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#### Abstract

NAMA : RUKIAH

REG. NO. : 08.3400030 DEPARTEMENT/PRODY : TARBIYAH/ BAHASA INGGRIS - 1 THESIS TITLE : THE EFFECT OF STAD COOPERATIVE LEARNING ON STUDEN'S WRITING ACHIEVEMENTS IN NARRATIVE TEXT AT FIRST GRADE IN MAN SIABU


Based on the fact of the problems about students' writing achievment's narrative text, the researcher identified many problems such as lack of vocabulary, lack of ideas, and student's not understand about sturucture of sentence. So that, these problems make them bored and accept what was in print directly without making consideration first, and they think that what is in print, it is true. Finally, the researcher was interested to search and to know the effect STAD of cooperative learning on student's writing achievement's narrative text at first grade MAN Siabu.

In this research, the researcher wanted to find out about how significantSTAD of cooperative learning on student's writing achievement's narrative text was. The population of research was all of students at first grade MAN Siabu and the sample of research was class X. 1 and class X.2, they were 60 students. As the instrument for collecting the data the researcher used the task writing form essey test. The researcher used T-test for analyzing data.

Based on the data, it was found that (1) the students'writing achievements narrative textby using STAD of Cooperative learning as "enough" $(72,14)$, (2) the students' writing Achievements narrative text by using conventional methodas "enough" ( 69,5 ), and (3) there is significant effect STAD of cooperative learning on students' achievements writing narrative text at first grade in MAN Siabu. rather than conventional method. ( $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{s}}=2,57$ ), categorized as "low". It means that the hypothesis is accepted.
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## A. Identity

| Name | $:$ Rukiah |
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B. Parent
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2. Mother's name : Sapiana Lbs
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4. Graduated from Junior High School in SMPNegeri3 Siabu from 2002-2005.
5. Graduated from Senior High School in MAN Siabu from 2005-2008.
6. Be University Student in STAIN Padangsidimpuan.

## APPENDIX 1

## PLANNING OF THE TEACHING CLASS EXPERIMENT

| School | : MAN Siabu |
| :--- | :--- |
| Subject matter | : English |
| Class / Semester | $:$ X /2 |

Standard Competence : Mengungkapkan makna dalam teks tulis fungsional pendek dan esei sederhana berbentuk narrative, dalam konteks kehidupan sehari-hari
Basic Competence : Mengungkapkan makna dan langkah retorika secara akurat, lancar dan berterima dengan menggunakan ragam bahasatulis dalam konteks kehidupan seharihari dalam teks berbentuk narrative.

| Kind of text | $:$ narrative text |
| :--- | :--- |
| Aspect / Skill | $:$ writing |
| Time | $: 4 \times 45$ Menit |

## 1. Indicators

a. Siswa mampu menggunakan kalimat past tense dalam menyampaikan sebuah peristiwa
b. Siswa mampu menghasilkan teks berbentuk narrative

## 2. Objectives

a.untuk membuat siswa mampu menggunakan kalimat past tense dalam menyampaikan peristiwa yang sudah terjadi.
b. untukmembuat siswa mampu menghasilkan teks berbentuk narrative

## 3. Matery : Malin kundang

| Sturuktural elements | Textural features | Narrative | Grammatical features |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Orientation <br> (obligatory) <br> - To set up what is to follow by introduci ng who, where, whe ie setting and narrator (1) | Reference <br> - Forward to foreshadow disruption to normal events ( malin kundang <br> - Out into context (1) <br> - Time conjuction ( west sumatra) | A long time ago, in a small village near the beach in West Sumatra, a woman and her son lived. They were MalinKundang and her mother. Her mother was a single parent because MalinKundang's father had passed away when he was a baby. <br> MalinKundang had to live hard with his mother. <br> MalinKundang was a healthy, dilligent, and strong boy. He usually went to sea to catch fish. After getting fish he would bring it to his |  |


|  |  | mother, or sold the caught fish in the town. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Complication <br> ( obligatory) <br> Sequence of events disrupted creating a problem or crisis for characters. Characters evaluate problematic events to give them significance |  | One day, when MalinKundang was sailing, he saw a merchant's ship which was being raided by a small band of pirates. He helped the merchant. With his brave and power, MalinKundang defeated the pirates. The merchant was so happy and thanked to him. In return the merchant asked MalinKundang to sail with him. To get a better life, | Clause combined in <br> different ways ie <br> expansion, <br> projection, non- <br> finite and finite <br> dependent, <br> embedded clauses as <br> participants <br> Participants ( malin <br> kundang, merchant, <br> mother <br> predominant theme <br> Sequence of past <br> tense <br> processes material <br> raided, helped, brave <br> thanked asked, <br> agreed) |


|  |  | MalinKundang agreed. He left his mother alone. | Past tense mental processes ( with his brave and power, merchant was so happy and thanked to him) and past tense relational processes ( was) to evaluate events, to show down action and build up suspense |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Resolution ( <br> Obligatory) <br> - Probl <br> em / <br> crisis <br> resolv <br> ed <br> and <br> norma <br> I <br> events resum e | Conjunction <br> - Causal ( many later) signaling beginning of resolution of crisis <br> - Temporal sequence ( when, and, after) | Many years later, MalinKundang became wealthy. He had a huge ship and was helped by many ship crews loading trading goods. Perfectly he had a beautiful wife too. When he was sailing his trading journey, his ship landed on a beach near a small village. The villagers recognized him. The news ran fast in the | Sequence of pasttense materialprocesses in quicksuccession ( helped,landed, wanted,released, came,dressed, <br> begged, <br> yelled) |


|  |  | town; <br> "MalinKundang has become rich and now he is here". An old woman ran to the beach to meet the new rich merchant. She was MalinKundang's mother. She wanted to hug him, released her sadness of being lonely after so long time. Unfortunately, when the mother came, <br> MalinKundang who was in front of his well dressed wife and his ship crews denied meeting that old lonely woman. For three times her mother begged MalinKundang and for three times he yelled at her. At last MalinKundang said |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


|  |  | to her "Enough, old woman! I have never had a mother like you, a dirty and ugly woman!" After that he ordered his crews to set sail. He would leave the old mother again but in that time she was full of both sadness and angriness. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Coda ( <br> optional ) <br> - Show how chara cters have been chang ed by the events <br> - Evalu ates whole incide nt | Conjunction <br> - Counter expectanc y (finally) | Finally, enraged, she cursed <br> MalinKundang that he would turn into a stone if he didn't apologize. <br> MalinKundang just laughed and really set sail. In the quiet sea, suddenly a thunderstorm came. <br> His huge ship was wrecked and it was too late for MalinKundang to apologize. He was | Mental processes projecting thought ( finally) Relational processes to evaluate (was) Expressions of attitude ( enraged) |


|  | thrown by the wave <br> out of his ship. He <br> fell on a small <br> island. It was really <br> too late for him to <br> avoid his curse. <br> Suddenly, he turned <br> into a stone |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

4. Method : STAD
5. Steps

## Meting 1

| No | KegiatanBelajar | Waktu |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Introduction <br> $>$ Greeting <br> $>$ Explain indicator and give motivation | 10 minutes |
| 2. | Main Activity <br> 1. Membentuk kelompok yang anggotanya sama dengan 4 orang secara heterogen (campuran menurut prestasi, jenis kelamin, suku, dan lain-lain). <br> 2. Guru menyajkan pelajaran <br> 3. Guru memberi tugas menulis kepada kelompok untuk dikerjakan oleh anggotaanggota kelompok. Anggota yang sudah mengerti dapat menjelaskan pada anggota lainnya sampai semua anggota dalam kelompok itu mengerti. <br> 4. Memberi evaluasi dengan mengumumkan | 60 minutes |


|  | nilai kelompok. <br> 5. Memberi kesimpulan. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3. | Closing <br> $>$ conclusion <br> $>$ Greeting | 10 minutes |
|  |  |  |

## Meting 2,

| No | KegiatanBelajar | Waktu |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Introduction <br> $>$ Greeting <br> > Explain indicator and give motivation | 10 minutes |
| 2. | Main Activity <br> 1. Guru memberi tugas menulis kepada seluruh siswa, pada saat menulis siswa tidak boleh saling membantu. <br> 2. Memberi evalusi dari tugas individu siswa <br> 3. Memberi kesimpulan. | 60 minutes |
| 3. | Closing <br> $>$ conclusion <br> > Greeting | 10 minutes |

## 6. Sumber Materi :

- Buku Paket Bahasa Inggris untuk Kelas X MAN
- Buku Teks yang Relevan


## 7. Evaluation

1. Grammar :

2 Organization :

3 Fluency
4. Vocabularies :
5. Mechanics :

Total score :

Validator,
Peneliti,

SojuangonRambe, S. S, M. Pd
NIP. 197908152006041003

## Rukiah

NIM. 083400030

## PLANNING OF THE TEACHING

## APENDIX II

## CLASS CONTROL

| School | : MAN Siabu |
| :--- | :--- |
| Subject matter | : English |
| Class / Semester | $:$ X / 2 |

Standard Competence : Mengungkapkan makna dalam teks tulis fungsional pendek dan esei sederhana berbentuk narrative, dalam konteks kehidupan sehari-hari
Basic Competence : Mengungkapkan makna dan langkah retorika secara akurat, lancar dan berterima dengan menggunakan ragam bahasatulis dalam konteks kehidupan seharihari dalam teks berbentuk narrative.

| Kind of text | $:$ narrative text |
| :--- | :--- |
| Aspect / Skill | $:$ writing |
| Time | $: 4 \times 45$ Menit |

## 1. Indicators

c. Siswa mampu menggunakan kalimat past tense dalam menyampaikan sebuah peristiwa yang sudah terjadi
d. Siswa mampu menghasilkan teks berbentuk narrative.

## 2 Objectives

a.untuk membuat siswa mampu menggunakan kalimat past tense dalam menyampaikan peristiwa yang sudah terjadi.
b. untukmembuat siswa mampu menghasilkan teks berbentuk narrative

## 3. Matery :

## MalinKundang.



A long time ago, in a small village near the beach in West Sumatra, a woman and her son lived. They were MalinKundang and her mother. Her mother was a single parent because MalinKundang's father had passed away when he was a baby. MalinKundang had to live hard with his mother. MalinKundang was a healthy, dilligent, and strong boy. He usually went to sea to catch fish. After getting fish he would bring it to his mother, or sold the caught fish in the town.

One day, when MalinKundang was sailing, he saw a
 the merchant asked MalinKundang to sail with him. To
 get a better life, MalinKundang agreed. He left his mother alone.

Many years later, MalinKundang became wealthy. He had a huge ship and was helped by many ship crews loading trading goods. Perfectly he had a beautiful wife too. When he was sailing his trading journey, his ship landed on a beach near a small village. The villagers recognized him. The news ran fast in the town; "MalinKundang has become rich and now he is here". An old woman ran to the beach to meet the new rich merchant. She was MalinKundang's mother. She wanted to hug him, released her sadness of being lonely after so long time. Unfortunately, when the mother came, MalinKundang who was in front of his well dressed wife and his ship crews denied meeting that old lonely woman. For three times her mother begged

MalinKundang and for three times he yelled at her. At last MalinKundang said to her "Enough, old woman! I have never had a mother like you, a dirty and ugly woman!" After that he ordered his crews to set sail. He would leave the old mother again but in that time she was full of both sadness and angriness.
Finally, enraged, she cursed MalinKundang that he would turn into a stone if he didn't apologize.
 MalinKundang just laughed and really set sail. In the quiet sea, suddenly a thunderstorm came. His huge ship was wrecked and it was too late for MalinKundang to apologize. He was thrown by the wave out of his ship. He fell on a small island. It was really too late for him to avoid his curse. Suddenly, he turned into a stone.

## 4. Method : Discussion

## 5. procedure

## Meting 1,2

| No | KegiatanBelajar | Waktu |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Introduction <br> $>$ Greeting <br> $>$ Explain indicator and give motivation | 10 minutes |
| 2. | Main Activity <br> Guru menjelaskan teks narrative <br> $>$ Guru menjelaskan bagaimana menulis teks narrative <br> $>$ Guru menyuruh siswa menulis sebuah teks narrative. | 60 minutes 10 minutes |
| 3. | Closing <br> $>$ conclusion <br> $>$ Greeting |  |

## 6. Sumber Materi :

- Buku Paket Bahasa Inggris untuk Kelas X MAN
- Buku Teks yang Relevan


## 7. Evaluation

1. Grammar :
2. Organization :
3. Fluency :
4. Vocabularies :
5. Mechanics

Total score

## APPENDIX 2

INSTRUMENT FOR PRE- TEST

## 1. Pengantar

a. Instrument ini hanya bertujuan untuk menjaring data dari siswa / I tentang student's writing achievements narrative text
b. Jawaban anda tidak mempengaruhi kedudukan anda disekolah ini.
2. Petunjuk
a. Perhatikanlahjudulceritadibawahini
b. Tulislah sebuah cerita berdasarkan pengalamanmu dari juduldibawahini, dan sesuaikan dengan indicator narrative text yaitu :

| Orientation | Orientation yaitu sebuah paragraph pembuka yang menggambarkan watak pelaku dalam sebuah cerita. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Complication | Complication yaitu paragraph yang <br> menggambarkan timbulanya sebuah maalah <br> dalam sebuah cerita    |
| Resolution | Resolution yaitu paragraph yang   <br> menggamabarkan solusi dari masalah yang  <br> terjadi dalam cerita.    |
| Coda | Coda yaitu paragraph yang mengambarkan ahir atau kesimpulan dalam sebuah cerita. |

c. Apabila ada pertanyaan yang kurang jelas, tanyakan langsung kepada pengawas.
d. Waktu yang tersedia 60 menit.
3. Soal : pilihlah salah satu judul dibawah ini, kemudian tulislah dalam sebuah bentuk narrative teks.
a. Sangkuriang
b. Lake Toba
c. Cinderella

Validator,

SojuangonRambe, S. S, M. Pd
NIP. 197908152006041003

## INSTRUMENT FOR POST- TEST

## 1. Pengantar

a. Instrument ini hanya bertujuan untuk menjaring data darisiswa / I tentang student's writing achievements narrative text
b. Jawaban anda tidak mempengaruhi kedudukan anda disekolah ini.

## 2. Petunjuk

a. Perhatikanlah judul cerita dibawah ini
b. Tulislah sebuah cerita berdasarkanpengalamanmudarijuduldibawahini, dansesuaikandengan indicator narrative text yaitu :

| Orientation | Orientation yaitu sebuah paragraph pembuka yang menggambarkan watak pelaku dalam sebuah cerita. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Complication | Complication yaitu paragraph yang <br> menggambarkan timbulanya sebuah maalah <br> dalam sebuah cerita    |
| Resolution | Resolution yaitu paragraph yang   <br> menggamabarkan solusi dari masalah yang  <br> terjadi dalam cerita.    |
| Coda | Coda yaitu paragraph yang mengambarkan ahir atau kesimpulan dalam sebuah cerita. |

c. Apabila ada pertanyaan yang kurang jelas, tanyakan langsung kepada pengawas.
d. Waktu yang tersedia 60 menit.
3. Soal ; pilih lah salah satu judul dibawah ini, kemudian tulis dalam bentuk narrative teks.
a. Snow white
b. Sampuraga
c. TangkubanPerahu

Validator,

SojuangonRambe, S. S, M. Pd
NIP. 197908152006041003

## APPENDIX V

## THE SCORE OF CONTROL CLASS

|  | Pre-test |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Post-test |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No | O | C | R | Cd | X | $\mathrm{x}^{2}$ | O | C | R | Cd | X | $\mathrm{x}^{2}$ |
| 1 | 20 | 10 | I5 | 20 | 65 | 4225 | 20 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 65 | 4225 |
| 2 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 20 | 60 | 3600 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 60 | 3600 |
| 3 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 20 | 65 | 4225 | 20 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 75 | 4225 |
| 4 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 20 | 70 | 4900 | 20 | 20 | 10 | 20 | 70 | 4900 |
| 5 | 15 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 65 | 4225 | 15 | 10 | 5 | 20 | 70 | 4900 |
| 6 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 3600 | 20 | 15 | 10 | 20 | 65 | 4225 |
| 7 | 15 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 70 | 4900 | 20 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 75 | 5625 |
| 8 | 20 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 65 | 4225 | 20 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 65 | 4225 |
| 9 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 10 | 50 | 2500 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 20 | 60 | 3600 |
| 10 | 15 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 65 | 4225 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 20 | 65 | 4225 |
| 11 | 20 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 70 | 4900 | 20 | 20 | 15 | 20 | 75 | 5625 |
| 12 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 20 | 70 | 4900 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 80 | 6400 |
| 13 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 20 | 60 | 3600 | 20 | 15 | 10 | 20 | 70 | 4900 |
| 14 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 60 | 3600 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 60 | 3600 |
| 15 | 15 | 5 | 15 | 10 | 65 | 4225 | 20 | 20 | 10 | 20 | 70 | 4900 |
| 16 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 60 | 3600 | 20 | 15 | 10 | 20 | 65 | 4225 |
| 17 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 60 | 3600 | 20 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 65 | 5625 |
| 18 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 80 | 6400 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 60 | 3600 |
| 19 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 60 | 3600 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 80 | 6400 |
| 20 | 20 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 60 | 3600 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 25 | 85 | 7225 |
| 21 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 20 | 65 | 4225 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 25 | 85 | 7225 |
| 22 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 50 | 2500 | 20 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 65 | 4225 |
| 23 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 20 | 65 | 4225 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 20 | 60 | 3600 |
| 24 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 60 | 3600 | 20 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 65 | 4225 |
| 25 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 60 | 3600 | 20 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 65 | 4225 |
| 26 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 65 | 4225 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 20 | 60 | 3600 |
| 27 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 50 | 2500 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 20 | 70 | 4900 |
| 28 | 20 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 70 | 4900 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 80 | 6400 |
| 29 | 20 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 70 | 4900 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 80 | 6400 |
| 30 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 50 | 2500 | 20 | 20 | 15 | 20 | 75 | 5625 |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 1895 | 121325 |  |  |  | 2095 |  | 148025 |

Note:

O : Orientation
C : Complication
R : Resolution
Cd : Coda

## THE SCORE OF EXPERIMENT CLASS

|  | Pre-test |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Post-test |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathrm{N} \\ \mathrm{o} \end{gathered}$ | O | C | R | Cd | X | $\mathrm{x}^{2}$ | O | C | R | Cd | X | $\mathrm{x}^{2}$ |
| 1 | 20 | 15 | 10 | 20 | 65 | 4225 | 20 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 70 | 4900 |
| 2 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 20 | 60 | 3600 | 20 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 70 | 4900 |
| 3 | 20 | 20 | 10 | 20 | 70 | 4900 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 80 | 6400 |
| 4 | 20 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 65 | 4225 | 20 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 75 | 5625 |
| 5 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 20 | 60 | 3600 | 20 | 20 | 10 | 20 | 70 | 4900 |
| 6 | 20 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 56 | 4225 | 20 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 75 | 5625 |
| 7 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 20 | 60 | 3600 | 20 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 70 | 4900 |
| 8 | 20 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 65 | 4225 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 50 | 2500 |
| 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 60 | 3600 | 20 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 70 | 4900 |
| 10 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 20 | 60 | 3600 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 60 | 3600 |
| 11 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 20 | 70 | 4900 | 20 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 75 | 5625 |
| 12 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 20 | 60 | 3600 | 20 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 75 | 5625 |
| 13 | 20 | 15 | 10 | 20 | 65 | 4225 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 80 | 6400 |
| 14 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 20 | 65 | 4225 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 80 | 6400 |
| 15 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 60 | 3600 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 50 | 2500 |
| 16 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 80 | 6400 | 20 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 75 | 5625 |
| 17 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 60 | 3600 | 15 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 75 | 5625 |
| 18 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 60 | 3600 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 60 | 3600 |
| 19 | 20 | 15 | 10 | 20 | 65 | 4225 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 80 | 6400 |
| 20 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 40 | 1600 | 15 | 20 | 15 | 10 | 80 | 6400 |
| 21 | 20 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 70 | 4900 | 20 | 20 | 10 | 20 | 70 | 4900 |
| 22 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 20 | 65 | 4225 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 60 | 3600 |
| 23 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 60 | 3600 | 20 | 20 | 10 | 20 | 75 | 5625 |
| 24 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 65 | 4225 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 80 | 6400 |
| 25 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 80 | 6400 | 20 | 20 | 10 | 20 | 70 | 4900 |
| 26 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 50 | 2500 | 20 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 75 | 5625 |
| 27 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 40 | 1600 | 20 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 75 | 5625 |
| 28 | 20 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 70 | 4900 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 80 | 6400 |
| 29 | 20 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 70 | 4900 | 20 | 20 | 15 | 20 | 75 | 5625 |


| 30 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 80 | 6400 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 80 | 6400 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 190 <br> 5 | 123425 |  |  | Total | 2705 | 205225 |  |

Note:

| O | : Orientation |
| :--- | :--- |
| C | $:$ Complication |
| R | : Resolution |
| Cd | $:$ Coda |

## APPENDIX VII

## THE SCORE OF CONTROL CLASS IN PRE-TEST

1. The score of control class in pre-test from low score to high score

50505050606060606060
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2. High score $=80$
3. Low score $=50$
4. Range $=$ high score - low score

$$
=80-50=30
$$

5. The total of classes $(B K)=1+3,3 \log (n)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =1+3,3 \log 30 \\
& =1+3,3(1,477) \\
& =1+4,874 \\
& =5,874 \\
& =6
\end{aligned}
$$

6. Interval (i)

$$
i=\frac{R}{B K}=\frac{30}{6}=5
$$

7. $\operatorname{Mean} \operatorname{score}(x)=\frac{\sum f_{i} x_{i}}{x_{i}}$

| Interval Class | F | X | x | fx | $\mathrm{x}^{2}$ | $\mathrm{fx}^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $50-54$ | 4 | 52 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 16 |
| $55-59$ | - | 57 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| $60-64$ | 10 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $65-69$ | 9 | 67 | -1 | -9 | 1 | 9 |
| $70-74$ | 5 | 72 | -2 | -10 | 4 | 20 |
| $75-79$ | - | 77 | -3 | -0 | 9 | 0 |
| $80-84$ | 2 | 82 | -4 | -8 | 16 | 32 |
| $i=5$ | 30 |  |  | -19 | 35 | 77 |

8. $M x=M^{1}+i \frac{\Sigma f x^{1}}{N}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
= & 62+5\left(\frac{-19}{30}\right) \\
= & 62+5(0,6) \\
= & 62+3 \\
= & 65 \\
& \quad i \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma f x^{\prime 2}}{N}}-\left[\frac{\Sigma f x^{\prime}}{N}\right]^{2} \\
\mathrm{SD}_{\mathrm{t}} & =5 \sqrt{\frac{77}{30}-\left[\frac{-19}{30}\right]^{2}} \\
= & 5 \sqrt{2,56-(0,6)^{2}} \\
= & 5 \sqrt{2,56-0,36} \\
= & 5 \sqrt{2,2} \\
= & 5(1,48) \\
& =7,4
\end{aligned}
$$

Table of the Frequency Distribution is Expected and Observation

| Interval <br> of <br> Score | Real Upper <br> Limit | Z - <br> Score | Limit of <br> Large of the <br> Area | Large <br> of area | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{h}}$ | $\mathrm{f}_{0}$ | $\frac{\left(\mathrm{f}_{\underline{0}}-\mathrm{f}_{\underline{n}}\right)}{\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{h}}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $80-84$ | 84,5 | 2,63 | 0,4957 | 0,8187 | 2,45 | 2 | 0,18 |
| $75-79$ | 79,5 | 1,95 | 0,4774 | 0,0777 | 2,33 | - | ,- 1 |
| $70-74$ | 74,5 | 1,28 | 0,3997 | 0,1739 | 5,21 | 5 | 0,04 |
| $65-69$ | 69,5 | 0,60 | 0,2258 | 0,2019 | 6,05 | 9 | 0,48 |
| $60-64$ | 64,5 | $-0,06$ | 0,0239 | 0,2474 | 7,42 | 10 | 0,34 |
| $55-59$ | 59,5 | 0,74 | 0,2704 | 0,503 | 1,50 | - | $0-1$ |
| $50-54$ | 54,5 | 1,41 | 0,4207 | 0,061 | 1,83 | 4 | 1,18 |
| 49,5 | 2,09 | 0,4817 |  |  |  |  |  |

Based on table above, reseracher found that $\mathrm{x}_{\text {count }}^{2}=3,18$ while $\mathrm{x}_{\text {table }}^{2}=$ 5,99 , cause $\mathrm{x}_{\text {cause }}^{2}<\mathrm{x}_{\text {table }}^{2}(3,18<5,99)$ with degree of freedom $\mathrm{dk}=5-3=2$ and significant level $\alpha=5 \%$. So distribution of control class by using conventional strategy (Pre-test) is normal.

Median

| No | Interval of Classes | F | X |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $50-54$ | 4 | 52 |
| 2 | $55-59$ | - | 57 |
| 3 | $60-64$ | 10 | 62 |
| 4 | $65-69$ | 9 | 67 |
| 5 | $70-74$ | 5 | 72 |
| 6 | $75-79$ | - | 77 |
| 7 | $80-84$ | 2 | 82 |

## Explanation :

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{Me} & =\mathrm{B}+\left(\frac{n / 2-\left(\sum f 2\right)}{f m e} \cdot C\right) \\
\mathrm{Me} & =\text { Median } \\
\mathrm{B} & \text { Low limit of the interval median conceives Me } \\
\mathrm{Fm} & \text { = Frequency of class conceives Me } \\
\mathrm{F}_{2} & \text { Frequencyof cumulative before interval of classes conceives Me } \\
\mathrm{C} & \text { Length of classes } \\
\mathrm{n} & =\text { Total of sample }
\end{array}
$$

Position of Me in the interval of classes is number 1, that:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{B} & =64,5 \\
\mathrm{~F}_{2} & =10 \\
\mathrm{C} & =6 \\
\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{me}} & =16
\end{array}
$$

$$
\mathrm{n} \quad=30
$$

So :

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Me} & =\mathrm{B}+\left(\frac{n / 2-\left(\sum f 2\right)}{f m e} . C\right) \\
& =64,5+\left(\frac{15-10}{16} \times 6\right) \\
& =64,5+(1,8) \\
& =66,3
\end{aligned}
$$

Modus $=60$

## APPENDIX VIII

THE SCORE OF EXPERIMENT CLASS IN PRE-TEST

1. The score of experiment class in pre-test from low score to high score 40405060606060606060
60606065656565656565
65657070707070808080
2. High score $=80$
3. Low score $=40$
4. Range $=$ high score - low score

$$
=80-40=40
$$

5. The total of classes $(B K)=1+3,3 \log (n)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =1+3,3 \log 30 \\
& =1+3,3(1,477) \\
& =1+4,874 \\
& =5,874 \\
& =6
\end{aligned}
$$

6. Interval (i)

$$
i=\frac{R}{B K}=\frac{40}{6}=6,6=7
$$

7. Mean score $(x)=\frac{\sum f_{i} x_{i}}{x_{i}}$

| Interval Class | F | X | x | fx | $\mathrm{x}^{2}$ | $\mathrm{fx}^{\mathbf{2}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $40-46$ | 2 | 43 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| $47-53$ | 1 | 50 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| $54-60$ | 10 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $61-67$ | 9 | 64 | -1 | -9 | 1 | 9 |
| $68-74$ | 5 | 71 | -2 | -10 | 4 | 20 |
| $75-81$ | 3 | 78 | -3 | -9 | 9 | 18 |
| $i=5$ | 30 |  |  | -23 | 19 | 46 |

$$
\begin{aligned}
M x & =M^{1}+i \frac{\Sigma f x^{1}}{N} \\
& =60+7\left(\frac{-23}{30}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =60+7(0,7) \\
& =60+(4,9) \\
& =64,9 \\
& \\
\mathrm{SD}_{\mathrm{t}} & =i \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma f x^{\prime 2}}{N}}-\left[\frac{\Sigma f x^{\prime}}{N}\right]^{2} \\
& =7 \sqrt{\frac{46}{30}-\left[\frac{-23}{30}\right]^{2}} \\
& =7 \sqrt{1,5-(0,7)^{2}} \\
& =7 \sqrt[7]{1,5-0,49} \\
& =7 \sqrt{1,01} \\
& =7(1,0) \\
& =7
\end{aligned}
$$

Table of the Frequency Distribution is Expected and Observation

| Interval <br> of <br> Score | Real Upper <br> Limit | $Z-$ <br> Score | Limit of <br> Large of the <br> Area | Large <br> of area | $f_{h}$ | $f_{0}$ | $\left(f_{0}-f_{\mathrm{h}}\right)$ <br> $f_{h}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $75-81$ | 81,5 | 2,37 | 0,4911 |  | 14,7 | 3 | 0,79 |
| $68-74$ | 74,5 | 1,37 | 0,4147 | 0,0764 | 12,4 | 5 | 0,59 |
| $61-67$ | 67,5 | 0,37 | 0,1443 | 0,2704 | 4,3 | 9 | 1,09 |
| $54-60$ | 60,5 | 0,62 | 0,2324 | 0,088 | 4,3 | 6,9 | 10 |
| $47-53$ | 53,5 | 1,62 | 0,4474 | 0,215 | 13,4 | 1 | 0,92 |
| $40-46$ | 46,5 | 2,62 | 0,4956 | 0,0482 | 14,8 | 2 | 0,86 |
|  | 39,5 | 3,62 | 0,4999 | 0,0043 | 14,9 |  | 0 |

Based on table above, reseracher found that $x^{2}{ }_{\text {count }}=4,69$ while $x^{2}{ }_{\text {table }}=$ 7,81 , cause $\mathrm{x}_{\text {cause }}^{2}<\mathrm{x}_{\text {table }}^{2}(4,69<7,81)$ with degree of freedom $\mathrm{dk}=5-3=2$ and significant level $\alpha=5 \%$. So distribution of experiment class by using STAD of cooperative learning (Pre-test) is normal.
8. Median

| No | Interval of Classes | F | X |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $40-46$ | 2 | 43 |
| 2 | $47-53$ | 1 | 50 |
| 3 | $54-60$ | 10 | 57 |
| 4 | $61-67$ | 9 | 64 |
| 5 | $68-74$ | 5 | 71 |
| 6 | $75-81$ | 3 | 78 |
|  |  |  |  |

Explanation :

$$
\mathrm{Me}=\mathrm{B}+\left(\frac{n / 2-\left(\sum f 2\right)}{f m e} . C\right)
$$

Where :

B $=60,5$
$\mathrm{F}_{2}=10$
$\mathrm{C}=6$
$\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{me}}=17$
$\mathrm{n}=30$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Me} & =60,5+\left(\frac{15-10}{17} \times 6\right) \\
& =60,5+(1,74) \\
& =62,24
\end{aligned}
$$

9. Modus $=60$

## APPENDIX IX

## THE SCORE OF CONTROL CLASS IN POST-TEST

1. The score of control class in pre-test from low score to high score
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2. High score $=85$
3. Low score $=60$
4. Range $=$ high score - low score

$$
=85-60=25
$$

5. The total of classes $(B K)=1+3,3 \log (n)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =1+3,3 \log 30 \\
& =1+3,3(1,447) \\
& =1+4,874 \\
& =5,874 \\
& =6
\end{aligned}
$$

6. Interval (i)

$$
i=\frac{R}{B K}=\frac{25}{6}=4,16=4
$$

7. Mean score $(x)=\frac{\sum f_{i} x_{i}}{x_{i}}$

| Interval Class | F | X | x | fx | $\mathrm{x}^{2}$ | $\mathrm{fx}^{\prime 2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $60-63$ | 5 | 62 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| $64-67$ | 10 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $68-71$ | 4 | 70 | -1 | -4 | 1 | 4 |
| $72-75$ | 5 | 74 | -2 | -10 | 4 | 20 |
| $76-79$ | - | 78 | -3 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| $80-83$ | 4 | 82 | -4 | -16 | 16 | 64 |
| $84-87$ | 2 | 86 | -5 | -10 | 25 | 50 |
| i: 4 | 30 |  |  | -35 | 56 | 143 |

8. $M x=M^{1}+i \frac{\Sigma f x^{1}}{N}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =66+4\left(\frac{-35}{30}\right) \\
& =66+4(-1.66) \\
& =66+4,64 \\
& =70,64
\end{aligned}
$$

9. $\mathrm{SD}_{\mathrm{t}}=i \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma f x^{\prime 2}}{N}}-\left[\frac{\Sigma f x^{\prime}}{N}\right]^{2}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =4 \sqrt{\frac{143}{30}-\left[\frac{-35}{30}\right]^{2}} \\
& =4 \sqrt{5,1-(1,16)^{2}} \\
& =4 \sqrt{5,1-1,16} \\
& =4 \sqrt{3,8} \\
& =4(1,94) \\
& =7,7
\end{aligned}
$$

Table of the Frequency Distribution is Expected and Observation

| Interval of Score | Real Upper Limit | Z - <br> Score | Limit of Large of the Area | Large of area | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{h}}$ | $\mathrm{f}_{0}$ | $\frac{\left(\mathrm{f}_{0}-\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{h}}\right)}{\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{h}}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 84-87 | 87,5 | 2,19 | 0,4857 | 0,0332 | 0,99 | 2 | 1,02 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80-83 | 83,5 | 1,67 | 0,4525 |  | 2,32 | 4 | 0,72 |
|  |  |  |  | 0,0776 |  |  |  |
| 76-79 | 79,5 | 1,15 | 0,776 |  | 4,77 | - | -1 |
|  |  |  |  | 0,1592 |  |  |  |
| 72-75 | 75,5 | 0,57 | 0,2157 |  | 5,15 | 5 | 0,02 |
|  |  |  |  | 0,1719 |  |  |  |
| 68-71 | 71,5 | 0,11 | 0,0438 |  | 2,68 | 4 | 0,49 |
|  |  |  |  | 0,0896 |  |  |  |
| 64-67 | 67,5 | 0,40 | 0,1334 |  | 5,62 | 10 | 0,77 |
|  |  |  |  | 0,1874 |  |  |  |
| 60-63 | 63,5 | 0,92 | 0,3212 |  | 3,11 | 5 | 0,60 |
|  |  |  |  | 0,1039 |  |  |  |
|  | 59,5 | -1,44 | 0,4251 |  |  |  |  |


|  | 3,62 |
| :--- | :---: |

Based on table above, reseracher found that $x^{2}$ count $=3,62$ while $x_{\text {table }}^{2}=$ 3,84 , cause $\mathrm{x}_{\text {cause }}^{2}<\mathrm{x}_{\text {table }}^{2}(3,62<3,84)$ with degree of freedom $\mathrm{dk}=4-3=1$ and significant level $\alpha=5 \%$. So distribution of control class by using conventional strategy (Post-test) is normal.
10. Median

| No | Interval of Classes | F | fk |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $60-63$ | 5 | 62 |
| 2 | $64-67$ | 10 | 67 |
| 3 | $68-71$ | 4 | 70 |
| 4 | $72-75$ | 5 | 74 |
| 5 | $76-79$ | - | 78 |
| 6 | $80-80$ | 4 | 82 |
|  | $84-87$ | 2 | 86 |

Explanation :

$$
\mathrm{Me}=\mathrm{B}+\left(\frac{n / 2-\left(\sum f 2\right)}{f m e} . C\right)
$$

Position of Me in the interval of classes is number 1, that:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{B} & =67,5 \\
\mathrm{~F}_{2} & =10 \\
\mathrm{fme}_{\mathrm{me}} & =15 \\
\mathrm{C} & =6 \\
\mathrm{n} & =30
\end{array}
$$

So :

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Me} & =67,5+\left(\frac{15-10}{15} \times 6\right) \\
& =67,5+(1,98) \\
& =69,5
\end{aligned}
$$

11. Modus $=65$

## APPENDIX X

## THE SCORE OF EXPERIMENT CLASS IN POST-TEST

1. The score of experiment class in pre-test from low score to high score

50506060607070707070
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2. High score $=80$
3. Low score $=50$
4. Range $=$ high score - low score

$$
=80-50=30
$$

5. The total of classes $(B K)=1+3,3 \log (n)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =1+3,3 \log 30 \\
& =1+3,3(1,477) \\
& =1+4,874 \\
& =5,874 \\
& =6
\end{aligned}
$$

6. Interval (i)

$$
i=\frac{R}{B K}=\frac{30}{6}=5
$$

7. Mean score $(x)=\frac{\sum f_{i} x_{i}}{x_{i}}$

| Interval Class | f | X | x | fx | $\mathrm{x}^{2}$ | $\mathrm{fx}^{\mathbf{2}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $50-54$ | 2 | 52 | 5 | 10 | 25 | 50 |
| $55-59$ | - | 57 | 4 | 0 | 16 | 0 |
| $60-64$ | 3 | 62 | 3 | 9 | 9 | 27 |
| $65-69$ | - | 67 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| $70-74$ | 5 | 72 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| $75-79$ | 11 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $80-84$ | 9 | 82 | -1 | -9 | 1 | 9 |
| $i=4$ | 30 |  |  | 15 | 56 | 91 |

8. $M x=M^{1}+i \frac{\Sigma f x^{1}}{N}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =77+5\left(\frac{15}{30}\right) \\
& =77+5(0,5) \\
& =77+(2,5) \\
& =79,5
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{SD}_{\mathrm{t}} & =i \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma f x^{\prime 2}}{N}}-\left[\frac{\Sigma f x^{\prime}}{N}\right]^{2} \\
& =5 \sqrt{\frac{91}{30}-\left[\frac{15}{30}\right]^{2}} \\
& =5 \sqrt{3,03-(0,5)^{2}} \\
& =5 \sqrt{3,03-0,25} \\
& =5 \sqrt{2,78} \\
& =5(1,66) \\
& =8,3
\end{aligned}
$$

Table of the Frequency Distribution is Expected and Observation

| Interval <br> of <br> Score | Real Upper <br> Limit | $\mathrm{Z}-$ <br> Score | Limit of <br> Large of the <br> Area | Large <br> of area | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{h}}$ | $\mathrm{f}_{0}$ | $\frac{\left(\mathrm{f}_{0}-\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{h}}\right)}{\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{h}}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $80-84$ | 84,5 | 0,60 | 0,2258 |  |  | 9 | 0,32 |
| $75-79$ | 79,5 | 0,0 | 0,00 | 0,2258 | 6,77 | 11 | 0,62 |
| $70-74$ | 74,5 | $-0,60$ | 0,2258 | 0,2258 | 6,77 | 5 | 0,04 |
| $65-69$ | 69,5 | -1.20 | 0,3849 | 0,1591 | 4,77 | - | 1 |
| $60-64$ | 64,5 | $-1,80$ | 0,4641 | 0,0792 | 2,37 | 3 | 2,61 |
| $55-59$ | 59,5 | $-2,40$ | 0,4918 | 0,0277 | 0,83 | - | 1 |
| $50-54$ | 54,5 | $-3,01$ | 0,4987 | 0,0069 | 0,20 |  |  |
|  | 49,5 | $-3,61$ | 0,4998 | 0,0011 | 0,03 | 2 | 0,03 |

Based on table above, reseracher found that $x^{2}$ count $=5,62$ while $\mathrm{x}_{\text {table }}^{2}=5,99$ cause $\mathrm{x}^{2}{ }_{\text {cause }}<\mathrm{x}_{\text {table }}^{2}(5,62<5,99)$ with degree of freedom $\mathrm{dk}=5-3=2$ and significant level $\alpha=5 \%$. So distribution of experiment class by using STAD of cooperative learning (Post-test) is normal.
9. Median

| No | Interval of Classes | F | X |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $50-54$ | 2 | 52 |
| 2 | $55-59$ | - | 57 |
| 3 | $60-64$ | 3 | 62 |
| 4 | $65-69$ | - | 67 |
| 5 | $70-74$ | 5 | 72 |
| 6 | $75-79$ | 11 | 77 |
| 7 | $80-74$ | 9 | 82 |

Explanation :

$$
\mathrm{Me} \quad==\mathrm{B}+\left(\frac{n / 2-\left(\sum f 2\right)}{f m e} . C\right)
$$

Position of Me in the interval of classes is number 1, that:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{Bb} & =69,5 \\
\mathrm{~F} & =11 \\
\mathrm{fm} & =9 \\
\mathrm{C} & =6 \\
\mathrm{n} & =30
\end{array}
$$

So :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =69,5+\left(\frac{15-11}{9} \times 6\right) \\
& =69,5+(2,64) \\
& =72,14
\end{aligned}
$$

12. Modus $=75$

## APPENDIX XI

THE SCORE OF CONTROL CLASS IN PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST

| No | Pre-test | Post-test | $\mathrm{Y}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{Y}_{2}{ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 65 | 65 | - | - |
| 2 | 60 | 60 | - | 25 |
| 3 | 65 | 75 | 10 | 100 |
| 4 | 70 | 75 | 5 | 25 |
| 5 | 65 | 70 | 5 | 25 |
| 6 | 60 | 65 | 5 | 25 |
| 7 | 70 | 75 | 5 | 25 |
| 8 | 65 | 65 | - | - |
| 9 | 50 | 60 | 10 | 100 |
| 10 | 65 | 65 | - | - |
| 11 | 70 | 75 | 5 | 25 |
| 12 | 70 | 80 | 10 | 100 |
| 13 | 60 | 70 | 10 | 100 |
| 14 | 60 | 65 | 5 | 25 |
| 15 | 65 | 70 | 5 | 25 |
| 16 | 60 | 65 | 5 | 25 |
| 17 | 60 | 65 | 5 | 25 |
| 18 | 60 | 60 | - | - |
| 19 | 80 | 80 | - | - |
| 20 | 60 | 80 | 20 | 400 |
| 21 | 65 | 80 | 15 | 225 |
| 22 | 50 | 65 | 10 | 100 |
| 23 | 65 | 60 | -5 | 25 |
| 24 | 60 | 65 | 5 | 25 |
| 25 | 60 | 65 | 5 | 25 |
| 26 | 65 | 60 | -5 | 25 |
| 27 | 50 | 70 | 20 | 400 |
| 28 | 70 | 80 | 10 | 100 |
| 29 | 70 | 80 | 10 | 100 |
| 30 | 50 | 75 | 25 | 625 |
|  | 1895 | 2095 | 195 | 2700 |

## APPENDIX XII

THE SCORE OF EXPERIMENT CLASS IN PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST

| No | Pre-test | Post-test | $\mathrm{Y}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{Y}_{2}{ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 65 | 70 | 5 | 25 |
| 2 | 65 | 70 | 10 | 100 |
| 3 | 70 | 80 | 10 | 100 |
| 4 | 65 | 75 | 10 | 100 |
| 5 | 60 | 70 | 10 | 100 |
| 6 | 65 | 75 | 10 | 100 |
| 7 | 60 | 70 | 10 | 100 |
| 8 | 65 | 50 | -10 | 100 |
| 9 | 60 | 70 | 10 | 100 |
| 10 | 60 | 60 | - | - |
| 11 | 70 | 75 | 5 | 25 |
| 12 | 60 | 75 | 15 | 225 |
| 13 | 65 | 80 | 15 | 225 |
| 14 | 65 | 80 | 15 | 225 |
| 15 | 60 | 50 | -10 | 100 |
| 16 | 80 | 75 | -5 | 25 |
| 17 | 60 | 75 | 15 | 225 |
| 18 | 60 | 60 | - | - |
| 19 | 65 | 80 | -15 | 225 |
| 20 | 40 | 70 | 30 | 900 |
| 21 | 70 | 80 | 10 | 100 |
| 22 | 65 | 60 | -5 | 25 |
| 23 | 60 | 75 | 15 | 225 |
| 24 | 65 | 80 | 15 | 225 |
| 25 | 80 | 70 | -10 | 100 |
| 26 | 50 | 75 | 25 | 625 |
| 27 | 40 | 75 | 35 | 1225 |
| 28 | 70 | 80 | 10 | 100 |
| 29 | 70 | 75 | 5 | 25 |
| 30 | 80 | 80 | - | - |
|  | 1905 | 2175 | 225 | 5650 |

## APPENDIX XIII

## HOMOGENEITY TEST (PRE-TEST)

Calculation of parameter to get variant of the first class as experiment class sample by using STAD of cooperative learning and variant of the second class as control clsass class sample by using conventional strategy are used homogeneity test by using formula:

$$
\mathrm{S}^{2}=\frac{n \Sigma x i^{2}-(\Sigma x i)}{n(n-i)}
$$

Hypothesis:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{H}_{0} & : \delta_{1}^{2}=\delta_{2}^{2} \\
\mathrm{H}_{1} & : \delta_{1}^{2} \neq \delta_{2}^{2}
\end{array}
$$

A. variant of the control class sample by using conventional strategy is:
$\mathrm{n}=30$
$\sum x i=1905$
$\sum_{x i} 2=123425$
So:

$$
\begin{aligned}
S^{2} & =\frac{n \Sigma x i^{2}-(\Sigma x i)}{n(n-i)} \\
& =\frac{30(123425)-(1905)^{2}}{30(30-1)} \\
& =\frac{3702750-3629025}{30(29)} \\
& =\frac{73725}{870} \\
& =84,74
\end{aligned}
$$

B. Variant of the experimental class sample by using skimming strategy is:
n $=30$
$\sum x i=1895$
$\sum_{x i} 2=121325$
So:

$$
S^{2}=\frac{n \Sigma x_{1}^{2}-\left(\Sigma x_{1}\right)^{2}}{n(n-1)}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =\frac{30(121325)-(1895)^{2}}{30(30-1)} \\
& =\frac{3639750-3591025}{30(29)} \\
& =\frac{48725}{870} \\
& =56,00
\end{aligned}
$$

The Formula was used to test hypothesis was:

$$
\mathrm{F}=\frac{\text { The Biggest Variant }}{\text { The Smallest Variant }}
$$

So:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{F} & =\frac{84,74}{56.00} \\
& =1,51
\end{aligned}
$$

After doing the calculation, researcher found that $\mathrm{F}_{\text {count }}=1,51$ with $\alpha 5 \%$ and $\mathrm{dk}=30$ from the distribution list F , researcher found that $\mathrm{F}_{\text {table }}=1,91$ cause $\mathrm{F}_{\text {count }}<\mathrm{F}_{\text {table }}(1,51<1,91)$. So, there is no difference the variant between the first class as control class by using conventional strategy and the second class as experimentclass by using STAD of cooperative learning (homogeneous).

## APPENDIX XIV

## HOMOGENEITY TEST OF THE BOTH AVERAGES

The formula was used to analyse homogeneity test of the both averages was ttest, that:
$t=\frac{\bar{X}_{1}-\bar{X}_{2}}{\sqrt[5]{\frac{1}{n_{1}}+\frac{1}{n_{2}}}}$ with $S=\sqrt{\frac{\left(n_{1}-1\right) S_{1}^{2}+\left(n_{2}-1\right) S_{2}^{2}}{n_{1}+n_{2}-2}}$
So:

$$
\begin{aligned}
S & =\sqrt{\frac{\left(n_{1}-1\right) S_{1}^{2}+\left(n_{2}-1\right) S_{2}^{2}}{n_{1}+n_{2}-2}} \\
& =\sqrt{\frac{(30-1)(56,00)+(30-1)(84,74)}{30+30-2}} \\
& =\sqrt{\frac{29(56,00)+29(84,74)}{58}} \\
& =\sqrt{\frac{1624+2457,46}{58}} \\
& =\sqrt{\frac{4081,46}{58}} \\
& =\sqrt{70,37} \\
& =8,38
\end{aligned}
$$

So:
$t=\frac{\bar{X}_{1}-\bar{X}_{2}}{\sqrt[5]{\frac{1}{n_{1}}+\frac{1}{n_{2}}}}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =\frac{64,9-65}{\sqrt[7,59]{\frac{1}{30}+\frac{1}{30}}} \\
& =\frac{0,1}{\sqrt[7,59]{\frac{2}{30}}} \\
& =\frac{0,1}{\sqrt[7,59]{0,06}} \\
& =\frac{0,1}{0,79} \\
& =0,12
\end{aligned}
$$

Based on researcher calculation result of the homogeneity test of the both averages, researcher found that $\mathrm{t}_{\text {count }}=0,12$ with opportunity $(1-\alpha)=1-5 \%=95 \%$ and $\mathrm{dk}=\mathrm{n}_{1}+\mathrm{n}_{2}-2=30+30-2=58$, reseracher found that $\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}=1,67$, cause $\mathrm{t}_{\text {count }}<$ $\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}(0,12<1,67)$. So, $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ is accepted, it means no difference the average between the first class as experimental class by using STAD of cooperative learning and the second class as control class by using STAD of cooperative learning in this research.

## APPENDIX XV

## HOMOGENEITY TEST (POST-TEST)

Calculation of parameter to get variant of the first class as experiment class sample by using STAD of cooperative learning and variant of the second class as control clsass class sample by using conventional strategy are used homogeneity test by using formula:

$$
\mathrm{S}^{2}=\frac{n \Sigma x i^{2}-(\Sigma x i)}{n(n-i)}
$$

Hypothesis:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{H}_{0} & : \delta_{1}^{2}=\delta_{2}^{2} \\
\mathrm{H}_{1} & : \delta_{1}^{2} \neq \delta_{2}^{2}
\end{array}
$$

C. variant of the control class sample by using conventional strategy is:
n $=30$
$\sum x i=2095$
$\sum_{x i} 2=148025$
So:

$$
\begin{aligned}
S^{2} & =\frac{n \Sigma x i^{2}-(\Sigma x i)}{n(n-i)} \\
& =\frac{30(148025)-(2095)^{2}}{30(30-1)} \\
& =\frac{4440750-438905}{870} \\
& =\frac{51725}{870} \\
& =59,45
\end{aligned}
$$

D. Variant of the experimental class sample by using STAD of cooperative learning is:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{n} \quad=30 \\
& \sum_{x i} x=2175 \\
& \sum_{x i} 2=159775
\end{aligned}
$$

So:

$$
\begin{aligned}
S^{2} & =\frac{n \Sigma x_{1}^{2}-\left(\Sigma x_{1}\right)^{2}}{n(n-1)} \\
& =\frac{30(159775)-(2175)^{2}}{30(30-1)} \\
& =\frac{4793250-4730625}{30(29)} \\
& =\frac{62625}{870} \\
& =71,98
\end{aligned}
$$

The Formula was used to test hypothesis was:

$$
\mathrm{F}=\frac{\text { The Biggest Variant }}{\text { The Smallest Variant }}
$$

So:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{F} & =\frac{71,98}{59,45} \\
& =1,21
\end{aligned}
$$

After doing the calculation, researcher found that $\mathrm{F}_{\text {count }}=1,21$ with $\alpha 5 \%$ and $\mathrm{dk}=30$ from the distribution list F , researcher found that $\mathrm{F}_{\text {table }}=1,90$ cause $\mathrm{F}_{\text {count }}<\mathrm{F}_{\text {table }}(1,21<1,90)$. So, there is no difference the variant between the first class as control class by using conventional strategy and the second class as experiment class by using STAD of cooperative learning (homogeneous).

## APPENDIX XVI <br> HOMOGENEITY TEST OF THE BOTH AVERAGES

The formula was used to analyse homogeneity test of the both averages was ttest, that:

$$
t=\frac{\bar{X}_{1}-\bar{X}_{2}}{\sqrt[5]{\frac{1}{n_{1}}+\frac{1}{n_{2}}}} \text { with } S=\sqrt{\frac{\left(n_{1}-1\right) S_{1}^{2}+\left(n_{2}-1\right) S_{2}^{2}}{n_{1}+n_{2}-2}}
$$

So:

$$
\begin{aligned}
S & =\sqrt{\frac{\left(n_{1}-1\right) S_{1}^{2}+\left(n_{2}-1\right) S_{2}^{2}}{n_{1}+n_{2}-2}} \\
& =\sqrt{\frac{(30-1)(59,45)+(30-1)(71,98)}{30+30-2}} \\
& =\sqrt{\frac{29(59,45)+29(71,98)}{58}} \\
& =\sqrt{\frac{1724,05+2087,42}{58}} \\
& =\sqrt{\frac{3811,47}{58}} \\
& =\sqrt{65,7} \\
& =8,10
\end{aligned}
$$

So:

$$
\begin{aligned}
t & =\frac{\bar{X}_{1}-\bar{X}_{2}}{\sqrt[5]{\frac{1}{n_{1}}+\frac{1}{n_{2}}}} \\
& =\frac{1724,05-2087,42}{\sqrt[11,41]{\frac{1}{30}+\frac{1}{30}}}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =\frac{3,63}{\sqrt[11,41]{\frac{2}{30}}} \\
& =\frac{3,63}{\sqrt[11,41]{0,06}} \\
& =\frac{3,63}{0,79} \\
& =4,59
\end{aligned}
$$

Based on calculation result of the difference test of the both averages, researcher found that $\mathrm{t}_{\text {count }}=4.59$ with opportunity $(1-\alpha)=1-5 \%=95 \%$ and $\mathrm{dk}=$ $n_{1}+n_{2}-2=30+30-2=58$, and researcher found that $t_{\text {table }}=2,02$ cause $t_{\text {count }}>t_{\text {table }}($ $4,59>2,02$ ). So, $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}$ is accepted, it means that there is a significant effect of using STAD of cooperative on students' achievement in writing narrative text..

## APPENDIX XXII

## PRODUCT MOMENT r Table

| N | Taraf | Signif | N | Taraf | Signif | $\mathbf{N}$ | Taraf$5 \%$ | Signif <br> $1 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5 \% | 1 \% |  | 5 \% | 1 \% |  |  |  |
| 3 | 0,997 | 0,999 | 27 | 0,381 | 0,487 | 55 | 0,266 | 0,345 |
| 4 | 0,950 | 0,990 | 28 | 0,374 | 0,478 | 60 | 0,254 | 0,330 |
| 5 | 0,878 | 0,959 | 29 | 0,367 | 0,470 | 65 | 0,244 | 0,317 |
| 6 | 0,811 | 0,917 | 30 | 0,361 | 0,463 | 70 | 0,235 | 0,306 |
| 7 | 0,754 | 0,874 | 31 | 0,355 | 0,456 | 75 | 0,227 | 0,296 |
| 8 | 0,707 | 0,834 | 32 | 0,349 | 0,449 | 80 | 0,220 | 0,286 |
| 9 | 0,666 | 0,798 | 33 | 0,344 | 0,442 | 85 | 0,213 | 0,278 |
| 10 | 0,612 | 0,765 | 34 | 0,339 | 0,436 | 90 | 0,207 | 0,270 |
| 11 | 0,602 | 0,735 | 35 | 0,334 | 0,430 | 95 | 0,202 | 0,261 |
| 12 | 0,576 | 0,708 | 36 | 0,329 | 0,424 | 100 | 0,195 | 0,256 |
| 13 | 0,553 | 0,684 | 37 | 0,325 | 0,418 | 125 | 0,176 | 0,230 |
| 14 | 0,532 | 0,661 | 38 | 0,320 | 0,413 | 150 | 0,159 | 0,210 |
| 15 | 0,514 | 0,641 | 39 | 0,316 | 0,408 | 175 | 0,148 | 0,194 |
| 16 | 0,497 | 0,623 | 40 | 0,312 | 0,403 | 200 | 0,138 | 0,181 |
| 17 | 0,482 | 0,606 | 41 | 0,308 | 0,398 | 300 | 0,113 | 0,148 |
| 18 | 0,468 | 0,590 | 42 | 0,304 | 0,393 | 400 | 0,098 | 0,128 |
| 19 | 0,456 | 0,575 | 43 | 0,301 | 0,389 | 500 | 0,088 | 0,115 |


| 20 | 0,444 | 0,561 | 44 | 0,297 | 0,384 | 600 | 0,080 | 0,105 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 21 | 0,433 | 0,549 | 45 | 0,294 | 0,380 | 700 | 0,074 | 0,097 |
| 22 | 0,423 | 0,517 | 46 | 0,291 | 0,376 | 800 | 0,070 | 0,091 |
| 23 | 0,413 | 0,526 | 47 | 0,288 | 0,372 | 900 | 0,065 | 0,086 |
| 24 | 0,404 | 0,515 | 48 | 0,284 | 0,368 | 1000 | 0,062 | 0,081 |
| 25 | 0,396 | 0,505 | 49 | 0,281 | 0,364 |  |  |  |
| 26 | 0,388 | 0,496 | 50 | 0,279 | 0,361 |  |  |  |

## APPENDIX XXIII

## Z-Table

Density Function:
Distribution Function:


$$
\begin{aligned}
& z=0.00 \\
& p=.50
\end{aligned}
$$

## Area between 0 and $\mathbf{z}$



|  | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 9}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{0 . 0}$ | 0.0000 | 0.0040 | 0.0080 | 0.0120 | 0.0160 | 0.0199 | 0.0239 | 0.0279 | 0.0319 | 0.0359 |
| $\mathbf{0 . 1}$ | 0.0398 | 0.0438 | 0.0478 | 0.0517 | 0.0557 | 0.0596 | 0.0636 | 0.0675 | 0.0714 | 0.0753 |
| $\mathbf{0 . 2}$ | 0.0793 | 0.0832 | 0.0871 | 0.0910 | 0.0948 | 0.0987 | 0.1026 | 0.1064 | 0.1103 | 0.1141 |
| $\mathbf{0 . 3}$ | 0.1179 | 0.1217 | 0.1256 | 0.1293 | 0.1331 | 0.1368 | 0.1406 | 0.1443 | 0.1480 | 0.1517 |
| $\mathbf{0 . 4}$ | 0.1554 | 0.1591 | 0.1628 | 0.1664 | 0.1700 | 0.1736 | 0.1772 | 0.1808 | 0.1844 | 0.1879 |
| $\mathbf{0 . 5}$ | 0.1915 | 0.1950 | 0.1985 | 0.2019 | 0.2054 | 0.2088 | 0.2123 | 0.2157 | 0.2190 | 0.2224 |
| $\mathbf{0 . 6}$ | 0.2257 | 0.2291 | 0.2324 | 0.2357 | 0.2389 | 0.2422 | 0.2454 | 0.2486 | 0.2517 | 0.2549 |
| $\mathbf{0 . 7}$ | 0.2580 | 0.2611 | 0.2642 | 0.2673 | 0.2704 | 0.2734 | 0.2764 | 0.2794 | 0.2823 | 0.2852 |
| $\mathbf{0 . 8}$ | 0.2881 | 0.2910 | 0.2939 | 0.2967 | 0.2995 | 0.3023 | 0.3051 | 0.3078 | 0.3106 | 0.3133 |
| $\mathbf{0 . 9}$ | 0.3159 | 0.3186 | 0.3212 | 0.3238 | 0.3264 | 0.3289 | 0.3315 | 0.3340 | 0.3365 | 0.3389 |
| $\mathbf{1 . 0}$ | 0.3413 | 0.3438 | 0.3461 | 0.3485 | 0.3508 | 0.3531 | 0.3554 | 0.3577 | 0.3599 | 0.3621 |
| $\mathbf{1 . 1}$ | 0.3643 | 0.3665 | 0.3686 | 0.3708 | 0.3729 | 0.3749 | 0.3770 | 0.3790 | 0.3810 | 0.3830 |
| $\mathbf{1 . 2}$ | 0.3849 | 0.3869 | 0.3888 | 0.3907 | 0.3925 | 0.3944 | 0.3962 | 0.3980 | 0.3997 | 0.4015 |
| $\mathbf{1 . 3}$ | 0.4032 | 0.4049 | 0.4066 | 0.4082 | 0.4099 | 0.4115 | 0.4131 | 0.4147 | 0.4162 | 0.4177 |


| 1. | 0.4192 | 0.4207 | 0.4222 | 0.4236 | 0.425 | 0.4265 | 0.4279 | 0.4292 | 0.4306 | 0. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 0.4332 | 0.4345 | 0.4357 | 0.4370 | 0.438 | 0.4394 | 0.4406 | 0.4418 | 0.4429 | 0.4441 |
| 1.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0. | 0.4 | 0.4495 | 0.4505 | 0.4515 | 0.4525 | 0.4535 | 0.4545 |
| 1.7 |  | 0.4 |  |  |  | 0.4599 | 0.4608 | 0. | 5 | 0.4633 |
| 1.8 |  | 0.4 | 0.465 | 0.4 |  | 0.4678 | 0.4686 | 0.4693 | 9 |  |
| 1.9 |  |  | 0. |  |  |  | 0 | 0. | 1 | 0.4767 |
| 2.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.4846 | 0.4850 |  |  |
| 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.4890 |
| 2.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.4909 | 0. | 3 | 0.4916 |
| 2. |  |  |  |  |  | 0.4929 | 0.4931 | 0.49 | 0.4934 | 0.4 |
| 2.5 | 0.4 | 0. |  | 0. |  |  | 8 | 0. | 1 | 0.4952 |
| 2. | 0.495 | 0.4 | 0.495 | 0.495 | 0. | 0.4960 | 0.4961 | 0.4962 | 0.4963 | 0.49 |
| 2.7 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.4970 | 0.4971 | 0.49 | 0.4973 | 0.49 |
| 2.8 | 0.4974 | 0.497 | 0.4976 | 0.497 | 0.497 | 0.4978 | 0.4979 | 0.4979 | 0.4980 | 0.49 |
| 2.9 | 0.4981 | 0.4982 | 0.498 | 0.4983 | 0.4984 | 4 | 0.4985 | 0.4985 | 0.4986 | 0.4986 |
| 3.0 | 0.4987 | 0.4987 | 0.498 | 0.4988 | 0.4988 | 0.4989 | 0.4989 | 0.4989 | 0.4990 | 0.4990 |

## APPENDIX XXIV

Chi-Square Table

| df | 0.995 | 0.99 | 0.975 | 0.95 | 0.90 | 0.10 | 0.05 | 0.025 | 0.01 | 0.005 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  |  | 0.001 | 0.004 | 0.016 | 2.706 | 3.841 | 5.024 | 6.635 | 7.879 |
| 2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.051 | 0.103 | 0.21 | 4.605 | 5.991 | 7.378 | 9.210 | 10.597 |
| 3 | 0.072 | 0.115 | 0.21 | 0.352 | 0.584 | 6.251 | 7.815 | 9.348 | 11.345 | 12.838 |
| 4 | 0.207 | 0.29 | 0.484 | 0.71 | 1.064 | 7.779 | 9.4 | 11.143 | 3.27 | . 860 |
| 5 | 0.412 | 0.55 |  | 1.14 |  | 9.23 | 07 | 12.833 | 086 | 16.750 |
| 6 | 0.67 | 0.8 |  |  |  | 10. | 12.59 | 14.449 | .812 | 18.548 |
| 7 | 0.9 |  |  |  |  | 12 | 14.06 | 16.013 | 18.475 | 20.278 |
| 8 | 1.344 |  | 2.180 | 2.733 | 3.490 | 13.3 | 15 | 17.5 | .090 | , |
| 9 | 1.735 |  |  |  |  |  | 16.919 | 19.0 | 21.666 | 23.589 |
| 10 | 156 | 2.558 |  | 3.940 |  | 15 | 18.307 | 20.48 | 23.209 | 25.188 |
| 11 | 2.603 | 3.053 | 3.8 | 4.5 | 5. | 17 | 19 | 21.920 | 24.725 | 26.757 |
| 12 | 3.07 | 3.571 | 4.4 | 5.22 | 6.3 | 18.54 | 21.02 | 23.337 | 6.21 | 28.300 |
| 13 | 3.5 | 4.107 | 5.009 | 5. | 7.042 | 19 | 22.36 | 24.736 | 7.688 | 29.819 |
| 14 | 4.075 | 4.660 | 5.62 | 6.571 |  | 21.06 | 23.68 | 26.119 | 9.141 | 31.31 |
| 15 | 4.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 27.4 | 30.578 | 32.801 |
| 16 | 5.142 | 5.81 | 6.908 | 7.96 | 9.312 | 23.54 | 26 | 28.845 | 32.00 | 34.26 |
| 17 | 5.6 |  |  | 8.6 | 10 | 24.76 | 27 | 30.191 | 3.40 | 35.71 |
| 18 | 6.265 |  |  | 9.39 | 10.86 | 25.98 |  | 31.526 | \% | . |
| 19 | 6.844 |  | 8.90 | 10 | 11. | 27.20 | 30 | 32.852 | 6.19 | 38.5 |
| 20 | 7.43 | 8.260 | 9.59 | 10.851 | 12.443 | 28.412 | 31 | 34.170 | . 5 | 39.997 |
| 21 | 8.03 | 8.897 | 10 | 11.59 | 13.240 | 29.61 | 32.671 | 35.479 |  | 41.40 |
| 22 | 8.6 | 9.542 | 10.982 | 12.338 | 14.04 | 30.813 | 92 | 36.781 | . 28 | 42.79 |
| 23 | 9.2 | 10 | 11. | 13.091 | 14.84 | 32.00 | 35.17 | 38.076 | 41.638 | 44.18 |
| 24 | 9.886 | 10.85 | 12.401 | 13.848 | 15.659 | 33.196 | 36.41 | 39.364 | 42.98 | 45.559 |
| 25 | 10.520 | 11.524 | 13.120 | 14.611 | 16.473 | 34.382 | 37.65 | 40.646 | 44.31 | 46.928 |
| 26 | 11.160 | 12.198 | 13.844 | 15.379 | 17.292 | 35.563 | 38.88 | 41.923 | 45.64 | 48.290 |
| 27 | 11.808 | 12.879 | 14.573 | 16.151 | 18.114 | 36.741 | 40.11 | 43.195 | 46.96 | 49.645 |
| 28 | 12.461 | 13.565 | 15.308 | 16.928 | 18.939 | 37.916 | 41.337 | 44.461 | 48.278 | 50.993 |


| df | $\mathbf{0 . 9 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 9}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 5}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 9}$ | 13.121 | 14.256 | 16.047 | 17.708 | 19.768 | 39.087 | 42.557 | 45.722 | 49.588 | 52.336 |
| $\mathbf{3 0}$ | 13.787 | 14.953 | 16.791 | 18.493 | 20.599 | 40.256 | 43.773 | 46.979 | 50.892 | 53.672 |
| $\mathbf{4 0}$ | 20.707 | 22.164 | 24.433 | 26.509 | 29.051 | 51.805 | 55.758 | 59.342 | 63.691 | 66.766 |
| $\mathbf{5 0}$ | 27.991 | 29.707 | 32.357 | 34.764 | 37.689 | 63.167 | 67.505 | 71.420 | 76.154 | 79.490 |
| $\mathbf{6 0}$ | 35.534 | 37.485 | 40.482 | 43.188 | 46.459 | 74.397 | 79.082 | 83.298 | 88.379 | 91.952 |
| $\mathbf{7 0}$ | 43.275 | 45.442 | 48.758 | 51.739 | 55.329 | 85.527 | 90.531 | 95.023 | 100.425 | 104.215 |
| $\mathbf{8 0}$ | 51.172 | 53.540 | 57.153 | 60.391 | 64.278 | 96.578 | 101.879 | 106.629 | 112.329 | 116.321 |
| $\mathbf{9 0}$ | 59.196 | 61.754 | 65.647 | 69.126 | 73.291 | 107.565 | 113.149 | 118.136 | 124.116 | 128.299 |
| $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | 67.328 | 70.065 | 74.222 | 77.929 | 82.358 | 118.498 | 124.342 | 129.561 | 135.807 | 140.169 |

## APPENDIX XXV

## T-Table

df - degrees of freedom for $t$ curve
P - area under the $t$ curve with df degrees of freedom to the right of $t(d f)$

## Example:

$\mathrm{P}[\mathrm{t}(2)>2.92]=0.05$
$\mathrm{P}[-2.92<\mathrm{t}(2)<2.92]=0.9$

|  | 0.25 | 0.2 | 0.15 | 0.1 | 0.05 | 0.025 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.005 | 0.0025 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0.001 | 0.0005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| df |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1.000 | 1.376 | 1.963 | 3.078 | 6.31 | 12.70 | 15.90 | 31.82 | 63.65 | 127.3 |
|  | 318.3 | 636.619 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 0.817 | 1.061 | 1.386 | 1.886 | 2.920 | 4.303 | 4.849 | 6.965 | 9.925 | 14.08 |
|  | 22.33 | 31.599 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 0.765 | 0.979 | 1.250 | 1.638 | 2.353 | 3.182 | 3.482 | 4.541 | 5.841 | 7.453 |
|  | 10.22 | 12.924 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 0.741 | 0.941 | 1.190 | 1.533 | 2.132 | 2.776 | 2.999 | 3.747 | 4.604 | 5.598 |
|  | 7.173 | 8.610 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 0.727 | 0.920 | 1.156 | 1.476 | 2.015 | 2.571 | 2.757 | 3.365 | 4.032 | 4.773 |
|  | 5.893 | 6.869 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | 0.718 | 0.906 | 1.134 | 1.440 | 1.943 | 2.447 | 2.612 | 3.143 | 3.707 | 4.317 |
|  | 5.208 | 5.959 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | 0.711 | 0.896 | 1.119 | 1.415 | 1.895 | 2.365 | 2.517 | 2.998 | 3.499 | 4.029 |
|  | 4.785 | 5.408 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | 0.706 | 0.889 | 1.108 | 1.397 | 1.860 | 2.306 | 2.449 | 2.896 | 3.355 | 3.833 |
|  | 4.501 | 5.041 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | 0.703 | 0.883 | 1.100 | 1.383 | 1.833 | 2.262 | 2.398 | 2.821 | 3.250 | 3.690 |
|  | 4.297 | 4.781 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | 0.700 | 0.879 | 1.093 | 1.372 | 1.812 | 2.228 | 2.359 | 2.764 | 3.169 | 3.581 |
|  | 4.144 | 4.587 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | 0.697 | 0.876 | 1.088 | 1.363 | 1.796 | 2.201 | 2.328 | 2.718 | 3.106 | 3.497 |
| 12 | 4.025 | 4.437 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0.696 | 0.873 | 1.083 | 1.356 | 1.782 | 2.179 | 2.303 | 2.681 | 3.055 | 3.428 |
| 13 | 3.930 | 4.318 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0.694 | 0.870 | 1.079 | 1.350 | 1.771 | 2.160 | 2.282 | 2.650 | 3.012 | 3.372 |
| 14 | 3.852 | 4.221 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0.692 | 0.868 | 1.076 | 1.345 | 1.761 | 2.145 | 2.264 | 2.624 | 2.977 | 3.326 |
| 15 | 3.787 | 4.140 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0.691 | 0.866 | 1.074 | 1.341 | 1.753 | 2.131 | 2.249 | 2.602 | 2.947 | 3.286 |
| 16 | 3.733 | 4.073 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0.690 | 0.865 | 1.071 | 1.337 | 1.746 | 2.120 | 2.235 | 2.583 | 2.921 | 3.252 |
|  | 3.686 | 4.015 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

$\left.\begin{array}{lllllllllll} & 17 & 0.689 & 0.863 & 1.069 & 1.333 & 1.740 & 2.110 & 2.224 & 2.567 & 2.898 \\ & 3.646 & 3.965 & & & & & & & \\ 18 & 0.688 & 0.862 & 1.067 & 1.330 & 1.734 & 2.101 & 2.214 & 2.552 & 2.878 & 3.197 \\ & 3.610 & 3.922 & & & & & & & & \\ 19 & 0.688 & 0.861 & 1.066 & 1.328 & 1.729 & 2.093 & 2.205 & 2.539 & 2.861 & 3.174 \\ & 3.579 & 3.883 & & & & & & & & \\ 20 & 0.687 & 0.860 & 1.064 & 1.325 & 1.725 & 2.086 & 2.197 & 2.528 & 2.845 & 3.153 \\ & 3.552 & 3.850 & & & & & & & & \\ 21 & 0.686 & 0.859 & 1.063 & 1.323 & 1.721 & 2.080 & 2.189 & 2.518 & 2.831 & 3.135 \\ & 3.527 & 3.819 & & & & & & & & \\ 22 & 0.686 & 0.858 & 1.061 & 1.321 & 1.717 & 2.074 & 2.183 & 2.508 & 2.819 & 3.119 \\ & 3.505 & 3.792 & & & & & & & & \\ 23 & 0.685 & 0.858 & 1.060 & 1.319 & 1.714 & 2.069 & 2.177 & 2.500 & 2.807 & 3.104 \\ & 3.485 & 3.768 & & & & & & & & \\ 24 & 0.685 & 0.857 & 1.059 & 1.318 & 1.711 & 2.064 & 2.172 & 2.492 & 2.797 & 3.091 \\ & 3.467 & 3.745 & & & & & & & & \\ 25 & 0.684 & 0.856 & 1.058 & 1.316 & 1.708 & 2.060 & 2.167 & 2.485 & 2.787 & 3.078 \\ & 3.450 & 3.725 & & & & & & & & \\ 26 & 0.684 & 0.856 & 1.058 & 1.315 & 1.706 & 2.056 & 2.162 & 2.479 & 2.779 & 3.067 \\ & 3.435 & 3.707 & & & & & & & & \\ 27 & 0.684 & 0.855 & 1.057 & 1.314 & 1.703 & 2.052 & 2.158 & 2.473 & 2.771 & 3.057 \\ & 3.421 & 3.690 & & & & & & & & \\ 28 & 0.683 & 0.855 & 1.056 & 1.313 & 1.701 & 2.048 & 2.154 & 2.467 & 2.763 & 3.047 \\ & 3.408 & 3.674 & & & & & & & & \\ 29 & 0.683 & 0.854 & 1.055 & 1.311 & 1.699 & 2.045 & 2.150 & 2.462 & 2.756 & 3.038 \\ & 3.396 & 3.659 & & & & & & & & \\ 30 & 0.683 & 0.854 & 1.055 & 1.310 & 1.697 & 2.042 & 2.147 & 2.457 & 2.750 & 3.030 \\ & 3.385 & 3.646 & & & & & & & & \\ 40 & 0.681 & 0.851 & 1.050 & 1.303 & 1.684 & 2.021 & 2.123 & 2.423 & 2.704 & 2.971 \\ 50 & 3.307 & 3.551 & & & & & & & & \\ & 0.679 & 0.849 & 1.047 & 1.299 & 1.676 & 2.009 & 2.109 & 2.403 & 2.678 & 2.937 \\ 60 & 3.261 & 3.496 & & & & & & & & \\ & 0.679 & 0.848 & 1.045 & 1.296 & 1.671 & 2.000 & 2.099 & 2.390 & 2.660 & 2.915 \\ 80 & 3.232 & 3.460 & & & & & & & & \\ & 0.678 & 0.846 & 1.043 & 1.292 & 1.664 & 1.990 & 2.088 & 2.374 & 2.639 & 2.887 \\ 100 & 3.195 & 3.416 & & & & & & & & \\ & 0.677 & 0.845 & 1.042 & 1.290 & 1.660 & 1.984 & 2.081 & 2.364 & 2.626 & 2.871 \\ 1000 & 3.174 & 3.390 & & 0.675 & 0.842 & 1.037 & 1.282 & 1.646 & 1.962 & 2.056 \\ & 3.098 & 3.300 & & & & & & & 230 & 2.581\end{array} 2.813\right\}$

Confidence level C

## CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

## A. Background

Writing is one of the four language skills, writing is a way to convey the ideas by written. Writing is important to be learned and mastered by every individual. Thus, writing as communication indirectly or without face to face. By writing, we can make expression what do you think about something and improve new ideas.

Generally, writing has a lot of significances. First, writing need in economic such as maintaining financial accounts. You must keep or maintain financial records and accounts which are reliable and provide an accurate view of your business. Common sense demands financial records as well. Without financial records you are probably going to lose deductions and have much less control over how much money you make ( or lose). So it must be maintained in written form.

Second, writing need in social such as writing consist of transmitting information accurately to a technical or non- technical audience. Where transmitting information is the way to transmit the data or the information through written form in structural ways. For example, SMS (short Message Service), books, letters, magazines, newspaper.

Third, writing need in education, such as keeping historical records. Means the modern practice of history begins with written records: evidence of human culture without writing is the realm of prehistory. Further discussion, the history is written to prove of the realm of history. Writing became a more dependable method of recording and presenting events in a permanent form, and writing determined the link between previously uncategorized and the first known writing. As conclusion, keeping historical records will be the evidence of the last time event up to the future. Thus, it can make you easy to finish a task in academic. Such as proposal, reports of research and so on.

There are some kinds of writing: exposition, description, narration, and argumentation. Narrative is written to tell story, describe an experience. Narrative is a text containing four components, such as, orientation, complication, resolution, and coda. The students should know about components of narrative text, so that, they are able to write narrative very well.

Writing in education is not easy learning activities. Because in writing need several rule as: vocabularies, ideas, structure of sentences. Actually, students at first grade in MAN SIABU can't write well. Based on information from teachers, the problems are about limitation of vocabularies, ideas, and words structure of sentence.

First, students do not have many vocabularies. Many vocabularies are one way to easy in written. But in reality, from the teacher's explanation about the ability of the students, they do not have many vocabularies. If the students are
ordered by teacher to write by model dictation, they usually use the dictionary because they do not know the written of the words. So that, it's make them difficult to write.

Second, students lack of ideas. A good idea is make writing easy to comprehend a text. The good idea can see of content a narrative text such as, orientation, complication, resolution, and coda. The students in MAN SIABU lack of idea because they do not understand about orientation, complication, resolution, and coda. So that, it makes them can't write narrative text.

The last, students do not understand about structure in a sentence. The structure sentence very important to easier in write, such as, arranges subject, predicate, and complement. But in reality, from the teacher's explanation that student cannot write goodly. If the students are ordered by teacher to write, they always write based on teacher saying without think how to arrange subject, predicate, and compliment in writing. So that, it makes them cannot write narrative text.

To make students understand writing narrative text, there are some strategies and methods that can be used in teaching and learning process. The strategies of cooperative learning, in cooperative learning there are jigsaw, TAI, STAD.

STAD (Student Teams- Achievement Division) is the method of teaching learning. That students divided in a small groups, makes students more easy in problem solving, because in groups the students enjoy and can sharing what they
want or think, STAD can help the students that weakness in writing. So, the process of teaching learning more active and creative. Based on the explanation above, the writer in interested to do a research that title:
"THE EFFECT OF STAD COOPERATIVE LEARNING ON STUDEN'S WRITING ACHIEVEMENTS IN NARRATIVE TEXT AT FIRST GRADE IN MAN SIABU"

## B. Identification of The Problem

Based on the explanation of background above, the identification of the problems are:

1. Students lack of vocabularies.
2. Students lack of ideas.
3. Students do not understand structure in sentences.

## C. Limitation of The Research

Based on identification of the problem above, the writer limits about writing narrative text at first grade in MAN SIABU.

## D. The Formulation of The Problem

To make the problem to be clear in research is pointed on the formulation of the problem. Based on identification above as follow: is there the effect STAD of cooperative learning on student's writing achievements narrative text in MAN SIABU?

## E. The Purposes of The Research

The objectives of research are:

1. To describe the achievement study with use STAD of cooperative learning what is effect or develop on achievement study in writing narrative after use STAD of cooperative learning.
2. To describe the achievement study in writing narrative without use STAD of cooperative learning.
3. To examine whether is there effect significance different of achievement study on writing narrative text with use STAD of cooperative learning than without make it.

Based on formulation above the writer determiners the purposes of the research is to examine effect of STAD cooperative learning on student's achievements writing narrative text in MAN SIABU.

## F. The Significance of Research

This research has significances to the following area:

1. For teacher, the result of this research will give one suitable method that can be used by teachers to get successful learning. This research is expected to provide information, which may have practical as well as theoretical values for English language teacher. Theoretically, the result of this research will add what has been found in the area of English teaching in foreign language. The result of this research will inform English language teachers in their attempts to decide which of the best method in teaching writing.
2. For students, using appropriate method in learning will make students enjoy to study and it make them to increase their motivation in learning, because one of the important factor to get successful learning is using appropriate method. For educational world, to increase the quality of education especially in English by using appropriate method in teaching English.
3. For other researcher, the result of this research is hoped to help the other research who will conduct further research in the same topic. This research can give them information about teaching method, especially writing STAD cooperative learning on student's writing achievements in narrative text. So, it makes them easier in their research.

## G. Definition of The Operational Variables

There are many variable of the title; the writer explains the variable below:

1. Effect is a change which is a result or consequence of an action or other cause.
2. Cooperative learning is one teaching method, refers to a variety of teaching method in which students work in small groups to help one another learn academic content. In conclusion, cooperative not a new idea in education, but until recently it has only been used by a few teachers for limited purposes, such as occasional group project or reports.
3. STAD is one cooperative learning, STAD is a small groups, as each four or five person, and the person in groups divided Heterogenic. In conclusion STAD is a teaching method focus on students centered approach until the effective and active in teaching and learning process.
4. Writing narrative text is a past activity, story or experience. In conclusion writing narrative text is a story talk the past activities or events which order to problematic and to give lesson to reader.
5. Achievement study is something that in obtaining or a result of activity.
6. The effect STAD cooperative learning on student's writing achievements in narrative text at first grade in MAN SIABU: is one effect model learning in comprehension writing narrative text in one the senior high school in SIABU.

## H. The Outline of Thesis

The systematic of this research is divided into five chapter, and each chapter consist of many sub chapters with detail as follows :

In chapter one, consist of background of the problem, identification of the problem, limitation of the problem, formulation of the problem, research objective, research significances, definition of operational variable.

In chapter two, consist of theoretical description, which consist sub chapter such as theoretical review consist STAD of cooperative learning on student's writing achievements in narrative text. Then review of related finding, and conceptual framework, hypothesis.

In chapter three, consist of place and time of the research, research design, population and sample. Instruments of data collecting, procedure of research, testing of instrument, data collecting data analysis.

In chapter four, consist of the result of the research which consist of description of the data, the testing of hypothesis, the result of research.

And the last is chapter five, consist of conclusion and suggestion.

## CHAPTER II

## THEORETICAL DESCRIPTION

## A. Theoretical Description

## 1. STAD Cooperative learning

## a. Cooperative learning

Cooperative learning refers to a variety of teaching methods in which students work in small groups to help one another learn academic content. In cooperative classrooms, students are expected to help each other, to discuss and argue with each other, to asses each other's current knowledge and fill in gaps in each other understands. Cooperative work rarely replace teacher in striation, but rather replaces individual seatwork, in study, and individual drill. Properly organized students in cooperative groups work with each other to make certain that everyone in the group has mastered the concepts being taught.

Cooperative learning is not a new idea in education, but until recently it has only been used by a few teachers for limited purposes, such as occasional group projects or reports. However, research over the last twenty years has identified cooperative learning methods that can be used effectively at every grade level to each every type of content, from math to reading to writing to science, from basic skills to complex problem solving. Increasingly, cooperative learning being used as teacher's main way of organizing classroom for instruction. ${ }^{1}$

[^0]Finally concluded, this method is focus centered students, not teacher's such last time until, students fell happy, not boring when do act teaching and learning process. The students can find source of material wherever until them always active in study. And make teacher easier in explanation learning.

## b. STAD Cooperative learning

STAD (students Teams Achievements Divisions) is one of the simplest of all cooperative learning methods, and is a good model to begin with for teachers who are new to the cooperative learning. In STAD consist of five components as: class presentation, teams, quizzes, individual improvements scores, and team recognition.

According Marhan (20: 9) STAD is the most researched of all cooperative learning methods and is very adaptable to a wide range of subjects and grades. In STAD, students study 4-5 members following a teacher presentation, teams are made up of students with varying academic abilities. ${ }^{2}$

Slavin (InNur: 2000: 26) in STAD student divided to become some group or team, each of group consisted of 4 or 5 groups. Every team have individual as heterogenic, likes, gender goodness, race, ethnic, and have ability not so bad and good, until event accumulation of characteristic different students. ${ }^{3}$

The application every team use spread sheet academic, and to make easy in mastery of study can with Question and answer or discussion between

[^1]group/team. Thus, to evaluation individual, the teacher will look at of every week, like a group or individual will do best to contribution for its group.

So, STAD is the existence of job in group and the determine group achievement efficacy of individual until every individual in group cannot efficacy with other group. Thus, students must active, creative find source material in teaching learning process.
c. The procedure method STAD

Applying of Method STAD consisted of the phase- study phase bring student at situation of together and cooperation. Phase of Activities of type STAD are:

1) Class achievement

The first teacher must prepare learn in order students can understand about learn as will discussion. Thus, result of study group will presentation in front of class. Presented in class STAD differ of system study group other, which presentation must focus at unit STAD. By this, students must focus with learn will teacher in order students able do evaluation as will give that tasks group or individual.
2) Group team

The special Characteristic of cooperative is group, which based form heterogeneities student in a class likes, gender, religion, tribe, and ability. Especial Focus team is prepare member to reach good value, because result out for draw up its member to reach for the good value, because result of
discussion that will accumulation become group value. So that, every member has responsibility for groups. ${ }^{4}$
3) Quiz

After teacher invite students to presentation result of discussion of each groups, if each groups give quiz to use know, what in a groups any group work as good with look at result quiz every member. ${ }^{5}$
4) Raise value individual

The aim give raise value at member is to give each student about picture of performance students attainment aim of result maximal work have been done by individual or groups. Every student gives point growth as determine based difference of last quiz value. With the quiz value nowadays, every student has same opportunity to render maximal value for groups.
5) Team confession

As confession on team has best value can be given appreciation at present, certificate, and others. ${ }^{6}$

## 2. Writing Achievement

Achievement is a result of capable every individual as can see or feel, such as in study. According by Piusabdillah p that"Achievement is study achievement

[^2]as have reach. ${ }^{7}$ And in dictionary Indonesian achievement is study achievement as have reach of as have reach after due process study. ${ }^{8}$

So, the conclusion is achievement study is the skill someone to do something, than event change skill of notable becomes able is show of achievement study.

Writing is an activity for producing and expressing, it is producing the words and sentences then it expressing with the meaning of ideas, thus writing skill is the activity to transfer the ideas through words and sentences the idea will change to scientific.

According to David Nunan, writing is both a physical and a mental act the most basic level. On other hand, writing is the mental work of inventing of ideas. Thinking about how to express them and organizing them into statements and paragraph that will be clear to a reader. It also both a process and a product, the writer imagines, organizes, drafts,, edits, and reads. This is the process of writing is often cyclical and sometimes disorderly, ultimately, what the audience sees, whether it is an instructor or a wider audience is a product an essay, letter, story, or research report. ${ }^{9}$

So, according David Nunan, writing is a both a physical and a mental work of inventing of idea and it also both a process and a product, the writer imagines, organizes, drafs, edits, and reads.

On other hand, H.R Tarigan said: " menulis ialah menurunkan atau melukiskan lambang-lambing grafik yang menggambarkan suatu bahasa yang di pahami oleh seseorang, sehingga orang-orang lain dapat membaca lambing-lambang grafik tersebut kalau mereka memahami bahasa dangan

[^3]barang grafik itu, menulis merupakan suatu representasi bagian dari kesatuan- kesatuan ekspresi bahasa". ${ }^{10}$

So, according H.R Tarigan, writing is an activity to transfer the ideas and describe a language, so the readers can understand what the writer means. So that, writing achievements is a skill transfers ideas in a written with process study until show good writing.

## 3. Narrative text.

a. The concept of narrative text
A.S Hornby in Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary defined: narrative is a description of events, especially in a novel or story, the act or process of feelling a story. ${ }^{11}$ It similiarly with john langan said "Narration is a writer tells the story of something that happened" through narrative, we make statement clear by relating in detail something that has happened to us. ${ }^{12}$ Menurut Otong Setiawan mengatakan: narrative adalah merupakan jenisteksceritadongeng yang bertujuan menghibur pembaca. ${ }^{13}$ So, According Otong Setiawan, Narrative is kinds of text about story of legend and resolution to amuse and to give entertain to readers.

And according to Pardiyono said that: Narrative adalah jenis teks yang sangat tepat untuk menceritakan aktivita s atau kejadian masa lalu yang menonjolkan problematika experience dan resolution dengan maksud

[^4]menghibur dan sering kali dimaksudkan untuk memberi pelajaran moral kepada pembaca. ${ }^{14}$

So, according Pardiyono Narrative is a story talk the past activities or events which order to problematic and to give lesson to readers.

According to Otong Setiawan Djuharie, to write the narrative, there are four components that should be care:

1) Orientation

Orientation is parts of text give setting or opening about the Narrative

## 2) Complication

Complication is parts of text to inform about the conflict in Narrative
3) Resolution

Resolution is parts of text to describe about the reaction to solve the problem
4) Coda

Coda is the describe reflection or evaluation the conflict about the Narrative.
The function of component Narrative:
a) Orientation

The function of orientation

1) Content of topic an activity or event which wonderfully will be talked.
2) Should be interest and can provoke the readers to know specially.
3) Using adjective to describe personal attitude generally.

[^5]b) Complication

1) Content details about the activities or the events which problematic which are arranged sequence from introduction, conflict until climax.
2) Talking chronologically, sequence the activities are done, the same in writing recount text, in narrative text is also used sequence. Makers: first, second, third, etc. or first, next, after, that, then, finally etc.
3) Grammatical features
a. Using predicate with the verb which past tense forming, past perfect tense, past continuous tense.
b. Using verb of doing on predicate, such as ran out, got and bent etc. which describe the activities.
c. Using adjective which the function to show the personal attitude, such as frightened, quiet, calm, worried, confused, anxious, happy.
d. Repenting subjective pronoun is same in text is general such as: first my aunt was very frightened, but she tried manage herself to be quiet.
e. Using conjunction is also found such as: first, my aunt was very frightened but she tried to manage herself to be quiet.
c) Resolution

Content problem solving has told until the climax.
d) Coda

1) Content about moral lesson which is possible can be taken at the events, such as my aunt was so relieved to see the snake leaving the room without making my harm to anybody. ${ }^{15}$

So, according pardiyono, narrative is an special kind of text which talks about events with problematic and unexpected outcome that entertains and instructs the reader or the listener, such as: novels, poems, comics, movies and other, and the pattern uses simple past tense.

Example of Narrative

## The Myth of MalinKundang.



A long time ago, in a small village near the beach in West Sumatra, a woman and her son lived. They were MalinKundang and her mother. Her mother was a single parent because MalinKundang's father had passed away when he was a baby. MalinKundang had to live hard with his mother. MalinKundang was a healthy, dilligent, and strong boy. He usually went to sea to catch fish. After getting fish he would bring it to his mother, or sold the caught fish in the town.

One day, when MalinKundang was sailing, he saw a merchant's ship which was being raided by a small band of pirates. He helped the merchant. With his brave and power, MalinKundang defeated the pirates. The merchant was so happy and thanked to him. In return the merchant asked MalinKundang to sail with him. To get a better life, MalinKundang agreed. He left his mother alone.

[^6]

Many years later, MalinKundang became wealthy. He had a huge ship and was helped by many ship crews loading trading goods. Perfectly he had a beautiful wife too. When he was sailing his trading journey, his ship landed on a beach near a small village. The villagers recognized him. The news ran fast in the town; "MalinKundang has become rich and now he is here". An old woman ran to the beach to meet the new rich merchant. She was MalinKundang's mother. She wanted to hug him, released her sadness of being lonely after so long time. Unfortunately, when the mother came, MalinKundang who was in front of his well dressed wife and his ship crews denied meeting that old lonely woman. For three times her mother begged MalinKundang and for three times he yelled at her. At last MalinKundang said to her "Enough, old woman! I have never had a mother like you, a dirty and ugly woman!" After that he ordered his crews to set sail. He would leave the old mother again but in that time she was full of both sadness and angriness.

Finally, enraged, she cursed MalinKundang that he would turn into a stone if he didn't apologize. MalinKundang just laughed and really set sail. In the quiet sea, suddenly a thunderstorm came. His huge ship was wrecked and it was too late for MalinKundang to apologize. He was thrown by the wave out of his ship. He fell on a small island. It was really too late for him to avoid his curse. Suddenly, he turned into a stone.

## 2) The Language Elements of Natrative

According to Otong Setiawan Djuharie, the language elements used in writing narrative paragraph are, nouns, individual participant, past tense, conjunction, action verb, and saying verb.
a. Noun is a word used as the name of a person, place or thing. ${ }^{16}$

Budi is our teacher
There is a table in the class
I saw a man in the market
b. Individual participant

Individual participant means that the subject who takes part in a situation or the story of specific subject. ${ }^{17}$ Such as story about snow white, Prophet Muhammad, MalinKundang.
c. Past Tense

The simple past is used of a complete action that happened at one specific time in the past. ${ }^{18}$ According to Betty Schrampfer Azar, simple past tense is used to talk about activities or situations that began and ended at a particular time in the past. ${ }^{19}$ Meanwhile, according to Jayanthi Dakshina Murthy, simple past tense is when a verb is used to

[^7]shown that an action was completed. ${ }^{20}$ So, simple past tense is a sentence or story as do past thus, can see of used verb and adverb of sentences.

## d. Conjunction

Conjunction is a word which is used to join one word to another word, or one sentence to another sentence. There are two types of conjunction subordinating conjunction. ${ }^{21}$ According to Slamet Riyanto dkk, conjunctions are words that are used to connect words or a group of words or sentence. ${ }^{22}$ so, conclusion conjunction is a word as function combine a word or sentences.
e. Action verb

The action verb divided into two forms. ${ }^{23}$

1. Regular verb

The A regular verb is a verb which has a normal inflection or normally added by "ed" or "d" to the infinitive. Example:

| Help | helped | helped |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Play | played | played |
| Open | opened | opened |

[^8]2. Irregular verb

An irregular verb is a verb which does not have a normal inflection or normally added by "ed"d" to the infinitive form. Example:

| Become | became | become |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Buy | bought | bought |
| Begin | began | begun |

According to Betty Schrampfer Azar, the action verb divided in two forms. ${ }^{24}$

1. Regular verb: the simple past and past participle and in-ed.

Example:

| Listen | listened | listened |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Study | studied | studied |
| Stop | stopped | stopped |

2. Irregular verb: the simple past and past participle do not end in-ed.

Example:

| Swim | swam | swum |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Find | found | found |
| Break | broke | broken |

f. Saying verb

It is about verb which to show the report or say such as said, told promised, thought, understood. ${ }^{25}$ According to Jayanthi Dakshina Murthy,

[^9]verb is described as a word which is used to indicate an actions, a state of being of existence or possession. Example, bought, save, handed, lent, offered, paid, played, promised, showed, sang, made, told, sent, sold, got. ${ }^{26}$

## B. Review of Related Finding

There were some related findings to this research. Many people had done research about English. These related findings discuss about strategy and method in English, like STAD, jigsaw. Then, discuss about writing, and about match. Clearly, these are some research:

The first, an analysis on the students ability writing narrative based on picture of the grade VIII at MTs. Mardiyah Islamiyah by Sakinah. She conclude that there were 31 students from the whole sample got average score $70 \%$ or more. It means that $67,39 \%$ of samples are able to write narrative stories based on pictures. There were 15 students from the whole the sample got average score less that $70 \%$. It means that $32,60 \%$ of samples are unable to write narrative stories based on pictures. After calculating and analyzing the data, it was shown from the score is $18,35 \%$ which was regarded in level fair to poor. Thus, based on the data is god, the grade VIII students of MTs, S MardiyahIslamiyah in 2009/2010 academic years were regarded as able to write narrative based on picture but they still faced in the language skill. ${ }^{27}$

[^10]The second, the ability of the eight Grade Students of SMP Negeri 3 Padangsidimpuan in Mastering Narrative Text in 2009-2010. The conclude that ability of the eight grade students of SMP 3 Padangsidimpuan in Mastering narrative text is good.it canbe be seen through the average score is $75 .{ }^{28}$

The third, the different achievement student use cooperative STAD with Discussion on kesetimbangan kimia in XI SMA N I Angkola selatan, based her conclusion in scription, by method stad more good in mastery student on kesetimbangan kimia. ${ }^{29}$

In conclusion above, the researcher interest to make the research about "THE EFFECT STAD OF COOPERATIVE LEARNING ON STUDENT'S WRITING ACHIEVEMENTS IN NARRATIVE TEXT AT FIRST GRADE IN MAN SIABU"

## C. Conceptual Framework

The successful of writing ability depend on many factors. One of them is how the teacher teaches English to the students. The suitable method is very important to teach writing narrative text ability. Writing narrative text is a text that is used to retell something that happened in the past and to tell a series of past event and it relates to somebody experienced. Biography and autobiography are the examples of recount texts.

[^11]However, it becomes main manifestation of the writer. As the framework for this research is if we study competitively and individually, we will be effective and this method is one way to motivate the students to do the best, and give them freedom to look for their ability distance. The relation of STAD cooperative in writing narrative text can be seen as follow:


From the pictures above, STAD Cooperative learning is a method used by the teacher on writing narrative text ability. In order the learning of writing
narrative text through STAD method to be easier, the teacher must be able to facilitate the students to learn effectively.

Based on the description above, using STAD should be seen as a suitable strategy in teaching and learning of writing narrative text ability and it develops the students' competencies. STAD of Cooperative learning gives maximum control for teacher to teach writing with large or small classes to convey the students' interest and motivation in writing narrative text subject especially. Hopefully, the students will write narrative text better STAD of cooperative learning.

## D. Hypothesis

Based on the explanation above the researcher formulated hypothesis of the research is "There is the effect Students achievements by using STAD is significantly than discussion on writing narrative text in MAN SIABU?

## CHAPTER III <br> RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

## A. Research Design

The method used in this research was experimental method. According to L.R Gay and Peter Airisian Stated that, experimental research is the only type of research that can test hypothesis to established cause and effect relationship. ${ }^{1}$ And IbnuHajar stated that experimental research is research design scientific which more careful and appropriate to do research the effect of something variable and another variable. ${ }^{2}$ In addition, Sugiyono stated that experimental research is a research that is used to find the effect of treatment, different with the other research does not use treatment. ${ }^{3}$

From the quotation above, researcher concludes that the experimental research was a kind of research which had to aim to know the causal effect relationship between one or more variables to another variable. So, writer will use experiment method as research design on "the effect of cooperative learning STAD on student's writing achievements in narrative text at first grade in MAN Siabu"

[^12]Table 1 Research Design of Instrument

| Class | Pretest | Treatment | Post test |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Experiment | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Control | $\checkmark$ | X | $\checkmark$ |

## 1. Pre-test

The pre-test is conducted to find out the homogeneity of the sample. Its function is to find scores of the STAD and discussion group before the writer treatment. In case, the writer hopes that the whole student's narrative text ability of writing narrative text ability. The experimental group and the control group are given some mate are same or if there is a difference between those group, the difference is hopefully not significant.
2. Treatment

The experimental group and the control group were given same material, which was consisted of communication aspects that will be taught by the teacher in different ways. The experimental groups was given treatment, it was taught by using the group presentation technique and the control group was taught by the conventional technique.

## 3. Post-test

After giving the treatment, the researcher conducted a post-test which the same test with the pre-test and it must conduct in the previous of the research. The post test will be the final test in the research, especially in measuring the
treatment whether it is significant or not. After conducting the post test, the researcher analysis the data.

## B. Time and Place of Research

This research will be done at MAN SIABU. It is located at Jl. MedanPadang, Kabupaten Mandailing Natal. This subject of research is at the first grade of students at MAN SIABU. This research is planned to start from April 2013 until finally.

## C. The Population and the Sample

## 1. Population

According to SuharsimiArikunto, "Populasiadalahkeseluruhan data subject penelitian". ${ }^{4}$ It means that population is the entire subject of the research. According to Gay and Airisian, "population is the group of interest to the researcher, the group to which she or he would like the results of the study to be generalizable". ${ }^{5}$ The last, Ary said that population is all members of well defined class of people, event, objects. ${ }^{6}$

From the definition above, it could be concluded that the population was the entire subject under study.

The population of this research is all the ten grade students of MAN Siabu in 2012/2013 academic year. This school consists of ten classes which consist of 183 students.

[^13]
## Table 2

The Population of the first Grade Students of MAN Siabu
In 2012/2013 academic year

| No. | Class | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | X.1 | 30 |
| 2 | X.2 | 30 |
| 3 | X.3 | 33 |
| 4 | X.4 | 30 |
| 5 | X.5 | 30 |
| 6 | X.6 | 30 |
| Total of Students |  |  |

2. Sample

According to Gay and Airisian, "Sample comprises the individuals, items, or events selected from a larger group referred to as a population. ${ }^{7}$ Suharsimi Arikunto said that when subject less than 100, sample was taken from all total of subject, while if its amount more than 100 , sample was taken by $10 \%-15 \%$ or $20 \%-25 \%$ or more appropriate with the researcher's ability. ${ }^{8}$ Therefore, in this sample, the analysis, but the group or classes consist of several individuals. The writer concludes this technique is used in this research, because the population is homogeneous. It means that in this research the sample
a. Normality test

To know whether data of research has normal. So, reseracher used ChiQuadrate formula, as follow:

[^14]$$
x^{2}=\sum\left(\frac{f_{o}-f_{h}}{f_{h}}\right)
$$

Where:

| $\mathrm{x}^{2}=$ | Chi-Quadrate |
| ---: | :--- |
| $\mathrm{f}_{0}=$ | Frequency is gotten from the sample/result of observation |
|  | (questioner) |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{h}}=$ | Frequency is gotten from the sample as image from |
|  | frequency is hoped from the population ${ }^{9}$ |

To calculate the result of Chi-Quadrate, expriment class (X-1) after doing the calculation, researcher found that ${ }^{2}{ }_{\text {count }}=4,69<\mathrm{x}_{\text {table }}^{2}=7,81$ used significant level $5 \%$ degree of freedom as big as total of frequency is lessened $3(\mathrm{dk}=5-$ 3). If result $x^{2}$ count $<x^{2}$ table. .So, it was could be concluded that the data was distributed by normal. Researcher calculation, it can be seen on the appendix XII. b. Homogenityvariant test

Homogeneity variant test was used to know whether control class and experimental class have the same variant or not. If the both of classes was same, it was could be called homogeneous. To test it, researcher used formula as follow:

$$
\mathrm{F}=\frac{\text { The Biggest Variant }}{\text { The Smallest Variant }}
$$

Where:

$$
\mathrm{n}_{1}=\text { Total of the data that bigger variant }
$$

[^15]$$
\mathrm{n}_{2}=\text { Total of the data that smaller variant }
$$

Criteria:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& H_{0}: \sigma_{1}{ }^{2}=\sigma_{2}^{2} \\
& H_{a}: \sigma_{1}{ }^{2} \neq \sigma_{2}{ }^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Where:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sigma_{1}{ }^{2}=\text { Variantof experimental class } \\
& \sigma_{2}{ }^{2}=\text { Variant of control class }^{10}
\end{aligned}
$$

$\mathrm{H}_{0}$ is accepted if $\mathrm{F} \leq F_{\frac{1}{2}}^{\left(n_{1}-1\right)\left(n_{2}-1\right)}$ while if $\mathrm{F}_{\text {count }}>\mathrm{F}_{\text {table }}$. So, $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ is rejected with significant level $5 \%(0,05)$ andF $_{\text {count was }} 0,12$ with significant level $\alpha=5 \%$ withdk $=\left(n_{1}+n_{2}-2\right)=(30+30-2)=68$ from the distributing list $F$ was found that $\mathrm{F}_{\text {table }}$ was 1.91 , cause $\mathrm{F}_{\text {count }}<\mathrm{F}_{\text {table }}(0,12<1.67)$.So, no difference the variant between the both of classes (homogeneous). From the above explanation the data was distributed normal and homogen. It means in this research the researcher use random sampling to taken the sample, as X. 1 ( Expriment class) and X. 2 (Control class), total of students was 60 students. it can be seen on the appendix XVIII.

## D. Instrument

A research must have a good instrument because it is able to guarantee for taking the valid data. In addition, Arikunto says," Instrument of the research is a tool of facility which is used by researcher in collecting data so that the process is

[^16]easier and better or more careful, complete, and systematic". ${ }^{11}$ In this research, the instrument of collecting data is using test.

Based on the definition above, when doing the research must use a tool, it means can be object or facility and its function is to collect the data from the field. In this research is the collection of many questions.

In making the instrument, it is based on both variables. In this case, teaching with cooperative STAD as independent or X variable and writing narrative text ability as dependent or Y variable.

## Test arrangement

The type of the test is task writing which form makes a opus. The researcher will gave a title narrative text. Then, students will write story title the appropriate narrative text. After that, the answer sheets collected for the analysis or examined by researcher. The function of the test is to measure students writing narrative achievement. In arranging the test, the researcher follows, the indicator writing:

## Grammar

\left.| No. | Indicator | Score |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Few ( if any) noticeable errors of grammar or word order |  |$\right\} 6$| 2 | Some error of grammar or word order which do not <br> however, interfere with comprehension |
| :---: | :--- |

[^17]| 3 | Error of grammar or word order fairly frequent occasional <br> re- reading necessary for full comprehension | 4 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 4 | Errors of grammar of word order frequent: efforts of <br> interpretation sometimes required an reader's part | 3 |
| 5 | Error of grammar of word order very frequent reader of ten <br> has to rely on own interpretation | 2 |
| 6 | Errors of grammar of word order so severe as to make <br> comprehension virtually impossible | 1 |

## Vocabulary

| No. | Indicator | Score |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | Use of vocabulary and idiom rarely (it at all) <br> distinguishable from that of educated native writer | 6 |
| 2 | Occasionally uses in appropriate terms or relies on <br> circumlocution: expression or ideas hardly impaired | 5 |
| 3 | Uses writing or inappropriate word fairly frequently <br> expression of ides maybe limited because of in adequate <br> vocabulary | 4 |
| 4 | Limited vocabulary and frequent errors clearly hinder <br> expression of ideas. | 3 |
| 5 | Vocabulary so limited and so frequently misused that <br> reader must often rely on own interpretation | 2 |
| 6 | Vocabulary limitation so extreme as to make <br> comprehension virtually impossible | 1 |

## Mechanic

| No. | Indicator | Score |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | Few (if any) noticeable lapses in punctuation or spelling | 6 |
| 2 | Occasional lapses in punctuation or spelling which do not, <br> however interfere with comprehension | 5 |
| 3 | Errors in punctuation or spelling fairly frequent occasional <br> re- reading necessary for full comprehension. | 4 |
| 4 | Frequent error in spelling or punctuation sometimes to <br> obscurity | 3 |
| 5 | Errors in spelling or punctuation so frequent that reader <br> must often rely on own interpretation | 2 |
| 6 | . Errors in spelling or punctuation so severe as to make <br> comprehension virtually impossible | 1 |

Fluency (style and ease of communication)

| No. | Indicator | Score |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | Choice of structures and vocabulary consistently <br> appropriate: like that of educated native writer | 6 |
| 2 | Occasional lack of consistently in choice of structures and <br> vocabulary which does not. | 5 |
| 3 | patchy, with some structures or vocabulary items <br> noticeably inappropriate to general style | 4 |
| 4 | Structures of vocabulary items sometime not only in <br> appropriate but also misused little sense of ease of <br> communication. | 3 |
| 5 | Communication often impaired by completely | 2 |


|  | inappropriate or misused structures or vocabulary items. |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 6 | . A hotch- potch of half learned misused structures and <br> vocabulary items rendering communication almost <br> impossible. | 1 |

## Form organization

| No. | Indicator | Score |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | Highly organized clear progression of ideas well linked : <br> like educated native writer | 6 |
| 2 | Material well organized linked could occasionally be <br> clearer but communication not impaired | 5 |
| 3 | Some lack of organization re- reading required for <br> clarification of ideas | 4 |
| 4 | Little or no attempt at connectivity, though reader can <br> deduce some organization | 3 |
| 5 | Individual ideas may be clear, but very difficult to deduce <br> connection between them. | 2 |
| 6 | . Lack of organization so severe that communication is <br> seriously impaired. ${ }^{12}$ | 1 |

## Score:

| No. | Indicator | Score |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | Grammar | 20 |
| 2 | Vocabulary | 20 |

${ }^{12}$ Arthur Hughes, Testing For Language Teachers, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. 91-93.

| 3 | Mechanic | 20 |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 4 | Fluency | 20 |
| 5 | Form organization | 20 |
|  | Total score | 100 |

## E. The Technique of Collecting Data

To get the data from the students, the writer collects by giving pre- test and post test to students. Test is some of question or view and other tool is used for measure skill, knowledge and intelligence ability. The test is divided into two kinds:

## 1. Pre-test

The pre-test is conducted to find out the homogeneity of the sample. Its function is to find scores of the STAD and discussion group before the writer treatment. In case, the writer hopes that the whole student's narrative text ability of writing narrative text ability. The experimental group and the control group are given some mate are same or if there is a difference between those group, the difference is hopefully not significant.
2. Post-test

After giving the treatment, the researcher conducted a post-test which the same test with the pre-test and it must conduct in the previous of the research. The post test will be the final test in the research.

## F. The Technique of the Data Analysis

## 1. Requirement test

a. Normality test

To know whether data of research has normal. So, reseracher used ChiQuadrate formula, as follow:

$$
x^{2}=\sum\left(\frac{f_{o}-f_{h}}{f_{h}}\right)
$$

Where:
$x^{2}=$ Chi-Quadrate
$\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{o}} \quad=$ Frequency is gotten from the sample/result of observation (questioner)
$\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{h}} \quad=$ Frequency is gotten from the sample as image from frequency is hoped from the population ${ }^{13}$

To calculate the result of Chi- Quadrate, it was used significant level $5 \%(0,05)$ and degree of freedom as big as total of frequency is lessened $3(\mathrm{dk}=\mathrm{k}-$ 3). If result $x_{\text {count }}^{2}<x_{\text {table }}^{2}$. So, it can be concluded that data is distributed by normal.
b. Homogeneity variant test

Homogeneity variant teat was used to know whether control class and experimental class have the same variant or not. If the both of classes is same, it is can be called homogeneous. To test it, researcher used formula as follow:

[^18]$$
\mathrm{F}=\frac{\text { The biggest variant }}{\text { The smallest variant }}
$$

Where:
$n_{1}=$ Total of the data that bigger variant
$n_{2}=$ Total of the data that smaller variant ${ }^{14}$

Hypothesis is rejected if $\mathrm{F} \leq \mathrm{F}_{\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{a}\left(\mathrm{n}_{1}-1\right)\left(1=\mathrm{n}_{2}-1\right)}$ while if $F_{\text {count }}>F_{\text {table }}$ hypothesis is accepted. It determined with significant level $5 \%(0,05)$ and dk numerator is $\left(\mathrm{n}_{1}-1\right)$ while dk denominator is $\left(\mathrm{n}_{2}-1\right)$.

## 2. Hypothesis Test

Data Analysis was used to test the hypothesis by using t -test, that:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}: \mu_{1} \neq \mu_{2} \\
& \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{o}}: \mu_{1}=\mu_{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

If $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}: \mu_{1}>\mu_{2}$, it was mean the result of students' writing achievements narrative text at first grade MAN Siabu was significant effect. But, if the $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ : it was meaning the result of students' writing achievement narrative using STAD of cooperative learning grade X MAN Siabu. Was no significant effect. To test the hypothesis, researcher used the formula as follow:

$$
t=\frac{\overline{x_{1}}-\overline{x_{2}}}{\sqrt[s]{\frac{1}{n_{1}}+\frac{1}{n_{2}}}}
$$

Where:

$$
\overline{x_{1}} \quad=\text { Mean of experimental class sample }
$$

[^19]$\overline{x_{2}} \quad=$ Mean of control classsample
$\mathrm{n}_{1} \quad=$ Total of experimental class sample
$\mathrm{n}_{2} \quad=$ Total of control class sample ${ }^{15}$

The formula of standard deviation was:

$$
s=\sqrt{\frac{\left(n_{1}-1\right) s_{1}{ }^{2}+\left(n_{2}-1\right) s_{2}{ }^{2}}{n_{1}+n_{2}-2}}
$$

Where:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{s} & =\text { Variant } \\
\mathrm{s}_{1}{ }^{2} & =\text { Variant of experimental class } \\
\mathrm{s}_{2}{ }^{2} & =\text { Variant of control class }^{16}
\end{array}
$$

To test criteria of hypothesis is if $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ is accepted by $-t_{\text {table }}<t_{\text {count }}<t_{\text {table. }}$ By opportunity $\left(1-\frac{1}{2} \alpha\right)$ and $d k=\left(n_{1}+n_{2}-2\right)$ and $H_{o}$ was rejected if there was $t$ has the other results.

[^20]
## CHAPTER IV

## RESULT OF THE RESEARCH

## A. Description of Data

The description of data was done by calculating the data of pre-test and post-test. The researcher used the formulation of T-test to test the hypothesis and to calculating more valid in calculating the data researcher to validated Mimunah S.Pd. I, Naimah S.Pd I and Retni Next, the researcher described the data as follow:

## 1. The Score of Experiment Class

a. Pre-test Experimental Class

Table 3
The Score of Experiment Class in Pre-test

| Total | 1905 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Highest School | 80 |
| Lowest Score | 40 |
| Range | 40 |
| Interval | 6 |
| Mean | 64,9 |
| SDt | 7 |
| Median | 62,2 |
| Modus | 60 |

Based on the table above the total score of experiment class in pre-test was 1905, mean was 64,9 , median was 62,2 modus was 60 . The researcher get the highest score was 80 and the lowest score was 40 . Next, the calculation of how to get it could be seen in the appendix X and XII. Then, the computed of the
frequency distribution of the students' score of experiment class could be applied into table frequency distribution as follow:

## Table 4

The Frequency Distribution of Students' Score

| No | Interval | Frequency | Percentages |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $40-46$ | 2 | $5 \%$ |
| 2 | $47-53$ | 1 | $5 \%$ |
| 3 | $54-60$ | 10 | $35 \%$ |
| 4 | $61-67$ | 9 | $30 \%$ |
| 5 | $68-74$ | 5 | $10 \%$ |
| 6 | $75-81$ | 3 | $15 \%$ |
| $i=7$ |  | 3 | $100 \%$ |

Based on the table above, it can be drawn at histogram as follow:


## b. Post-test Experiment Class

Table 5
The Score of Experiment Class in Post-test

| Total | 2175 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Highest Score | 80 |
| Lowest Score | 50 |
| Range | 30 |
| Interval | 5 |
| Mean | 79,5 |
| SDt | 8,3 |
| Median | 72,14 |
| Modus | 75 |

Based on the table above the total score of experiment class in post-test was 2175 , mean was 79,5 median was 72,14 modus was 75 . The researcher get the highest score was 80 and the lowest score was 50 . Next, the calculation of how to get it could be seen in the appendix X and XIV. Then, the computed of the frequency distribution of the students' score of experimentclass could be applied into table frequency distribution as follow:

Table 6
The Frequency Distribution of Students' Score

| No | Interval | Frequency | Percentages |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $50-54$ | 2 | $5 \%$ |
| 2 | $55-59$ | - | $0 \%$ |
| 3 | $60-64$ | 3 | $15 \%$ |
| 4 | $65-69$ | - | $0 \%$ |
| 5 | $70-74$ | 5 | $15 \%$ |
| 6 | $75-79$ | 11 | $35 \%$ |
| 7 | $80-84$ | 9 | $30 \%$ |
| $i=4$ |  |  |  |

Based on the table above, it can be drawn at histogram as follow:

2. The Score of Control Class
a. Pre-test Control Class

Table 7
The Score of Control Class in Pre-tes

| Total | 1895 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Highest Score | 80 |
| Lowest Score | 50 |
| Range | 30 |
| Interval | 5 |
| Mean | 65 |
| SDt | 7,4 |
| Median | 66,3 |
| Modus | 60 |

Based on the table above the total score of control class in pre-test was 1895, mean was 65 median was 66,3 modus was 60 . The researcher get the highest score was 80 and the lowest score was 50 . Next, the calculation of how to get it could be seen in the appendix XI and XIII.

From the table above, the researcher concluded that the students' ability before using conventional strategy was enough. It was improved by the means score of experiment class and control class was 60 and 60 . Then, the computed of the frequency distribution of the students' score of control class could be applied into table frequency distribution as follow:

Table 8
The Frequency Distribution of Students' Score

| No | Interval | Frequency | Percentages |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $50-54$ | 4 | $15 \%$ |
| 2 | $55-59$ | - | $0 \%$ |
| 3 | $60-64$ | 10 | $35 \%$ |
| 4 | $65-69$ | 9 | $30 \%$ |
| 5 | $70-74$ | 5 | $15 \%$ |
| 6 | $75-79$ | - | $\%$ |
| 7 | $80-84$ | 2 | $5 \%$ |
| $i=5$ |  | 30 | $100 \%$ |

Based on the table above, it can be drawn at histogram as follow:

b. Post-test Control Class

Table 9
The Score of Control Class in Post-test

| Total | 2095 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Highest Score | 85 |
| Lowest Score | 60 |
| Range | 25 |
| Interval | 4 |
| Mean | 70,64 |
| SDt | 7,7 |
| Median | 69,5 |
| Modus | 67,5 |

Based on the table above the total score of control class in post-test was 2095, mean was 70,64 median was 69,5 modus was 67,5 . The researcher get the highest score was 85 and the lowest score was 60 . Then, the calculation of how to get it could be seen in the appendix XI and XV. Next, the computed of the frequency distribution of the students' score of control class could be applied into table frequency distribution as follow:

Table 10
The Frequency Distribution of Students' Score

| No | Interval | Frequency | Percentages |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $60-63$ | 5 | $15 \%$ |
| 2 | $64-67$ | 10 | $35 \%$ |
| 3 | $68-71$ | 4 | $15 \%$ |
| 4 | $72-75$ | 5 | $15 \%$ |
| 5 | $76-79$ | - | $0 \%$ |
| 6 | $80-83$ | 4 | $15 \%$ |
| 7 | $84-87$ | 2 | $5 \%$ |
| $i=4$ |  | 30 | $100 \%$ |

Based on the table above, it can be drawn at histogram as follow:


## 3. Requirement Test

a. Normality test of Experiment Class and Control Class in Pre-test

Table 11
Normality Test and Homogeneity Test in Pre-test

| Class | Normality <br> Test |  | Homogeneity <br> Test |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{t}_{\text {count }}$ | $\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}$ | $\mathrm{t}_{\text {count }}$ | $\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}$ |
| Experiment <br> Class | 4,69 | 7,81 | $0,12<1,67$ |  |
| Control Class | 3,15 | 5,99 |  |  |

Based on the table aboveresearcher calculation, the score $\mathrm{x}^{2}$ tablewith degree of freedom $\mathrm{dk}=(\mathrm{k}-3)=(5-3)=2$ and significant level $\alpha$ was $5 \%$, researcher
found that $\mathrm{x}_{\text {table }}^{2}$ Was 5,99 . Cause $\mathrm{x}^{2}{ }_{\text {count }}<\mathrm{x}_{\text {table }}^{2}$ in the both class. So, $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{o}}$ is accepted, it means that experiment class and control class are distributed normal. Researcher calculation, it can be seen on the appendix XII and XIII.

## b. Homogenity test of experiment Class and Control Class in pre-test

From the researcher calculation of the homogeneity variant test, researcher found that $\mathrm{F}_{\text {countwas }} 0,12$ with significant level $\alpha=5 \%$ withdk $=\left(\mathrm{n}_{1}+\mathrm{n}_{2}-2\right)=$ $(30+30-2)=68$ from the distributing list F was found that $\mathrm{F}_{\text {table }}$ was1.91, cause $\mathrm{F}_{\text {count }}<\mathrm{F}_{\text {table }}(0,12<1.67)$. So, no difference the variant between the both of classes (homogeneous).Researcher calculation, it can be seen on the appendix XVIII.

So that, based on analysis the score pre-test, researcher was concluded that the sample is distributed normal and homogeneous (pre-test). It means that both of classes in this research is begun from the same situation.

## c. Normality Test of Experiment Class and Control Class in Post-test

Table 12
Normality Test and Homogeneity Test in Post-test

| Class | Normality <br> Test |  | Homogeneity <br> Test |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{t}_{\text {count }}$ | $\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}$ | $\mathrm{t}_{\text {count }}$ | $\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}$ |
| Experiment <br> Class | 5,62 | 5,99 | $4,59<2,02$ |  |
| Control Class | 3,62 | 3,84 |  |  |

Based on table aboveresearcher calculation of normality test to the experiment class by using skimming strategy in post-test, researcher found that the score $\mathrm{x}^{2}$ table with degree of freedom $\mathrm{dk}=(\mathrm{k}-3)=(4-3)=1$ and significant level $\alpha=5 \%$, researcher found that $\mathrm{x}_{\text {table }}^{2}=3.84, \mathrm{x}_{\text {count }}^{2}$ in the experiment classby using STAD of cooperative learningand in the control class by using conventional strategy $<\mathrm{x}^{2}$ table. Cause the both classes $\mathrm{x}^{2}{ }_{\text {count }}<\mathrm{x}_{\text {table. }}^{2}$ So, $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ is accepted, it means that the both classes are destributed normal. Researcher calculation, it can be seen on the appendix XIV and XV.

## d. Homogenity test experiment Class and Control Class in post-test

From the researcher calculation of the homogeneity variant test, researcher found that $\mathrm{F}_{\text {countwas }} 4,59$ with significant level $\alpha=5 \%$ withdk $=\left(\mathrm{n}_{1}+\mathrm{n}_{2}-2\right)=$ $(30+30-2)=58$ from the distributing list F was found that $\mathrm{F}_{\text {tablewas1.91, cause }}$ $\mathrm{F}_{\text {count }}<\mathrm{F}_{\text {table }}(4,59<2,02)$. So, no difference the variant between the both of classes (homogeneous).Researcher calculation, it can be seen on the appendix XVI

## B. Hypothesis Test

The data would be analyzed to prove hypothesis by using formula of T-test.
The result of the researcher calculation, it can be seen on the table as follow:
Table 13
Result of T-test from the Both Averages

| Pre-test |  | Post-test |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{t}_{\text {count }}$ | $\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}$ | $\mathrm{t}_{\text {count }}$ | $\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}$ |
| $\mathrm{O}, 12$ | 1,67 | 4,59 | 2,02 |

Hypothesis test uses the difference test of the both averages with criteria:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& H_{0}: \mu_{1}=\mu_{2} \\
& H_{a}: \mu_{1} \neq \mu_{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Where:
$H_{a}$ : There was a significant effect of using STAD of cooperative learning on student's achievement's writing narrative text.
$\mathrm{H}_{0}$ : There was no significant effect of using STAD of cooperative learning on student's achievement's writing narrative text.

Based on researchercalculation, researcher found that $t_{\text {count }} 4,59$ while $t_{\text {table }}$ 1,66. With opportunity $(1-\alpha)=1-5 \%=\%$ anddt $=\left(n_{1}+n_{2}-2\right)=(30+30$ $-2)=68$, cause $t_{\text {count }}>\mathrm{t}_{\text {table }}\left(4,59>2,02\right.$. It means that hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}\right)$ wasaccepted; it means there is a significant effect of using STAD of cooperative students' achievement on writing narrative text. It described the mean score of experiment class by using STAD of cooperative 79,5 and mean score of control class in using discussion strategy is 70,6 So, From the explanation above it was students' achievement writing narrative text by using STAD was better than conventional strategy $\left(\mu^{1>} \mu^{2}\right)$.Researcher calculation, it could be seen on appendix XVI

## C. Discussion

In this research, researcher found that the students' achievement in writing narrativeis low. Student's could't determine or understand about indicator of
narrative text orientation, complication, resolution, coda, lack of vocabulary, ideas and structure in a sentence, It is known when researcher asked them to find mean idea or information from the text directly, most of students can not answered it.

After doing the observation, researcher found the problem. It is because strategy that used in writing is bored. So the students' motivation in learning English especially in writing narrative is low. From the problem, researcher tried to give the treatment by using STAD of cooperative. STAD of cooperative was practiced by students in class which the students was full monitored by researcher to get the maximal result of this research. The purpose of this strategy is to examine is STAD can use in learning narrative text. The result of the treatment is students' writing achievements in narrative higher than before. Although the research found the effect was very low.

Analysis results and hypothesis testing show that both these variables have the effect and hypothesis alternative (Ha) was accepted. This means that students' writing narrative text achievement by using STAD of cooperative is better than conventional strategy $\left(\mu^{1>} \mu^{2}\right)$. Hypothesis zero (Ho) was rejected. Finally, the researcher concluded that STAD of cooperative learning was effective in writing narrative.

## D. The Threats of the Research

The steps of the research had been done appropriate with the steps which were on the methodology of research. The steps were done to get the result of the research objectively and systematically, but to get the excellence results from this research were more difficult because there were the weakness of this research.

The weakness of rsearcher such astime, because the students had activities, and also there were many weakness of the researcher that has not been known. In this research, the researcher had weakness in doing the research, because in MAN Siabu just heve examination semester and they not focus again to study, they always think on result of examination them. So that, the writer must repeat explanation of matery again in do research at X MAN Siabu.

In this research, there were so many problems, but the researcher attempted to do the best, so some weaknesses and decreases the meaning of this research were finished by consultation with the advisors.

## CHAPTER V <br> CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

## A. Conclusion

Based on the result of data analysis that has described in the previous chapter, the researcher concluded as follows:

1. The students' achievement in writing narrative text by using STAD cooperative learning at grade in MAN Siabu was 72,14
2. The students' achievement writing narrative using conventional strategy at first grade in MAN Siabu was 69,5
3. The Student's achievement's writing narrative by using STAD of cooperative learning was better than conventional strategy $\left(\mu_{1}>\mu_{2}\right)$. Hypothesis alternative $\left(\mathrm{H}_{a}\right)$ was accepted.. It can be seen from the mean score of experimental and control class (76.84> 72.12)..

## B. Suggestion

After finishing the research, researcher gets much information which relates to the teaching and learning process. In addition, the result of the research is using STAD cooperative has a significant effect on students' achievement's writing narrative and could help the students to increase their writing narrative text. Therefore, researcher has suggestion:

1. The researcher hopes that the students especially the first grade of MAN Siabu will improve their writing narrative by STAD of cooperative learning.
2. For the students, students should memorize and practice their writing narrative text in their daily activities.
3. For the teacher, STAD of cooperative learning can be used as a strategy in teaching writing to improve student's writing achievement in narrative text.
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