

**STUDENT'S ABILITY IN ENGLISH SPEAKING SKILL BY USING PICTURE
(A COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN MUHAMMADIYAH ISLAMIC SCHOOL AND
SMAN 1 SIMEULUE TIMUR)**

Indratmoko Ariwibowo¹

ABSTRACT

This study is intended to figure out if there is a significant difference in English speaking ability between public school students and Islamic school students. The population of this study is the second year students of both SMAN 1 Simeulue Timur and Muhammadiyah Islamic School Simeulue Timur. The samples of this study were 20 students taken from two classes at SMAN 1 Simeulu Timur and 20 students taken from two classes at Muhammadiyah Islamic School Simeulue Timur. So, the total number of samples from the two schools was 40 students. In collecting the data, the writer gave a picture of 26th December 2004 tsunami in Aceh. The students were asked to describe the picture by their own words. In analyzing the data, the writer used t-test formula to see the significant difference between the students of the two schools in English speaking ability. The mean and standard deviation scores for Muhammadiyah Islamic School Simeulue Timur are 35.25 and 8.20. While the mean and standard deviation scores for SMAN 1 Simeulue Timur are 39 and 8. The result of t-test of the two schools is 13.20. It is considered higher than t value on the table if significance at level 0.05 and 38 for the degree of the freedom which is stated 2.02. The writer concludes that the speaking ability between SMAN 1 Simeulue Timur and Muhammadiyah Islamic School Simeulue Timur is significantly different. Furthermore, the writer found that students of SMAN 1 Simeulue Timur are better in speaking ability than those of Muhammadiyah Islamic School Simeulue Timur. Therefore, the writer suggests that the teachers of boarding school should evaluate their teaching learning process and have more motivation to improve their student's ability English speaking

Keywords: *Speaking, Picture*

¹ Indratmoko Ariwibowo, Dosen Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris – STKIP Bina Bangsa Getsempena, Jalan Tgk Chik Di Tiro, Peuniti, Banda Aceh, Telepon 0651-33427, Email: moko@stkipbbg.ac.id

A. Background of the study

English has four major skills. They are listening, speaking, reading and writing. Among the other skills, speaking is considered as the most important skill in learning a language. According to Brown and G. Yule. (1988:76), "Many language learners regard speaking ability as the measure of knowing a language". These learners define fluency as the ability to converse with others, much more than the ability to read, write, or comprehend oral language. They regard speaking as the most important skill they can acquire, and they assess their progress in terms of their accomplishments in spoken communication.

Speaking skill has become the first priority to be taught between the four skills since communicative approach implementation has been influential in foreign language learning. It is based on instruction goal of curriculum 2006 of KTSP (Disdiknas 2006). English teachers should create active learning condition and develop their technique to help learners communicate more effectively by considering suitable activities for each group of learner. Brown and Yule (1988:103) say that one of the main aims of most English teachers is to make their students able to communicate and convey information effectively in spoken English. Besides, the English teachers should create active learning condition and develop their techniques.

Scott (1982:70) states that oral communication is an activity involving two or more people whom the participants are the

hearer and the speaker. The hearer is the person who gets the message and the speaker is the person who gives the message. Student, who studies English, certainly has to be active in speaking. Before the students are expected to speak well and fluently, they should already have good knowledge about language aspect such as grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary. In order to speak well, Susan (1978:43) points out that a learner of a language need to know and master grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary. Bourdon in Nunan (1993:43) states that spoken language needs the mastery of vocabulary habit. This means that practice speaking needs much time to fulfill the requirements of the mastery of spoken English, either from school or the environment.

Speaking is a skill in language mastery. Improving speaking skill, a lot of practice is needed. As the writer mentioned above, there are four skills while learning a language. But improving speaking skill is different from the other skills. The other three, the learner can practice alone, on his/her own, without anyone else. He/she can listen to the radio alone, read a book alone, write a letter alone, but the learner can't really speak alone. That is why in increasing speaking skill, it is important to make every effort possible to find somebody to speak with.

In this case the institution like schools play an important role in the learning process. The writer will try to compare students' speaking ability between two school which

have different system. They are Muhammadiyah Islamic School and SMAN 1 Simeulue Timur.

At Muhammadiyah, they have English and Arabic as the subjects, they have to practise both of the languages at school, they have to speak with their friends and teachers with those both foreign languages every school days, six days a week.

At SMAN 1 Simeulue Timur although they just have English as the subject but the English teachers also the students have their own way to increase their English Speaking ability, they make one day to speak only in English between English teachers and the students.

Based on this situation, the writer considers that this kind of situation help the students of Muhammadiyah to increase their speaking ability. Otherwise, the students of SMAN 1 Simeulue Timur do not have enough friends and time to practice their English for, they just meet their friends and teacher only at school which has limited time. Due to the fact, the writer would like to investigate whether there are some significant differences in English speaking ability between Muhammadiyah Islamic School students and SMAN 1 Simeulue Timur students due to the different system of the two schools.

B. Result and Discussion

Before analyzing the collected data, it is first necessary to tabulate them in such a manner. Data tabulation is needed to make analysis more systematic and easier. The aim of data tabulation is to compare the score

between the result of oral test at boarding school and non boarding school in material presentation. Firstly, the writer gives the score to oral proficiency of the samples. Then, the data was made in the table in order to make it easy. After the writer made the data tabulation, she employed some statistical formulas that are mean score, standard deviation and T-test.

1. Students' Scores of Oral Test at Muhammadiyah Islamic School

Table 1. Students' Scores of Oral Test At Islamic School.

		Aspects						
		Grammar	Vocabulary	fluency	Pronunciation			
1	859	1	2	1	2	6	30	
2	764	1	2	2	2	7	35	
3	767	1	2	1	1	5	25	
4	769	1	1	2	2	6	30	
5	774	1	2	2	1	6	30	
6	783	1	2	3	2	8	40	
7	827	1	1	2	1	5	25	
8	827	2	1	1	2	6	30	
9	865	1	1	1	1	7	35	
10	866	2	1	2	1	6	30	
11	829	2	2	3	2	9	45	
12	830	2	3	3	2	10	50	
13	796	1	2	2	2	7	35	
14	797	1	2	2	1	6	30	
15	795	2	2	3	2	9	45	
16	799	1	1	2	1	5	25	
17	873	2	1	1	2	6	30	
18	837	2	2	3	3	10	50	
19	838	2	3	3	2	10	50	
20	802	1	2	3	1	7	35	
TOTAL								705

This table means that the total score ($\sum X_1$) for this test was 705. The count of the raw score was the sum of the oral proficiency score consisting grammar proficiency,

vocabulary, fluency, and pronunciation. Then, they were multiplied with five. The highest score was 50. It was obtained by three students (student 12, 18, and 19). While the lowest score was 25. It was obtained by three students (student 3, 7, and 16).

The mean score is:

$$\bar{X}_1 = \frac{\sum X_1}{N_1}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{X}_1 &= \frac{705}{20} \\ &= 35.25 \end{aligned}$$

This score means that the average score for this test was in the middle. This amount were from the number of score divided by the number of sample. From all the students which were took the test, the average was 35.25.

Table 2. The Distribution of the Test Result of Muhammadiyah Islamic School Students

No	Student number	X_1	\bar{X}_1	$(X - \bar{X}_1)$	$(X - \bar{X}_1)^2$
1	859	30	35.25	-5.25	27.56
2	764	35	35.25	-0.25	0.06
3	767	25	35.25	-10.25	105.06
4	769	30	35.25	-5.25	27.56
5	774	30	35.25	-5.25	27.56
6	783	40	35.25	4.75	22.56
7	827	25	35.25	-10.25	105.06
8	827	30	35.25	-5.25	27.56
9	865	35	35.25	-0.25	0.06
10	866	30	35.25	-5.25	27.56
11	829	45	35.25	9.75	95.06
12	830	50	35.25	14.75	217.56
13	796	35	35.25	-0.25	0.06
14	797	30	35.25	-5.25	27.56
15	795	45	35.25	9.75	95.06
16	799	25	35.25	-10.25	105.06

17	873	30	35.25	-5.25	27.56
18	837	50	35.25	14.75	217.56
19	838	50	35.25	14.75	217.56
20	802	35	35.25	-0.25	0.06
		705			1346.7

The Standard Deviation is:

$$\begin{aligned} SD_1 &= \sqrt{\frac{\sum (X_1 - \bar{X}_1)^2}{N_1}} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1346,7}{20}} \\ &= \sqrt{67,33} \\ &= 8,20 \end{aligned}$$

2. Students' Scores of Oral Test at SMAN

1 Simeulue Timur.

Table 3. Students' Score of Oral Test Of SMAN 1 Simeulue Timur

		Aspects					
		Grammar	Vocabulary	fluency	Pronunciation		
1	9930788927	2	2	1	2	7	35
2	9930789062	3	2	3	3	11	55
3	9930788974	2	2	3	3	10	50
4	9930788975	2	1	2	3	8	40
5	9930788976	2	2	2	2	8	40
6	9930789066	3	2	2	1	8	40
7	9930789067	2	2	3	3	10	50
8	9930789068	2	1	2	1	6	30
9	9930788928	2	2	2	1	7	35
10	9930788929	3	2	2	1	8	40
11	9920123723	1	2	2	2	7	35
12	9930789041	1	2	3	2	8	40
13	9920123681	2	1	1	1	5	25
14	9930789069	1	2	2	1	6	30
15	9930788983	1	2	2	2	7	35
16	9930789072	2	2	3	2	9	45
17	9930788932	2	2	2	3	9	45
18	9930789086	2	3	2	3	10	50
19	9930788078	2	1	1	2	6	30
20	9930789094	2	1	1	2	6	30

TOTAL						1780	14144	35	39	-4	16
						16	14156	45	39	6	36
						17	14169	45	39	6	36
						18	14176	50	39	11	121
						19	14180	30	39	-9	81
						20	14185	30	39	-9	81
								780			1280

This table means that the total score ($\sum X_2$) for this test was 780. The count of the raw score was the sum of grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and pronunciation score multiplied with five. The highest score was 55. It was obtained by one student (student 2). While the lowest score is 25. It was obtained by one student (student 12).

The Mean score is:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{X}_2 &= \frac{\sum X_2}{N_2} \\ \bar{X}_2 &= \frac{780}{20} \\ &= 39 \end{aligned}$$

This score means that the average score for this test was high. These amounts from the number of the score divided by the number of sample. From all the students which was took the test, the average was 39.

Table 4. The Distribution of the Test Result of SMAN 1 Simeulue Timur Students.

No	Student number	X_2	\bar{X}_2	$(X_2 - \bar{X}_2)$	$(X_2 - \bar{X}_2)^2$
1	14064	35	39	-4	16
2	14071	55	39	16	256
3	14072	50	39	11	121
4	14074	40	39	1	1
5	14077	40	39	1	1
6	14078	40	39	1	1
7	14086	50	39	11	121
8	14095	30	39	-9	81
9	14098	35	39	-4	16
10	14104	40	39	1	1
11	14111	35	39	-4	16
12	14116	40	39	1	1
13	14123	25	39	-14	196
14	14125	30	39	-9	81

The Standard Deviation is:

$$\begin{aligned} SD_2 &= \sqrt{\frac{\sum (X_2 - \bar{X}_2)^2}{N_2}} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1280}{20}} \\ &= \sqrt{64} \\ &= 8 \end{aligned}$$

3. Data Analysis

After getting the Mean score (X) and the Standard Deviation (SD) of oral tests both at Islamic school and Public school, the writer then analyzed the data. The writer used of T-score formula in order to know whether there were any significant differences between Muhammadiyah Islamic School and SMAN 1 Simeulue Timur in oral test.

Table 5. Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Oral Test of Muhammadiyah Islamic School and SMAN 1 Simeulue Timur

Furthermore the data are applied into the T-score formula to see the differences from these tests whether significant or not. For the first test and second test (test I and test II)

$$T \text{ score} =$$

No	Test	Mean score (\bar{X})	Standard Deviation (SD)	Number of Students (N)
1	Oral test of Muhammad iyah Islamic School's students	35,25	8,20	20
2	Oral test of SMAN 1 Simeulue Timur's students	39	8	20

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{(N_1 - 1)sd_1^2 + (N_2 - 1)sd_2^2}{N_1 + N_2 - 2} \left(\frac{1}{N_1} + \frac{1}{N_2} \right)}} \\
 \text{T-score} &= \frac{35,25 - 39}{\sqrt{\frac{(20 - 1)8,20^2 + (20 - 1)8^2}{20 + 20 - 2} \left(\frac{1}{20} + \frac{1}{20} \right)}} \\
 &= \frac{3,75}{\sqrt{\frac{(19)8,20^2 + (19)8^2}{40 - 2} \left(\frac{2}{20} \right)}} \\
 &= \frac{3,75}{\sqrt{\frac{155,8 + 152}{38}} (0,1)} \\
 &= \frac{3,75}{\sqrt{\frac{307,8}{38}} (0,1)} \\
 &= \frac{3,75}{\sqrt{8,1} (0,1)} \\
 &= \frac{3,75}{2,84 (0,1)} \\
 &= \frac{3,75}{0,284} \\
 &= 13,20
 \end{aligned}$$

After calculating the data to T-score, it is found that T-count is 13.20. The writer used

0.05 in the level of significance in certain degree of freedom. In this study, the degree of freedom was 38. It was obtained from $N_1 + N_2 - 2 = 20 + 20 - 2 = 38$.

From the table by Henry E. Garrett (1954:427) as quoted by Anas Sudijono (1987:374) it was obtained that 38 degree of freedom on the significance level of 0.05 was 2.02, while the T-test value was 13.20. This T-test was bigger than T-table. It means that there was any significant difference between Muhammadiyah Islamic School and SMAN 1 Simeulue Timur in speaking ability. The result proved that SMAN 1 Simeulue Timur students as the representative of public school is better than Muhammadiyah Islamic School students as the representative of Islamic school in speaking ability.

4. Discussion

The writer used statistical formulas to analyze the data of this study in the previous sub-title. After analyzing the data of Muhammadiyah Islamic School and SMAN 1 Simeulue Timur by using statistical analysis, it was found that the mean score for Muhammadiyah Islamic School and SMAN 1 Simeulue Timur were different. The mean score for Muhammadiyah Islamic School was 35.25, while the mean score for SMAN 1 Simeulue Timur was 39. Actually, it was clear that there is different performance between the two schools in speaking ability compared from their mean score. Based on the mean score of the two groups which has been gotten, it was shown that the mean score of SMAN 1

Simeulue Timur was higher than the mean score of Muhammadiyah Islamic School. It indicated that SMAN 1 Simeulue Timur performance was better than Muhammadiyah Islamic School in speaking ability.

However, the writer needed to prove the hypothesis by using statistical procedure to see if there is any significant difference between the two groups. In this case, the writer used t-test formula and got 13.20 for the score. In this study, the writer wanted to see whether T-count is bigger than T-table for 38 degree of freedom on the level of significance 0.05 or not. It was found that T-table for 38 degree of freedom on the level of significance 0.05 is 2.02. So, from the result of calculation above, the writer found that $T\text{-count} > T\text{-table}$ ($13.20 > 2.02$). If the T-count value was bigger than T-table value, it indicated that research hypothesis is accepted and null hypothesis is rejected. The writer has proven statistically that the difference in speaking ability between Muhammadiyah Islamic School and SMAN 1 Simeulue Timur is highly significant. On the other words, SMAN 1 Simeulue Timur students performed better in speaking ability than Muhammadiyah Islamic School students.

From the results above, the writer found a fact that although students in Islamic school have their full school days to practice English, it does not guarantee their speaking ability could be better. However, the students of public school can also be better in speaking ability.

C. Conclusion

In the previous chapter, the writer

stated that the aim of this research is to see whether there is any significant difference between islamic school students and public school students in speaking ability. In this case, the writer used statistical procedure to see if there is any significant difference between the two groups. The statistical procedure in this study was T-test formula. But before T-test procedure had been calculated, the writer needed to calculate the mean and standar deviation of both groups first. The writer got 35.25 as the mean score and 8.20 as standard deviation for Muhammadiyah Islamic School. Meanwhile, for SMAN 1 Simeulue Timur, the writer got 39 as the mean score, and 8 as the standard deviation. The result indicated the mean score and standard deviation of SMAN 1 Simeulue Timur is bigger than Muhammadiyah Islamic School.

After finding the value of mean and standard deviation of both groups, the writer applied the scores into t-test formula. T-test formula was used to know if there is any significant difference between the two groups mentioned above. After calculating, the writer got 13.20 as the T-test value. Then, this T-test value was consulted with T-table value. The value of T-table was 2.02. It was stated on the table by the level of significance 0.05 and the degree of freedom for this study was 38.

In this case, the T-count was much bigger than T-table ($T\text{-count} > T\text{-table}$). The result shows that there is significant difference in English speaking ability between the two schools. It is indicated that the students of SMAN 1 as public school, they are better in speaking ability than those of Muhammadiyah

Islamic School as an Islamic school. The writer can conclude that Islamic school system with a good learning atmosphere and some rules about speaking foreign language in their daily activities does not guarantee the speaking ability.

REFERENCE

- Al-Kufaishi, Adil. 1988. *A Vocabulary Building Program Is Necessity Not A Luxury*. English Teaching Forum. Vol xxvi 2 April 1988.
- Arikunto, Suharsimi. 2005. *Manajemen Penelitian*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Brown, H. Douglas. 2004. *Language Assesment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. USA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Brown, and G. Yule. 1988. *Teaching the spoken language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
<http://www.wikipedia.com>
Access on Thursday, January 21st, 2007, 10:30 WIB.
- Brumfit, Christopher. 1994. *Communicative Methodology in Language Teaching*. Massachussets: Cambridge university press.
- Campbell, N. Russel. 1979. *Linguistic and Social Aspects of Communicative Competence*. USA: Wn.C.Brown Company Publisher.
- Chitravelu, N. Sithamparam, S and Choon, the soo. 1996. *ELT Methodology: Principle and Practice*. Selangor: Fajar Bakti Sdn. Bhd. Darul Ehsan.
- Davies, R. 2000. *Qualitative and Quantitative Market Research*. Canada: Orient Pacific Century. Available in <http://www.Asiamarketresearch.Com/columns/markets.Html>. Access on January 22, 2008.
- Gautam. 1988. In Nurul Inayah's Thesis. Syiah Kuala University. 2007.
- Green, A. Harry and Petty T. Walter. 1963. *Developing Language Skills in Elementary Schools*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Gurrey, P. 1986. *Testing English as a Foreign Language*. London: Longmans Green and Co, Ltd
- Hajar, Siti. 2004. *Comparative Study between Private English Fast and Harvard English Students in Mastering Reading Comprehension*. Unsyiah, Banda Aceh. Unpublished.
- Hance, Kenneth. G. David. C. Raphl and Milton, J. Wiksell. 1962. *Principles of Speaking*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth publishing Company.
- Harris, David P. 1969. *Testing English as The Second Language*. New York: M 49 Graw Hill Book Company.
- Harycraft, John. 1988. *An Introduction to English Language Teaching*. London: Longman Group.
- Hopkins, W.G. 2000. *Quantitative Research Design*. New Zealand: University of Otago. Available in <http://www.Sportsci.Org/jour/0001/wghdesign.Html>. Access on January 22,

- 2008.
- Hieke, AE. 1985. *A Componential Approach to Oral fluency*. Evaluation the Modern Language Journal. University of Wisconsin press.
- Hornby. 1989. In Dini Rizki's thesis. Syiah Kuala University. 2008.
- Hornby, AS. 2000. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English 6th Edition*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Hornby, AS. And Gatenby, E.V. Wakefield. H. 1963. *The Advance Learner's dictionary of Current English 2nd Edition*. London: Oxford university press.
- Hutchison, Tom and waters, Alan. 1986. *English for Specific Purpose: A Learning Centered Approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- John, C. 2007. *Quantitative Research. Europe: Barron's Educational Series, Inc.* Available in http://www.answer.com/topic/quantitative_research. Access on January 22, 2008.
- Khan, & Best. 1993. In Nurul Inayah's Thesis. Syiah Kuala University. 2007.
- Kurikulum 2008. 2006. *Standar Kompetensi Pelajaran Bahasa Inggris*. Jakarta. Departemen Pendidikan.
- Lambardo, Linda. 1984. *Oral Testing: Getting Sample of real Language*. English Teaching Forum.
- Madsen, H. Douglas. 1983. *Principle of Language Learning and Teaching*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Mifflin, Houghton. 1979. *The Heritage Illustrated Dictionary of The English Language, vol.II*, Boston; Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Muckridge-Fong, Susan. 1978. *Teaching The Speaking Skill in English as A Second or Foreign Language: In Marianne Celce Murcia and Lois Mc. In Tosh (editors) Teaching English as A Second or Foreign Language*. Massachussets: Newburry House Publisher, Inc.
- Murcia, Mariane. 1979. *The Teaching English as A Second or Foreign Language*. Massachussets: Newburry House Publisher, Inc.
- Nunan, David. 1993. *Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Boston: Heinle/ Thomson Learning.
- Nuttal, Christine. 1983. *Teaching Reading Skill in A Foreign Language*. London: Heineman Educational Books.
- Pahuja, NP. 1994. *Vocabulary (Improve Your Vocabulary)*. Anmol Publicayion Put. Ltd.
- Rivers, Wilga M. 1983. *Communicating Naturally in A Second Language: Theory and Practice in Language Teaching*. Maasachussets: Cambridge University Press.
- Robinet, Betty wallace. 1985. *Teaching English to Speaker of Other Language*. New York: University of Minnesota Press.
- Savigno. 1983. In Dini Rizki's thesis. Syiah Kuala University. 2008.
- Scott, Roger. 1982. *Communication in The*

- Classroom: Application and for Communication Approach*. London: Longman Group Limited.
- Shumin, Kang. 1997. In Dini Rizki's thesis. Syiah Kuala University. 2008.
- Shafritz, Jay M. Koeppel, Richard P. And Soper, Elizabeth W. 1988. *The Facts on File Dictionary of Education*. USA: Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data.
- Sidney I, Ladau. 1975. *The Doubleday Dictionary for Home, School, and Office*. USA: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Skinner, Paul. H and Shelton, Ralph. L. 1978. *Speech, Language, and Hearing (Normal Processes and Disorder)*. Philipines: Addison Publishing Company, Inc.
- Sudjana, MA. 2002. *Metoda Statistika*. Bandung: Tarsito.
- Sudijono, Anas. 1987. *Pengantar statistic pendidikan*. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo.
- Supriatna, Agus. 1999. *Pendidikan Keterampilan Berbahasa*. Modul Departemen Agama RI. Dirjen Pembinaan Kelembagaan Agama Islam.
- Vasile, Albert J and Mintz, Harold K. 1977. *Speak with Confidence: A Practical Guide*. Cambridge. Massachussets: Winthrop publisher, Inc.
- Wigg, Hammerson. E and Eleanor, Missing Semel. 1985. *Language Assesment and Intervention for The Learning Disabled*. Colombus, Ohio: E. Merril Publishing Company.
- Wise, and Gray. 1959. In Dini Rizki's thesis. Syiah Kuala University. 2008.
- Wise, and Brochers. 1996. In Septia Irnanda's Thesis. Syiah Kuala University. 2007.
- Woolbert. 1920. In Septia Irnanda's Thesis. Syiah Kuala University. 2007.