

THE EFFECT OF A COOPERATIVE SCRIPT IN ENHANCING THE STUDENTS' NARRATIVE WRITING

Amrizal ¹⁾, Zohri Hamdani ²⁾

¹ English Education Department, Muhammadiyah Lampung University
Email: iyeck.izal@gmail.com

² English Education Department, Muhammadiyah Lampung University
Email: zohriamdani703@gmail.com.

Abstract

The objective of this study is to find out and analyze empirically the effects of cooperative script in enhancing the narrative writing of students. The study used experimental method with a control and experimental group. The study of population was 80 students 'electrical Engineering in the second semester at Muhammadiyah Lampung University 2016/2017. The subjects of the study were taken from the seven sections randomly elected by the fishbowl technique. The data collection method used pretest and posttest while data analysis used t-tests in SPSS 16.0. The study of results showed that the mean scores in the pre-test and post-test in both control and experimental groups significantly varied. First, the treatment or the cooperative script significantly increased the performance of the second semester students in narrative text writing, from good to very good. Second, a significant difference existed in the post-test mean scores of the control and experimental groups. The treatment increased the performance of the second semester students in narrative writing. Third, the use of a cooperative script significantly affected the performance, particularly of the experimental group.

Keywords: Cooperative Script, Writing Skill, Narrative Text

1. INTRODUCTION

Writing, speaking, listening, and reading are among the language skills that teachers should develop in students. With the fast-growing pace brought

about by globalization, communication has become an indispensable skill that people cannot live without. Most importantly, people with a good grasp of language, particularly English, have a competitive advantage. One form of

Open Access



Creation is distributed under the Creative Commons License Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International
Published in: <http://ejournal.stkipmpringsewu-lpg.ac.id/index.php/smart>
Jurnal SMART : Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics.

communication that is less likely to be developed among students is writing. Writing is a form of communication that allows students to put their feelings and ideas on paper, organize their knowledge, ideas, and beliefs and convey information through properly constructed texts. Written texts may be in the form of business communication, love letters, and written notes up to the most difficult forms that include writing poems, news, short stories novels and others. Such forms of expression make life meaningful and joyful.

Based on observations in class, learning how to write is challenging and boring for students. When a teacher gives students writing materials, the normal response is negative. Students tend to associate such activity with punishment for not paying attention or failing to submit requirements. The lack of vocabulary skills, low motivation, and the influence of technology make writing skills undeniably discouraging. Understanding such, a teacher must think of activities, create suitable writing materials, and provide more inspiring lectures and, most importantly, the teacher herself should write.

Suparno and Yunus (2008: 13) expressed that writing is an activity of message delivery (communication) by

using written language as medium tool and Tarigan (2008: 22) said that writing provides graphic representations depicting a language that a person understands so that others can read the graphic symbols if they understand the language and graphic representations. Based on those explanations, the conclusion can be made that writing is an activity to providing graphic representations depicting a language that a person understands as a media tool so that others can read the graphic symbols.

Writing skill is not just the ability to write graphic symbols in the form of words that are arranged into sentences according to certain rules. Writing skills demand high language mastery that may not be controlled by everyone. To develop good writing skills, a writing ladder needs to be considered. Learning the writing skill is done in stages. There are some of stages among others are: 1) copying the manuscript in the language, 2) rewriting/reproducing what has been heard and read, 3) combining what has been memorized and heard with small adaptations, 4) guided writing, and 5) composition with a student's own theme, title, or topic.

According to Rebecca (2003) narrative text is a text, which paints a series of plausible and timeless events

experienced by actors. Further, he states that some keys to understanding a narrative include, among others, the sense of plot, theme, character, and event, and how they relate. Moreover, Anderson and Anderson (2003a) explained that the text that tells a story so as to entertain the audience. It has characters and settings, and actions. Characters, settings, and narrative problems are usually introduced at the beginning. The problem reaches its high point in the middle. The end of the story solves the problem. There are some of generic structures to make narrative text, among others are Purpose (Social Function), Text Organization (Orientation, Complication and Resolution) and Language Features (Derewianka, 1991).

According to Slavin, (1994:175), a cooperative script is a learning model that can improve student memory while A'la (2011:97) said that a cooperative script is a learning method in which students work in pairs and verbally summarize parts of the material they learn in the classroom. It is very helpful for students in developing and linking facts and concepts that have been obtained in problem solving. Brousseau in Hadi (2007:18) wrote that cooperative-

script learning is a learning contract between the teacher and the students and the students on how to collaborate.

There are series steps of in the Cooperative Script Learning Model. They are:

1. The teacher divides the students into pairs.
2. The teacher shares the discourse/material of each student to write a text and read and summarize.
3. Teacher and students define who first acts as a speaker and who acts as a listener.
4. The speaker reads the summary as completely as possible by incorporating the main ideas in his summary, while the listener must listen or complete or finalize the underlying basic idea and help to remember or to memorize the main ideas/ideas by linking the previous material or with other materials.
5. Exchanging roles, originally acting as speakers converted into listeners and vice versa. Then, the activities return first step.
6. Formulating conclusions with students and teachers
7. Closing (Riyanto, 2009:280).

From the explanation above, the conclusion can be made that in the cooperative script learning model for narrative text writing, the teacher divides students into groups and then shares the discourse (topic) and students write narrative text based on topic. Every student has a job. A student writes a paragraph about orientation, another writes a paragraph about complication and a third writes about resolution. Then one member of the group must read the work in front of class and summarize and then ask questions for listeners from other groups about what he read. All activities return to first step then teacher and students formulate the conclusion and closing.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

The experimental method was employed in this study using two groups of subjects: 1) the control and 2) the experimental group. The experimental method of research is a method or procedure involving the control or manipulation of conditions for studying

the relative effects of various treatments applied to members of a sample or of the same treatment applied to members of different samples. The cause-and-effect relationship is determined by exposing one or more experimental groups to one or more treatment conditions and comparing the results to one or more control groups not receiving the treatment (Calderon and Gonzales, 1993: 83).

Population and Sample

This study was conducted from April 3, 2017 to June 12, 2017 and was done by two researchers. The control and experimental groups were taken from a population of 80 second semester students' electrical engineering at Muhammadiyah Lampung University. The subjects of the study were taken from the seven sections randomly selected by fishbowl technique to comprise the experimental and control groups. Each section had 30 students.

The Data Collection Method

This study, the researcher used easy test to know students' skill and result this study. In this study, students were given twice tests (pretest and posttest) the question about students' experience.

The Data Analysis Method

The researcher used some of indicator of writing to analysis among others were content, form, grammar, vocabulary and punctuation. Every element had score and every indicator was 20 so total of indicator was 100. To use calculate, the researcher used SPPSS 16.0.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A test was conducted after the experiment. The group subjected to treatment was the experimental group while no treatment was done to the control group. Using SPSS, t-tests were computed to reveal whether significant differences existed between the pre-test and post-test scores of the control and experimental groups. Findings of the study were several. First, the mean scores obtained in the pre-test of the control group and experimental group were 51.33 and 62.63 respectively. These were interpreted as good. The scores obtained after conducting the treatment revealed that the mean scores of the control group after the treatment were higher than before the treatment. However, the mean score was only 57.66. Comparing the mean scores of the experimental group before and after the treatment, the score

was higher after the treatment indicated by 75.12 mean rating. This was interpreted as very good. Second, the computed T value based on the results of the pre-test in the control and experimental groups was 11.78, greater than the tabular value of 2.04 at df of 29, at 5% level of significance Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. Furthermore, the computed T value in the post-test of the control and experimental groups was 4.37, which was higher than the tabular value of 2.04, at df of 29 and 5% level of significance. Thus, the null hypothesis that stated that no significant difference existed in the post-test mean scores of the control and experimental groups was rejected. Third, the use of cooperativescript had increased the performance in test of the Grade Seven students' writing skills using narrative texts.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, the following conclusions are drawn. First, the mean scores in the pre-test and post-test in both control and experimental groups significantly varied. This means that the treatment or the cooperativescript had significantly increased the performance of the second semester in narrative writing, from good to very

Amrizal.....

good. Second, a significant difference existed in the post-test mean scores of the control and experimental groups. The treatment increased the performance of the second semester students in narrative writing. Third, the use of a cooperativescript had significantly affected the performance in the test particularly that of the experimental group. Moreover, the cooperativescript is recommended for use by teacher

Jakarta: KencanaPrenada Media Group.

Slavin, R.E. (1994). *Educational psychology: Theory and practice* (3rded.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Suparno, & Mohamad, Yunus. (2008). *Keterampilandasarmenulis*. Jakarta: Universitas Terbuka.

Tarigan, H.G. (2008). *Menulis sebagai suatu keterampilan berbahasa*. Bandung: Angkasa

5. REFERENCES

A'la, M. (2011). *Quantum teaching*. Yogyakarta: Diva Press.

Anderson, M., & Anderson, K. (2003a). *Text Types in English 2*. New South Wales: Macmillan Education Australia PTY LTD.

Calderon, J.F., & Gonzales, E.C. (1993). *Methods of research and thesis writing*. Manila: National Bookstore.

Derewianka, B. (1991). *Exploring How Texts Work*. Sydney: Primary English Teaching Association (PETA).

Hadi, S. (2007). *Statistik*. Yogyakarta: Andi.

Rebecca, J. L. (2003). *A critical handbook of children's literature*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Riyanto, Y. (2009). *Paradigmabarupembalajaran*.