

THE EFFECT OF COOPERATIVE LEARNING TYPE TERROR CARDS AND NIGHTMARE CARDS TOWARDS THE ELEVENTH GRADE STUDENTS' SPEAKING

Enda Hendrawati (1), Muhammad Muhlisin (2)
English Department, FPBS IKIP Mataram
endahendawati@yahoo.co.id

Abstract

This research aimed to find out the effect of cooperative learning type terror cards and nightmare cards towards students' speaking skill at SMAN 1 Sakra Timur in academic year 2017/2018. The research was pre-experimental with one-shot case study design. The population of the study was the eleventh grade students of SMAN 1 Sakra Timur that consisted of 3 classes. All of classes were chosen as the samples, those were XI IPS 1 as experimental group I, XI IPS 2 as experimental group II and XI IPS 3 as control group. They were chosen by using total sampling technique. Experimental group I treated by using terror cards, experimental group II treated by using nightmare cards, and control group treated by using think pair share. The data of the research were gathered from speaking test and the data analysis used ANOVA. Based on the data analysis was gotten F-test = 3.352 and F-table = 2.44. It means that f-test was higher than f-table ($3.352 > 2.44$) with signification level 0.04. So that way, alternative hypothesis (H_a) accepted and null hypothesis (H_o) rejected. Therefore, it took conclusion that there is significant effect of cooperative learning toward students' speaking skill at SMAN 1 Sakra Timur in academic year 2017/2018.

Key Words: *Terror Cards, Nightmare Cards, and Speaking.*

Abstrak

penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui pengaruh cooperative learning type terror cards dan nightmare cards terhadap keahlian berbicara di SMAN 1 Sakra Timur tahun ajaran 2017/2018. Disain penelitian ini menggunakan pre experimental dengan desain one shot case study. Populasi dalam penelitian ini adalah seluruh siswa kelas sebelas di SMAN 1 Sakra Timur dan sampel penelitian dalam penelitian ini adalah kelas XI IPS I dan XI IPS II sebagai kelompok experimental dan kontrol. Sample dalam penelitian ini menggunakan total sampling teknik. Kelompok experimental I dan II diberikan treatment yang berbeda dengan menggunakan terror cards dan nightmare cards sedangkan control group dikasih treatment menggunakan think pair share. Pengumpulan dalam penelitian ini menggunakan speaking test (test kemampuan berbicara) dan data di analisis dengan menggunakan ANOVA. Berdasarkan data analysis diperoleh nilai F-hitung = 3.217 dan F-tabel = 0.05. artinya nilai f-hitung lebih besar daripada F – table ($3.217 > 2.44$) dengan derajat kebebasan 0.05. oleh sebab itu, hipotesis alternatif di terima dan hipotesis nihil di tolak. Oleh sebbab itu dapat diambil kesimpulan bahwa terdapat pengaruh signifikan penggunaan terror card dan nightmare cards terhadap keahlian berbicara di SMAN 1 Sakra Timur tahun ajaran 2017/2018

Kata Kunci: *Terror Cards, Nightmare Cards, dan Speaking*

INTRODUCTION

Speaking is one of important language skills in communicating orally with other. By speaking, people can interact with communicate orally with other people and

able to know about the information in the surrounding. According to Richards and Renandya, (2002: 204) state that effective oral communication requires the ability to use the language appropriately in social

interactions that involves not only verbal communication but also paralinguistic elements of speech such as pitch, stress, and intonation. It was speaking which serves as natural means of communication of the member's community for both expression of thought and form a social behavior. However, there were so many factors that influence students impression of how well someone speak a language, study make some discussion for easy to understand.

In teaching learning process, the students should master several speaking components, and the components of speaking such as; pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, comprehension, and fluency. After the conducted an observation the researcher found some problem in speaking. One of the problems that found by students in speaking skill was the students less to produce language when the students' speak, the students difficult to express their ideas, and the students difficult to speak fluently and accurately in front of class. Besides that, in the learning process has many obstacles that hinder of the students process. One of the problems from the teacher was less communicative between students and the method previously of the teacher less precise or not suitable with the through material. The method used previously by the teacher was cooperative learning type Think Pair Share less effective in developing students speaking skills, so that students were lack in speaking, difficult to understand a material and get bored in the class because it takes a long time in learning process.

Furthermore, most of the students confused in expressing their opinions because the students' did not know what the students' want to say and also feared of making mistakes when the students' speaking in the classroom. To solve the problem teachers should be creative in choose suitable method. Therefore the team interest in taking the tittle "the effect of cooperative learning type terror cards and

nightmare cards towards the eleventh grade students' speaking skill at SMAN 1 Sakra Timur in academic year 2017/2018?

Review of Related Literature

According to Brown, (2004: 140) speaking is a productive skill that can be directly and empirically observed, those observations are invariably colored by the accuracy and effectiveness of a test-takers listening skill, which necessarily compromises the reliability and validity of an oral production test.

According to Richards and Renandya, (2002: 204) state that effective oral communication requires the ability to use the language appropriately in social interactions that involves not only verbal communication but also paralinguistic elements of speech such as pitch, stress, and intonation. Speaking is the process of producing words and sentences by used spoken language in which speaking was a communication tool that used in everyday life. The people can interact with communicated orally with other people and able to know about the information in the surrounding.

Based on the definitions above, it can be inferred that speaking was a basic of person skill to produced language that has meaning and be understood by other people about what the speaker says. Speaking ability of students developed new ideas in something usual being something different that something which was never imagined with people in which, someone can overcome the problems by give the ideas or create something new because they has good comprehension.

In this part, the researcher wants to show the indicator of speaking. According to Brown, (2004: 140) there were five indicators of speaking they were:

Pronunciation: Pronunciation is the way for students to produced language when they speak. It deals with the phonological

process that determine how sounds vary and pattern in a language.

Grammar: It is needed for students to arrange a correct sentence in conversation, or the student's ability to manipulate structure and to distinguish appropriate ones. The utility of grammar was also to learn the correct way to gain expertise in a language in oral and written form.

Vocabulary: One cannot communicate effectively or express their ideas both oral and written from if they do not has sufficient vocabulary. So, vocabulary means the appropriate diction which used in communication.

Fluency: Fluency can be defined as the ability to speak fluently and accurately. Signs of fluency include a reasonably fast speed of speaking and only a small number of pauses and 'ums' or 'ers'. These signs indicate that the speaker does not has to spend a lot of time searching for the language items needed to express the message.

Comprehension: For oral communication certainly requires a subject to respond speech as well as to initiate it.

Rubric Score of Speaking

It based on Brown, (2004: 172-173), state scale rating scores as follow:

Table 1. Scoring Rubric of Speaking

No.	Indicator	Score	Description
1.	Pronunciation	5	Equivalent to and fully accepted by educated native speakers.
		4	Errors in pronunciation are quite rare.
		3	Errors never interfere with understanding and rarely

			disturb the native speakers. Accent may be obviously foreign.
		2	Accent is intelligible through often quite faulty.
		1	Error in pronunciation are frequent but can be understood by a native speakers used to dealing with foreigner attempting to speak his language.
2.	Vocabulary	5	Speech on all level is fully accepted by educated native speakers in all its features including breadth of vocabulary and idioms, colloquialisms, and pertinent cultural references.
		4	Can understand and participate in any conversation within the range of his experience with a high degree of precision of vocabulary.
		3	Able to speak the language with sufficient vocabulary to

			participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, and professional topics. Vocabulary is broad enough that he rarely has to grope for a word.			sufficient structural accuracy to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, and professional topics.
		2	Has speaking vocabulary sufficient to express him simply with some circumlocutions.		2	Can usually handle elementary constructions quite accurately but does not have thorough or confident control of the grammar.
		1	Speaking vocabulary inadequate to express anything but the most elementary needs.		1	Errors in grammar are frequent, but speaker can be used to dealing with foreigners attempting to speak his language.
3.	Grammar	5	Equivalent to that of an educated native speaker.			
		4	Able to use the language accurately on all levels normally pertinent to professional needs. Errors in grammar are quite rare.		4.	Comprehension
		3	Control of grammar is good. Able to speak the language with		5	Equivalent to that of an educated native speaker.
					4	Can understand any conversations within the range of his experience.
					3	Comprehension is quite complete at a normal rate of speech.

		2	Can get the gist of most conversations of non-technical subjects (i.e., topics that require no specialized knowledge).			ease. Rarely has to grope for words.
		1	Within the scope of his very limited language experience, can understand simple questions and statements if delivered with slowed speech, repetition, or paraphrase.		2	Can handle with confidence but not with facility most social situations, including introductions and casual conversations about current events, as well as work, family and autobiographical information.
					1	(No specific fluency description. Refer to other four language areas for implied level of fluency.)
5.	Fluency	5	Has complete fluency in the language such as that his speech is fully accepted by educated native speaker.			
		4	Able to use the language fluently on all levels normally pertinent to professional needs. Can conversation within the range of this experience with a high degree of fluency.			
		3	Can discuss particular interests of competence with reasonable			

Cooperative Learning Type Terror Cards

According to Macpherson, (2008: 63) Terror cards is one of the cooperative learning types in which teachers choose random codes to identify who will participate. The card contains the initials of each student's name. This method aimed to be individually accountable in a team or group situation or encourage individual accountability of group members. The role of the Terror Card ensures that the same person was not selected and there was random individual accountability.

According to Plevin, (2016: 29) Terror Card provides a great way of making sure that all students are included in a lesson. The teacher randomly picks a terror card to identify who was participating in a given activity.

This method can be used to overcome barriers to equal opportunities that often color group work. In many groups, there was often a child who was overly dominant and does not talk. Conversely, there was also a child who was passive and resigned to his partner who was more dominant. In such a situation, equal distribution of responsibilities within a group cannot be achieved because a passive child was too dependent on his dominant partner. This method ensures that every student has the opportunity to participate and everyone ready to respond.

Procedures of Cooperative Learning Type Terror Cards: (1) Ask students write their first name and initial on an index card. (2) Teacher shuffles the deck of cards and stores them in a box on his/her desk. (3) Teacher makes some group discussion. (4) Teacher gave a topic for discussion with the partner. (5) Whenever a response is required from a student a Terror Card is drawn from the deck and the named student is called on to answer or participate. (6) The card is returned to the box of cards.

Based on the method there are advantages and disadvantages of the Cooperative Learning Type Terror Cards. Advantages of Terror Cards to make the students more able to practice speaking in front of the class because the students must discussion with the partner group and more able to express their idea. Disadvantages of Terror Cards, the students got high anxiety because the teacher select the students were randomly for practice speaking in front of the class and everyone in the group was ready to respond. It takes a long time to prepare for the task.

Nightmare Cards

According to Macpherson, (2008: 74) Nightmare cards is a cooperative learning type by using a card or worst case to identify the worst scenarios you can imagine or that might happen to ourselves. This method asks

students to work in groups with other students for how to discuss the "worst case scenario" to change students' perceptions of what might happen and what students might do about it. A good structure to used at the end of a topic or prior assessment to consolidate student learning and to identify common misconceptions.

According to Millis, (1994: 327) Nightmare cards is one of cooperative learning has some skeptical students. There are discussion questions at the end. Nightmare cards were methods that require the exchange of thoughts and information between students to found solutions from the worst case scenario.

Allows students to share information with their respective group pairs and work together to found solutions. In this method students has many opportunities to process information and improve communication skills.

Procedures of Cooperative Learning Type Nightmare Cards: (1) Teacher makes some group discussion. (2) Teacher gave a topic (bad or nightmare scenarios) for discussion with the partner. (3) Teacher asking the students give the respond about the bad scenarios or nightmare scenarios, change perception of students and what might happen or what the students might do about it. (4) Teacher asking the students for presentation about the bad scenarios or nightmare scenarios, give the solution about the topic.

Based on the method there were advantages and disadvantages of the Cooperative Learning Type Nightmare Cards. Advantages of Nightmare Cards to make the students feel good in learning and enjoy with the material, able to create an active and fun learning atmosphere. Disadvantages of Nightmare Cards, the students' with may make quite nervous because the students must identify imaginary but realistic worst case scenarios for situations. Demanding certain traits of

students or the tendency to work together in solved problems.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

The method that used in this research was pre-experimental with One-Shot Case Study in which in this design the groups of the research was not used by randomly. According to Sugiyono, (2013: 74) One-Shot Case Study was consist of two groups that were experimental group and control group, both of these groups were gave the post-test only without pre-test, then experimental group was being treated by used “Cooperative Learning Type Terror Cards and Cooperative Learning Type Nightmare Cards” while control group was being used Cooperative Learning Type Think Pair Share of the method previously by the teacher.

Population Study

According to Miller, (2005: 53) a population is defined as collection of all the possible object, people or scores of a particular type. Based on the research, the population of the study is included the eleventh grade of the students of SMAN 1 Sakra Timur in the school year 2017/2018 which consist of three classes those were XI IPS 1= 16, XI IPS 2 = 15 and XI IPS 3= 16 students. So the total numbers of population in that eleventh grade are 47 students. Where in XI IPS 1 and XI IPS 2 class has been experimental group and XI IPS 3 class has been control group. To determine the sample of this research, the researcher used the total sampling technique because all of the population as sample.

Research Instrument

Instrument was a tool that the researcher used in testing students' speaking skill in this research; the researcher used one kind of instruments for speaking skill is “Speaking Test”. Speaking test was an instrument to found out the effect of

teaching speaking by used cooperative learning type terror cards and cooperative learning type nightmare cards, the researcher provided oral test and video recording as an instrument of this research, the scoring of the test and record were highly subjective and the researcher divided as five criteria, which were the scores of pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension.

At the end to identify whether the data was homogeneity. The value of F-obtained compared to F-table. If the result of F-obtained was lower than F-table (F-obtained < F-table) means that the data was homogeneity. After the normality and homogeneity found the counting would continue to the analysis of variants for one way anova. The formula was as follow:

Table 2. One Way Anova or Single Classification

SV	Df	Sum of Quadrate (SQ)	Mean of Quadrate (MQ)	F-test
Tot	N-1	$X_{tot}^2 \frac{\sum X_{tot}^2}{n_{group}}$		
Between group	m-1	$\frac{\sum (\sum group)^2}{N}$	$\frac{SQ_{bet}}{m-1}$	$\frac{MQ_{bet}}{MQ_{wit}}$
Within group	N-1	$SQ_{tot} - SQ_{bet}$	$\frac{SQ_{wit}}{N-m}$	

(Sugiyono, 2017: 173)

RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Research Findings

This chapter presented the data analysis of pretest and posttest. These result showed the students ability before and after given treatment with different learning

model. The following table was the result of the students' speaking score of pre-test and post-test in detail:

The researcher calculated the result of pre-test done in experimental group I, experimental group II, and control group towards the eleventh grade students' speaking skill. The result of pre-test towards students' speaking skill in experimental group I used Terror Cards, experimental group II used Nightmare Cards and Control group used Think Pair Share. Based on the output table of SPSS above, that before the students were given the treatment used the method, the initial ability of the students in experimental group I has an average of 66.37 with the highest score of 73, the lowest score of 58 and the standard deviation of 5.38, at the experimental group II class has an average of 65.20 with the highest score of 73, the lowest score of 54 and the standard deviation of 5.91 and the control group has an average of 65.87 with the highest score of 73, the lowest score of 54 and the standard deviation of 6.24.

The researcher compared the result of Chi Square obtained to Chi Square table. If the result of Chi Square obtained was lower than Chi Square table (Chi Square obtained < Chi Square table) it means that the data was in normal distribution.

Based on the output of SPSS, the researchers look at the data analysis used Shapiro-Wilk because the researcher has the total number of students was 47, where Shapiro-Wilk data analysis used if the population was less than 50. It means that the data was normal with distribution significant level 0.05.

The result in the table above, sig. for experimental I has a value of 0.067 while the sig. for experimental II has a value of 0.332. And sig. to control has value of 0.051, so that way, alternative hypothesis accepted.

After doing the data analysis of homogeneity, the researchers found that the

score of F-test was lower than F-table. This indicated that the data was homogeneity.

Based on SPSS analysis was gotten that the level significant of homogeneity was 0.876. Where the result of this analysis showed the score of homogeneity test was higher than F – Table ($0.876 > 0.05$). So that way, it took the conclusion that there was similar variance between terror cards and nightmare cards in first and second experimental groups treatment, and also with the variance of control group that treated by using think pair share.

After gave the treatment the researcher got the result of post-test towards students' speaking skill in experimental group I used Terror Cards, experimental group II used Nightmare Cards and Control group used Think Pair Share, the researcher gathered the data as follows:

Based on the result of SPSS analysis above, the researcher found the average score of experimental group I was 75.12 with higher score 81 and lower score 65, standard deviation 5.22. In the experimental group II the researcher found the average score of experimental group I was 80.26 with higher score 87 and lower score 68, standard deviation 5.58. The control group has an average was 75.93 with the highest score was 84, the lowest was 65 and the standard deviation was 6.78.

The researcher compared the result of Chi Square obtained to Chi Square table. If the result of Chi Square obtained was lower than Chi Square table (Chi Square obtained < Chi Square table) it means that the data was normal distribution.

Based on the output of SPSS, the researchers look at the data analysis used Shapiro-Wilk because the researcher has the total number of students was 47, where Shapiro-Wilk data analysis used if the population was less than 50. It means that the data was normal with distribution significant level 0.05.

The result in the table above, sig. for experimental I has a value of 0.051 while the sig. for experimental II has a value of 0.060. And sig. to control has value of 0.064, so that way, alternative hypothesis accepted.

After doing the data analysis of homogeneity, the researchers found that the score of F-test was lower than F-table. This indicated that the data was homogeneity.

Based on SPSS analysis was gotten that the level significant of homogeneity was 0.317. Where the result of this analysis showed the score of homogeneity test was higher than F-Table ($0.317 > 0.05$). So that way, it took the conclusion that there was similar variance between terror cards and nightmare cards in first and second experimental groups treatment, and also with the variance of control group that treated by using think pair share.

After all three variance proved has normality and homogeneity, the researchers tested one way ANOVA, to test whether the three variance has the similarity of average. Output of ANOVA was the end of the calculation used as a determination analysis of the hypothesis to be accepted or rejected.

Based on SPSS analysis was gotten that F-test = 3.352 with the significant level 0.04 and F-table = 2.44 with the value of F table was 3.21, It mean that F-test was higher than F-table ($3.352 > 3.21$) with significant level 0.05, it indicate H_a is accepted and H_0 is rejected. In conclusion: there is significant effect of cooperative learning type terror cards and nightmare cards towards the eleventh grade students' speaking skill at SMAN 1 Sakra Timur in academic year 2017/2018.

Discussion

Based on the data analysis, the value of students' speaking skill in pre-test for experimental group I (terror cards) of mean was 66.37, in experimental group II (nightmare cards) was 65.20 and control group (think pair share) was 65.87. Then the

value of descriptive analysis of students' speaking skill in post-test, the value mean of experimental group I (terror cards) was 75.12, experimental group II (nightmare cards) was 80.26 and control group (think pair share) was 75.93 From the explanation above, it can be seen that, there was significant different between the result of pre-test and post-test. Cooperative learning type nightmare cards (experimental group II) were more effective towards students' speaking skills than cooperative learning type terror cards and think pair share.

Based on the explanation above, the researcher concluded from table one way anova used SPSS, F-test = 3.352 and F-table = 2.44 with the value of F-table 3.21, and significant level in table of one way anova was 0.04.

The value of F-test was 3.352 is greater than F-table 3.21, F-test > F-table was $3.352 > 3.21$ with significant level $0.04 < 0.05$, it means H_0 is rejected and H_a accepted. It was clear that: There is a significant effect of cooperative learning on the eleventh grade students' speaking skill at SMAN 1 Sakra Timur in academic year 2017/2018.

According to Macpherson, (2008: 74) Advantage of Nightmare Cards to make the students felt good in learning and enjoy with the material, able to create an active and fun learning atmosphere, because cooperative learning type nightmare cards used the script with the sentence for gave the topic and the students must discussion with the partner of group it makes the students easy to found solution, beside that from the script, the students got idea for express their idea when speak in front of class, and more speak fluently and accurately for developed the contents of the script. While terror cards was less effective between nightmare cards because used the poster for the topic. The students got difficult to found idea or developed their idea because the researcher only gave the poster without the script with

the sentence. So, the students did not know what the students want to say or speak and in terror cards the students was ready to respond when the teacher select the students were randomly, it makes the students feel more afraid for speak in front of class and for think pair share was less effective between nightmare cards and terror cards because in the learning process take a long time, it makes the students got bored in the class and less attention about the topic in learning process.

CONCLUSION

In the SPSS of one way anova output table, the researcher analyzed the H_a and H_o hypotheses. From table one way anova above $F\text{-test} = 3.352$ and $F\text{-table} = 2.44$ with the value of $F\text{-table} 3.21$, and significant level in table of one way anova was 0.04 .

The value of $F\text{-test}$ was 3.352 is greater than $F\text{-table} 3.21$, $F\text{-test} > F\text{-table}$ was $3.352 > 3.21$ with significant level $0.04 < 0.05$, it means H_a is accepted and H_o is rejected. It indicates the alternative hypothesis (H_a), which states “There is a significant effect of cooperative learning on the eleventh grade students' speaking skill at SMAN 1 Sakra Timur in academic year 2017/2018” is accepted. Meanwhile the null hypothesis (H_o) which, states “There is no a significant effect of cooperative learning on the eleventh grade students' speaking skill at

SMAN 1 Sakra Timur in academic year 2017/2018” is rejected.

REFERENCES

- Brown, H. Douglas. 2004. *Language Assessment Principle and Classroom Practices*. San Francisco: Longman..
- Macpherson, Alice. 2008. *Cooperative Learning Group Activities For College Courses A Guide For Instructors*. Kwantlen Polytechnic University.
- Miller, Steve. 2005. *Experimental Design and Statistic*. Second Edition. London and New York: Routledge.
- Millis, Barbara J. 1994. *Conducting Cooperative Cases*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska.
- Plevin, Rob. 2016. *Engaging Lesson Activities*.
www.needfocusedteaching.com.
- Richards, Jack C., & Renandya, Willy A. 2002. *Methodology in Language Teaching an Anthology of Current Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sugiyono. 2013. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R & D*. Bandung: Alfa beta.
- 2017. *Statistika untuk Penelitian*, Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Thornbury, Scott. 2002. *How to Teach Vocabulary*. England: www.longman.com.