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ABSTRACT


The objective of this research is to improve students’ speaking skill and motivation in learning English using Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) approach.

The collaborative classroom action research was conducted by the researcher from October, 2010 to June 2011 to the eighth grade students of SMP Negeri 5 Surakarta. There were 36 students as the subjects of the research. At the pre-observation, it was found that the students had difficulties in producing grammatical sentences of their utterances. They produced inappropriate words to express their ideas. The students also had difficulties in pronouncing the words correctly and they did not pay enough participation to the lesson.

In this research, the researcher taught speaking using Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) approach. Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) is a variety of teaching learning approach in which students are divided to work in a group, help and criticize one another. The primary role of learners in cooperative learning is as a member of a group who must work collaboratively with another group member. One of the characteristics of cooperative language learning is a group of learning activities in which there is learners’ interaction to increase the motivation. It means that it is through language that learners come to understand ideas. In delivering ideas, students need to talk, and through this way, students’ speaking skill can be improved since the purpose of cooperative learning itself is to stimulate students’ interaction or to make students talk.

The researcher conducted two cycles of action. There were great improvements resulted from conducting the action. The result of the action showed that the students’ speaking skill improved as shown in the result of both the observation of students’ activities during the actions and the results of the pre-test and the post-test mean scores. The pre-test mean score was 5 increasing to 7.1 in the post-test. There were also improvements in students’ behavior. During the action, the students paid good participation to the lesson. It was proven by their activeness in doing all the assignments. They could collaborate well with other students and fully participate in the lesson.

At the end of the research, the writer gives suggestions for the English teacher. Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) can be chosen as an appropriate approach in order to improve students’ speaking skill and make the students more motivated in learning English.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Study

In Indonesia, English is the first foreign language being learned from elementary. Learning English is demand for students, especially in this globalization era, in order to understand knowledge and science which are mostly written and spoken in English.

According to the Indonesian’s SMP syllabus, time allotment given to learn English is as much as Indonesian subject. It deals with communicative competence. Brown (1994: 227) says that communicative competence is aspects of our competence that enables us to convey and interpret messages and to negotiate meaning interpersonally within the context. It means that the students are hoped to be able to use English as a means of communication.

The 2006 curriculum of junior high school states objectives of the teaching English in the level of Junior High School are as follows:

“Mata pelajaran bahasa inggris di SMP/MTs bertujuan agar peserta didik memiliki kemampuan sebagai berikut.

1. Mengembangkan kompetensi berkomunikasi dalam bentuk lisan dan tulis untuk mencapai tingkat literasi functional
2. Memiliki kesadaran tentang hakikat dan pentingnya bahasa inggris untuk meningkatkan daya saing bangsa dalam masyarakat global
3. Mengembangkan pemahaman peserta didik tentang keterkaitan antara bahasa dan budaya.

Teaching English should develop four skills such as; reading, listening, speaking, and writing. The fact is that most of teachers only pay attention to reading, grammar, and vocabulary to anticipate the final written test. Mostly, they only teach about the language, not how to use it. The statements above can be seen in the following teacher’s statement, “untuk speaking mungkin agak terabaikan masalahnya lebih focus pada reading dan
writing”. The students are great in answering some extracted questions, but it was difficult for them to use English in spoken language. The result of pre-test that researchers conducted showed low scores indicating that they really low in speaking.

The writer saw some problems that attack the students’ speaking skill when conducting pre-observation in SMP Negeri 5 Surakarta. The problems can be seen in this student’s statement, “karena kita kan ada yang nggak tau grammarnya, trus ngucapinya kan lidah kita kan beda ama lidah orang luar gitu ya, jadi kalau mau ngucapin kan agak gak gok gak gok gimana”. That statement showed (1) students have difficulties in producing grammatical sentences of their correct utterances. For example, they say “I like sing instead of I like singing”; (2) students have difficulties in pronouncing words correctly. They often pronounce word “know” as “/kno:/”; (3) students are often producing inappropriate words to express their language function. For example, in the presentation stage someone said “that’s enough” to close is wrong; it should be “that’s all”; (4) Students’ utterance is halting and incoherent. When they speak, they think what and how to speak. They only produce speech on their mind; it needs more time in producing the speech, and they tend to produce fragmented utterances, pause and use fillers (“em…”, “err…”, “aaa…” etc), the speech tends to be slower and more hesitant, and the worst, there will be no communication at all since it is very impossible after there are too much fragmented and incoherent utterances.

Beside, there were also problems that faced students’ speaking skill from the classroom situation, such as (1) Students were not confident in practicing a language so they speak slowly. They were still afraid to make mistake in expressing their ideas through speaking. As the English teacher’s statement, “ya mungkin karena Bahasa Inggris itu termasuk bahasa internasional, English as a second language or English as foreign language maka mungkin siswa dalam mengutarakan speakingnya itu masih malu, takut,
Some of the cases faced by the eight grade students of SMP Negeri 5 Surakarta might occur because the teaching approach used by the teacher does not motivate students for engaging the students in speaking activities. Therefore, the teacher has to be able to use her creativity to establish enjoyable and motivating classroom environment. One of the ways is by applying the teaching approach that can motivate students to speak in speaking class.

In solving the problem, the researcher proposes cooperative learning. Cooperative Learning (CL) is the appropriate approach for teaching speaking. Cooperative learning is an approach which provides some techniques that can be used in the classrooms. Cooperative learning can improve students’ speaking skill through activating individuals in a group of learning.

Olsen and Kangan (1992: 192), cooperative learning is an activity in such a way so that learning is dependent on the society structured exchange of information between learners in groups and in which each learner is held accountable for his or her own learning and is motivated to increase the learning of others. Cooperative learning invites students to works together and help each other to learn the materials. It focuses on cooperation rather than competition. It involves all students in teaching learning process so that it could motivate students to be more active.

To reach the better academic achievement of the students, especially speaking skill, is greatly influenced by the appropriate approach used by the teacher. This is in line with Brown (1994:74) who says that an approach or theory of language and language learning takes great importance. Based on the pre- research to the eight grade students of SMP Negeri 5 Surakarta done
by the writer on February 4th 2011, the technique used by the teacher is still traditional which means speaking class is still dominated by the teacher and students spent a lot of time in listening to the teacher then talking.

There are reasons for the writer to use Cooperative Language Learning in her class to improve speaking skill. Cooperative learning implies full participation of both teacher and student and the interaction of student with student (as stated by Rivers, 1994). It leads to the capability of asking and answering/responding questions. Questioning and responding will lead the learners into the use of listening and speaking as communicative strategy and for its interdependence that cannot be separated each other. It introduces a wide range of topics into the classroom, which can lead the learners to a free interaction. It is one of the main reasons for the writer to choose Cooperative Language Learning as the technique to improve students’ speaking skill. Generally, the commonest problem faced by the teacher or lecturer of speaking is what the learners are interested in talking about. Cooperative Language Learning introduces a wide variety of topics; it can help them to develop a feel for what interests their learners. By the using of Cooperative Language Learning, they can engage the learners in free or guidance conversations about these topics of interest.

From the explanation above, the researcher tries to relate cooperative learning in teaching speaking in second grade of senior high school students, and this research entitles Implementing Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) to Improve Students’ Speaking Skill (Action Research at the Eighth Grade of SMP Negeri 5 Surakarta in Academic Year 2010/2011)

B. Problems Statement

From the explanation of background of the study, there are some problems that can be formulated as follows:
1. Can the use of Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) improve students’ speaking skill?
2. Can the use of Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) improve students’ motivation in learning English?

C. Objectives of the Study

The research is conducted to:
1. Identify whether or not Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) improves students’ speaking skill.
2. Identify whether or not Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) improves students’ motivation in learning English.

D. Benefits of the Study

The benefits of the study that the writer expects are:
1. For the students, the study can enhance the students’ awareness at using English communicatively rather than theoretically.
2. For the teachers, the benefit is that it can be a reference in solving problems related to speaking, developing the learning quality and they can implement this technique in their classroom in order to create interesting and enjoyable classroom condition.
3. For other researchers, the research will motivate them to study and find out the better techniques to improve students’ speaking skill.
4. For the writer herself, the study can bring her to a better understanding of bringing about changes and improvement in students speaking skill.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW ON RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter, the writer presents the theories underlying the research related to the case that the writer wants to analyze, namely improving speaking skills through Cooperative Language Learning. The theory covers the concept of speaking skill, cooperative language learning, the relationship between cooperative language learning in improving speaking skill, motivation, rationale and, hypotheses.

A. Speaking Skill

1. The Nature of Speaking

There are some definitions of speaking stated by some experts. Speaking is a skill of being able to use language orally. Brindley (1995:19) makes specifications about oral language. Here, oral can be defined as speaking. He believes that oral is to:

   a. Express oneself intelligibility
   b. Convey intended meaning accurately with sufficient command of vocabulary
   c. Use language appropriate to context
   d. Interact with other speakers fluently

It means that speaking should involve intelligibility, accuracy, appropriateness, and fluency.

According to Syakur (1987: 5), speaking is a complex skill concerned with components of pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary and fluency.

   a. Pronunciation

Pronunciation is the student’s way to utter English words. Pronunciation is one of the difficult language components of a grammar made up of the elements or principles to determine how sound vary and pattern in a language.
b. Vocabulary

Vocabulary means the appropriate diction which is used in conversation. Having limited vocabulary is a barrier that precludes learners from learning a language. Without having a sufficient vocabulary, one cannot communicate effectively or express ideas in both oral and written form.

c. Grammar

It concerns with how to arrange a correct sentences in conversation. It can develop the ability to understand and respond quickly, and the ability to articulate. The utility of grammar is also to learn the correct way to gain expertise in a language in oral and written form.

d. Fluency

Fluency is the ability to speak fluently and accurately suited with professional necessity. In other words, being fluent means able to keep the language coming. There may be mistakes, fillers and repetition.

Underwood (1996: 11) states that speaking is a creative process where speakers are almost always in the position of formulating what they are saying as a result of behavior of their listeners or as a result of added thoughts of their own. It means that someone is able to speak up because of his understanding in his listening to other speaker. So, if he hears incorrect sound, it will make wrong perception for the listener.

Widdowson (1996: 58-59) defines speaking in the usage sense as simply the physical embodiment of abstract systems, which involve the manifestation either of the phonological system or of the grammatical system of the language or both. In the sense of use, he also defines speaking as part of reciprocal exchange in which both reception and production play a part. Later he says that the skill of speaking involves both receptive and productive
participation. It means that speaking involves productive and receptive skill because it used for communication.

Speaking is one of the abilities people have to communicate with others. In fact, this is important way in communication in order to build a good relationship with others. Based on Bygate (1987: vii), speaking is an undervalued skill. Perhaps this is because we can almost all speak, and so take the skill too much for granted. Speaking is often thought of as a ‘popular’ form of expression which uses the unprestigious ‘colloquial’ register: literary skills are not on the whole more prized. This relative neglect may perhaps be due to the fact that speaking is transient and improvised, and can therefore be viewed as facile, superficial, or glib. It means that speaking is very important skill for human being. People can not live alone without communicating each other because they have social characteristics required by other’s help. For building a good communication, people must have a good speaking skill.

From the explanation above, it can be concluded that speaking is creative process of constructing meaning that involves producing, receiving, and processing information that includes intelligibility, appropriateness, fluency, and accuracy. In this research, the researcher only focuses on fluency and accuracy of students’ speaking skill of the eighth grade students of SMP Negeri 5 Surakarta and the criteria assessment of speaking test is taken from Ur’s criteria assessment of speaking test.

2. Teaching Speaking

Nunan in Kayi (2006) states that what is meant by "teaching speaking" is to teach ESL learners to:

a. Produce the English speech sounds and sound patterns

b. Use word and sentence stress, intonation patterns and the rhythm of the second language.

c. Select appropriate words and sentences according to the proper social setting, audience, situation and subject matter.
d. Organize their thoughts in a meaningful and logical sequence.

e. Use language as a means of expressing values and judgments.

f. Use the language quickly and confidently with few unnatural pauses, which are called as fluency.

To achieve a successful speaking activity in the teaching of speaking, teachers should know the procedure of teaching speaking, problems in speaking activity, suggestion for teacher in teaching speaking, and the criteria of a successful speaking activity.

3. The Types of Classroom Speaking Performance

Brown (1994: 266) states that there are six types of classroom speaking performance:

a. Imitative

Imitative types, learners spend their time to initiate speech, for example, they are practicing an intonation contour, trying to pinpoint a certain vowel sound, etc. Intonation of these kinds is carried out not the purpose of meaningful interaction, but for focusing on some particular element of language form. For example is drilling activity. Drills offer students an opportunity to listen and to repeat certain string of language that may pose some linguistic difficulty – either phonological or grammatical.

Here are some guidelines for successful drills:

1) Keep them short (a few minutes of class hour only)

2) Keep them simple (preferably just one point at a time)

3) Keep them “snappy”

4) Make sure students know why they are doing the drill

5) Limit them to phonology and grammar points

6) Make sure they ultimately lead to communicative goals

7) Don’t overuse them
b. Intensive

Intensive is designed to practice some phonological or grammatical aspect of language. Intensive speaking can be self-initiated or it can be even form part of some pair work activity.

c. Responsive

Responsive is short replies to the teacher or students initiated questions or comments which are usually and do not extend into dialogue.

d. Transactional (dialogue)

Transactional is extended form of responsive language. Transactional dialogue is not just limited to give the short respond but it can convey or exchange specific information.

e. Interpersonal (dialogue)

Interpersonal dialogue is designed for maintaining social relationships than for the transmission of fact or information.

4. The Procedure of Teaching Speaking

a. Teacher Role

Byrne (1997: 2) states three stages in teaching speaking, as follows:

1) Presentation stage

In the presentation stage (when the teachers introduce something new to be learned), the teachers play a role as informant.

2) Practice stage

In the practice stage (when the teachers allow the learners to work under their direction), the teachers have a role as conductor and monitor.
3) Production stage

In the production stage (when the teachers give the learners opportunity to work on their own). At this stage the learners must work independently in performing the speaking skill they have.

Besides these three roles of each stage, there is another key role that is the teachers as motivator. The teachers must be able to motivate their students in order to interest and involve them in what they are doing.

5. Problems with Speaking Activities

According to Ur (1996: 121), there are some examples of problem faced by students in speaking:

a. Inhibition

Unlike reading, writing, and listening activities speaking requires degree of real time exposure to an audience. Learners are often inhibited about trying to say things in a foreign language in the classroom or losing fate, or simply shy of the attention that their speech attracts.

b. Nothing to say

Even if they are not inhibited, learners often complain that they cannot have anything to say. They have no motivation to express themselves beyond the guilty feeling that they should be speaking.

c. Low or uneven participation

Only one participant can talk at a time if he or she is to be heard, and in large group this means that each one will have only very little talking time. This problem is compounded by the tendency of some learners to dominate, while others speak very little or not at all.
d. **Mother tongue use**

In classes where all or number of the learners share the same mother tongue, they may tend to use it because it feels unusual to speak to one another in a foreign language, and because they feel less “exposed” if they are speaking their mother tongue. If they are talking in small groups it can be quite difficult to get some classes, particularly the less disciplined or motivated ones to keep the target language.

6. **Suggestion for Teacher in Teaching Speaking**

Ur (1996: 121-122) defines some suggestion for teacher to solve the problems of speaking. They are as follows:

a. **Use group work**

This increases the sheer amount of student talk going on in a limited period of time and also lowers the inhibitions of students who are unwilling to speak in front of the full class. It is true that group work means the teacher can not supervise all students speech, so that not all utterances will be correct, and students may occasionally slip into their native language; nevertheless, even taking into consideration occasional mistakes and mother tongue use, the amount of time remaining for positive, useful oral practice is still likely to be far more than in the full-class-set up.

b. **Base the activity on easy language**

In general, the level of the language needed for a discussion should be lower than used in intensive language learning activities in the same class. It should be easily recalled and produced by the participants, so that they can speak fluently with the minimum of hesitation. It is a good idea to teach or review essential vocabulary before the activity starts.
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c. Make a careful choice of topic and task to stimulate interest.

On the whole, the clearer the purpose of the discussion more motivated participants will be. A good topic is one which students can relate using ideas from their own experience and knowledge. It should also represent a genuine controversy. Some questions or suggested lines of thought can help to stimulate discussion. A task is essentially goal-oriented. It requires the group, or pair, to achieve an objective that is usually expressed by an observable result such as brief notes or lists, a rearrangement of jumbled items, a drawing, and a spoken summary.

d. Give some instructions or trainings in discussion skills

If the task is based on group discussion then it includes instructions about participation when introducing it. For example, tell students to make sure that everyone in the group contributes to the discussion and appoint a chairperson to each group who will regulate participation.

e. Keep students speaking the target language

Teachers might appoint one of the groups as monitor, whose job is to remind participants to use the target language, and perhaps report later to teacher how well the group managed to keep it. Even if there is no actual penalty attached, the very awareness that someone is monitoring such lapses helps participants to be more careful.

7. Characteristics of a Successful Speaking Activities

These are the characteristics of a successful speaking activity as proposed by Ur (1996: 120):

a. Learners talk a lot

As much as possible of the period of time allotted to the activity is in fact occupied by learner talk. This may seem obvious, but often most time is taken up with teacher talk or pauses.
b. Participation is even

Classroom discussion is not dominated by a minority of talkative participant: all get a chance to speak, and contributions are fairly evenly distributed.

c. Motivation is high

Learners are eager to speak: because they are interested in the topic and have something new to say about it, or because they want to contribute to achieving a task objective.

d. Language is of an acceptable level

Learners express themselves in utterances that are relevant, easily comprehensible to each other, and of an acceptable level of language accuracy.

B. Review on Cooperative Language Learning (CLL)

1. The Nature of Cooperative Language Learning (CLL)

Cooperative learning is a group of learning activity organized so that learning depend on the socially structured exchange of information between learners in groups and in which each learner is held accountable for his or her own learning and motivated to increase the learning of others. (Olsen and Kagan, 1992: 8).

Cooperative Learning offers ways to organized group work to enhance learning and increase academic achievement. Cooperative Learning is carefully organized so that each learner interacts with others and all learners are motivated to increase each other’s learning (Kessler, 1992: 1).

As what Kessler (1992) stated in cooperative learning propounded by Dewey, it is an approach to education based on the philosophy that education should be learner centered and learner
directed; that learners can be teachers; and those teachers are guides and facilitators rather than the source of all knowledge and direction.

From the definition above, it can be concluded that cooperative learning is a group of learning activities that there is an interaction of each learners and motivated to increase each other learning.

2. The Benefit of Cooperative Learning

Kesser (1992: 7) states that cooperative learning offers three major benefits:

a. Cooperative Learning provides a richness of alternatives to structure interactions between students.

b. Cooperative Learning content area learning and language development needs within the same organizational framework.

c. The variety of ways to structure student practice with lesson material increases opportunities for individualized instruction, such as peer-provided clarifications.

Besides, Slavin (1995: 16) says that Cooperative Learning improves learners motivation because of the rewarding group based on the group performance. It encourages the learners to exert maximum effort. In language teaching Cooperative Learning goal is to enhance learner motivation and reduce learner stress and to create a positive affective classroom climate (Richards, 2001: 197).

3. Kinds of Cooperative Language Learning (CLL)

There are many kinds of Cooperative Language Learning (CLL), they are: Students Team Achievement Division (STAD), Jigsaw, Think Pair Share, Think Pair Square, Round Robin, and Numbered Head Together. In this research, the researcher only used Think Pair Share and Numbered Head Together as the method in improving students’ speaking skill of the eighth grade of SMP Negeri 5 Surakarta.
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a. **Think- Pair- Share**

   It is built for giving students more time to think and to respond and to help each other. Think- Pair- Share employs three following steps:

   Step 1 – Thinking : the teacher poses questions or issue associated with the lesson and asks students to spend a minutes thinking alone about the answer of the issue.

   Step 2 – Pairing : the teacher asks the students to pair off and discuss what thinking about. Interaction during this period can be sharing the ideas if a specific issue was identified.

   Step 3 – Sharing : in the final step, the teacher asks the pairs to share what they have been thinking about with the whole class.

   Think-Pair-Share allows students to think about a response before sharing them with another student or the class. Students are often more willing to share an idea with a partner than speaking up in the class. This strategy allows them to try out their ideas in a supportive dialog with a partner. Thinking and talking about an idea also helps students sharpen their ideas as they listen to others. If students are asked to report out to the whole class, more confident students get a chance to volunteer the answer for their pair, while less confident students still hear their ideas presented.

b. **Numbered- Head- Together**

   Lie (2007: 59) says that this technique will give the students opportunities to share their ideas and motivate them to improve their cooperative ability. The steps are:

   Step 1 – Numbering : teacher divides students into three to five member teams and has them numbered off so
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each student on the team has different number between 1 – 5.

Step 2 – Questioning: teacher asks students a question or information.

Step 3 – Heads together: students put their heads together to figure out and make sure everyone knows the answers.

Step 4 – Answering: A teacher calls a number and students from each group with that number raise their hands and provide the answers or information to the whole class.

All of member had to master the topic that they are discussed because they had to be ready to answer teacher’s question when the teacher call their number. So there will be interaction between the members of each group to discuss about the topic.

4. Cooperative Classroom Management

Classroom management is important since it can help to ensure the success of the teacher and the activities which are used.

a. The Teacher’s Role

The teacher’s role is generally one facilitating, monitoring students’ engagements with the process or clarifying information rather than primarily one of the providing information.

b. The students’ Role

1) Pair Work

As Hammer (1998: 247) states, pair work is a way of increasing student’s participation and language use. It allows the students to use the language and also encourage the student cooperation which is itself important for the atmosphere of the class and for motivation to learn with each other.
2) Group Work

Group work is more dynamic than pair work, there are more people to react with and against in a group therefore, there is a greater possibility of discussion. It puts demand on the student’s ability to cooperate closely with only one other person (Hammer, 1998: 245).

C. The Relationship Between Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) and the Improvement of Speaking Skill

Cooperative learning is a variety of teaching learning approach in which students are divided to work in a group, help and criticize one another efforts or contribution, and receive a group performance score. The primary role of learners in cooperative learning is as a member of a group who must work collaboratively with another group member.

In conducting teaching speaking, the teacher should conduct the activities which involve real communication which are essential for language learning. Language is used for carrying out meaningful tasks that promote learning because language that is meaningful to the learner supports the language process. (Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 223)

According to Crandall, 1999 and kagan, 1995 in Zhang cooperative language learning creates natural, interactive contexts, where students listen to each other, ask question, and clarify issues. Group interaction assists learners in negotiating for more comprehensible input and in modifying their output to make it more comprehensible to others.

Jing Meng (2010) said that through cooperative learning method, speaking activities can be highly motivated and students can be willing to open their mouth instead of being afraid of making mistakes in front of the whole class. If teachers have set up the activity properly, and can give useful feedback, students will get tremendous satisfaction from it.
One of the characteristics of cooperative language learning is a group of learning activities that there is an interaction of each learner to increase the motivation each others learners. It means that it is through language that learners come to understand ideas. In delivering ideas, students need to talk, and through this way, students’ speaking skill can be improved since the purpose of cooperative learning itself is students interaction or to make students talk.

D. Review on Motivation

1. The Nature of Motivation

Motivation is important aspect in every occasion. It influences someone’s work on its process and result. Someone success because of he is motivated. Motivation also has important role in learning. So the teacher should understand about motivation.

Some experts suggest some definitions of motivation. Brophy (1993: 3) defines that motivation refers to students’ subjective experiences, especially their willingness to engage in lesson and learning activities and their reasons for doing so. According to Weiner in Elliot et al (2000: 332) defines that motivation is an internal states that arouses us to action, pushes us in particular direction, and keep us engaged in certain activities.

From the definition above, it can be concluded that motivation is subjective experiences or internal states that arouses to an action, pushes in particular direction, especially willing to engage in lesson and learning activity.

2. Types of Motivation

Elliot et al (2000: 233) distinguish two type of motivation: Intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation is the desire of students themselves to learn, without the need for external motivation. When motivation generates interest and enjoyment, and a reason of performing the
activities lies within the activity itself. Then the motivation is to intrinsic. This indicates that the motivation comes from the learners’ needs, wants, and desires for their own purpose. This motivation exists when the learner learns because of an inner desire to accomplish a task successfully, whether it has some external value or not.

Extrinsic motivation is rewards and inducements external to students such as scores, prizes, and other rewards. Students’ reason for doing an activity is to gain something outside the activity itself, such as getting the best score, obtaining financial rewards. The motivation is likely to be extrinsic. Thus, it is clear that the extrinsic motivation exists when the learners are motivated by an outcome that is external. Extrinsically motivated students carried out task in anticipation of reward from outside and beyond themselves.

Intrinsic motivation gives more contribution to students for learning than extrinsic motivation. But in motivation students to learn, the external stimulus is also needed by the students to reach their goals. This stimulus is used to improve students’ motivation in teaching learning process.

3. **The Function of Motivation in English Learning**

Elliot et al (2000:332) sums up that motivation is an important psychological construct that affects learning and performance in four ways:

a. Motivation increases an individual’s energy and activity level. It influences the extent, to which an individual is likely to engage in a certain activity intensively or half-heartedly.

b. Motivation directs an individual toward certain goals. Motivation affects choices people made and the result they find rewarding.

c. Motivation promotes initiation of certain activities and persistence in those activities. It increases the possibility that people will begin something on their own, persist on the face of difficulty, and resume a task after a temporary interruption
d. Motivation affects the learning strategies and cognitive processes an individual employs. It increases the possibility that people will pay attention to something, study and practice it and try to learn it in a meaningful fashion. It also increases the possibility that they will seek help when they meet difficulty.

4. The Characteristics of Motivated Students

Ur (1996:275) says that motivated learner is someone who is willing or even eager to invest effort in learning activities and to progress. Moreover this learner motivation makes teaching and learning immeasurably easier and more pleasant as well as productive. Naiman (in Ur, 1996:275) also adds that the most successful learners are not necessarily those whose language comes very easily; they are those who display certain typical characteristics, most of them clearly associated with motivation. There are: 1) Positive Task Orientation. The students who are motivated in learning are willing to tackle tasks and challenges and have confidence in his or her success, 2) Ego-Involvement. The student finds it important to succeed in learning in maintaining and promote his or her own positive self image, 3) Need for achievement. The student has a need to achieve, to overcome difficulties and succeed in what he or she sets out to do, 4) High aspiration. The student is very aware of the goals of learning or of specific learning activity and directs his or her efforts toward achieving them, 5) Perseverance. The student consistently invests a high level of effort in learning and is not discouraged by setbacks or apparent lack of progress, 6) Tolerance of ambiguity. The student is not disturbed of frustrated by situation involving a temporary lack of understanding or confusion; he or she can live with these patiently, in confidence that the understanding will come latter.

Moreover, Folk Wisdom (2004) says that “unmotivated students just won’t learn”, that “you can lead a horse to water, but you can’t make it drinks”. This proverb comes to mind when seen from how different are
various student’s attitude to foreign language. For one student, learning a language is personally significant, he is motivated to language learning (though motives may differ: self-actualization, high achievement motivation, goal orientation, avoidance of failure); for another student, language is a heavy burden which he has to carry, and he does not hide his boredom. But this situation can be understood differently by a teacher who can think critically: it is mostly a sign which reveals whether the teaching methods and approaches are effective and relevant to students’ need.

E. Rational

Students of SMP Negeri 5 Surakarta find the difficulties in learning speaking skill. The students are not fluent, their utterances are often halting and incoherent, and find it difficult to express ideas logically and pronounce it correctly. They are not interested in English class because they think that English is difficult subject. It may be caused by their never practicing their oral English.

Based on the pre-observation, it was found that students’ difficulties were related to their low motivation in learning English, and a teacher dominate in teaching learning process. To overcome the problems above, here, the writer decides to use cooperative language learning as a technique. Cooperative language learning is group learning activity organized in such a way that learning was depend on the socially structured exchange of information between learners in group and in which each learner is held accountable for his or her own learning and is motivated to increase the learning of others.

From the explanation above, it can be assumed that cooperative language learning can improve the speaking skill at the eight grade students of SMP Negeri 5 Surakarta.
F. Hypothesis

Considering carefully the theory underlying speaking skill and cooperative language learning technique, the writer assumes that cooperative language learning can improve the speaking skill of the eight grade students of SMP Negeri 5 Surakarta in 2010/2011 academic year.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. The Setting of the Research

In this study, the researcher did the research at SMP Negeri 5 Surakarta as the place of the research where the researcher teaches English. It is located at Diponegoro Street 45, Surakarta 57131.

B. The Subject of the Research

The subject of this research is the eighth grade students of SMP Negeri 5 Surakarta in the academic year 2010/2011. This research uses one class as the research subject that is 8F. There are 36 students in this class that consist of 17 girls and 19 boys. The location of the classroom is not suitable to do a lesson activity. Because it near football yard, so sometimes some voice of football activities is heard by the students when they got a lesson. It caused the students can not give their full attention to the lesson, because their attention separate to the outside of the class. The facility in the class is not good enough. The classroom is too small for 36 students. There is a whiteboard, a cupboard, an announcement board, chairs and tables for students and teacher.

C. The Method of the Research

In this study, the research designed by the researcher is classroom action research. Kemmis in Hopkins (1993: 44) states that action research is a form of self-reflective inquiry conducted by participants in a social interaction situation (including education) in order to improve educational practice by group or participants and by means of own reflection upon effects of these actions.
According to Ebbutt (1985) in Hopkins (1993: 45), action research is about the systematic study of attempts to improve educational practice by groups of participants and by means of their own practical actions and by means of own reflection upon the effects of those actions.

Furthermore, Kemmis and McTaggart (1988) in Nunan (1992: 17) state that there are three characteristics of the action research. Firstly, the action research is carried out by practitioners rather than outside researchers, secondly, the kind of the action research is collaborative, and thirdly, the action research is aimed at changing things.

From the definition above, it can be concluded that action research means a systematic study carried out by practitioners in collaboration of teachers and researcher in a form of self-reflective inquiry of their own reflection upon the effects of those actions in order to improve educational practice.

In this study, the classroom action research the researcher does is aimed at overcoming the students’ problems in speaking skill by means of cooperative language learning. This classroom action research is carried out by the researcher collaboratively with the teacher of the eight grade students of SMP Negeri 5 Surakarta by implementing cooperative language learning.

D. The Model of Action Research

Kemmis and McTaggart in Burns (1999: 32), the implementation of Action Research includes four steps as follows:

1. Planning
   Develop a plan critically informed action to improve what is already happening.
2. Action
   Act to implement the plan.
3. Observation

Observe the effects of the critically informed action in the context in which it occurs.

4. Reflection

Reflecting process on these effects as the basis for further planning, subsequent critically informed and so on, through a succession of stages.

Figure 3.1 The spiral model (Kemmis and McTaggart in Burns 1994: 33)
E. The Procedure of Action Research

The procedures of action research that was done in this research are as follows:

1. Identifying the problem

   The researcher identified the problem before planning the action. The problem referred to the students’ difficulty in learning speaking. The problem was caused by the way the teacher delivered the material of the lesson which was not interesting to the learners. It was obtained by observing the teaching learning process, interviewing, and conducting a pre-test.

2. Carrying out the real classroom research

   a. Planning the action

      In this step, the researcher prepared everything related to the action as follows:

      1) Planning the steps and technique for delivering the material in the form of lesson plan.
      2) Designing the steps in doing the action.
      3) Preparing the material.
      4) Preparing sheets for classroom observation (to know the situation of teaching learning process).
      5) Preparing teaching aids.
      6) Preparing a test.

      It was done to know whether students’ speaking could be improved or not.

   b. Implementing the action

      In this step, the researcher implemented the teaching and learning activities of speaking skill through cooperative language learning. The real implementations were generally presented as follows:
1) The researcher greeted the students and checked the students’ attendance at the beginning of the class.

2) The researcher gave guiding question to the students in order to attract students’ interest.

3) The researcher told students what they are going to learn on that day.

4) The researcher presented the material.

5) The researcher asked some students to give their opinion based on the theme given.

6) The researcher gave explanation about the words that used to express an opinion.

7) The researcher gave explanation about grammar that used.

8) The researcher gave drilling to help students in pronouncing the words correctly.

9) The researcher divided students into some groups and gave a picture to them. They worked it in group.

10) The researcher called a number and students from each group with that number raised their hands and provided the answers or information in the whole class.

11) The researcher gave evaluation of the pronunciation, and corrected their sentences in expressing an opinion. The researcher drilled the mispronunciation to the students.

12) After doing practices, the researcher reviewed the material.

c. Observing the action

In this step, researcher observed all of the activities in the teaching and learning process. It is done during the teaching and learning process. The researcher also took notes related of the teaching learning process. Collaboration with the English teacher helped the
researcher to observe all of the activities happening in the teaching and learning process.

Burns (1999: 81) distinguishes some basic factors which should be considered in order to help guiding observations and make them more manageable:

1) Decide on a focus for the observation which is relevant to your group’s research.
2) Identify a specific physical location in which the observation will be conducted (e.g. playground, coffee area, classroom, reading corner).
3) Consider the group or individual to be observed (e.g. whole class, student group, a mixed-gender pair, individual student).
4) Record the events as they happen or as soon as possible after they happen.
5) Be as objective and precise as possible in your observations and avoid using attitudinal or evaluative language that makes inferences about people’s behavior or thinking (e.g. ‘surly’, ‘anxious’, ‘unwilling’, and so on).
6) Try to record complete events or incident. This allows a more inclusive and holistic picture of the situation to emerge, so that ordinary as well as unusual events are observed.
7) Develop a system for recording that fits in with other activities occurring in the context of the observations.

Based on the guide observation above, the researcher did the observation with the rule as follows:

1) The researcher decided the focus of observation that is speaking skill and students’ motivation.
2) The researcher prepared the instrument to know the progress of speaking skill and students’ motivation. For the speaking skill, the researcher had prepared pre-test, post-test 1 and post-test 2 to measure the improvement of students’ speaking skill. The researcher used speaking rubric for measuring the speaking score. The researcher focused on students’ speaking fluency and accuracy. And for the students’ motivation, the researcher had prepared a note to write down all of activities during the lesson and did the interview with the students after implementing the action.

3) The researcher did the observation in the classroom of 8F as the physical location. The researcher did the observation to the whole class.

4) The researcher recorded the events that had happened by making field notes and took photographs of all activities done in the process of teaching and learning.

5) The researcher did the observation as objective and precise as possible and avoided using attitudinal that made inferences about students’ behavior or thinking.

6) The researcher recorded a complete events or incidents by making notes and took photographs.

7) The researcher developed other activities which occurred in the context of observation and record them in the field notes.

d. Reflecting the observation result

In this step, the researcher reflected critically on what has happened and evaluated all actions in the cycle. The researcher observed what she had done in order to find out the weaknesses and the strengths of the teaching process which had been carried out.
Through the observation, the researcher saw whether the students were active or passive during the teaching and learning process.

3. **Doing evaluation**

After the whole teaching and learning process has been conducted in the classroom, the researcher gave a test. At the end, the researcher analyzed the result of the test by scoring it, and then found the mean score. It is done in order to make sure whether there is an improvement of students’ speaking skill or not.

**F. The Speaking Skill Scoring Rubric**

Ur (1996: 135) designs a scale to score speaking test. Below is the rubric scales for assessing speaking skill on oral test criteria.

*Table 3.1 The Speaking Skill Scoring Rubric*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCURACY</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little or no language produced</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor vocabulary, mistake in basic grammar, may have very strong foreign accent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate but not reach vocabulary, makes obvious grammar mistakes, slight foreign accent</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good range of vocabulary, occasional grammar slips, slighter foreign accent</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide vocabulary appropriate used, virtually no grammar mistakes, slight foreign accent</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLUENCY</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little or no communication</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very hesitant and brief utterances, sometimes difficult to</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The result of the test is taken from the total score of accuracy and fluency.

6. The Scoring Rubric of Motivation

Based on the characteristics of motivated students that stated by some experts, it can be summarized that the scoring rubric of motivation as follow:

Table 3.2 The Scoring Rubric of Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Motivation</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| High                | 1. The students do the task and perform the task in front of the class bravely and confidently.  
2. The students are active in the lesson or in group discussion.  
3. The students focus on the lesson (they pay attention to the teacher’s explanation) |
| Middle              | 1. The students do the task confidently but they are not brave to perform the of their task  
2. The students are active in answering teacher’s questions, but they are still passive in group discussion.  
3. The students’ focus is separated to the other. (they do not give full attention to the teacher’s explanation) |
1. The students are not confidence in taking a task and they are not brave to perform the result of their task.

2. The students are passive in the class and in group discussion.

3. The students do not focus on the lesson. (They are doing non-academic activities, such as disturbing their friends or chatting).

H. The Technique of Collecting Data

The data of this research were collected by using some techniques. They are interview, observation, and test. Photograph was also taken during the implementation of the research to provide more accurate data. The data, which were collected in this research, consisted of the information of pre-research, the process and the result of Action Research. The whole data collection used in this research was summarized as follows:

Table 3.3 The data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps of the research</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Techniques</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-research</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Observation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Transcript of the interview result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Photograph</td>
<td>Photograph during the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Observation

Burns (1999: 80) says that observation is taking regular conscious notice of classroom action and occurrences, which are particularly relevant to the issues or topics being investigated.

In this research, an observation was done in the pre-observation and in the implementation of the research. In pre-research, observation was conducted to get information about classroom environment, class condition, and teaching learning techniques. In the implementation, the observation was done by the researcher and the teacher as collaborator. In this way, the observer observed, make field notes, and take photograph of all activities done in the process of teaching and learning. Observations are ways of finding out more about the students’ response, students’ behavior, and students’ activities during the learning process dealing with both the students’ speaking skill and students’ motivation.
2. Interview

According to Burns (1999: 17), interviews and discussions are face-to-face personal interaction, which generate data about the research issue and allow specific to be discussed from other people's perspective.

The researcher interviewed the teacher and the students about the way she implemented the material, and the problem faced. The researcher also interviewed the students about their response about learning speaking skill through Cooperative Language Learning (CLL). The researcher did the interview before and after conducting research in order to know the teacher’s view of the teaching-learning process, students’ speaking skill, and students’ motivation.

Interview comes in many different forms. As stated by Wallace (1998: 146), there are three broad categories of interview as follows:

a. Structured interview

Structured interview is an interview that has a very tight structured and in which the question will probably be read from a carefully prepared interview schedule.

b. Unstructured interview

Unstructured interview can be quite free-wheeling, without losing sight of the research purpose. This open-ended approach can be revealed which might otherwise be withheld in a more formal setting.

c. Semi-structured interview

Semi-structured interview is a kind of compromise between the two extremes. There will almost certainly be a prepared interview schedule, but most of the questions will be probably open questions. It combines a certain degree of control with a certain amount of freedom to develop the interview.
In this research, researcher used semi-structured interview. The researcher made a schedule first before doing the interview, and prepared the questions for interview. The questions are related to the students’ speaking skill, the implementation of Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) and students’ motivation.

Wallace (1998: 147-150) states the guidance interview as follows:

a. The time

Time is an important aspect of interviewing for several different reasons. Powney and Watts in Wallace (1998: 147) suggest that for each hour of interviewing, a further three (making arrangement, possibly travelling to the interview venue, and the analyzing) should be allowed for preparation and summary – and this does not include transcription.

The researcher did the interview in the beginning and the end of the research. The place of the interview is in the language laboratory. The researcher made the arrangement of the questions for the interviewer (students and teacher), analyzing the result of the interview and made transcript of interview result.

b. Recording interview data

There are three ways in which interview data can be recorded. They are:

1) Simple recall

This way is depend on interviewer memory. When the interviewer used this approach, interviewer’s recollection should be written down or audio recorded as soon as possible after the interview is over.
2) Note taking

In this way, the interviewer makes note during the interview. Note taking may be more difficult, as there is an obvious conflict between being an attentive and reactive listener on the one hand and taking extensive notes on the other.

3) Taping

In this way, the interviewer does the interview through audio or video. The tape will have to be listened to or watched again and also may have to be transcribed, either in whole or in part.

In this research, the researcher used taping when the interview did. The researcher used audio to record the conversation between the interviewer (researcher) and the interviewee (teacher and students). Taping way is the richest approach to do the interview. Because the researcher can switch on again the record of the interview in order to make the transcript of the interview.

c. Individual and group interview

Most interviews are one-to-one, but it is also possible to have an interview with a group, which could take the form of a kind of structured discussion.

In this research, the researcher did the interview individual. It means that, the researcher did the interview one-to-one to the teacher and students. In the beginning of the research, the researcher asked to the teacher about the difficulties are faced by students and how far the students’ motivation in learning English. The researcher asked to the students about the way they are learning English, the difficulties that are faced, their motivation. In the end of the research, the researcher asked to the teacher the way she implemented the material to teach speaking skill and the improvement of students’ motivation in learning
English. The researcher asked the students about students’ response or comments about the way researcher deliver and implemented Cooperative Language Learning (CLL), students’ feeling when researcher taught them by Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) to teach speaking skill, and students’ motivation.

d. Prior notification of questions

Interviewees may be more relaxed if they know what questions they are going to be asked. It can help them to provide fuller, more informative answer.

The researcher showed the questions first to the teacher and students before the interview happen. After the interviewer read the questions, researcher started interview the interviewer.

e. Conduct of the interview

Interview should begin and finish on time. The atmosphere should be relaxed and friendly.

The researcher did the interview as schedule that it has been made by researcher and interviewer. The location was on laboratory language. The situation was relaxed and friendly because there is an air-conditioner on the room, so that the condition when the interview happens was not hot. The situation is quiet enough so that both of researcher and interviewer can focus on the interview. The recording machine to record the conversation is in good condition. So that the researcher conducted the interview was run well.

f. Interviews: variety of focus

Powney and Watts in Wallace (1998: 149) state that interview focus is used to elicit response from the interviewer.

In this research, the interview focus that is used by researcher is:

commit to user
1) The interview schedule. The researcher made an appointment to the interviewer.

2) Interviewing the teacher. The researcher asked the teacher to see and to observe the way she implemented Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) to teach speaking skill and to improve students’ motivation. After that, the researcher asked to the teacher for her reaction and her comment at that point.

3) Interviewing students. The researcher implemented Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) to teach speaking skill and to attract students’ motivation in each meeting for two cycles. The researcher asked students’ about their feeling, their comment, and their reaction before and after the implementation.

3. Test

The researcher also gave speaking test in the end of every cycle. The test was about giving their opinion of a picture of tourist resort that has been provided. The score was involved their accuracy and fluency. The result is used to find the improvement of the students’ speaking skill.

I. The Technique of Analyzing Data

To analyze the data, the researcher used qualitative and quantitative technique.

1. Qualitative

The researcher analyzed the data of implementation cooperative language learning inn teaching speaking skill through observation, field notes, interview, and photographs.
According to McKernan (1996) in Burns (1999: 156-160) there are five steps in analyzing the data. They are:

a. Assembling the data

The first step is to assemble the data that the researcher has collected over the period of the research: field notes, interview, and so on. At this step, broad patterns should begin to show up which can be compared and contrasted to see what fits together.

b. Coding the data

Coding is a process of attempting to reduce the large amount of data that may be collected to more manageable categories of concepts, themes, or types. Data analysis become more messy and coding becomes less clear cut when the researcher dealing with diary entries, classroom recording, or open-ended survey questions.

c. Comparing the data

Comparison is made to see whether themes or patterns are repeated or developed across different data gathering techniques. At this step, the researcher is able to map frequencies of occurrences, behaviors or responses. The main aim at this step is to describe and display the data rather than to interpret or explain them.

d. Building interpretations

This is the point where the researcher moves beyond describing, categorizing, coding, and comparing to make some sense of the meaning of the data.

e. Reporting the outcomes

At this step, it involves presenting an account of the research for others.
2. **Quantitative**

There is a speaking test before and after each of the cycle (the pre-test and the post-test). From the test, the researcher found the comparison of students’ achievement before and after the research. The researcher also compared the mean of each test to know whether there is an improvement or not dealing with students’ speaking skill. The mean of pre-test and post-test can be calculated with the formula as follows:

\[
\bar{x} = \frac{\sum x}{N} \quad \bar{y} = \frac{\sum y}{N}
\]

Where:

\[\sum x = \text{The sum of students’ score before the action} \]
\[\sum y = \text{The sum of students’ score after the action} \]
\[\bar{x} = \text{Mean of students’ score before the action} \]
\[\bar{y} = \text{Mean of students’ score after the action} \]
\[N = \text{number of student} \]

Finally, by analyzing the data from the qualitative and quantitative data, the researcher can make a conclusion whether Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) can improve students’ speaking skill or not. If almost the students give positive response to the teaching learning activities and their post-test score is higher than pre-test score, the implantation of Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) is successful, but if the students give negative response...
response during the lesson and their post-test is lower than pre-test, the implementation of Cooperative Language Learning is not successful.
CHAPTER IV

THE RESULT OF THE STUDY

The objective of the research is to know whether cooperative language learning (CLL) can improve students speaking skill or not, and to know whether cooperative language learning (CLL) can improve students’ motivation in learning English or not. It is presented in chapter four which is divided into two parts. The first is the action process and the second is the result discussion. Each part is described as follows:

A. Process of the Research

The research was conducted collaboratively by the researcher and the English teacher of SMP Negeri 5 Surakarta. In the process of action research, the English teacher was acting as observer and the researcher was acting as practitioner who implemented the action. This research was conducted through two cycles. The first cycle was conducted in three meetings, and the second cycle was conducted in two meetings.

1. Pre-Research

The pre-research was held before conducting the research. It was held in order to identify the problem occurred and the teacher’s technique used in teaching speaking. Pre-Research includes: interviewing the English teacher, interviewing the students, observing the teaching learning process, and giving pre-test to the students.

From the pre-research, the researcher found some problems dealing with the speaking skill. There are some indicators of the problem, such as: 1) students have difficulties in producing grammatical sentences of their correct utterances. It can be seen on the students’
statement: “karena kita kan ada yang nggak tau grammarnya, trus ngucapinnya kan lidah kita kan beda ama lidah orang luar gitu ya, jadi kalau mau ngucapin kan agak gak gak gok gok gimana”. For example when the researcher conducted pre- test a students said “Many tourists usually visited there”, it should “Many tourists usually visit there”. 2) students have difficulties in pronouncing words correctly. For example: they pronounce the word “beautiful” not in the right pronunciation of /'bjuːtlɪfl/ 3) students have difficulties in producing English words to express their language function. They did not know the English words, so they stopped their speaking to translate the words. 4) students’ utterance is halting and incoherent. When they want to speak, they think what and how to speak. They only produce speech on their mind; it needs more time in producing the speech. They tend to produce halting and fragmentary utterances, pausing and fillers (“em…”, “err…”, “aaa…” etc), the speech tends to be slower.

The indicators also come from non-linguistic aspect. It can be seen from the students’ behavior during the English teaching learning process. Some of the students do non academic activities instead of focusing on the lesson. They tend to make noise, talk to their friend and disturb the others. The researcher also observed students’ facial expression while they were doing pre- test. While they were speaking English, they looked nervous. It could be seen when they spoke up their opinion, some of them shook their body. They were less confident with what they performed, so they spoke in low voice. Those problems were also reinforced by interviewing with the English teacher. She said, “mereka masih malu- malu ya mbak, malu untuk speak up. Jadi mereka hanya pasif saja kalau kita tidak menunjuk satu- satu”. Motivation is one of important factors influence the result of teaching and learning process.
In this pre-research, the researcher also gave pre-test to know the students’ speaking skill. The pre-test was done to the eighth grade students of SMP Negeri 5 Surakarta which consist of thirty six students. The type of the test was individual test. The pre-test items was about describing or giving their opinion based on the picture provided. There were three pictures. They might choose one picture. And each student has to present his or her opinion about the picture provided that he or she had chosen in front of the class one by one orally. From the pre-test result based on the scoring rubric stated by UF (1996: 135), it was found that the students’ score was still very low, because the mean score they got was 5 from the level 1-10 and the result of detail can be described as follows:

**Table 4.1 The speaking skill pre-test result**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaking Skill Test</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Accuracy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Little or no language produced</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 20 students</td>
<td>2-2.5</td>
<td>Poor vocabulary, mistake in basic grammar, may have very strong foreign accent</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 13 students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adequate but not reach vocabulary, makes obvious grammar mistakes, slighter foreign accent</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 student</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Good range vocabulary, occasional grammar slips, slighter foreign accent</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Fluency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Little or no communication Very hesitant and brief utterances, sometimes difficult to understand</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 22 students</td>
<td>2-2.5</td>
<td>Get idea across, but hesitantly and briefly Effective communication in short turns</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 12 students</td>
<td>3-3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 student</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Considering those causes of the problems and the result of low score in pre-test, the researcher proposed to use Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) to improve students’ speaking skill. Cooperative learning can improve students’ speaking skill through activating individuals in a group of learning. Cooperative learning invited students to work together and help each other to learn the materials. It is focused on cooperation rather than competition. It involves all students in teaching learning process so that it could motivate students to be more active.

2. Research Implementation

This research was implemented to improve students’ speaking skill. The teaching approach used was Cooperative Language Learning (CLL). The research was conducted in two cycles. The first cycle included three meetings: the topic was “Teenager Life”. It was conducted in March 12th 2011, March 17th 2011, March 18th 2011. The second cycle included two meetings; the topic was “Recreation”. It was held in March 23rd 2011, March 24th 2011. It follows the time schedule from the school; each meeting took 2x 40 minutes.

Table 4.2 The timetable of the research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycles</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time of the research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Cycle</td>
<td>1st meeting</td>
<td>Saturday, March 12th 2011</td>
<td>11.50 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd meeting</td>
<td>Thursday, March 17th 2011</td>
<td>07.15 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd meeting</td>
<td>Friday, March 18th 2011</td>
<td>08.50 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Cycle</td>
<td>1st meeting</td>
<td>Wednesday, March 23rd 2011</td>
<td>10.10 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd meeting</td>
<td>Thursday, March 24th 2011</td>
<td>07.15 a.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Every cycle consists of a series of steps: identifying the problem, planning the action, implementing the action, observing the action, reflecting the result, and revising the plan.

a. Cycle 1

1) Identifying the problem

Before implementing the action, the researcher had done some observation. From those observations, she found some problems. The problems were identified as follows: 1) students have difficulties in producing grammatical sentences of their correct utterances. 2) students have difficulties in pronouncing words correctly. 3) students have difficulties in producing English words to express their language function, and 4) Students’ utterance was halting and incoherent. The indicators also come from non-linguistic aspects. It can be seen from the students’ behavior during the English teaching learning process. Some of the students do non-academic activities instead of focusing on the lesson. The students’ motivation in learning English is very low. It causes of the teacher’s approach was monotonous. There is no variety in learning English. This caused the students to be bored. The researcher also observed students’ appearance while they were doing pre-test. While they were speaking English, they looked nervous.

2) Planning the action

Finding the fact that students’ speaking skill was very low, the researcher would implement Cooperative Language Learning (CLL). The problems of pronunciation that faced by the students can be solved by practicing their right pronunciation that they got from the drilling technique to others. If their friend still had wrong
pronunciation, the other friend can help them to say in the right pronunciation. When they want to produce right grammatical sentences and English words, they might have group discussion to share their idea. Cooperative learning is student centered. So they will be more active to share their ideas better then just listen to their teacher explanation.

Cooperative language learning was appropriate for the students because one of the characteristics of cooperative language learning is a group of learning activities that there is an interaction of each learner to increase the motivation each others. It means that in delivering ideas, students need to talk, and through this way, students’ speaking skill can be improved since the purpose of cooperative learning itself is students’ interaction or to make students talk.

3) Implementing the action

In implementing the action, the researcher used the lesson plan that had been prepared before. The action of every meeting consists of three sections: opening, main activity, and closing.

a) First Meeting (Saturday, March 12th 2011 at 10.50 a.m. – 12.10 p.m.)

(1) Opening

The researcher greeted the students “Good morning class” and checked the students’ attendance list. The researcher opened the lesson by showing them a picture of camping activity. The researcher asked the students to repeat after her the right pronunciation of “camping” and wrote the phonetic symbol on the white board. The researcher gave guided question about camping activity. It
was done to help students in pronunciation. The researcher also asked them to give their opinion about camping activity on the picture. The researcher wrote the students’ opinion about camping activity on the whiteboard. The researcher gave evaluation of grammar based on students’ opinion that she has written. The researcher explained the right grammar used. After that the researcher told them that they are going to discuss how to ask and give an opinion and the theme was teenagers’ life. The researcher also gave her opinion of the picture. The researcher underlined the words that showed expression of asking and giving opinion. Then the researcher explained the word that used to express asking and giving opinion. To help students’ pronunciation, the researcher gave drilling. The researcher drilled her opinion about “camping” that she had written on the white board in right pronunciation. The researcher asked the students to repeat after her. The researcher did it many times.

The researcher told the students that they would study of asking and giving opinion by using think pair share technique. The students looked confused. Some students asked the researcher “think pair share itu apa miss?” So, the researcher gave little explanation about think pair share. The researcher told the students that they should give their opinion individually first. After they got their idea or their individual opinion, they might pair off and discuss what they think about.
After the researcher told about think pair share, the researcher distributed pictures to the students. The picture was a flag ceremony. They looked very noisy because they saw that the flag ceremony happened in their school. Then the researcher asked the students to give their opinion based on the picture. The researcher said to them that they should do think pair share technique.

(2) Main Activity

The researcher gave time to them to work individually. The class looked very crowded. Many students asked the researcher about the English word. For example “*miss petugas upacara bahasa inggrisnya apa?*”. Then they might pair off and discuss it. The researcher said that in discussing, they should use English. But in fact, most of the students still used Bahasa Indonesia. In discussion section, the students could cooperate with their pair to share their ideas. But some students still looked disturbing their friends. For example they talked with their friend without thought of their assignment. The researcher checked all pair discussion and remembered them to try speaking in English.

When the discussion was done, the researcher asked a member of each group to speak up or to share their opinion about the picture with the whole class. Some students were still mispronouncing English words and they made some grammar mistakes. After the presentation finished, the researcher gave her opinion about their performance and opinions related to the picture.

*commit to user*
(3) Closing

When the time was over, the researcher summed up the lesson by telling the students what they learned today, and that they did a good job and telling the students to do more practice in speaking. Before closing the lesson, the researcher asked the students if there were some things they didn’t understand. When the researcher found that the students had understood the lesson, she closed the lesson by saying good bye.

b) Second Meeting (Thursday, March 17th 2011 at 07.15 a.m. – 08.35 a.m.)

(1) Opening

The topic was still same with the previous meeting that was asking and giving an opinion. In this meeting, the researcher implemented Numbered Head Together (NHT). NHT gives the students opportunities to share their idea and motivated them to improve their speaking skill. All members had to master the topic that they were discussed because they had to be ready to answer teacher’s question when the teacher called their number. So, there will be interaction between the members of each group to discuss. All of member had to master the topic that they discussed because they had to be ready to answer teacher’s question when the teacher call their number. So there will be interaction between the members of each group to discuss about the topic.

Before the researcher started the lesson, she greeted the students and checked students’ attendance first. The
researcher gave some guided question to introduce the topic. The researcher asked the students of their opinion if they got too much homework. They looked very enthusiastic to share their opinion, but it made the class so noisy. Actually the researcher asked them to speak in English, but most of them still used Bahasa Indonesia. The researcher wrote the students’ opinion on the white board. The researcher corrected their grammar. For example: the student said, “I think it make me clever”. It should be “I think it makes me be clever”. The researcher wrote the phonetic symbol and gave them drilling to help them in pronouncing English word correctly. For example: the researcher did drilling the word “clever” and wrote the phonetic symbol /’klevə(r)/. The researcher also reviewed explaining the words of asking and giving opinion by underlying the words of expressing asking and giving an opinion.

The researcher divided the students in groups. There are nine groups and every group consisted of four students. Class VIIIIF consists of 36 students. The students were very crowded when they were grouped. After all students had a group, the researcher told that they would study asking and giving opinion by Numbered Head Together technique. Some students asked “*apa itu miss*?” The researcher told them what Numbered Head Together is. The researcher told that they should work in a group to discuss an issue that they got. The researcher numbered the students off so the students in the group has different
number between 1-4. The researcher would call a number and the students from each group with that number raised their hands and provided to share their opinion about an issue that they got to the whole class. So, all member of each group should know or be ready with their group opinion. The researcher also reminded them that they had to use English in the discussion sections.

(2) Main Activity

After the researcher told the role of Numbered Head Together technique, she distributed an issue “facebook” to the students. They looked very enthusiastic when the researcher told the issue. The students had 20 minutes to have group discussion. They should discuss their group’s opinion about facebook. They looked very crowded and active to share their idea in the group discussion. The researcher walked round to check the discussion. Although the researcher told them that they should use English in their discussion, but most of them still use Bahasa Indonesia. After the discussion had finished, the researcher called number 3, all of member who got number three in every group raised their hand. They provided their group opinion about facebook to the whole class. Some of students who got number three in every group looked unready to present their group discussion’s result. But they tried to speak up. When it’s done, the researcher gave her opinion and feedback about the students’ presentations.
(3) Closing

The researcher asked the students whether they still found difficulties or not. There were no questions from the students then, she summed up the lesson, told the students to have more practice. She said goodbye to close the lesson.

c) Third Meeting (Friday, March 18th 2011 at 08.50 a.m. – 10.10 a.m.)

(1) Opening

In this meeting, the researcher implemented Numbered Head Together (NHT). The material was still same with the previous meeting that was asking and giving an opinion but different topic. Last meeting discussed about “facebook”, but in this meeting the students discussed about “handphone”. Before the researcher starting the lesson, she greeted the students and checked students’ attendance first.

The researcher started the lesson by showing a picture of television and gave some questions that related to the picture. She also asked the students’ opinion about the picture. The researcher wrote their opinion about the picture on the whiteboard. The researcher gave evaluation of their grammar and pronunciation. The researcher also gave her opinion about the picture. She did drilling to help students in pronouncing English words correctly. The researcher repeated explaining about correct expression in asking and giving opinion.
The researcher asked the students whether they remembered about Numbered Head Together (NHT) or not. The students answer “yes miss”. A student asked “yang kayak kemarin miss?” The students have remembered the role of NHT, so the researcher didn’t review the role again. The researcher divided the students into nine groups. Each group consisted of four students. The researcher numbered them off, so each students on the group had different number between 1-4. Then the researcher distributed pictures and questions to every group. The researcher asked them to choose their own picture.

(2) Main Activity

The researcher asked them to have group discussion to give their opinion and the answer of the question. The researcher reminded them that they should discuss in English. And all of member had to master the answer that they were discussed because they had to be ready to answer when the researcher call their number. They finished their group discussion in 20 minutes. The discussion was done well. When a student had difficulties in producing correct grammar, their group members help them to correct it.

After the students finished in their group discussion, the researcher called number two. Students from each group with number two raised their hands and provided the answer and shared their group opinion to the whole class. Some students looked shocked and didn’t ready yet. The researcher motivated them that they can. So they tried to
speak up although in short turn and still mispronouncing words. The researcher also invited other group to have their own opinion. Finished in all group presentation, the researcher gave her opinion to evaluate the grammar mistakes and mispronounce words. When the students did presentation stage, the researcher wrote their grammar mistakes and mispronounces words. So, after all presentation finished, the researcher explain the right one and gave drilling of the mispronouncing words that did by the students.

(3) Closing

When the time was over, the researcher summed up the lesson by telling the students what they learned today, and that they did a good job and telling the students to do more practice in speaking. The researcher told the students the next topic. Before closing the lesson, the researcher asked the students if there were some things they didn’t understand. When the researcher found that the students had understood the lesson, she closed the lesson.

4) Observing the action

Observing is an important aspect in a classroom action research. It can help the researcher to gain a better understanding of her own research. Observation is done to know whether Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) could be implemented in teaching English to improve students’ speaking skill.

Observation was done during the implementation of action. When the students were doing the activity, the researcher collaboratively with the English teacher observed all activities in
the teaching learning process by writing all activities simultaneously in the form of field notes. The English teacher as an observer when the researcher implemented Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) to improve students’ speaking skill. She made a field note in every meeting. Generally, the teaching and learning process using this technique ran well. The activities during the teaching learning process became more living. The students became more motivated and enthusiastic in speaking class. It was shown from the students’ responses when they were joining the cooperative language learning activities. The students were enthusiastic when they discussed and shared their ideas. They were not afraid of making mistakes again. But sometimes, they still use Bahasa Indonesia.

Most of the students were able to do the activities through Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) approach. Moreover, the result of first speaking post-test was good enough. The results of first speaking post-test based on the scoring rubric stated by Ur (1996: 135) are presented in table 4.3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaking Skill Test</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Accuracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 6 students</td>
<td>2-2,5</td>
<td>Poor vocabulary, mistake in basic grammar, may have very strong foreign accent</td>
<td>16,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 26 students</td>
<td>3-3,5</td>
<td>Adequate but not reach vocabulary, makes obvious grammar mistakes, slight foreign accent</td>
<td>72,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 4 student</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Good range vocabulary, occasional</td>
<td>11,1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Fluency
   - 3 students 2-2,5 Very hesitant and brief utterances, sometimes difficult to understand
   - 30 students 3-3,5 Get idea across, but hesitantly and briefly
   - 3 student 4 Effective communication in short turns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>grammar slips, slighter foreign accent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, the teaching learning process ran well, the students showed their interest and enthusiasm in learning activity. The students looked enjoy it. However, the result of cycle 1 was not satisfying yet because of some weaknesses during the implementation of the action. There were still some students did non academic activity during the teaching learning process. A few students dominated speaking up. Only some students were not active during the teaching learning process, some students were still passive. Beside that, the problem arisen during the cooperative language learning was some students made mistakes when they pronounced some words, for example: “tired”, “participant”, “Monday”, and so on.

5) Reflecting the action result

By observing and analyzing the result of observation, the researcher found several positive result and some weaknesses in the first cycle. They were as follows:

a) Positive results

(1) There was improvement of students’ motivation in learning English. It can be seen from students’ attitudes during the lesson. They paid more attention to the teacher’s
explanation. They did the assignment given enthusiastically and more seriously.

(2) The students could cooperate with the other students in the group discussion. The students were not afraid in sharing their utterance. They spoke too much English words. So, it made improvement of their speaking skill.

(3) The students seemed more active.

b) Weaknesses

(1) Some students were still mispronouncing English words.

(2) The students’ utterance was still halting.

(3) The students made some grammar mistakes.

(4) Although some students were more active but there were some students still passive.

(5) The students tended to make noise when discussing the assignment given. It made the class crowded.

From the research reflection of the observation above, it can be concluded that the result of cycle one was not satisfactory yet. So, the researcher thinks that it was necessary to make the next planning and conduct the next cycle. It is in order to solve the problems appeared in cycle 1 and to overcome those weaknesses.

b. Cycle 2

1) Revising the plan

To solve the problem appeared in the first cycle, the researcher revised the next action plan. They are:

a) The researcher drilled the pronunciation. She believed that drilling improve their pronunciation.
b) The researcher gave evaluation of their grammar after the end of cooperative learning activity. It can help them to use grammar correctly.

c) The researcher tried to explain the role of Numbered Head Together (NHT) and Think Pair Share once again, so that the students understood and could do the assignment effectively. When they discussed with their friends, the researcher believed that it helped them speak fluently.

d) The researcher decided to continue the next theme “Recreation” but still used expression of asking and giving opinion.

2) Implementing the Action

a) First Meeting (Wednesday, March 23th 2011 at 10.10 a.m. – 11.30 a.m.)

(1) Opening

Before the researcher started the lesson, the researcher greeted and checked students’ attendance. The students looked still a little crowded, the researcher asked the students to keep silent.

The researcher told the students that they would learn a new theme “Recreation” and the technique was “Think Pair Share”. It allowed students to think about a response before sharing them with another students or the class. Students were more willing to share an idea with a partner than speaking up in the class. The strategy allowed them to try out their ideas in a supportive dialog with a partner. The researcher showed a picture “beach” and asked some questions to introduce the topic. The researcher
patched the picture and wrote the word “beach” on the white board. The teacher pronounced the words beach and asked students to repeat after her. The researcher asked the students to mention English word that related to the picture. It was done to dig their vocabulary. The researcher pronounced the English words that they mentions and asked the students to repeat after her. It was done to improve students pronounce English words correctly. The researcher wrote her opinion on the white board. The researcher gave drilling of read her opinion about “Parangtritis Beach” that she had written on the white board. The researcher identified” adjective clause” that used in the opinion about “Parangtritis Beach” that she had written on the white board by underlines it. It was done to help students in grammar. The researcher explained about adjective clause. Before the students did Think Pair Share, the researcher explained them the role of it. The researcher distributed a picture of “Tawangmangu Waterfall” to the students.

(2) Main Activity

The researcher asked the students to give their individual opinion based on the picture of “Tawangmangu”. They had to think their opinion about “Tawangmangu” without discussing with their friends. The researcher also reminded them the expression that is used in expressing asking and giving opinion. When they thought their opinion about “Tawangmangu”, they looked confused. Some students asked the researcher about the
vocabulary. For example “mbak air terjun bahasa inggrisnya apa?”. So the class was so crowded of students questions. After they got individual opinion about “Tawangmangu”, the researcher asked them to pair off and discussed what they have thought about the picture. The discussion section was done well. They share their ideas to the partner. They could cooperate in taking their pairs’ opinion. They had 15 minutes to have pair discussion. After the discussion finished, the researcher asked the pair to share what they had been thinking about the picture with the whole class. A student of each pair present their pairs’ opinion to the whole class. Some students did it very well. Most of the students were able to speak with a little pause and in correct grammar. After the all group finished in presenting their opinion about “Tawangmangu”, the researcher gave her opinion to evaluate the grammar mistakes and mispronounce words.

(3) Closing

The researcher asked the students whether they still found difficulties or not. There were no questions from the students, she summed up the lesson and said goodbye.

b) Second Meeting (Thursday, March 24th 2011 at 07.15 a.m. – 08.35 a.m.)

(1) Opening

The researcher started the lesson by asking them to pray first because it was the first lesson on that day. Then the researcher greeted the students and asked who were absent.
The researcher gave some guided question to introduce the topic. The researcher showed the picture “Malioboro”. The researcher asked the students to mention the English words that related to “Malioboro”. It could help the students to have many vocabularies. So, it will help them to make their opinion. The researcher wrote the English words on the white board that they had mentioned. The researcher pronounced the English words and asked the students to repeat after her. It was done help them in improving their pronunciation. The researcher wrote her opinion about “malioboro” on the white board. The researcher read her opinion and asked the students to repeat after her again. The researcher also reminded them that in giving opinion, they should use the English word of asking and giving an opinion.

The researcher divided the students into nine groups, every group consist of four students. The researcher asked them that they would do Numbered Head Together (NHT) technique. The researcher told the role of Numbered Head Together (NHT) to remind them so the activity would run well. The researcher numbered them off, so each students on the groups has different number between 1- 4. Then, the researcher distributed a picture “Klewer” and questions about the picture to every group.

(2) Main Activity

The researcher asked them to have group discussion in English to give their opinion about the pictures and the answers of questions. After the discussion was done, the
researcher called a number and the students from each group with that number raised their hands and provided their group opinion about the picture. The researcher also invited other group to have their own group opinion.

(3) Closing

The researcher asked the students whether they still found difficulties or not. There were no questions from the students, she summed up the lesson and said goodbye.

3) Observing and Monitoring the Action

Observing and monitoring the action was done during the implementation of the action. In cycle two, the teaching and learning process using cooperative language learning ran well. Cooperative language learning provided all the students with abundant opportunities to speak and every student had to deliver the topic that they had discussed with their own language to their group members. By using cooperative language learning approach, all students got same portion to speak, not only students who had a high skill to speak, but also those who never participate during the teaching learning process. There was no serious problem faced by the students. The students liked to work together with their friends and they helped one another. It could be seen when one of the students got difficulty in delivering idea, the other students tried to help him to find the right expression. They could cooperate well with their group to discuss the assignment. They were very enthusiastic in following all the procedure of the lesson.

After implementing cooperative language learning, the students’ motivation in learning English improved. Some students were active in asking questions. They seemed to enjoy in doing the
activity. Besides, the number of wrong pronunciation can be decreased. Most of the students presented the story with the correct pronunciation even some of them used their body language in delivering the story. The second cycle ran very well and satisfactory.

The result of speaking test was also better than previous cycle. Most of students are able to speak with a little of pauses, using the correct grammar and pronunciation. There was also an improvement of the test result. The results of post-test two that has been calculated based on the scoring rubric stated by Ur (1996: 135) are presented in table 4.4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaking Skill Test</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Accuracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 22 students</td>
<td>3-3,5</td>
<td>Adequate but not reach vocabulary, makes obvious grammar mistakes, slight foreign accent</td>
<td>61,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 14 students</td>
<td>4-4,5</td>
<td>Good range vocabulary, occasional grammar slips, slighter foreign accent</td>
<td>38,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fluency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 25 students</td>
<td>3-3,5</td>
<td>Get idea across, but hesitantly and briefly</td>
<td>69,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 11 students</td>
<td>4-4,5</td>
<td>Effective communication in short turns</td>
<td>30,6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Reflecting the Result of the Observation

Based on the observing and monitoring result, the researcher found some differences between the result of the action in cycle I and cycle II. There were some positive results in cycle II. The positive results are:

a) The students did not find any difficulties in finding the pronunciation.
b) Most of students were able to speak with a little pause and in correct grammar.

c) The students’ motivation was improved during the teaching learning process. The passive students in cycle I were getting more active. The students looked more enthusiastic and cooperative in following the lesson.

d) The researcher could manage the class better than in the first cycle. Although some students were noisy and disturbed to the other friends, but the number of them was less than in cycle I. Mostly, the students made noisy in the class because they had discussing the assignment given by the researcher.

From the reflection, the researcher decided to stop the cycle since in the last result of the cycle had shown better improvements of students’ speaking skill. Thus, the researcher did not revise the plan. The researcher concluded that Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) is an appropriate approach to improve students’ speaking skill.

B. Discussion

1. Result Finding

After doing the steps or procedures of the action and analyzing the observation result, the researcher found some research finding to answer the research questions. All of the findings were gotten from the data that were collected by the researcher. The data were collected from many sources. They are field notes, interview, photograph, lesson plan, audio recording, video recording, the score of pre-test and post test. The researcher concluded several findings which answered the research question as stated in chapter I. The research findings
include: the improvement of students’ speaking skill and the responses of the students or students’ motivation when cooperative language learning approach was applied.

**Table 4.5: the research findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Findings</th>
<th>Before Action Research</th>
<th>After Action Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students’ speaking ability improvement</td>
<td>The students low of speaking skill</td>
<td>The improvement of students’ speaking skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The achievement of speaking test was low.</td>
<td>The achievement of speaking test is increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are 33 students</td>
<td>There are 33 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From the accuracy test:</td>
<td>From the accuracy test:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. The students who got score 1 in pre test: 2 students</td>
<td>a. There are no students who got score 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. The students who got score 2-2.5 in pre test: 20 students</td>
<td>b. There are no students who got score 2-2.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. The students who got score 3 in pre test: 13 students</td>
<td>c. The students who got score 3-3.5 in final post-test: 22 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. The students who got score 4 in pre test: 1 students</td>
<td>d. The students who got score 4-4.5 in final post-test: 14 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From the fluency test:</td>
<td>From the fluency test:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. The students who got score 1 in pre test: 1 students</td>
<td>a. There are no students who got score 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. The students who got score 2-2.5 in pre test: 22 students</td>
<td>b. There are no students who got score 2-2.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. The students who got score 3 in pre test: 12 students</td>
<td>c. The students who got score 3-3.5 in final post-test: 25 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. The students who got score 4 in pre test : 1 students</td>
<td>d. The students who got score 4-4.5 in final post-test: 11 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The students could not use the grammar and pronounce the words correctly. They have a little vocabulary.</td>
<td>The students are able to speak with the correct grammar and pronunciation; they have a large number of vocabularies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The students' utterance was halting and incoherent.</td>
<td>The students could speak more naturally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The students' motivation and responses when Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) is applied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The students were passive during the teaching learning process.</th>
<th>The students tend to be more active during teaching learning process.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The students were nervous because they were afraid of making mistakes to join the speaking lesson.</td>
<td>The students looked more relax without afraid of making mistakes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The students did non academic activities instead of focusing the lesson. They were too crowded in the teaching learning process, disturbing each others.</td>
<td>The students’ number of noisy and disturbed to the other friends was less. Mostly, the students made noisy in the class because they had discussing the assignment given by the researcher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, it can be concluded that 1) Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) can improve students’ speaking skill. The speaking skill improvements in this research include the use of vocabulary, the use of grammar and pronunciation correctly and they speak more naturally with little pauses in students’ speaking. 2)
was an improvement of students’ motivation in learning English when the Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) approach was applied. The students looked more relaxed without felt afraid of making mistakes. They tend to be more active during teaching learning process. The students’ number of noise and disturbed to the other friends was less. Mostly, the students made noise in the class because they had been discussing the assignment given by the researcher. By using Cooperative Language Learning, the students are accustomed to speak.

2. Result Discussion

The last step of action research process was discussing the result of the research with the English teacher as a final reflection. The researcher and the English teacher concluded that using Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) in teaching speaking was an effective approach to improve students’ speaking skill.

The researcher decided to stop the cycle since the result of the last cycle had shown a good improvement of students’ speaking skill. It can be seen from:

a. Test Analysis

From the analysis of the mean score of the students’ speaking skill, it can be concluded that speaking class by using Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) can improve the students’ speaking skill.

Table 4.6: mean score table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The mean score of Pre-test</th>
<th>The mean score of first post-test</th>
<th>The mean score of final post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,6</td>
<td>7,1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Therefore, the researcher did not revise the plan. From the comparison result between mean score in pre-test, first post-test, and final post test had shown good improvement.

b. Field Notes

In observing the action, the researcher used field notes. The researchers noted down all the incidents occur during the action. By using field notes, the researcher could analyze the weaknesses and strengths during the implementation of Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) in teaching speaking. It was found in cycle one, cooperative language learning was implemented, but there were still problems to be solve. The students’ speaking was still low. It could be analyzed from their wrong grammar and pronunciation; they also only had little vocabulary. Besides, some students were still passive and they tend to make noise when discussing the assignment. Therefore, the researcher continued the research by revising the plan and moving on to the second cycle. The revising plan would be drilling section, gave evaluation of grammar mistakes, and told the role of Cooperative Language Learning approach again. The researcher also gave a prize to the students who got the best mark. As the result, there is improvement of students’ motivation in learning English. The teaching learning process ran well and the students were easier to be controlled and they became more active in speaking class.

From the result of the test above and the field note wrote by the researcher, it can be concluded that Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) can improve students’ speaking skill.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION, IMPLICATION, AND SUGGESTION

This chapter discusses about the conclusion of the research, the implication, and the suggestion for the English teachers, the Institutions of Education, the students and the other researchers. This research is about implementing Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) to improve students’ speaking skill.

A. Conclusion

Based on the result of the research, after implementing two cycles, the researcher drew a conclusion that Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) can improve students’ speaking skill. This can be seen from the research findings during the action research. By using Cooperative Language Learning (CLL), the students show a great interest to be actively involved during the teaching learning process. This approach encourages them to be active learners and take responsibility of their own learning. It also brings positive result in developing their skill in speaking.

The finding of the research can be summarized 1) the students speaking skill before action research was conducted, the students got difficulties in producing grammatical sentences, pronouncing English words correctly, finding appropriate vocabulary, and their utterance was halting and incoherent. After action research was conducted, the students speaking skill improved. The students are able to speak with the correct grammar. They used present tense when they described place. They are able to speak with the correct pronunciation. For example, when they pronounce “beautiful”, they pronounced with the right pronunciation “/’bjuːtɪfl/ ”. They are able to use appropriate words. For example: they used expression words of giving
opinion when they gave their opinion. They started by said "in my opinion". They speak more naturally. For example: they looked more confident when they were speaking. They do not need time to think what they will speak. So there is no halting and fillers in their utterances. 2) the students’ motivation in learning English when Cooperative Language Learning implemented improved. The students tend to be more active during the teaching learning process and group discussion. They focus on the lesson or pay attention to the teacher’s explanation. They do the tasks and perform the task in front of the class bravely and confidently. The students also looked more relaxed. They are not afraid of making mistakes and the number of noisy students and disturbed to other friends was less. Mostly, the students made noise because they had been discussing the assignment given by the researcher.

B. Implication

In language teaching and learning, it is necessary to implement an appropriate approach. The approach that is used by the teacher should be appropriate with the level of the students. The junior high school students are classified as beginners. So based on the conclusion above, Cooperative Language Learning can be developed in the process of teaching learning language. This is proven to be an effective way to improve students’ speaking skill. There are some advantages of using Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) for the students which include: 1) it makes students more active learners because all of the are involved in the teaching learning process; 2) it gives them more opportunities to practice the language; 3) it can develop the social skill of students by sharing, discussing and solving problems because team work is needed in order to accomplish the goal.
C. Suggestion

The results of the study prove that implementing Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) can improve the students’ speaking skill. For that reason, the researcher hopes that this study will provide benefits in English teaching and learning process. The researcher would like to propose some suggestion dealing with the study that has been conducted. Hopefully, the following suggestions will be useful for the English teachers, the Educational Institutions, the students, and the other researchers.

1. for the English teachers

   The English teachers should improve their quality to teach Speaking. They have to choose appropriate approach or teaching aids that suitable with the situation and the condition in the classroom because it is important to attract students’ interest toward teaching speaking and to motivate students toward maximize result in learning English. The English teachers can use Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) approach in teaching speaking in order to make students to be more involved and motivated in joining the lesson.

2. for the students

   One of the important aspects in achieving successful learning is students’ own motivation and interest toward learning. The students should build their own motivation to learn. The students should be more active to practice their English and Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) is one of alternative ways that can be chosen to improve their speaking skill since Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) provides the students opportunities to discuss and share ideas with others.

3. for the other researchers

   This research studies the implementation of Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) to improve students’ speaking skill. It is hoped that the
result of this study can be used as additional reference for further research on similar problems for the other researchers.
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