IMPROVING SPEAKING SKILL OF THE ELEVEN GRADE SMA NEGERI 7 PALU THROUGH THINK-PAIR-SHARE TECHNIQUE

*Zetrin Olivia[1], Syahrul Munir[2], Mashuri[3]

[1,2,3]English Education Study Program, Teacher Training and Education Faculty
Tadulako University, Palu

*Zetrinolivia877@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This research aims to find out was think pair share can improve students' speaking skill of Eleven Grade at SMA Negeri 7 Palu or not. The instrument used to collect the data was speaking test. The students in this research were divided into two groups which are experimental and control group. 30 sudents from each group were asked to do pre-test and post-test. The students speaking skill were analyzed by use rubric score adapted from Weigle (2002). Then, the data were analyzed using formula proposed by Arikunto (2013). The result shows that the t-counted is 9.65 and t-table is 2.00 where the t-counted was higher than the t-table. It indicates that the think pair share technique can improve students' speaking skill of Eleven Grade at SMA Negeri 7 Palu.

Key Terms: Correlation; Pronunciation; Speaking Ability

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, English has become more and more important. English has become a tool for international communication in transportation, commerce, banking, tourism, process of technology and scientific research. Moreover, English has achieved a genuinely global status since it developed a special role that is recognized in every country. Therefore, English is considered as a global language which is spoken by many people all over the world either as the first or the second language.

The government of Indonesia states that English is a foreign language and should become a compulsory subject at school. It is taught from elementary school to college or university and it becomes one of the subjects in the National Test. Because of that, students need to understand spoken and written English to communicate their ideas effectively. There are four language skills in English. They are listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Speaking is one of the essential skills that are taught in teaching English. Through speaking, students can express their feelings and express what they want to say to the listener in spoken form. It also gives the students a chance to express their ideas and opinions to others. When the student wants to speak, they have to think about what is going to speak and have to consider some of language components like vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation and fluency to be acceptably in giving and responding the information.

Moreover, speaking as a language production is considered a difficult subject for students because the students are not only required to speak and share ideas in spoken form, but they should also be able to understand the meaning of the words they speak. The students have many ideas, opinions, or experiences but they cannot express, explain, or describe them in spoken form. Most of the students do speaking activities to fulfill the requirements of speaking assignments. If the teachers do not give them any tasks to do like doing exercises, practicing dialogue or conversation, the students will do nothing to improve their speaking skills. This indicates that students are not interested in their speaking. And also think speaking is a difficult subject for them.

Based on the preliminary research at SMA Negeri 7 Palu, the researcher observed that the school used *Kurikulum Merdeka*. She also found some problems faced by the tenth-grade students. First, due to the English as foreign language which means it is not their mother tongue. Second, the Students have a limited amount of vocabulary because of some reasons such as they are not interested in learning English, the circumstances do not support them to learn English well. Third, the students feel shy to speak. They lack self-esteem because they rarely practice to speaking English. Third, there are no additional classes especially for the students who have poor skill to speak English. Due to the pre-observation, the researcher also found that every class has same ability and the students of the tenth grade have medium skill in speaking English. Fourth, based on the education system, each student is not differentiated based on their ability. Students who have poor, medium, and high ability are in same class. So that, there is no specific method

to teach based on their ability. Last, the researcher found that the school has limited tool to learn English. The teachers only use book and internet in teaching English. The teaching and learning have reached chapter 4 where there the total of chapters is nine.

Because of those problems, the researcher tries to find effective teaching strategies to help the students improve their speaking skills. The researcher considers that the cooperative learning strategy is the right strategy for teaching speaking. Moreover, Isjoni (2009) says that one appropriate way to solve the problem is by applying a new strategy in the learning process to improve the students' speaking skills; the teacher sufficiently used a cooperative learning strategy. According to Cruickshank et, al. (2006), cooperative learning strategy is a strategy that is used for class procedure instruction where the students work together in a small group. As a part of cooperative learning, the Think-Pair-Share technique can be used in teaching speaking. Lyman (1987, p. 48) states that the "think-pair-share technique can solve the students' problem in speaking skills". In addition, Svinicki & Janes (2011, p. 194) argue that in the Think-Pair-Share technique, students feel freer to participate in a general discussion of a problem.

Based on the explanation above, the researcher can conclude that in learning a language, speaking skill is the most difficult among the other skills. Therefore, effective teaching media is needed. One of the effective ways is using the think-pair-share Technique that can assist the students in overcoming their fear, relieve their boredom, and produce their consciousness that speaking English is fun on SMA Negeri 7 Palu.

METHOD

In this research, the researchers applied the quantitative research method. According to Creswell (2014), quantitative method explains about the reductions to a parsimonious set of variables, tightly controlled through design or statistical analysis and provides measures or observations for testing a theory. The quantitative method used in this research is quasi-experimental. According to Cohen (2007:275) "a quasi-experimental is one where the treatment variable is manipulated but the group not equated before manipulation of the independent variable, and a research design having some but not entire characteristic of true experiment." The research design which is chosen by the researcher is a quasi-experimental research design which is divided into two types of designs; they time series design and non-equivalent control group. This study used a non-equivalent control group.

In this research, the researchers took the SMA Negeri 7 Palu students as the population of this research. Considering the large number of the students, the researchers need to select a sample. The sampling technique used in this research was purposive. Cohent. et al. (2007:115) state that in the purposive sampling technique, the sample is satisfactory to specific needs. As its name suggests, the sample has been chosen for a specific purpose. Purposive sampling is when subjects are selected because of some characteristic. This research used purposive sampling because the researcher took some of the population to be analyzed intentionally and based on the characteristics and constellations of context that occurred. XI MIA 1 as the control group and XI MIA 2 as the experimental group were chosen as the sample. X MIA 1 consists of 30 students

and X MIA 2 consists of 35 students. The reason why the researcher chose both classes is that they have the same ability to learn English, especially in speaking skills.

In collecting the data, the researcher used the interpersonal test. The test is pre-test and post-test. The instruments used in this study are a pretest in the first meeting and a posttest in the last meeting. A pre-test is to know the basic knowledge of the students in speaking English and the post-test is to know the influence and the effectiveness of using Think-Pair-Share in teaching speaking. Before the teaching and learning process, the researcher will conduct the pre-test first.

The class as the control group is not given the treatment. Meanwhile, the class that will receive the treatment is the experimental group. After six times of meetings, the post-test will be given to both classes. This research will be conducted in 8 meetings. After that, the researcher will use the scoring rubric system to measure students' abilities. The researcher found the standard that suits the students is four. The researcher did not want to set standard scores too high. The scoring system took 0-100 scores where the total score obtained by the students on each component was divided by the maximum score multiplied by 100. In order to get students' standard score, he applied the formula by Arikunto (2013) as follows:

$$NP = \frac{R}{SM} \text{ x } 100$$

Next, the researcher calculates the mean deviation of both control and experimental groups. After computing the mean score of the pre-test and the post-test, the researcher will use the mean score of deviation formula suggested by Arikunto (2013:313) as follows:

a) The formula for the experimental group:
$$Mx = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$
b) The formula for the control group:
$$My = \frac{\sum Y}{N}$$

Then, the researcher will count the square deviation of each group using the formula of Arikunto (2013:312) as follows:

a)   The formula for the experimental group:
$$\sum x^2 = \sum X^2 - \frac{(\sum X)^2}{N}$$

b)   The formula for the control group:
$$\sum y^2 = \sum Y^2 - \frac{(\sum Y)^2}{N}$$

Last, the researcher applied the t-test formula to see the significant difference between the result of the pre-test and post-test from the both control group and experimental group using Arikunto's formula (2013: 311) as follows:

$$t = \frac{Mx - My}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\sum x^2 + \sum y^2}{Nx + Ny - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{Nx} + \frac{1}{Ny}\right)}}$$

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The data of students' speaking skills were collected through pre-test and post-test. The researcher used both tests to get students' speaking skills raw score. The researcher also adapted scale rating purpose by Weigle which consist of 3 aspects with the maximum score is 12 to get the raw score of students' speaking skills as follows:

Rating Scores of Oral Test

ASPECT	SCORE	DESCRIPTION
Fluency	4	The fluency is disturbed by language problem
	3	The fluency is disturbed more by language problem
	2	Speech is frequently hesitant and jerky; sentences may be left uncompleted
	1	Speech is so halting and fragmentary that conversation is virtually impossible.
Comprehensibility	4	Understand almost all, although there is repetition in certain part.
	3	Understand most of what she/he talks in slow speaking.
	2	Difficult to understand what she/he talks.
	1	Cannot understand although in simple conversation
Accuracy	4	Correct grammar (tense and structure), good pronunciation and right vocabulary.
	3	Correct grammar (tense and structure), almost good pronunciation and right vocabulary.
	2	Some incorrect grammar (tense and structure), pronunciation mostly influenced by mother tongue and right vocabulary.
	1	Correct grammar (tense and structure), seriously pronunciation errors and wrong vocabulary.

After the students raw score has been obtained, the researchers counted their standard score used formula purposed by Arikunto (2013):

$$\Sigma = \frac{x}{N} \text{ x100}$$

After that, the researcher presented all of students' standard score in table below:

Students Standard Score of Pre-Test and Post-Test

Number of Students	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	x_1	x_2	y_1	y_2
1.	50	66.6	41.6	50
2.	25	33.3	50	50
3.	50	66.6	58.3	41.6
4.	58.3	66.6	41.6	41.6
5.	50	66.6	58.3	58.3
6.	50	58.3	25	33.3
7.	50	66.6	41.6	33.3
8.	50	66.6	33.3	41.6
9.	25	41.6	50	50
10.	50	58.3	25	25
11.	58.3	75	50	41.6
12.	50	66.6	50	50
13.	41.6	50	58.3	58.3
14.	25	41.6	50	50
15.	50	66.6	41.6	50
16.	50	58.3	50	50
17.	33.3	50	50	50
18.	50	41.6	50	41.6
19.	50	66.6	33.3	41.6
20.	50	58.3	41.6	41.6
21.	41.6	50	50	50
22.	41.6	50	50	58.3
23.	50	58.3	41.6	41.6
24.	50	66.6	25	25
25.	50	66.6	50	50
26.	41.6	50	41.6	50
27.	50	58.3	50	50
28.	50	58.3	50	41.6
29.	50	58.3	33.3	33.3
30	50	66.6	58.3	50
Sum ($\sum$)	1391.3	1748.7	1349.3	1349.2

In order to find out the mean deviation of pre-test both control and experimental groups, the researcher calculated the mean score of deviation formula suggested by Arikunto (2013:313) as follows:

The formula for the experimental group:

$$Mx = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$
$$= \frac{1391.3}{30}$$
$$= 46.37$$

The formula for the control group:

$$My = \frac{\sum Y}{N}$$

$$= \frac{1349.3}{30}$$
$$= 44.97$$

From the result above, the researcher found that the mean score of pre-test in experimental group is 46.37 and the control group is 44.97 which is relatively low.

Next, the researcher calculated the mean deviation of post-test both control group and experimental group, the researcher calculated the mean score of deviation formula suggested by Arikunto (2013:313) as follows:

The formula for the experimental group:

$$Mx2 = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$
$$= \frac{1748.7}{30}$$
$$= 58.29$$

The formula for the control group:

$$My2 = \frac{\sum Y}{N}$$
$$= \frac{1349.2}{30}$$
$$= 44.97$$

Based on the result, it is showed that the mean score of post-test for experimental group is 58.29, while the mean score of control group is 44.97. It showed that there is a difference in the result of score between pre-test and post-test in experimental group, while the result of score between pre-test and post-test in control group is still same.

In order to find out the deviation and square deviation between the score of the pre-test and post-test in each group, the researcher presents the data in table. More details about the deviation and square deviation of both the group can be seen in table below:

Deviation and Square Deviation of Experimental and Control Group

NO	Experimental Group		Deviation X	Square Deviation (X2)	Control Group		Deviation Y	Square Deviation (Y2)
	X1	X2	(X2-X1)		Y1	Y2	(Y2-Y1)	
1	50	66.6	16.6	275.56	41.6	50	8.4	70.56
2	25	33.3	8.3	68.89	50	50	0	0
3	50	66.6	16.6	275.56	58.3	41.6	-16.7	278.89
4	58.3	66.6	8.3	68.89	41.6	41.6	0	0
5	50	66.6	16.6	275.56	58.3	58.3	0	0
6	50	58.3	8.3	68.89	25	33.3	8.3	68.89
7	50	66.6	16.6	275.56	41.6	33.3	-8.3	68.89
8	50	66.6	16.6	275.56	33.3	41.6	8.3	68.89
9	25	41.6	16.6	275.56	50	50	0	0

10	50	58.3	8.3	68.89	25	25	0	0
11	58.3	75	16.7	278.89	50	41.6	-8.4	70.56
12	50	66.6	16.6	275.56	50	50	0	0
13	41.6	50	8.4	70.56	58.3	58.3	0	0
14	25	41.6	16.6	275.56	50	50	0	0
15	50	66.6	16.6	275.56	41.6	50	8.4	70.56
16	50	58.3	8.3	68.89	50	50	0	0
17	33.3	50	16.7	278.89	50	50	0	0
18	50	41.6	8.3	68.89	50	41.6	-8.4	70.56
19	50	66.6	16.6	275.56	33.3	41.6	8.3	68.89
20	50	58.3	8.3	68.89	41.6	41.6	0	0
21	41.6	50	8.4	70.56	50	50	0	0
22	41.6	50	8.4	70.56	50	58.3	8.3	68.89
23	50	58.3	8.3	68.89	41.6	41.6	0	0
24	50	66.6	16.6	275.56	25	25	0	0
25	50	66.6	16.6	275.56	50	50	0	0
26	41.6	50	8.4	70.56	41.6	50	8.4	70.56
27	50	58.3	8.3	68.89	50	50	0	0
28	50	58.3	8.3	68.89	50	41.6	-8.4	70.56
29	50	58.3	8.3	68.89	33.3	33.3	0	0
30	50	66.6	16.6	275.56	58.3	50	-8.3	68.89
	Total		374.1	5180.09			-0.1	1115.59

From the calculating above, the researcher computed the mean score of the deviation of the pre-test and post-test of experimental group using the formula as follows:

$$Mx = \frac{\Sigma x}{N}$$
$$Mx = \frac{374.1}{30} = 12.47$$

Next, the researcher computed the mean score of the deviation of the pre-test and post-test of control group using the formula as follows:

$$My = \frac{\Sigma y}{N}$$
$$My = \frac{-0.1}{30}$$
$$= 0.003$$

Moreover, the researcher also computed the sum of square deviation of experimental and control groups by using following ways:

The formula for the experimental group:

$$\sum x^2 = \sum X^2 - \frac{(\sum X)^2}{N} = 5180.09 - \frac{(374.1)^2}{30}$$
$$= 5180.09 - \frac{139950.81}{30}$$
$$= 5180.09 - 4665.027$$
$$= 515.063$$

The formula for the control group:

$$\sum y^2 = \sum Y^2 - \frac{(\sum Y)^2}{N} = 1115.59 - \frac{(-0.1)^2}{30}$$
$$= 1115.59 - \frac{0.01}{30}$$
$$= 1115.59 - 0.0003$$
$$= 1115.589$$

In order to find out the significant difference between the experimental and the control group, the researcher calculated the value of t-counted as follows:

$$t = \frac{Mx - My}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\Sigma x^2 + \Sigma y^2}{Nx + Ny - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{Nx} + \frac{1}{Ny}\right)}}$$
$$t = \frac{12.47 - 0.003}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{515.063 + 1115.589}{30 + 30 - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{30} + \frac{1}{30}\right)}}$$
$$t = \frac{12.46}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1630.652}{58}\right)\left(\frac{2}{30}\right)}}$$
$$t = \frac{12.46}{\sqrt{(28.11)(0.06)}}$$
$$t = \frac{12.46}{\sqrt{1.68}}$$
$$t = \frac{12.46}{1.29}$$
$$t = 9.65$$

After computing the t-counted by using some way above, the researcher found that the result of t-counted was 9.65.

Based on the data analysis, t-counted were 9.65. By applying 0.05 level of significance with degree of freedom (df) = 58, the researcher found that t-table was 2.00. It means that the t-counted was higher than t-table value. In other word, the hypothesis of this research was accepted. The use of think-pair-share technique is effective to improve students' speaking skill of the Eleven Grade Sma Negeri 7 Palu.

The aim of this study was to investigate whether the implementation of the think pair share technique could enhance the speaking abilities of Eleventh Grade students at Sma Negeri 7 Palu. The research specifically targeted improvements in fluency, accuracy, and comprehensibility. To accomplish this, a quasi-experimental design involving two groups was employed: an experimental group receiving the technique and a control group taught using conventional methods. Each group comprised 30 students.

Before administering the treatment to the experimental group, the researcher conducted a pre-test for both groups on different dates: January 4th, 2024 for the experimental group and January 5th for the control group. The results of the pre-test revealed that the majority of students exhibited poor speaking skills, lacking fluency, accuracy, and comprehensibility. Several factors contributed to this deficiency. Firstly, students expressed anxiety about making mistakes, leading

to a lack of confidence in speaking, often resulting in speaking softly. Secondly, students lacked practice in speaking English, highlighting the need for regular practice. Analysis of the pre-test scores showed that none of the students achieved the maximum score. The highest score recorded was 58.3, while the lowest was 25, with mean scores of 46.37 and 44.97 for the experimental and control groups, respectively. This indicates a low level of speaking proficiency among students at SMA Negeri 7 Palu before receiving any intervention. To enhance their speaking skills, the researcher conducted six sessions of treatment exclusively for the experimental group, each lasting 2x45 minutes. The researcher employed the "think pair share" technique to teach speaking during these sessions.

After administering a pre-test to both groups, the researcher provided a six-session treatment exclusively to the experimental group. Tailoring the treatment to the students' individual needs and with their agreement on the technique, the researcher opted for the think-pair-share method as an appropriate approach. This technique was chosen for its potential to facilitate English speaking proficiency among students. During the initial session, students were instructed to form groups, totaling four groups in all. Subsequently, they were tasked with locating references on a given topic within a ten-minute timeframe. Among these groups, two were assigned to argue in favor of the topic, while the remaining two were designated to take an opposing stance. Each group member was then required to present their views in English, with the researcher also mandating that every group prepare questions for discussion.

After giving the treatment, the researcher gave post-test for both groups. The test was the same as the pre-test but there were some the words and the sentences were different. The researcher conducted the post-test on 28th February 2024 to experimental class and post-test on 29th February to control class. The students were asked to introduce themselves first. Then, they were asked to choose one from three topics. The tests were used in order to measure the significant improvement of groups. Based on the result of the post-test, the researcher found that the experimental groups had different result from the pre-test while the control group showed same result as the pre-test. In control group, the highest score of students in post-test was 58.3 and the lowest score was 25 where the mean score is still same with the pre-test. The mean score was 44.97. In experimental class, the highest score of students in post-test was 75 and the lowest score was 50 where the mean score increased to 58.29. It means that the students' pronunciation was improved by applying think pair share technique.

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis presented in the preceding chapter, it is determined that employing the think pair share method effectively enhances students' speaking abilities at SMA Negeri 7 Palu. Initially, students exhibited relatively low proficiency in speaking skills during the pre-test, but demonstrated improvement in the post-test. This is evidenced by the experimental group's pre-test mean score of 46.37, which increased to 58.29 after the intervention, compared to the control group's consistent pre-test and post-test scores of 44.97. There exists a notable disparity in mean scores between the pre-test and post-test for both the experimental and control groups.

Specifically, the post-test mean score of the experimental group surpassed that of the pre-test. Statistical analysis further confirms these findings, with the calculated t-value (9.65) exceeding the critical t-value (2.00), thereby validating the research hypothesis. In essence, the utilization of the think pair share technique effectively enhances the speaking skills of eleventh-grade students at SMA Negeri 7 Palu.

REFERENCES

Arikunto, S. (2013). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Cohen. (2007). Research Methods in Education (6th ed.). London and New York: Routledge Falmer.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). Educational research: planning, conducting, evaluating, quantitative and qualitative research (Fourth Edition). United State of America: Pearson Education Inc.

Cruickshank, D. R., Jenkins, D. R., & Metclaf, K. K. (2006). The Act of Teaching: Analysis and application (4th Edt). New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Isjoni. (2009). Cooperative Learning. Bandung: Alfabeta

Lyman, F. T. (1981). The Responsive Classroom Discussion: the Inclusion of all Students. In A. Anderson (Ed.), Mainstreaming Digest (pp. 109-113). College Park: University of Maryland Press.

Svinicki, M & Janes, W. (2011). Mckeachie's Teaching tips: Strategies, Research And Theory For Collage And University Teacher. Boston: Changage Learning.

Weigle, S, C. (2002). Assessing Writing. Georgia States University