experimental class was 4.551

## 2. Mean and Standard Deviation Post-test of Control Class

Based on the table above, it could be seen that the mean (Mx) of Post-test of control class was 54.00 , and Standard Deviation (SD) of control class was 3.601 .

## 7. Data analysis of Students' Post-Test Score of Experimental Class

The data of students' post-test score of experimental class were obtained from the result of their speaking ability. Based on the description data in page 47, the result could be classified the score as follows:

TABLE IV. 20
THE CLASSIFICATION OF STUDENTS' SCORE OF POST TEST EXPERIMENTAL CLASS

| No | Categories | Score | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Very Good | $80-100$ | - | $0 \%$ |
| 2 | Good | $66-79$ | 5 | $17 \%$ |
| 3 | Enough | $56-65$ | 23 | $77 \%$ |
| 4 | Less | $40-55$ | 2 | $6 \%$ |
| 5 | Fail | $30-39$ | - | $0 \%$ |

Based on the table above, it could be seen that the classifications of the students' score: the category number 1 showed no frequency ( $0 \%$ ), the category number 2 showed 5 frequencies (17\%), the category number 3 showed 23 frequencies (77.\%), the category number 4 showed 2 frequencies ( $6 \%$ ) and the category number 5 showed no frequency $(0 \%)$. The table above also showed that the highest percentage of experimental class was $77 . \%$. The mean score of
experimental class was 60.33 . Thus, the majority of the students in experimental class could be as classified enough.

## 8. Data analysis of Students' Post-Test Score of Control Class

The data of students' post-test score of control class was obtained from the result of their speaking ability. Based on the description data in page 50, the writer could classify the score as follows:

TABLE IV. 21
THE CLASSIFICATION OF STUDENTS' SCORE OF POST TEST OF CONTROL CLASS

| No | Categories | Score | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Very Good | $80-100$ | - | $0 \%$ |
| 2 | Good | $66-79$ | 1 | $3 \%$ |
| 3 | Enough | $56-65$ | 6 | $20 \%$ |
| 4 | Less | $40-55$ | 23 | $77 \%$ |
| 5 | Fail | $30-39$ | - | $0 \%$ |

Based on the table above, it could be seen that the classifications of the students' score: the category number 1 showed no frequency ( $0 \%$ ), the category number 2 showed 1 frequency (3\%), the category number 3 showed 6
frequencies ( $20 \%$ ), the category number 4 showed 23 frequencies ( $77 \%$ ), and the category number 5 showed no frequency. The table above also showed that the highest percentage of control class was $77 \%$. The mean score of control class was 54.00. Thus, the majority of the students in control class could be classified into

## less.

## 9. The Data Analysis of $\mathbf{t}$ - test

The data analysis presented the statistical result followed by the discussion about the difference on students' speaking ability between those students who were taught by using summary ball technique and those who were not at the second year students of Islamic Junior high school of PP.Darun Nahdha Thawalib Bangkinang.

TABLE IV. 22
GROUP STATISTICS

|  | class | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Std. Error Mean |  |  |  |
| score | 1 | 30 | 11.40 | 6.729 |

Based on the table above, it could be seen that the total students' from each class, the experimental class (1) consisted of 30 students and so was control class (2). The mean of experimental class improvement was 11.40 , and the mean of control class improvement was 4.77 . Standard deviation from experimental class
was 6.729 , while standard deviation from control class was 4.232 . Standard error mean from experimental class was 1.229 , and control class was 773 .

TABLE IV. 23
INDEPENDENT SAMPLES TEST

|  |  | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances |  | t-test for Equality of Means |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2tailed) | Mean Differenc e | Std. Error Difference | 95\% Confidence Interval of the Difference |  |
|  |  | Lower |  |  |  |  |  |  | Upper |
| score | Equal variances assumed |  | 5.111 | . 028 | 4.570 | 58 | . 000 | 6.633 | 1.451 | 3.728 | 9.539 |
|  | Equal <br> variances not assumed |  |  | $4.570$ | $48.836$ | $000$ | 6.633 | 1.451 | 3.717 | 9.550 |

Based on the data output above, it was answered the hypothesis of the research that Ho was rejected and Ha was accepted because $0.000<0.05$. The next standard for analysis based on Equal variant assumed.

From the data output above, it could be seen that score of $t$-test was 4.570 with $\mathrm{df}=58$, because $\mathrm{df}=58$ was not found from the " t " table $\left(\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{t}}\right)$, so the researcher took $\mathrm{df}=60$. Mean difference was 6.633 and standard error difference
was 1.451 . Lower interval of the difference was 3.728 and upper confidence difference was 9.539

If $\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{0}}(\mathrm{t}$ Observation $)=4.570$ compared with $\boldsymbol{t}_{\boldsymbol{t}}$ with $\mathrm{df}=60$, the t critic point was:

Significance $5 \%=2.00$

Significance $1 \%=2.65$

It could be seen that the $\boldsymbol{t}_{\boldsymbol{o}}$ was higher than $\boldsymbol{t}_{\boldsymbol{t}}$ in significance level $5 \%$ and $1 \%$ ( $2,00<4.570>2,65$ ). It means $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{o}}$ was rejected and $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}$ was accepted; or there was a significant difference on students' ability in writing report paragraph between those who were taught by using summary ball technique and those who were not.

## CHAPTER V

## CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

## A. Research Conclusion

Based on the data analysis and data presentation explained at the chapter IV, the researcher concluded that:

1. There was students' reading comprehension in narrative text before using Specialized Roles in Discussion strategy at SMA N I Seberida is low. It was shown the mean score of experimental class was 57.16 and the control class was 56.90 .
2. There was improvement on students' reading comprehension in narrative text by using Specialized Roles in Discussion Strategy at SMAN I Seberida. The improvement was shown the mean score of experimental class was 66.45 while the control class was 60.39 .
3. From analysis of Independent Sample T-Test formula, there is significant effect of using Specialized Roles in Discussion Strategy toward reading comprehension of the second year students at SMAN I Seberida. The $H_{o}$ is rejected and $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}$ is accepted because $0.002<0.05$. Besides, Mean students’ score in pre-test at experimental class is 57.16. Mean students' score in post- test at experimental class is 66.45 . And the mean improvement of students reading comprehension at experimental class is 9.29 . While, mean students' score in pre-test at control class is 56.90 . Mean students' score in post test at control class is 60.38 . And the mean improvement of students
reading comprehension at control class is 3.48 . It means that the effect of using Specialized Roles in Discussion Strategy is better than Conventional Strategy.

This strategy is so helpful in teaching-learning process, especially in comprehending narrative text.

## B. Suggestion

Based on the research finding, the researcher would like to give some suggestions, especially to the teacher, students and the school. From the conclusion of the research above, it is found that using Specialized Roles in Discussion strategy can give significant effect toward reading comprehension of the students especially in narrative text. The suggestions are below:

1. The teacher should support the strategy used by using interesting topic that is suitable with to the students' level and presents the lesson objective clearly in order to make the students motivated in learning activity.
2. The teachers should support their teaching activity with the interesting media.
3. For the students, they have to have read often to improve their reading comprehension and take a part actively in learning process in order to support their comprehension.
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