

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION**

In this chapter the researcher presents research finding and discussion. It consists of research finding, data analysis, hypothesis testing, and discussion.

#### **A. The Description of Data**

In this research, the researcher presented the data on the student's speaking ability between students that taught speaking using Cooperative Script Method and those taught without using Cooperative Script Method. The subjects of the research consisted of two classes; they were X MIPA as Experimental class and X IIS class as Control class. The purposed of the researcher was to know the effect of using Cooperative Script Method toward students' speaking ability at the first grade of MA Hasanuddin Siraman Blitar. The data were collected from students pre-test and post-test of both classes. The data were described as follow:

##### **1. The Data of Experimental Class**

The table below showed the student's score of pre-test and post-test of Experimental class that was consist of 26 students of first grade of MA Hasanuddin Siraman Blitar.

The pre-test in this experimental class was given by students about Narrative text with their partner. There were 26 students as subject. The test was speaking ability in Narrative text. The theme of pre-test was "The Story of Lake Toba" and post-test was "Snow White".

This test is to know the data of the students' speaking ability before taught by Cooperative Script Method. The list of students' score in pretest can be seen in appendix 8.

The researcher used IBM SPSS Statistics 23 to know the student's speaking ability at Experimental class. First, the researcher gave the student's pre-test to know their basic speaking ability. The result can be seen on the table 4.1 below:

**Table 4.1 Descriptive Statistic Pre-test of Experimental Class**

**Descriptive Statistics**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
pre-test experimental	26	56	68	62,81	3,112
Valid N (listwise)	26				

According to the result of pre-test from the table above, it shown that the minimum of students score in pretest was 56, the maximum was 68, and the mean was 50. The standard deviation was 3.112. And after the researcher gave the treatment by using Cooperative Script Method in teaching speaking ability, the researcher gave the students post-test scores. The data in the post test showed on the table 4.2 below:

**Table 4.2 Descriptive Statistic Post-test of Experimental Class****Descriptive Statistics**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
post-test experimental	26	81	93	86,81	3,868
Valid N (listwise)	26				

According to the result of post-test from the table above, it shown that the minimum of data was 81. The maximum score of pre-test was 93 and the mean of data was 86.81. And the standard deviation was 3,868.

Based on descriptive statistic pre-test and post-test of Experimental class, it shown the *Mean* of pre-test score was 62.81 and the *Mean* of post-test score was 86.81. Therefore, there are differences of score between before and after taught by using Cooperative Script Method in speaking ability. From the data above that the score after taught by using Cooperative Script Method better and higher than taught before using Cooperative Script Method. Hence, there was significance different score between pre-test and post-test.

## 2. The Data of Control Class

The table below showed the students' score of pre-test and post-test of Control class that was consist of 22 students at first grade of MA Hasanuddin Siraman Blitar. The test was speaking ability in Narrative text.

The theme of pre-test was “The Story of Lake Toba” and post-test was “Snow White”. Students’ score of pre-test and post-test can be seen in appendix 4.

The researcher used IBM SPSS Statistics 23 to know the student’s speaking ability at control class. First, the researcher gave the student’s pre-test to know their basic speaking ability. The result can be seen on the table 4.3 below:

**Table 4.3 Descriptive Statistic Pre-test of Control Class**

**Descriptive Statistics**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
pre-test control	22	51	70	60,05	6,051
Valid N (listwise)	22				

According to the result of pre-test from the table above, it shown that the minimum of students score in pretest was 51, the maximum was 70, and the mean was 60.05. The standard deviation was 6.051. And after the researcher teaching speaking in Narrative text using Cooperative Script Method, the researcher gave the students post-test. The data in the post-test showed on the table 4.4 below:

**Table 4.4 Descriptive Statistic Post-test of Control Class****Descriptive Statistics**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
post-test control	22	55	72	62,82	5,252
Valid N (listwise)	22				

According to the result of pre-test from the table above, it shown that the minimum of students score in post-test was 55, the maximum was 72, and the mean was 62.82. The standard deviation was 5.252.

Based on descriptive statistic pre-test and post-test of Control class, it shown the *Mean* of pre-test score was 60.05 and the *Mean* of post-test score was 62.82. Therefore, there are differences of score between before and after taught by using Cooperative Script Method in speaking ability. From the data above that the score after taught by using Cooperative Script Method better and higher than taught before using Cooperative Script Method. Hence, there was slight significance different score between pre-test and post-test.

## **B. Data Analysis**

The analysis of data here is the researcher tries to find both of normality and homogeneity of the data. Those analyses are used to determine the next step that is testing the hypothesis. The result of measuring both normality and homogeneity and presented below:

### **1. Normality Testing**

Normality test intended to show that the sample data come from a normally distributed population. The normality testing in this research to know the normality, the researcher used IBM SPSS Statistics 23 One Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test by the value of significance ( $\alpha$ ) = 0.05. The result of normality testing can be seen in the table 4.5 below:

**Table 4.5 Normality Test of Experimental Class****One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test**

		pre-test	post-test	Unstandardized
		experimental	experimental	Residual
N		26	26	26
Normal	Mean	62,8077	86,8077	,0000000
Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Std.			
	Deviation	3,11152	3,86801	3,08795088
Most	Absolute	,144	,107	,119
Extreme	Positive	,124	,107	,106
Differences	Negative	-,144	-,103	-,119
Test Statistic		,144	,107	,119
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		,175 <sup>c</sup>	,200 <sup>c,d</sup>	,200 <sup>c,d</sup>

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.

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

**Table 4.6 Normality Test of Control Class****One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test**

		pre-test	post-test	Unstandardized
		control	control	Residual
N		22	22	22
Normal	Mean	60,0455	62,8182	,0000000
Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Std.	6,05119	5,25209	1,93994445
	Deviation			
Most Extreme	Absolute	,114	,116	,202
Differences	Positive	,114	,113	,202
	Negative	-,112	-,116	-,113
Test Statistic		,114	,116	,202
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		,200 <sup>c,d</sup>	,200 <sup>c,d</sup>	,020 <sup>c</sup>

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.

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

Based on the result of the test above in table 4.7 and table 4.8, can be seen that the significance value pre-test of experimental class was 0.175, post-test of experimental class was 0.200, pre-test of control class was 0.200 and post-test of control class was 0.200. So, all of them were more than 0.05. It means that  $H_0$  was accepted and  $H_a$



was rejected. So, it can be interpreted that all of the data were normal distributed.

## 2. Homogeneity Testing

Homogeneity is conducted after ensuring whether the data has been normal distributed. Calculating the homogeneity of the data is aimed to see whether the data includes to homogeneous or heterogeneous data. The homogeneity testing in this research using IBM SPSS Statistics 23 that Levene Statistic by the value of significance ( $\alpha$ ) = 0.05. The samples can be categorized as homogeneity if value of significance  $> 0.05$ , so it means that the data of sample had same variance. The result can be seen below:

**Table 4.7 Homogeneity of Test**

### Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Hasil belajar siswa

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
3,374	1	46	,073

From the result above, the test was homogeneity because significant was 0.073, it known that the significant was more than 0.05 ( $0.073 > 0.05$ ). It means that  $H_0$  was accepted and  $H_a$  was rejected. So, the homogeneity testing of variance in post-test of experimental clas and control class for narrative text speaking ability in this research

showed that the data had homogeneous variance, so it was qualified to be analyzed.

### **C. Hypothesis Testing**

The writer analyzed the significant difference of data by using the formula of Paired Sample Test. This is aimed to prove statistically whether there is any significant difference between students' speaking ability both in pre-test and post-test. The hypothesis testing of this study as follow:

1.  $H_0$  : Cooperative Script Method is not effective to teaching students' speaking ability
2.  $H_a$  : Cooperative Script Method is effective to teaching students' speaking ability

The hypothesis testing of this study followed the rule as follows:

1. If the significance value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is rejected and alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) is accepted.
2. If the significance value is more than 0.05, the alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) is rejected and null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is accepted.

To know whether there were any significant different students speaking ability between the students who are taught using Cooperative Script Method and those taught without using Cooperative Script Method. The calculating result should show whether  $H_0$  is rejected meanwhile  $H_a$  is accepted. To analyzed data, the researcher by using IBM SPSS Statistics 23, the result can be seen on table 4.8 below:

**Table 4.8 Descriptive Statistic of Post-test (Experimental Class and Control Class)**

**Descriptive Statistics**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
experimental class	26	81	93	86,81	3,868
control class	22	55	72	62,82	5,252
Valid N (listwise)	22				

Based on table above, it showed there were two classes, experimental class and control class. Experimental class showed there were 26 students, *Mean* of score experimental class was 86.81, *Standard Deviation* for experimental class was 3.868. Meanwhile, in control class, shows there were 22 students, *Mean* of score control class was 62.82, and *Standard Deviation* for control class was 5.252.

In addition, the result of t-test testing with the helped of IBM SPSS Statistics 23 can be seen on table 4.9 as follow:

**Table 4.9 Independent Sample T-test****Independent Samples Test**

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
	F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
								Lower	Upper	
hasil belajar siswa	3,374	,073	18,191	46	,000	23,990	1,319	21,335	26,644	
Equal variances assumed										
Equal variances not assumed			17,737	37,979	,000	23,990	1,353	21,251	26,728	

Based on the table above, the result of t-test can be concluded that significant value (sig-2 tailed) was 0,000, and it was smaller than 0.05 ( $0.000 < 0.05$ ). it means that  $H_0$  was rejected and  $H_a$  was accepted. So, it can be interpreted that there is significant difference of students' score between students taught by using Cooperative Script Method those taught without using Cooperative Script Method. It means that teaching speaking using Cooperative Script Method was effective.

#### **D. Discussion**

Based on the research finding, the data were analyzed with IBM SPSS Statistics 23. The student who were taught by using Cooperative Script Method made significant improvement, as seen from the mean score of pre-test was 62.81 and the mean score of post-test was 86.81. Meanwhile, the students who were taught without Cooperative Script Method did not make significant improvement, as seen from the mean score of pre-test was 60.05 and the mean score of post-test was 62.82. Based on the mean score between experimental class and control class, there are significance difference. So, we can conclude that the mean score of experimental class was higher than control class.

From the explanation above, experimental class has better speaking ability than control class on posttest. The findings of the present research confirm the finding of previous research done by Dwi Maria Ulfah (2004). She found that teaching speaking by using Cooperative Script Method got good effect to improve students' speaking ability. It means that there is significant effect of using Cooperative Script Method to improve speaking skill. So, Cooperative Script Method can be applied as an alternative method to support teaching speaking.

Based on the research at MA Hasanuddin Siraman Blitar, it can be inference that teaching speaking by using Cooperative Script Method was better than without using Cooperative Script Method. Furthermore, the students who learned speaking through Cooperative Script Method and those who taught without using Cooperative Script Method having such a

significant difference that the students' speaking scores who were taught using Cooperative Script Method was higher than those who were not. it can also be concluded that using Cooperative Script Method was effective to teach speaking.

Cooperative Script Method can improve students' speaking ability was in line with theory of Dansereau (1988) who explains that cooperative script is one method of learning, where students work in pairs and take turns verbally, to recapitulate portions of the material being studied. Dansereau and his colleagues at Texas Christian University have found in an impressive series of brief studies that college students working on structured "cooperative scripts" could learn technical material or procedures far better than the students working alone. Dansereau and his colleagues found in a series of studies that both the speaker and the listener learned more than the students who worked alone. So, by using one of method cooperative learning, that Cooperative Script Method made students confident to speaking.

Over all, the results above imply that the use of Cooperative Script Method gave positive effect to the students' narrative speaking ability during teaching and learning process. It has been verified by the result of data analysis that there was significant difference score at the first grade of MA Hasanuddin Siraman Blitar in narrative speaking ability between they who were taught by using Cooperative Script Method and those who were taught without using Cooperative Script Method. Thus, it can be conclude

that the use of Cooperative Script Method was effective to teach narrative speaking ability at the first grade of MA Hasanuddin Siraman Blitar.