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Abstract

The objective of this research is to find out whether teaching speaking by using Think Pair Share technique improved students’ speaking skill. This research was conducted at the second grade students of SMP Negeri 14 Banda Aceh. The design of this study was quantitative research. In speaking class, the common problem faced by the students is difficulty in expressing ideas. Through this technique students enter the stage of thinking, pairing, and sharing process. The data were collected by using pre-test and post-test. The instrument of this study was oral test. The result of the test showed that by using speaking assessment which is proposed by Brown (2004). The result of the test was analyzed by using t-test. The calculation result showed that t-score was higher than t-table (3.66 > 1.68). The result of this study revealed that there was improvement on students' speaking after taught by using think pair share technique which the mean score of experimental class is 86.4 while the mean score of control class is 72.1. By implementing Think Pair Share, the students are motivated to do the speaking activity during this technique. This method is assumed to give the students an opportunity to practice the target language. It keeps students more active in cooperation and makes them more confident in the class.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Speaking is a form of communication that allows students to express their feelings, ideas, and arguments orally. It is the skill of students to make a social contact or interact to other people. Speaking is one of the most important skills to be learned by students of English as a Foreign Language (EFL). The communication runs smoothly by having a good speaking skill. According to Nunan (2003), speaking is a process of communication to extend the meaning verbally. This statement means that it is the way how to deliver meaning by the
system of verbal production. Moreover, Roswati & Zain (2014) stated that speaking is an interaction between speaker and interlocuter to deliver information by oral communication. However, mastering speaking as a foreign language is not an easy matter to be mastered by students. According to Brown (2004), speaking has five aspects that include pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. If the aspects of speaking work together in a context, it would be a perfect speaking in communicative activity. So, speaking is one of the important skills that should be acquired by students.

In 2013 curriculum, students should be able to express meaning in a transactional conversation (to get things done) and interpersonal conversation (social) using a variety of short simple spoken language accurately, fluently, and acceptable to interact with the immediate environment that involves speech acts: (1) asking, giving information and denying the information (2) asking, giving and rejecting opinion. Djuwairiah (2014) mentioned that teachers lead students to being active in class during learning held in 2013 curriculum process. During the learning process, students need to communicate with others in order to express their ideas. The aim of speaking in the curriculum of junior high school is to make students able to express meaning in transactional and interpersonal languages in the daily life context. In addition, Richards (2008) states the mastery of speaking skills in English is priority formally in second language or foreign learners. The students of junior high school are expected to be able to express meaning of short functional text and monologues in many kinds of text such as descriptive, recount, and narrative formally and informally.

Based on the preliminary study (February – June 2015) during Internship Program (PPL) at SMP Negeri 14 Banda Aceh, the writer found many students at the second grade were unable to express their ideas. Most of them got score under the average while the passing score (KKM) is 70. This problem is caused by several factors. Firstly, some students lack of vocabulary. According to Kusrini (2012), vocabulary is the main factor that makes students felt difficult to express their ideas. For example, when students were speaking English in the classroom, most of them use the vocabulary of Indonesian to complete their speaking. It showed that vocabulary influenced the students’ speaking skill to express their ideas. It is a very important thing in basic skill. A good vocabulary makes students a better communicator. Secondly, students tended to use native language (Acehnese) to transfer. Some of them still used Acehnese when English learning took place.

Tuan & Mai (2015) stated that student prefers using mother-tongue to explain something to another because it is easy when they use with their own language. As a result, they rarely practice to use English in the classroom and even no initiative to speak English with their classmates. There is no motivation in students competed to obtain a good score in speaking. Thirdly, students learnt in a monotonic technique of teaching, which was lecturing way. They were not given the opportunity to be active in the learning Process. According to Khurshid & Ansari (2012), most students copy notes from the material that has given by the teacher as an imperative task but it does not make students actively involved in the classroom. The teacher becomes active and the pupils become passive (Lanovastia et al.2016). As a consequence, students were not
triggered to speak actively in English class so that their skill in speaking was still low.

Related to the problem above, the writer intends to improve their speaking skill by using Think Pair Share technique. Think Pair Share technique is one of cooperative learning strategy in which students work together to solve a problem or answer a question. According to Kusrini (2012), think pair share is a technique which gives chance for the students to think about the topic using oral communication through critical thinking. This technique keeps all the students involved in class discussion and provide an opportunity for every student to share and answer to every question.

Think pair share is a technique to make students more active in thinking, formulating and sharing their ideas by giving a time with another students (Usman, 2015). Usman (2015) categorizes think pair share technique into three steps: think, pair, and share. Think Pair Share provides students with the opportunity to carefully think and talk about what they have learned. This technique requires a minimal effort on the part of the teacher yet encourage a great deal of participation from students, even reluctant students. Think Pair Share (TPS) is chosen because it has some advantages in learning speaking, such as: give time for the students to think about a problem or topic, enhances students’ verbal communication through critical thinking and meaningful interaction, and builds the democratic situation where the students are free to suggest and give their opinion. This technique can help the students in speaking by sharing and express their ideas in pairs and in a group confidently. It is a good way to increase students’ speaking performance.

From the elaboration above, the writer is interested in conducting a research entitled “Teaching Speaking by Using Think Pair Share technique (An Experimental Research at Second Grade Students of SMP Negeri 14 Banda Aceh).”

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Speaking

Speaking is an ability to communicate for interaction (Richards, 2008). It is an activity used by someone to communicate with other people. It is also an ability that needs special attention and instruction to make people understand in a conversation. Speaking is a communication process in order to interact with other people. It is an important part of skills in English which should be emphasized in teaching learning process in the classroom. According to Brown (2004), speaking is a process of involving producing and receiving, and processing information by doing an interaction to construct the meaning.

In addition, Bailey & Nunan (2005) assert that speaking is an interactive process of constructing meaning that involves producing and receiving and processing information. It can be perceived that speaking is a kind of interaction process involving two or more people in order to convey and receive the intended information. Furthermore, Widdowson (2008), speaking is a process of communication that involves receptive and productive. But speaking is more productive than receptive because it is represented by the oral system rather than visual medium. An act of communication through speaking is commonly
performed in face to face interaction and occurs as part of dialogue or other from of verbal exchange (Fata&Wahyuni, 2016). Meanwhile, Thornbury (2005) states speaking as a part of activities that people do to communicate and interact on a daily basis. The average person produces tens of thousand words a day, although some people may produce more than that. Consequently, the speech act should play a control role in the process of speech production which speakers begin with the intention of affecting their listeners in particular way.

2.2 Teaching Speaking

Teaching is giving the knowledge of someone has and conveying its to another to be learned. According to Brown (2007), teaching is guiding and facilitating learning, enabling the learner to learn, setting the condition for learning. Teaching speaking is to provide knowledge to students in the form of communication to the target audience through voice revenue system of the mouth. In teaching speaking, teachers are expected to deliver learning well. According to Hughes (2002), the aims of teaching speaking is to build on students’ dexterity in talking. Teacher should be able to make the students to actively speak.

2.3 Definition of Cooperative Learning

Cooperative learning is one of the most remarkable and fertile areas of theory, research, and practice in education. According to Kristiawan (2013), cooperative learning is the key to deal with children with various abilities and diverse area of intelligences. It is a part of a group of teaching learning techniques where students interact with each other to acquire and practice the elements of a subject matter and to meet common learning goals. It is much more than just putting students into groups and hoping for the best. In the same respect, Macpherson (2007) claims that cooperative learning is learning in small groups where interaction is structured according to carefully worked-out principles. Cooperative learning designs activities to make students contribute to the task.

Cooperative learning can also be defined as an approach to group work that minimizes the occurrence of those unpleasant situations and maximizes the learning and satisfaction that result from working on a high performance team (Felder & Breat, 2007). According to Isjoni (2004), cooperative learning is the method learning based on the work group carried out to a special purpose. Cooperative learning refers to one of instructional techniques where students work in small, mixed ability learning group. It means the students in each group are responsible not only for the material that was being taught but also for helping their group mate learns.

2.4 Think Pair Share

Think-Pair-Share is a cooperative learning technique which is said as a multi-mode discussion cycle in which students listen to a question or presentation. Kusrini (2012), think pair share is a technique that gives opportunities for students to being active in the classroom through process of thinking, pairing, and sharing to another students. The teacher asks students to think about a
specific topic, pair with another student to discuss their thinking and share their ideas with the group. Think pair share is very helpful to make students active in speaking in which each students must report to a partner and then the partner must report to the class.

In addition, Isjoni (2004) states that think pair share is a cooperative learning structure that is very useful, the point is when the teacher presenting a lesson, asking students to think the answer of teacher’ question, and pairing with partner discussion to reach consensus on the question. Finally, the teacher asks students to share the discussion. Think pair share provides students with the opportunity to carefully think and talk about what they have learned. The technique requires a minimal effort on the part of the teacher yet encourages a great deal of participation from students, even reluctant students.

According to Usman (2015) there are three steps in implementing Think Pair Share technique, namely: think, pair, share. 1) Think: the teacher poses a question or issue and each students are asked to think about the answer for a few minutes. 2) Pair: are asked to discuss or compare the answer what they have gotten in step of thinking. 3) Share: the student pairs share their ideas in the class.

3. METHODS

This research design is quantitative. The quantitative research can be seen from the use of the figures starting from the data collection, the interpretation of the data, as well as the appearance of the results as proposed by Arikunto (2010). A quantitative approach is used to determine students mastery learning by giving a special treatment. The method that the writer used in this research is experimental research. According to Sugiyono (2014), experimental research is a research methodology that is used to find out the influence of specific treatment against another in condition that occurs. It is used to determine if factors may affect the result of an experiment.

The instrument of data collection in this research was oral test. Richards & Schmidt (2010) say that a test is any procedure for measuring ability, knowledge, or performance. The test is considered valid as it is taken from the textbook, syllabus, and curriculum. In this case, the writer used content validity to determine the validity of the instrument. The writer gave many pictures to students as instruments. The writer chose one of the learning materials related to “how to describe something.”

In scoring the students’ speaking in this study, there are four aspects to be scored. It includes grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and pronunciation. The writer did not use the aspect of comprehension because the test in this study that the writer use was monologue. Meanwhile, the comprehension is used for dialogue. Each component was given 25 as the maximum score and 1 as the minimum score. Therefore, if students got 25 for whole component, so the total score that they got was 100. The scoring rubric that the writer used in this research is proposed by Brown (2004).
4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Findings of Students’ Pre-Test and Post-Test Score

This includes the result of students pre-test and post-test score of experimental class (EC) the result of students pre-test and post-test scores of control class (CC), hypothesis testing and discussions. The researcher classified students writing ability based on the score that the students obtained by means of the result of post test.

The findings were tabulated based on the classifications based on the aspects of speaking. The following figure presented the result of students’ speaking ability in each aspect. The score of pre-test and post-test in experimental class could be seen in table 1, chart 1 and 2 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaking Aspects</th>
<th>Mean Score in Experimental Class</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>21.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>11.75</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>45.25</td>
<td>84.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen that the post-test score is higher than the pre-test score. It shows that the average score of students’ grammar in pre-test is 10.7 and 21.05 for the post-test. It has difference 10.35 point. Then, the result of vocabulary has difference 10.2 point, it is 12.6 for pre-test and 22.8 for post-test. For fluency, 11.75 for pre-test and 21.5 for post-test. This aspect has difference 9.75 point. Finally, the students’ pronunciation for pre-test is 10.2 and 19.4 for post-test. This aspect has difference 9.2 point. It can be seen from the figure as follows:

![Figure 1. Students’ Average Score of Speaking Aspects of Experimental Class.](image)

The figure above reveals that the lowest average score of students’ pre-test is pronunciation and the highest average score is vocabulary. Furthermore, the lowest average of students’ post-test score in is pronunciation. While the highest average score is vocabulary.

The following table and figure showed the increased of the mean score of students’ pre-test and post-test in control class which is not given the treatment by the writer.
Table 2. Mean Score of Speaking Aspects of Pre-test and Post-test in Control Class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaking Aspects</th>
<th>Mean Score of Control Class</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>10.85</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>12.05</td>
<td>20.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>17.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is evidenced in the table above that the students’ post-test is higher than pre-test. The table shows that the average score of students’ grammar is 10.85 for pre-test and the average score of students’ grammar in post-test is 18.3. It means that this aspect increases slightly that is 7.45 points. Then, the result of students’ vocabulary improves 8.2 point, it is 12.05 for pre-test and 20.25 for post-test. Besides, the fluency of students’ pre-test is 11.3 and 17.85 for post-test. It enhances 6.55 point. Finally, the result of average score of students’ pronunciation in the pre-test is 9.8 while 15.6 for post-test. This aspect rises up only 5.8 point. The score of post-test is slightly higher than pre-test. It is not given the treatment by the writer. The following chart 2 shows the differences score of student’s pre-test and post-test in control class.

Figure 2. Students’ Average Score of Speaking Aspects of Control Class.

The figure above reveals that the lowest average score of students’ pre-test is pronunciation (9.8) and the highest average score is vocabulary (12.05). Furthermore, the lowest average of students’ post-test score is pronunciation (15.6) while the highest average score is vocabulary (20.25). Thus, based on the table 4.4 and chart 4.3 above, it could be concluded that there is a little improvement in students’ post-test after the writer did not give the treatment to control class.

4.2 Discussion

In analyzing the hypothesis, the writer used t-score formula. It referred to the t-table at significant standard α 0.05 with the degree of freedom / df = (n₁ + n₂ - 2). Based on the result of post-test from both classes (experimental and control), the mean score of post-test for experimental class is $(x) = 86.4$
variance, $S_b^2 = 167.77$ and $S_b = 12.95$ while the mean score of control class is $x = 72.1$ variance, $S_2^2 = 149.305$ and $S_2 = 12.21$.

So, the standard deviation combination can be concluded as follows:

\[
S_2 = \frac{(n_1 - 1)s_b^2 + (n_2 - 1)s_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2} \frac{19(167.77) + 19(149.305)}{20 + 20 - 2}
\]

\[ S_{\text{combination}} = 12.59 \]

To prove the hypothesis, the researcher used the following formula:

\[
t = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{S \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}}}
\]

\[
t = \frac{12.59}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{20} + \frac{1}{20}}}
\]

\[
t = 14.3
\]

The writer used t-score in testing the hypothesis. After getting the score of calculating the t-score formula, the writer referred to the critical score on t-score measurement table to find out whether the hypothesis is accepted or rejected. Based on the calculation above, the result of t-test was 3.66 and t-table was 1.68. It can be concluded that t-test was higher than t-table (3.66 > 1.68). It means that the alternative hypothesis ($H_a$) was accepted and the null hypothesis ($H_0$) was rejected. So, Think Pair Share technique improved the students’ speaking skill.

5. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

After completing this study, it was found that after the treatment the students’ post-test score got a better result than pre-test score. This research shows that the Think Pair Share technique affected the students’ speaking skill. In addition, the t-test was applied in order to know whether the difference between the pre-test and post-test mean was significant already clear. The result of t-test score was 3.66 is higher than critical score at the significant standard $\alpha = 0.05$ that is 1.68, which proved that the alternative hypothesis of this study is accepted and the null hypothesis was rejected. It indicates that there is a positive impact after teaching speaking by using think pair share technique.

Based on the research results and discussions, the writer concluded that the use of think pair share technique improves students’ speaking skill. It was proven by the improvement of students’ learning outcomes. The mean score of post-test for experimental class was higher than the pre-test. It means that there is improvement in speaking skill for experimental class. Meanwhile, the mean score of post-test for control class was lower than the post-test of experimental class. The result shows that there was no improvement in speaking skill for control class. Finally, the main finding of this is think pair share technique
improves students’ speaking skill. This technique increases students’ motivation and students’ participation during teaching and learning process.
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