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ABSTRACT

Siti Ani Nur Fauziyah. 11310031. *Enhancing the Students’ Speaking Skill Using Think-Pair-Share on the Eleventh Grade of SMK Diponegoro Salatiga in Academic Year of 2013/2014*. Final Project. The English Department of STAIN Salatiga. The advisor is Noor Malihah, Ph.D.

This study is conducted in order to enhance the students’ speaking skill on eleventh grade students of SMK Diponegoro Salatiga through Think-Pair-Share. The study is related to the results of a preliminary study showed that the students were still poor in English speaking skill, especially in giving interpersonal response. This study used a classroom action research which is conducted to solve the students’ problem in English speaking. The classroom action research was done based on Kemmis and Mc Taggart’s (2010) concept. The writer did two cycles in which each cycle consists of planning, action, observation and reflection. Each cycle consists of two meetings. The data were gathered through qualitative and quantitative data. The qualitative data were obtained by analyzing the interview, observation and questionnaire. Then, quantitative data were obtained from the students speaking score of pre-test and post-test. The findings of this study show that the implementation of Think-Pair-Share was successful since the criteria of success were achieved. The first criterion was 75% of students could pass the target score ≥70.0 based on the KKM. The findings show that 78% of students had already achieved the target score in the second cycle. Besides, the second criterion was the students who become more active involved in teaching learning process. The results of observation, interview and questionnaire show that by using Think-Pair-Share students actively involved in the classroom. Based on the findings of this study, the writer suggests that the English teacher could implement Think-Pair-Share in teaching speaking in order to motivate students in learning English speaking.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the writer will discuss about introduction. The introduction consists of background of the study, problems of statement, purpose of the study, benefits of the study, the definition of the terms and the outline of graduating paper. The writer provides further explanation of each section below.

1.1 Background of the Study

English is learned seriously by many people to have a good prospect in the community of international world. Many countries use English as a means of communication today, for example America, England, Australia and other countries in the world. Likewise, in Indonesia many people learn English as a foreign language. English has been introduced to educational institutions as an obligatory subject for students from junior high school to university level, and as a local content in an elementary school. By learning English, the students are intended to have some language skill: speaking, reading, writing and listening.

Speaking is an important skill that must be practiced to communicate orally (Brindley, 1995: 19). When speaking, people can deliver their ideas and exchange the information to others. Speaking is a habit formation that needs practicing as often as possible (Tarigan, 1990).

SMK Diponegoro Salatiga is a school in which an English speaking skill is taught. The writer has conducted an observation on how the students’
speaking skill. Based on the observation, the writer has found that the teachers are really competent in teaching English. The students are cooperative and have the ability to master English. However, based on the writer’s observation, one of the problems the students face is their speaking ability. Their English speaking ability is still low. There are several causes of the problem why the students got difficulty in speaking. The problem may come from the students, the teachers and the methods as well as techniques used in the teaching learning process. The problems which probably come from the students’ side are (i) they feel shy when speaking English, (ii) they are afraid when other students laugh because he or she make mistake while speaking English, (iii) they do not know how to start an idea when they have to speak. If they try to speak English, they feel their grammar and pronunciation are poor.

To anticipate the problems above, the teacher must be able to choose the appropriate teaching methods, for example by considering the material presented, time available and learning objectives. Teachers should use various teaching methods to stimulate the students’ motivation to learn and reinforce them to learn speaking. There are several methods and techniques which are frequently used by teacher to teach speaking to overcome these problems, for examples: Think-Pair-Share, Jigsaw, Role Play, Think-Aloud Pair Problem Solving, Critical Debate (Barkley et al., 2005: 141). One method that the writer is looking at is Think-Pair-Share.
Barkley et al. (2005) define Think-Pair-Share as a method in which students think individually for a few minutes, then discuss and compare their responses with a partner before they do speech in front of the classroom. They argue that Think-Pair-Share can improve both students and teacher’s motivation to be active and creative in a teaching learning process, especially in speaking. By applying Think-Pair-Share students and teachers are expected to improve the English learning activities.

Based on the explanation above, in this study, the writer would like to conduct a research entitled “ENHANCING THE STUDENTS’ SPEAKING SKILL USING THINK-PAIR-SHARE ON THE ELEVENTH GRADE OF SMK DIPONEGORO SALATIGA IN ACADEMIC YEAR OF 2013/2014”.

1.2 Problems of Statement

Based on the background of the study, the writer wants to find out whether using Think-Pair-Share can enhance the students’ speaking skill on the eleventh grade of SMK Diponegoro Salatiga. The problems are formulated as follows:

1. How the teaching learning process when Think-Pair-Share are applied in the classroom.
2. Whether Think-Pair-Share can improve the students’ speaking skill or not.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

Generally, the purpose of this study is to find out whether using Think-Pair-Share can enhance the students’ speaking skill on the eleventh grade of SMK
Diponegoro Salatiga in the academic year of 2013/2014. The purposes of this study especially are to get information about:

1. How the teaching learning process is when Think-Pair-Share is applied in the classroom.

2. Whether or not the use of Think-Pair-Share improve the students’ speaking skill.

1.4 Benefits of the Study

In this study the writer expects that this study has some benefits both theoretically and practically:

1. Theoretical benefits:

   The results of the research can be used as the reference for those who want to conduct a research on the selection of method to improve speaking skills in the English teaching learning process.

2. Practical benefits:

   (a) The readers get a wide knowledge about teaching speaking using Think-Pair-Share.

   (b) The writer has an ability to choose the appropriate method in teaching English.

1.5 Definitions of Terms

To make the title easily understood, the writer wants to give the definition and explanation of the terms used. They are:
1.5.1 Speaking

According to Hornby (1995: 318), speaking is making use of word in an ordinary voice, uttering word, knowing and being able to use a language, expressing oneself in words and making a speech.

1.5.2 Think-Pair-Share

Barkley (2005: 96) states that Think-Pair-Share is a very simple but effective technique to increase the quantity and quality of discussion participation. It is a technique in which students think individually for a few minutes, then discuss and compare their responses with a partner before sharing with the entire class.

1.5 Outline of Graduating Paper

This graduating paper is organised into five chapters: Chapter I, Chapter II, Chapter III, Chapter IV, Chapter V. Chapter I is introduction. It describes background of the study, problems of statement, purpose of the study, benefits of the study, definitions of terms and outline of graduating paper. Chapter II presents the review of related theory, including the definition of speaking, definition of Think-Pair-Share. Chapter III provides a discussion on research method. This chapter includes the setting of the research, the research subject, the procedure of research, type of data, techniques of collecting data, research instrument, techniques for analyzing data, criteria of the action success and implementation of the study. Chapter IV presents the results and discussion. Finally, Chapter V present the closure consisting of a conclusion and suggestion.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED THEORY

In this chapter, the writer discusses about review of related theory. Review of related theory consists of explanation of speaking, explanation of Think-Pair-Share and the understanding about curriculum KTSP. The writer provides further explanation of each section below.

2.1 Speaking

2.1.1 Definition of Speaking

According to McDonough and Shaw (2003: 133), speaking is not the oral production of written language but include learners in the mastery of a wide range sub skill which added together, then it supports speaking skill. Its mean that speaking is produce without some combination of language skill but it must be included a numbers of skill.

The word speaking has many different meaning. Speaking is the productive aural/oral skill. It consists of producing systematic verbal utterances to convey meaning (Nunan, 2003: 28). For most people, the ability to speak language is the same as knowing a language since the speech is the most basic means of human communications. When we speak, a great deal more than just mouth is involved such as nose, pharynx, epiglottis, trachea, lungs and more. But, according to
Cornbleet and Carter (2001: 17), speaking just not make sound and though it may be communication of sorts, it is not speaking.

From the statement above, it can be concluded that speaking is an important instrument of communication included expressing ideas, feeling or opinion to other by using words or sound of articulations in order to inform. All people can speak and so take the skill to much for granted. It means that speaking is very important skill for human being.

2.1.2 Aspects of Speaking

In practicing English, aspects of speaking are important to be paid attention. Gower, Philips and Walters (1995: 99) state that there are two skills in speaking, accuracy and fluency. Accuracy involves the correct use of vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation, while fluency can be thought as the ability to keep going when speaking spontaneously. So, if students want to speaks English, they have to pay attention to the aspects of speaking. Below is further explanation of each element in speaking skill.

2.1.2.1 Pronunciation

Pronunciation is one of the students’ way to utter English words. As stated by Brown (2001: 270), pronunciation is a key to gaining full communicative competence. Pronunciation is one of the difficult language components for teaching oral communication skills to determine how sound vary and pattern in a language.
2.1.2.2 Vocabulary

Vocabulary is an element that must be processed by the speakers and the listeners in order the process of speaking run well. Vocabulary refers to a list or set of words that individual speakers of a language might use (Hatch and Brown, 1995: 1). It means the appropriate diction which is used in conversation. Having limited vocabulary is a barrier that precludes learners from learning a language. Without having a sufficient vocabulary, one cannot communicate effectively or express ideas in both oral and written form.

2.1.2.3 Grammar

Grammar as stated by Ur (1996: 75) is sometimes defined as ‘the way words are put together to make correct sentences’. It concerns with how to arrange a correct sentences in conversation. It can develop the ability to understand and respond quickly, and the ability to articulate. The utility of grammar is also to learn the correct way to gain expertise in a language in oral and written form.

2.1.2.4 Fluency

When speaking fluency students should be able to get the message across with whatever resources and abilities they have got, regardless of grammatical and other mistakes. Nunan (2003: 55) defines fluency as the extent to which speakers use the
language quickly and confidently, with few hesitations or unnatural pauses, false starts, word searches, etc. It means that fluency is being able to communicate one’s ideas without having a stop and think too much about you are saying.

2.1.3 Assessing Speaking

According to Luoma (2004: 1), assessing speaking is challenging. However, there are so many factors that influence our impression of how well someone can speak a language. Then, we also expect test scores to be accurate and appropriate for our purpose. To comprehend speaking from someone, needful to act of determining purpose of the study. Thus, we can determine ways to assesses and point that assessing by the teacher in order to be achieving the purposes that use by the teacher. Ur uses some ways to assess speaking. He submits what he calls as the scoring rubric. Explanation of the scoring rubric can be seen on table 2.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>ASPECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Pronunciation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Produces words with correct and clear pronunciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Produces words with mostly correct pronunciation but sometimes there is any error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Produces words with some errors pronunciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>May have many strong foreign accents or produces words with too many errors pronunciation and unintelligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Little or no language produces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Little or no language produces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum score = 20
Score = the results of score x 100

Based on the explanation above, the score is the students’ score which is calculated from the score obtained by the students, divided which maximum score and multiplied by 100%. The obtained score is the score which is gained by every student in the aspects of pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary and fluency. The maximum score is the highest score when the students speaking based on the four aspects determined.
2.1.4 Methods and Techniques of Teaching Speaking

According to Barkley et al. (2005: 141), there are some methods and techniques which can be used to enhance the teaching of many different subjects by actively involving students in class. Some of these methods in teaching speaking are: to involve students working in groups is Jigsaw and Role Play, to involve students working in pairs is Think-Aloud Pair Problem Solving and Think-Pair-Share. These methods and techniques can be used by college and high school classes and are suitable for large and small groups. Below is further explanation of each methods can improve speaking skill.

2.1.4.1 Jigsaw

Jigsaw is strategy that involves students working in groups to become experts on a specific topic (Barkley et al. 2005: 236). This method used with narrative material in grades 3-12. Each team member is responsible for learning a specific part of a topic. After meeting with members of the groups, who are the “expert” in the same part, the “expert” return to their own groups and present their findings. Team members then are quizzed on all topics. Based on this technique, it has been proven that the Jigsaw can be used for speaking lessons. For example, Gusdartiwiwensif (2006) investigates the effectiveness on Jigsaw technique to improve the students’ speaking ability in the grade students of SD N Pasir Tanjung 1 Karawang.
2.1.4.2 Role Play

Role Play is a classroom activity which gives the students opportunity to practice the language, the aspect of role behaviour (Barkley et al. 2005: 226). The purpose of the Role Play is to provide visual environment for students in the direct feel emotional and intellectual response of an imagined situation. Priscilia and Islam (2012), conducted a researches to look at the effectiveness of role play to enhance the speaking skills of the learners in a large classroom.

2.1.4.3 Think-Aloud Pair Problem Solving

Think-Aloud Pair Problem Solving (TAPPS) is a peer instruction technique that involves students working in pairs to solves problems. One student in the pair is assigned the role of problem-solver and the other student is assigned the role of listener. The problem-solver works a given problems, describing out loud how he is solving the problem. His partner listens to this explanation and gives feedback on the problem-solving techniques used. Students in each pair will switch roles either during the same class or for the next class session. This strategy helps students learn and refine problem-solving techniques (Barkley et al 2005: 259). Barkley (2005) conducts a research on the use of TAPPS to stimulate the students to think and speak in speaking lesson.
2.1.4.4 Think-Pair-Share

Think-Pair-Share is a cooperative learning strategy that can promote and support higher-level thinking. The teacher asks students to think about a specific topic, and then work in pair with another student to discuss their thinking and, after that, share their ideas with the group (Ontario, 2006). Kusrini (2012) has implemented Think-Pair-Share to improve the students speaking skill. Her findings show that the use of Think-Pair-Share leads the students to be more active and busy as well as challenged to share their ideas. The students also have some more practices comprehensively.

From the results of pre-observation above, the writer will use Think-Pair-Share to improve students’ speaking skill. The writer provides further explanation of Think-Pair-Share below.

2.2 Think-Pair-Share

2.2.1 Definition of Think-Pair-Share

Barkley et al. (2005: 96) state that Think-Pair-Share is a very simple but effective technique for increasing the quantity and quality of discussion participation. It is a technique in which students think individually for a few minutes, and then discuss and compare their responses with a partner before sharing with the entire class.

According Lie (2002: 57), Think-Pair-Share is a process of learning that gives students the opportunity to work independently and
in cooperate with others. In this case, a very important role of teachers to guide students to the discussion, thus creating a learning atmosphere that is more alive, active, creative, effective and fun.

Think-Pair-Share is a cooperative discussion strategy that has three parts to the process, there are students think about a question or an issue, they talk with a partner about their thoughts, then some children share their discussion and thinking with the class (McCandlish, 2012).

Based on the definitions above, it can be concluded that Think-Pair-Share is a learning technique that provides a structured opportunity to students to think about the case, issue or certain topic, work in pair to discuss their individual ideas, and share those ideas with other students to improve communication skill.

2.2.2 Method and Techniques of Teaching English

The writer needs to know the definition of method and technique in teaching English.

2.2.2.1 Method of Teaching English

English teacher needs a method to help their students in mastery English ability. According to Brown (2001: 16), method is generalized set of classroom specification of accomplishing linguistic objectives. Method is treated at the level of design in which the roles of teachers, learners and instructional materials are specified (Fauziyati, 2002: 5). Based on the definitions
method above, the writer concludes that Think-Pair-Share is a method in teaching English.

2.2.2.2 Technique of Teaching English

According to Brown (2001: 16), technique is any of wide variety of exercises, activity or divides used in the language classroom for realizing lesson objectives. Fauziyati (2002: 6) describes that technique is classroom practice done by the teacher when presenting a language program. This is the way the classroom activities are integrated into lessons and used as the basis for teaching learning.

The writer is interested in dialogue as one technique of teaching skill. Dialogue is a conversation between two or more people to share ideas or view points. It helps the students practice in speech, pronunciation, vocabulary. Today, dialogue is often used in educational program. Dialogues used in such school to improve the students speaking skill by treat them to represent their conversation in pairs to the class. The technique is good for generating class discussion and sharing of opinions and ideas.

2.2.3 Purpose of Using Think-Pair-Share

Barkley et al. (2005: 155-156) state that the purpose of Think-Pair-Share is to practice comments first with a peer tends to improve the quality of student contributions and generally increases willingness and
readiness to speak in a larger group. It is also preparing students to participate more fully and effectively in whole class discussion. It can be indicated as follows:

1. To help students process the information.
2. To develop communication skills.
3. To encourage students to think about a question, issue, or problem.
4. To refine their understanding through discussion with a partner.

2.2.4 Procedures of Using Think-Pair-Share

The procedures of using Think-Pair-Share in teaching speaking based on Richards and Rodgers (2001: 198) are:

1. Teacher posses a discussion topic or a question

   Teacher presents an issue for discussion in the form of a problem or question. Teacher provokes students’ thinking with a question or prompt or observation.

2. Students think of a response individually

   Students should be given time for about one until two minutes to think about the issue.

3. Students discuss their responses with a partner

   Students form pairs in order to discuss the issue. Discussion time may vary depending on the question and how the discussion run within the pairs. Students in pairs compare their thoughts to identify and to find the best arguments or answers of the question.
4. Randomly call on a few students to share their ideas with the class. Individuals share their thoughts or may their partner’s thoughts with the entire class. This strategy is designed to foster short class discussion. Other students can respond to what is said or they can share their own opinion or arguments.

2.2.5 Advantages of Think-Pair-Share

There are some advantages of teaching speaking by using Think-Pair-Share class (Ontorio: 2006), they are:

1. When students have appropriate “think time”, the quality of their responses improves.
2. Students are actively engaged in thinking.
3. Thinking becomes more focused when it is discussed with a partner.
4. More critical thinking is retained after a lesson in which students have had an opportunity to discuss and reflect on the topic.
5. Many students find it easier or safer to enter into a discussion with another classmate, rather than with a large group.
6. No specific materials are needed for this strategy, so it can be easily incorporated into lessons.
7. Building on the ideas of others is an important skill for students to learn.
8. In sharing their ideas, students take ownership of their learning and negotiate meanings.
2.2.6 Disadvantages of Think-Pair-Share

Beside Think-Pair-Share gives some advantages for learning process, it also has several disadvantages. As each student should think individually at first, express their ideas in pairs later and discuss what they make to other teams, learning with Think-Pair-Share needs a lot of time.

Automatically, the students should discuss step by step (first think individually, then discuss with their partner in pair. Next, they should discuss or share in class. After that, the teacher should give feedback for the students work). Within these steps, it can be seen that the students need more time to discuss and share their ideas.

In addition, when the teacher provides the students with an interesting topic, the students will be more enthusiastic to have the discussion and share their ideas to their friends. The implementation is that it takes longer time for the students to have the discussion. In this situation, the teacher should be able to manage the time well. Teacher may avoid this problem by monitoring the class and controlling every step used for the students to think, to work in pair and to share the ideas. If this is prepared by the teacher well, Think-Pair-Share will run successfully. While there are disadvantages of Think-Pair-Share, but the advantages from this method can be used to improve students’ speaking.
2.3 Curriculum KTSP

2.3.1 Definition of Curriculum

There are many point of views related to the definition of curriculum. According Brown (2001: 16), Curriculum is designed to carry out a particular language program. Features include a primary concern with the specification of linguistic an subject-matter objectives, sequencing and materials to meet the needs of a designated group of learners in a defined context. Brown (2001, cited in Setyaningrum 2009) stated that:

“Curriculum is broad and varied as the child’s school environment broadly conceived, curriculum embraces not only on the subject matter but also various aspects of the physical and social environment consisting of school facilities, subject matter, other children and teacher from interaction or the child with these elements learning results”

From the definition above, the writer can conclude that curriculum is a set plan of teaching learning process, which consists of teaching materials, lesson plan, learning experiences and specific objectives that are planned and applied. In Indonesia, there are several curriculum used in a school depending on the need of the school, for example curriculum 1968, 1975, 1988, KBK and KTSP. In this study, the school that the writer will investigate applies the use of curriculum KTSP which the writer will discuss in the next section.

2.3.2 Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP)

According to Kunandar (2007: 103), KTSP is an operational curriculum that is arranged and applied by each educational unit that reflects on
knowledge, skills and attitude so that it can increase the whole students’ potency

In addition, Mulyasa (2006) defines KTPS curriculum as a derivation model curriculum in a school level, which is developed and suited to characteristics of the school, the region, the social characteristics of the surrounding and the characteristics of its pupils.

Based on the definition above, the writer concludes that KTSP is the operational curriculum of the competency-based curriculum that is arranged by each educational unit, which is suited and adapted to the characteristic of school, region, socials and pupils.

2.3.3 Characteristics of KTSP

According to Mulyasa (2006), there are at least four characteristics of KTSP, which can be identified, namely:

1. The full authority of headmaster and educational unit

Each school has a board of trustee that is responsible for all aspects of school operation. In this case, the headmaster has some rules dealing with the school operation such as the full authority holder of the school and the decision maker of the school together with school committee. Related to the concept of KTSP, the headmaster should be able to adopt the student’s need and the local community need based on the characteristics and cultural environment background.
2. Parents and society have more influences

Parents and society may also participate in making school decision. Through the school council, parents and society are able to supervise and help school in managing the school program. The participation can be taken directly and indirectly in school program and learning process.

3. The democratic and professional leadership

According to Sutisna (1993), the leadership can be defined as a process of affecting individual or group activity in order to achieve the intended goal in certain condition. In the school, the headmaster has the significant role in determining the school policy.

Dealing with the concept of KTSP, the existence of the headmaster as the person elected by the school committee and some school personnel’s hold the responsibility for creating conducive atmosphere which is suited to teaching learning process dealing with school decision. The headmaster has the high authority for making school decisions in line with the school committee agreement.

4. Transparent teamwork

A school system consists of some intercorelated components namely the students, the teachers, parents and some other school personnels. Those all components work together in order to realize
the intended goal. It means that those components need good coordination.

Based on the characteristics above, all school components are required to conduct and manage the coordination properly in order to achieve the certain purpose. Related to the KTSP concept, the intended goals have to deal with the mission and visions of the school.

2.3.4 The Purpose of English Lesson in KTSP

Based on the Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan (BSNP) Jakarta (2006: 111), the purposes of English lesson are: (1) Be able to get knowledge and basic skill English language to advocate of attainment competency and (2) To apply ability and skills English language to good communication by spoken or written in level intermediate.

The purposes above should be completed by any schools giving English lesson to the students. The same is also for the vocational high school or Sekolah Menengah Kejuruan (SMK) that students of SMK should attain the basic skill of English language and be able to use the language in communication.

2.3.5 The Aspects English Lesson in KTSP

According BSNP Jakarta (2006: 112), the aspects of English subject in a vocational high school are:

1. The basic of communication English language level novice.
2. The basic of communication English language level elementary.
3. The basic of communication English language level intermediate.
The English language level novice is for tenth grade in vocational high school. The English language level elementary is for eleventh grade and level intermediate is for twelfth grade in vocational high school. Based on the levels above, the writer infers that the aspect in competency standard on the eleventh grade in SMK is the basic of communication English language level elementary.

2.3.6 Standard Competency of English Subject Matter

The standard competency of English as a subject is a potency of measurement in competency minimum, which should be achieved by students after following instruction. According BSNP Jakarta, (2006: 115), the standard competency of English subject for Vocational High School (Sekolah Menengah Kejuruan or SMK) must be achieved are four skills in English language, they are:

1. Listening: Students are able to understand the simple everyday conversation both in professional and personal contexts with people not native speakers.

2. Reading: Students are able to understand the simple instructions.

3. Writing: Students are able to take a note in the simple message either directly or by interaction tool.

4. Speaking: Students are able to create a message with a short message and a list of word choice, spelling and grammar writing acceptable.
From the explanation above, KTSP is dealing with the mission and visions of the school and standard competency KTSP. Especially, students are able to create a message with a short message and a list of word choice, spelling and grammar writing acceptable. This is why the writer will use the Think-Pair-Share to achieve characteristics and standard competency as mentioned in KTSP.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHOD

In this chapter, the writer will discuss the methodology of the research and the implementation of the research. In section 3.1, the writer will describe a review of an action research. Then, section 3.2, discusses about classroom action research. Finally, in section 3.3, the writer will present the implementation of the research.

3.1 Action Research

According to Elliott (1982, cited in Winter, 1989: 10), action research as the study of a social situation, with a view to improving the quality of action within it and the action research provides the necessary link between self-evaluation and professional development, there are two points. The first points is that the process involves reflection, as indicated in the word ‘evaluation’ and the second is that the process involves changes in practice, as indicated in the term ‘professional development’.

In addition, Carr and Kemmis (1986, cited in Mayrina 2011: 27) define action research is a form of self-reflective enquiry undertaken by participations in social (including educational) situations in order to improve the rationality and justice of (a) their own social or educational practices, (b) their understanding of these practices and (c) the situations in which the practices are carried out.

From the definitions above, it can be concluded that action research is carried out as a device to overcome problems in learning activity.
3.2 Classroom Action Research

Arikunto (2006: 104) argues that classroom action research is a research in which the root of the problems appear in the class. This classroom action research is conducted by the teacher that pertinent in the study to develop their teaching skill. In addition, Kusumah states that classroom action research can be conducted using four ways. They are: planning, action, observation and reflection. Kusumah argue that classroom action research is aimed to develop teachers’ teaching skill and to improve students’ score.

Based on the definitions above, classroom action research is aimed not only to develop teaching skill for the teacher but also to improve students’ score and solve their problem in learning. As the writer has found that the speaking skill of the students in class D Marketing is still low, the writer would like to conduct a classroom action research in this class to improve their speaking skill ability. In conducting classroom action research, the writer will apply specifically Think-Pair-Share through some procedures that the writer will explain further in the next section.

3.2.1 The Setting of the Research

This research is conducted at SMK Diponegoro Salatiga which is located at Jl. Kartini 2, Salatiga, Jawa Tengah. This school has eighteen classrooms. Each grade consists of six classes. Beside classrooms, this school has a teacher’s room, some toilets, a hall and parking space for students and teachers. It has also some facilities to support teaching and learning process, for instance a computer laboratory, language
laboratory, business center, cash register laboratory, natural sciences laboratory, a library and many others.

3.2.2 The Research Subject

The subject of the research is the eleventh grade students of marketing program, class D, SMK Diponegoro Salatiga in academic year 2013/2014. The subject is chosen purposively by the teacher based on the lowest score of English speaking test from all the eleventh grade classes. The number of the students is 33 students that consist of 6 boys and 27 girls. The name of the students are confidential. The writer used a sign of code to give the identity of the students. For example 001B, 001 is the number of the respondent and B is a boy.

3.2.3 The Procedure of Research

Kemmis and Mc Taggart (1988, cited in Arikunto, 2010: 132) suggest a model of an classroom action research. They state that an classroom action research occurs through a dynamic and complementary process which consists of four fundamental steps in a spiraling process. They are as follows:

1. Planning is develop a plan of critically informed action to improve what is already happening.
2. Action is act to implement the plan.
3. Observation is observe the effect of the critically informed in the context in which it occurs.
4. Reflection is reflect these effects as the basic for further planning.
Kemmis and Mc Taggart (2010: 132) illustrate the concept of an classroom action research in figure 3.1. There are two cycles in which each cycle contains four phases: planning, action, observation and reflection.

**Figure 3.1**

The Classroom Action Research Concept
(Kemmis and Mc Taggart 2010: 132)

The action research in this study was a collaborative classroom action research. It means the writer was assisted by one of the English teachers as collaborator in conducting this study. The writer and the teacher did all of the research activities starting from the planning of the action, the implementation of the action, the observation of the implementation and the reflection of the action. The writer acted as a teacher who taught speaking using Think-Pair-Share. While the
collaborator acted as the observer who observed the implementation of the action and the whole of teaching and learning process. This kind of action research design is called a systematic process of collaboration in which one teacher observes and gives feedback with some form of reciprocity to another teacher (Brown, 2001: 441).

3.2.4 Type of Data

In this study, the writer has collected the data using both qualitative method and quantitative method. The qualitative data is collected using an observation, an interview, a documentation and a questionnaire. On the other hand, the quantitative data is collected from the test that consists of a pre-test and a post-test. A pre-test is conducted in the beginning of the cycle and a post-test is conducted in the end of the cycle. The tests are conducted to know whether the score of the students’ speaking skill improves or not. The writer will discuss each data further in the next section.

3.2.5 Techniques of Collecting Data

To collect the qualitative data, the writer uses an interview, an observation, a documentation and a questionnaire. While for quantitative data, the writer has collected using a pre-test and a post-test. The writer provides explanation for each technique used below:

3.2.5.1 Interview

Before implementing a classroom action research, the writer interviewed the teacher about students’ problems related to their
speaking skill, the kinds of teaching learning method applied by the teacher in teaching speaking and the students’ condition during speaking activity.

3.2.5.2 Observation

In this study, observation is conducted before and during the research. Observation before research was conducted to identify the students’ problem in studying English especially speaking skill and the situation of speaking class before research. The writer has taken an observation notes about situation in the class while teaching learning process occured. This observation was to look at what the teacher said, students’ responses, instructions from the teacher, situation of the class and everything acted by the teacher and the students related to speaking skills, such as: pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, fluency and comprehension.

3.2.5.3 Documentation

Documentation is a set of documents relevant to the research including students’ work sheet, lesson plans and classroom materials. In this study, the writer needs these documents to complete the data, especialy a the test results the students’.

3.2.5.4 Questionnaire

A questionnaire was given to the eleventh grade students of Marketing program, class D of SMK Diponegoro Salatiga in
order to know their responses toward the process of teaching learning speaking using Think-Pair-Share. Therefore, such a questionnaire is also used to identify the students’ motivation and problems in learning speaking before and after they are taught using Think-Pair-Share.

3.2.5.5 Pre-test
A pre-test is used to know how far is the students ability about speaking before applying a particular method. In this study, the pre-test is given to the students orally.

3.2.5.6 Post-test
After the students are given a pre-test, the writer gave a post-test to the students. The next type of the post-test was in the form of oral production test. The post-test are given to investigate whether Think-Pair-Share can improve students’ speaking skill.

3.2.6 Research Instrument
Instrument of research is developed by the writer to keep the content of validation. They are to kinds of the instruments that writer uses they are:

3.2.6.1 Test Instrument
Test instrument uses to measure the basic skill or the students’ achievement. It used to know the level of the students comprehension of the Think-Pair-Share. The test uses to measure the students’ speaking skill is subjective test.
3.2.6.2 Non-test Instrument

Non-test instrument is the instrument that uses to get the information about the situation without test instrument. Non-test instrument is needed to get the real data that related with cognitive and behavior.

3.2.7 Technique for Analyzing the Data

Techniques for analyzing the data in this study are analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively. It means that all the data gathered from the observations during teaching learning process, interview and questionnaire after and before classroom action research are analyzed qualitatively. While data obtained from the pre-test and post-test are analyzed descriptive statistic technique. The descriptive statistic technique is used to know students’ participation and their activities in the classroom. To analyze the data statistically, first, the writer calculated the students’ score using formula in figure 3.2.

**Figure 3.2 Means (Sudjana, 2002: 67)**

\[
\bar{x} = \frac{\sum x}{N}
\]

- \(\bar{x}\) : means
- \(\sum x\) : individual score
- \(N\) : number of student

Second, the writer continued the analysis by getting the class percentages from the students who passed the target score of the
minimal mastery level criterion or *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimum* (KKM). In kurikulum KTSP in SMK Diponegoro Salatiga, the KKM for speaking subject is 7.00. To get percentages the writer used formula as illustrated by Sudijono (2008: 43) in figure 3.3.

**Figure 3.3 Class percentage**

\[
P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100\%
\]

- **P**: the class percentage
- **F**: total percentage score
- **N**: number of student

Finally, the writer analyzed the students speaking score from the pre-test and the post-test. This analysis is to know whether or not the students improve their score. To get the percentage of the students’ improvement, the writer used the Meltzer’s formula (2008: 3) as illustrated in figure 3.4.

**Figure 3.4 The percentage of students’ improvement**

\[
P = \frac{y^1 - y}{y} \times 100\%
\]

- **P**: percentage of students’ improvement
- **y^1**: post-test 1
- **y**: pre-test results
3.2.7 Criteria of the Action Success

Classroom action research is able to be called successful if it can exceed the criteria which has been determined. In this study, the students’ speaking score could achieve the target of the minimal mastery level criterion or *Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimum* (KKM) of English (70.0) and it is considered successful if 75% of the students could pass the assessment score 70.0 which is adapted from the school agreement in SMK Diponegoro Salatiga.

In addition, the success of the action is not only measured with the achievement students’ speaking score, but also the Think-Pair-Share can motivate the students and they become more actively in learning process. If the criterion of the action success achieved, it means that the next action of the classroom action research would be stopped, but if this condition has not been reached yet, the alternative action be done in the next cycle.

3.3 Implementation of the Study

In this study, the writer would like to discuss the implementation of the classroom action research activities. This study is undertaken in eleventh grade students of Marketing program, class D because the teacher in SMK Diponegoro Salatiga found that class D Marketing students face many difficulties in speaking English.

In order to find the facts regarding to the problems, the writer undertook a preliminary study. In the preliminary study, the writer conducted
an interview to the teacher, observed the class, gave questionnaire to all
students of eleventh grade class D Marketing and a pre-test.

3.3.1 The Preliminary Study

3.3.1.1 Interview

This interview was conducted on Saturday, March 29, 2014 to
the English teacher in SMK Diponegoro Salatiga who teaches
students of eleventh grade class D Marketing. The interviews
was taken twice, that is before and after classroom action
research. The writer asked to the teacher some questions which
were devided into three catagories of question. They are: the
general condition of class, the difficulty in speaking skill and the
strategy used by the teacher in teaching learning (see appendix 1
more for detail).

3.3.1.2 Observation

This observation was conducted on Monday, March 31, 2014.
The writer took observation notes about situation in the class
while teaching learning process occured. This observation was
to look at what the teacher said to the students, the students’
responses, the instructions from the teacher, situation of the
class and everything acted by the teacher and the students
related to the speaking skills, such as: pronunciation,
vocabulary, grammar and fluency.
3.3.1.3 Questionnaire

The questionnaire was conducted before and after the implementation of Think-Pair-Share. The first questionnaire was on Monday, April 21, 2014, to know the students’ response in teaching learning process, Identifying students’ problems in learning English especially speaking, students’ background, activities done in speaking class. The second questionnaire was given after the implementation of Think-Pair-Share on Thursday, May 5, 2014. The second questionnaire was given to find out whether or not there is an improvement on the students’ speaking activity. For detail of the second questionnaire, please see appendix 4 and 5.

3.3.1.4 Pre-test

The pre-test is done before implementing Think-Pair-Share. The pre-test was conducted on Monday, April 21, 2014. There were 33 students joined the speaking class to pre-test. The writer gave a text ‘Mount Ciremai’ and the writer asked the students to make a conclusion from the text orally. The pre-test was to measure the students’ speaking ability before the implementation of Think-Pair-Share. About the instruments for the pre-test, see appendix 6 for more detailed in information. The schedule of the pre-test given in table 3.1
Table 3.1 The Schedule of Preliminary Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Saturday, March 29</td>
<td>06.30 - 07.15 a.m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Monday, March 31</td>
<td>10.15 - 11.45 a.m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Monday, April 21</td>
<td>10.15 - 11.45 a.m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.2 Implementation of Think-Pair-Share

To implement Think-Pair-Share in teach speaking, the writer arranged two cycles. Arikunto (2010: 142) argues that there are more than one meetings in one cycle. He states that one meeting is not enough because, the teacher or the researcher will have limited experience to look at the teaching learning process occurred in the class. Therefore, in this study the writer used two meetings for each cycle. There are four steps in each cycle: planning, action, observation and reflection. The whole steps of this research will be explained in the description bellow:

3.3.2.1 Cycle 1

3.3.2.1.1 Planning

The writer planned the action conducted in cycle 1 based on the problems found on preliminary observation. The writer prepared a lesson plan for two meetings with time allocated is 2 x 45’ each meeting. The writer looked for materials of...
expressions used in describing processes. Before conducting the research, the writer also prepared some instruments of research, such as: prepare list of the students’ name, prepared the students’ worksheet and everything related to the action.

In cycle 1, there were two meetings. The first meeting was to present the materials with implementation of Think-Pair-Share and the second meetings was for post-test. For detailed schedule of implementation of cycle 1, it can be seen on Table 3.2 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Cycle 1</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Thursday, April 24 2014</td>
<td>08.30 -10.00 a.m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Meeting (Post-test 1)</td>
<td>Monday, April 28 2014</td>
<td>10.15-11.45 a.m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.2.1.2 Action

In implementing the action, the writer played a role as a teacher. Meanwhile, the observer was M. Abdul Gafur, S.PdI. He was the collaborator. He helped the writer observe the students response, participation, achievement, the teacher’s activity and everything during the teaching and learning process. In order to make this phase real and concrete, the observer also took an observation note in order to know how
far the method influences the student’s speaking ability in classroom.

The writer undertook the teaching learning process in three phases: opening, main activities and closing. The opening phase covered activities related to introduction such as greeting, checking students’ attendance. In this phase, the writer asked some questions to the students about their experiences and motivated the students to learn more about the materials. The activities in this phase were: explaining materials, thinking stage, pairing stage, sharing stage. In the closing phase, the writer gave advice to students’ motivation and concluded the materials. The writer presented the detailed activities of the first and second meeting in cycle 1 as follows:

1. **The First Meeting**

   The first meeting was conducted on Thursday, April 24, 2014. The topic was *expressions used in describing processes*.

   (a) Opening

   The class started at 08.30 a.m. The writer was in front of the class as the teacher. The observer was in back side to observe the students, the teacher and the situation of the class. Then, the writer looked at all of
students, conditioned and waited the students until they were ready to get lesson. Before starting the lesson, the writer and the students prayed together, then greeted the students and checked their attendance. There were 33 students joining the speaking class.

After that, the writer stated the goal of the lesson to learn “expressions used in describing processes” and reviewed the previous material. The writer gave warming up and said “Have you ever make a pudding?”. Many students answered “Yes Miss”. The writer said “How to make instant pudding?” Some students answered “Open the pudding mix than pour it into the bowl”. The writer asked “ Anything else? Please raise your hand!. After few minutes, one student raised her hand and said “Mix the pudding and enjoy it”.

(b) Main activity

The writer started to explain the expressions used in describing processes material, such as: the purpose of expressions describing processes and expressions used in describing processes. The students listened to the writer’s explanation carefully. After discussing the
material, the writer gave examples expressions from the text and asked to the students “Any question guys?”. But, only few students answered “No” and the others were just silent. Writer felt that students did not enjoy the activities.

Then, the writer introduced Think-Pair-Share in teaching English by using the topic that has been determined. The writer gave an ‘omelette’ picture and from the picture, the writer asked the students to think individually about steps of making omelette. After thinking individually, the writer asked the students to work in pair with their partner. The writer said “Ok, after you think about ‘steps making omelette’. Now, you discuss your opinion about how to make omelette with your partner. I will give you 5 minutes to discuss and you share in front of class. Do you get it?”. Some students answered “Yes, i get it Miss” but another students said “Hii, tidak usah maju to miss” (Hii, we do not need to go forwards miss). The writer said “Loh kenapa? (Why?) You can do it”. After 10 minutes, the students tried to share their discussion. When they shared their opinion about how to make an omelette, they were still nervous, confused. They did
not know what they had to do and doubtfully to express their idea.

(c) Closing
Before closing the class, firstly the writer asked the students about the difficulties during the teaching learning process. But, there were not questions concerning to the material. While to closing the class, the writer gave information about next meeting.

2. The Second Meeting (Post-test 1)
The second meeting was conducted on Monday, April 28, 2014. The essence of this meeting was to know the competence of students after implementing Think-Pair-Share, whether there was any improvement or not.
(a) Opening
The class started at 10.15 a.m - 11.45 a.m. The writer and the observer entered the classroom and took the position. The writer was as the teacher and the collaborator was as the observer. But, when the post-test was given, the writer and the observer played a role as assessors. There should be two assessors to make the assessment valid and fair.

Before starting the lesson, the writer and the students prayed together, then greeted the students
and checked their attendance. There were 33 students joined the speaking class. The writer reviewed the previous material “Do you remember about some expressions used in describing processes?”. Many students answered “Yes, ingat, Miss (Remembered, Miss)”. The writer said “OK. Let’s check your understanding. Now let me ask you, how to describe a process? Who knows? Please raise your hand”. Many students answered the question in a grumble without raising their hands. Then, the writer repeated the instruction “Someone please raise your hand and answer the question” But, no student raised his hand. Finally, the writer pointed one student “What is your opinion, Isna?” and the student answered the question. The writer gave reinforcement “Very good, Isna. Yes, your answer is true”.

(b) Main activity

The writer asked students to tell about one’s own daily activities with expressions used in describing processes. After that, the writer asked the students to find their partner to have a discussion in pair about daily activities. After they discuss the activities, the writer asked the students to share in front of class.
Before starting to assess, the writer told the students about scoring of post-test. There were several aspects, they are vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation and fluency. But, the students together answered “Susah, Miss”. “Well, let’s try it first and I will help you. Let’s do this together. One student answer ”Got the point Miss?” The writer answered “Of course”.

After all students finished preparing their dialogue, the writer called the students one by one with partner to share the dialogue in front of class with orally. When they told about their daily activities, there were many varieties of presentation. Some others pairs were nervous but they could manage it. Some others were very confident, but some were shy to speak.

(c) Closing

The writer gave feedback to all presenters and asked them to make a reflection of the activity. “How about the test today?” and many students replied that the activity was amazing, “deg-degan Miss but happy” and they laughed together. The writer say “All of you were great, although some of you were still nervous but it is ok, you have good progress. So, through all
our activities that have been done, have you all understood the expressions used in describing processes? And all students replied “Yes, Miss”. Then writer ended the meeting and said “Thanks a lot for you guys for today and see you next time”.

3.3.2.1.3 Observation

During the teaching and learning process, the writer was helped by the observer about observing the things happened in the class. The aim of this observation was to know whether using Think-Pair-Share could improve the students’ speaking skill or not. The results between pre-test would be compared with the post-test 1 results which had been taken after the implementation the action. The class observation was done when teaching and learning process happened. The observation was made based on the field notes written by the observer.

The classroom conditions was still uncontrolled yet, There were some trouble makers who disturbed the other students while the learning process was processing. Then, the observer suggested the teacher to clarify the instructions, gave more explanations and example in Think-Pair-Share activity. If the writer still cannot control students, the observer suggested to gave punishment. The students also looked shy
when they speak English. Students could not manage the time and task. (see appendix for detail sheet of results of the observational note).

3.3.2.1.4 Reflection

After analyzing the observation results of the cycle 1, the writer and the observer concluded that there were some positive and negative results from the observation that could be used to guide the reflection. Based on the results of first post test, it showed that only 45.45% who had passed the target score of the KKM. While from the observer’s assessment, the percentage of students who passed the KKM only 48.48%. So, to achieved 75% of students could pass the target score ≥70.0 based on the KKM, the writer and the observer had to move to the next cycle. (for more detail, see results of post test cycle 1 in chapter VI).

3.3.2.2 Cycle 2

3.3.2.2.1 Planning

The cycle 2 was carried out to solve the problems that had been found in cycle 1. The writer prepared the new lesson plan for two meetings, each meeting is 2 x 45’ minutes. The topic was making a conclusion. In this lesson the writer explained the definition of conclusion and some steps to
make a good conclusion and explain the characteristic of good informations.

The writer planned the action of cycle 2 into two meetings. The first meeting was for presenting the new materials with implementation of Think-Pair-Share and the second meetings was for post-test 2. For detailed schedule of implementation of the classroom action research, see Table 3.7 below:

Table 3.7 The Schedule of Implementation of Cycle 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Cycle 2</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Meeting 1</td>
<td>Thursday, May 1, 2014</td>
<td>08.30 -10.00a.m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Meeting 2 (Post-test 2)</td>
<td>Monday, May 5, 2014</td>
<td>10.30-11.45a.m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.2.2.2 Action

There were still three phases in this cycle: opening, main activities and closing. The opening phase covered all the things related to introduction such as greeting, checking students’ attendance and also gave apperception by asking some questions to students about their experiences and motivated the students to learn more about the materials. The main activities included the following activities: explaining materials, thinking stage, pairing stage, sharing stage. The
closing phase was to give an advice to student’s motivation and concluded the materials. The writer presented the phase in detail on the following action:

1. The First Meeting

The first meeting in cycle 2 was conducted on Thursday, May 1, 2014. The topic was making conclusion.

(a) Opening

The class started at 08.30 – 10.00 a.m. The writer was in front of the class as the teacher and the observer was in back side to observe the students, the teacher and the situation of the class. Then, the writer’s looked at to all of students, conditioned and waited the students until they were ready to get the lesson. Before starting the lesson, the writer and the students prayed together, then greeted the students and checked their attendance. There were 33 students joined the speaking class.

The writer also did flashback about the results of previous post-test in cycle 1 and told that the students’ speaking skill was improved and the result was good. But there were still many students who were not actively involved in discussion both in pairs. The writer motivated the students to be more active.
(b) Main Activity

The writer said to students “I’m really happy because I meet you again but why you look so exhausted today? Supriono answered “Ngantuk miss, I am tired”. The writer gave responds “How pity you are. Ok, now to make you are not sleepy anymore and hungry, I am going to teach you to make “banana dance” was anyone know what banana dance is?”. Some students answered “Yes, i know miss”. The writer explained about what banana dance is to students. Students followed the dance like writer.

After giving the game, the writer started the lesson by explaining the definition of conclusion. Then, explained the steps make good conclusion, characteristic good informations and gave example about making a conclusion. “Any question guys?” All students answered “No”. The writer felt that the students enjoyed the activities.

Then, the writer gave some pictures in a series. Based on the pictures, the writer asked to students to think individually about the story in picture. After thinking individually, the writer asked to students to work in pair. The writer said “ Ok, after you think
about story in picture. Now, you discuss your opinion with your partner and arrange the sentence in the correct order to form a meaningful paragraph based on the picture. You may not change your partner, so you still in the same group like previous week. Do you understand? all the students say “Paham, Miss (Yes, I understand, Miss)”.

Students discussed the material for about 40 minutes. The teacher walked around the class to watch the discussion and to help students if they have any difficulties.

(c) Closing

In closing, the writer gave feedback to some pairs about their discussion. The writer also explained the instruction of a task for the next meeting that the students have to complete the discussion results to be shared and evaluated in the next meeting.

2. The Second Meeting (Post-test 2)

The second meeting was conducted on Monday, May 5, 2014. The topic was still making a conclusion. In this meeting, the students tried to share their discussion. The essence of this meeting was to continue the previous
activity. Some of them presented the results of pair discussion.

(a) Opening

The class started at 10.30 a.m – 11.45 a.m. In this meeting, the writer and the collaborator played a role as assessors in the post-test. As in cycle 1, there were also two assessors in this cycle.

Before starting the lesson, the writer and the students prayed together, then greeted the students and checked their attendance. There were 33 students joined the speaking class. After that, writer asked the students to sit with their partner of to discuss in the previous meeting. She asked them whether they were ready to present the results of discussion or not but most of them said that they were not ready. Then the writer replied that they have to be ready and the writer finally pointed one of the groups to present the results.

After one of the groups present the results yesterday, the writer asked to the students “April 21 you celebrate Kartini’s day, right?. All of students answered “Yes, miss”. The writer say “ Ok, if you hear about of Kartini, what do you think about it? Do you know Izzatunnisa?. Izza answered “Ya, beliau
adalah seorang pahlawan (Yes, she is a national heroine)”. After that, all students discusses about who Kartini is with their friend. To facilitate discussion, the writer gave a text about Kartini and asked to making a conclusion about text in short dialogue. After they discuss, the writer asked to share in front of class for oral test.

(b) Main Activity

In the main activity, before starting to assess, the writer told that there were several scoring aspect in the post-test 2: vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation and fluency. The writer asked some pairs to share the results of their discussion in front of class. There were many varieties of presentation. Some pairs felt shy when they were speaking. But they can manage it. Some pairs were really enthusiastic when they were speaking in front of class. In this cycle, the students’ participation was really good.

(c) Closing

The writer gave feedback to all students “Today all of you were really great. It is surprising performance and I’m really satisfied with your presentation. I like performance by 026B, 018B, 017B, 015, 007, 010B
and 004B. You are seldom speak up bravely in front of the class, although you still get score under KKM. But today all of you have significant improvement. Thank you. Then the writer ended the meeting by saying greeting and said “Good Bye“.

3.3.2.2.3 Observation

From the observation note that has been taken by observer, the classroom situations controlling can be handled by the writer. So, when students played Think-Pair-Share, overall students seemed more enthusiastic in doing Think-Pair-Share activity than before. The students also looked brave when they spoke English and the quality of responses increased. All students paid attention to the teacher when the writer explained the material. Students could manage the time and task, so they finished their task on time. Most students become more confident when they were asked to share and deliver their idea. Most students were fluent in delivering their arguments. They did not get deadlock in delivering arguments like in cycle I. (see appendix for detail sheet of results of observational notes.

3.3.2.2.4 Reflection

After analyzing the observation results of the cycle 2, the writer and the observer conclude that there were some
positive and negative results from the observation that could be used to guide the reflection. Besides, reflecting the results of implementation in the cycle two are the aspects which have been achieved already and the aspects which have not been achieved yet. (for more detail, see results reflection in chapter VI).

From the results of post-test 2, the percentage of students who passed the KKM by the the writer and the observer was 78%. So, it met the requirement of action success which was 75% students passed the target score \( \geq 70.0 \) based on the KKM. It means that the writer and the observer didn’t need to move to the next cycle.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the writer discusses the results of the study. First, the writer presents the results of the preliminary study, including the results of the interview, observation, questionnaire and the pre-test. After that the writer demonstrates the results of the phases in cycle 1 and cycle 2. The detailed explanation will be given in the following sections.

4.6 Results of Preliminary Study

4.6.1 The Results of Interview

In the first interview, the writer asked the teacher three categories of questions about the general condition of class, the difficulty in speaking skill and the strategy used by the teacher in teaching.

There are two questions in the first category of questions. The questions deal with the general condition of the class, especially in speaking. One example of the question and the answer in the interview is shown in (1) below.

(1) Writer : Bagaimana kondisi kelas XI SMK Diponegoro Salatiga khususnya dalam belajar speaking class? (How is the class situation in eleventh grade of SMK Diponegoro Salatiga especially in speaking class?)

Teacher : Banyak siswa tidak menyukai pelajaran bahasa Inggris karena mereka menganggap bahasa Inggris itu sulit. Apalagi ketika guru meminta mereka untuk berbicara, siswa selalu beralasan tidak bisa. Setiap meminta mereka untuk berbicara Inggris saya harus memberi warming up dulu. (Many students do not like English lesson because they felt English language is difficult. So, when the
teacher ask the students to speak English, they always said that they can not speak in English. Every time I ask them to speak English, I must gave a warming up in beginning studies.

(field note/interview no 1)

In example (1) the teacher said that most of students did not like studying English. Students thought that English is difficult. They have low competence in English. The teacher also said that speaking is the most difficult skill to be learned in XI D Marketing, because most of them were hardly pass the target score of the minimal mastery level criterion (Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal/ KKM).

The second question deals with the difficulties the students faced in mastering speaking skill. The teacher said that students got a problem with their pronunciation. They lack of self confidence. They also confuse how to organize words into a meaningful sentence. The interview on this topic is illustrated in example (2).

(2) Writer : Dalam belajar speaking, kesulitan apa yang sering dihadapi siswa XI D Marketing?
(In speaking lesson, what problems often appear in the eleventh grade of D class Marketing program?)

Teacher : Pronunciation yang tidak jelas sehingga menyebabkan mereka tidak percaya diri untuk berbicara, rangkaian kata ke kalimat sering tidak tepat. Mereka juga kesulitan di grammar. (Unclear pronunciation, so they lost their self confidence. They can not arrange a grammatical sentence. They got difficulties in understanding grammar.

(field note/interview no 3)
The last question is about the strategy used by the teacher in teaching English speaking. An interview example on this topic is given in (3).

(3) Writer: *Strategi pengajaran yang seperti apa, yang sering anda gunakan dalam mengajar berbicara bahasa Inggris?* (What the teaching strategy that you often used in teaching English speaking?)

Teacher: *Saya belum pernah menggunakan Think-Pair-Share dikelas. Kalau untuk speaking saya selalu menggunakan dialogue-based learning technique. saya juga menyuruh siswa untuk selalu membawa kamus setiap jam pelajaran saya. Karena saya seringkali meminta mereka untuk mentranslate.* (I never implement Think-Pair-Share in my speaking class when I was teaching speaking, I used dialogue-based learning technique. To my students, I also asked my students to bring a dictionary during speaking class. This because I often ask them to translate many things.)

(field notes /interview no 4)

The teacher said that in every meeting he always gave opportunity to the students to speak English in class. He also said that he has never used Think-Pair-Share while teaching speaking. He usually teaches speaking using dialogue-based learning techniques.

4.1.2 The Results of the Observation

The observation was conducted in order to know the teaching learning process directly before implementing the classroom action research. Based on the observation notes conducted on Monday, March 31, 2014, it was known that in teaching speaking at eleventh grade, class D Marketing students of SMK Diponegoro Salatiga, the teacher used
dialogue-based learning technique. He gave students text dialogue and asked to read the dialogue then perform the dialogue with their partner.

Based on the class observation, the writer got the data that only few students who were smart and attractive were active in speaking class. Some of them just followed what were being discussed and did not join to give some ideas to be presented.

4.1.3 The Results of Questionnaire

The questionnaire was conducted on Monday, April 21, 2014. Based on the results of questionnaire before the implementation of classroom action research, the writer would like to present explanations: from the first question, there are 32 (96.96%) students felt satisfied when they learn English and only 1 (3.04%) students who felt easy when they learn English. The results from question number 2 shows that 20 (60.60%) students like to learn speaking English and 13 (39.40%) students did not like speaking English. Question number 3 shows only 4 (12.12%) students were fluent when they speak English and 29 students (87.88%) were not fluent when they speak English. From question number 4, 30 (90.91%) students felt that the teacher gave opportunity to speak English in class and only 3 (9.09%) students felt that the teacher never gave opportunity the students to speak English. The results from question number 5, 6 and 7 show that 33 (100%) students felt that the teacher gave opportunity to ask a question when they do not understand lesson. Students said the teacher asked the students to have discussion
with their group and the teacher gave opportunity to the students to actively speak English. The results from question number 8 show 20 (60.60%) students felt excessively to enrich their vocabulary and 13 (39.40%) students did not. From question number 9, show 10 (30.30%) students said that the teacher was monotonous when he was teaching and 23 (69.70%) students claimed that the teacher was not monotonous when he was teaching. From question number 10, it is shown that 19 (57.58%) students enjoyed the class and 14 (42.42%) said that did not enjoy learning English in class.

Related to the results of the questionnaire, it could be concluded that the students’ activity and motivation in learning English speaking is not good enough. Therefore, it is necessary to improve the students’ motivation and responses toward the English speaking class, namely by implementing an action.

4.1.4 The Results of Pre-test

The pre-test was conducted on Monday, April 21, 2014. Pre-test from the students’ speaking ability was not so good. It could be seen from the table 4.1 and 4.2 below.
Table 4.1 The Students’ Pre-test Score Assessed by the Writer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ASPECT</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>3 2 3 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>3 2 3 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003B</td>
<td>2 2 3 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004B</td>
<td>2 2 3 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>4 3 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>2 2 4 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>3 2 3 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>3 2 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>3 3 4 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010B</td>
<td>2 2 3 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>3 3 4 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td>3 3 2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013</td>
<td>3 3 3 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014</td>
<td>4 3 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015</td>
<td>2 2 3 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016</td>
<td>2 2 3 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017B</td>
<td>2 2 3 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018B</td>
<td>2 2 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
<td>3 3 4 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>3 3 4 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021</td>
<td>4 3 4 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022</td>
<td>3 2 3 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>023</td>
<td>3 4 4 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>024</td>
<td>4 3 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>025</td>
<td>2 2 3 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>026B</td>
<td>2 2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>027</td>
<td>2 3 3 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028</td>
<td>3 2 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029</td>
<td>4 3 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>030</td>
<td>3 3 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031</td>
<td>4 3 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>032</td>
<td>3 3 3 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>033</td>
<td>3 3 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total score</strong></td>
<td><strong>93</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

: Students who pass KKM

: Students who do not pass KKM
Table 4.2 The Students Pre-test score Assessed by the Collaborator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Vocab</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Score (The results of score X 100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>023</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>024</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>025</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>026B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>027</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>030</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>032</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>033</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total score: 90 x 85 x 102 x 99 = 1880

- Students who pass KKM
- Students who do not pass KKM
In the pre-test, the writer assessed four aspects as given by Ur (1996, see table 2.1). They are pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary and fluency. The criteria of the assessment is also based on the what the writer has discusses in section of assessing speaking in chapter II.

Based on the data above, the writer calculated the mean score by employing the formula that has already been previously pointed out in figure 3.2. Next, to know the class percentage that passed the target score of *Kriterias Ketuntasan Minimal* (KKM), the writer used formula as shown in figure 3.3. The writer presents the results of the mean score and class percentage of KKM in the following table.

**Table 4.3 The Results of Mean Score and the Class Percentage that Passed the Target Score of KKM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Writer</th>
<th>Collaborator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td>56.96</td>
<td>56.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class percentages of KKM</td>
<td>30.30%</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the results of pre-test, the data shows that the mean score of pre-test was 56.96. There are ten students (30.30%) out of 33, whose scores are above the KKM. However, there is a bit different results of the pre-test score given by the collaborator with the same mean score of the pre-test, there are nine students pass the KKM. This is because the subjectivity between the writer and the collaborator. However, this difference does not influences anything in the next process of this research.
According to the data of the students’ pre-test results, the writer found some indicators of problems in speaking skill. Firstly, the students were not able to pronounce some words correctly because they seldom practice the pronunciation of new words. Secondly, they were still confused when they had to think twice of the translation of some words. The students seemed to be doubtful and not confident enough to speak up in front of the class. Many students said, “Boleh bawa catetan ya, Miss? (can I brought some notes, Miss?)”. The writer allowed the students to bring their notes but did not allowed them to read it except they forgot the ideas. But in fact, they still read their notes. Thirdly, the students were afraid of making mistakes in grammar and pronunciation.

4.2 Results of the Implementation of Think-Pair-Share

4.2.1 The Results of Post-test in Cycle 1

To know the results of students’ speaking of first post-test, the writer demonstrated the results as shown in table 4.4 and table 4.5. Table 4.4 presents the students’ score of the first post-test conducted by the writer. On the other hand, table 4.5 shows the scores given by the collaborator.
Table 4.4 The Students’ Post-test Score Assessed in Cycle 1 by the Writer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ASPECT</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>023</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>024</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>025</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>026B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>027</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>030</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>032</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>033</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total score</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- : Students who pass KKM
- : Students who do not pass KKM
Table 4.5 The Students’ Post-test Score Assessed in Cycle 1 by the Collaborator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ASPECT</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>THE results of score X 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Vocab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>023</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>024</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>025</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>026B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>027</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>030</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>032</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>033</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total score | 105 | 101 | 111 | 114 | 2155 |

- : Students who pass KKM
- : Students who do not pass KKM
Table 4.5 above shows the results of the first post-test both by the writer and the collaborator, with 33 students. The writer presents the mean score, the class percentage and the students improvement of the students score 4.6.

**Table 4.6 The Results of Three Aspects in the Post-test in Cycle 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Writer</th>
<th>Collaborator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td>63.93</td>
<td>65.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The class percentages of KKM</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
<td>48.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The improvement of the students score</td>
<td>12.23%</td>
<td>14.64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 demonstrates the results of the first speaking on the post-test in cycle 1. From the two results of the mean scores above, there is a slight different percentages of the post-test mean score. On the other hand, from the two results of the class percentage of KKM, there is a bit different percentages given by the writer and collaborator. This is because the subjectivity between the writer and collaborator.

Finally, to know whether students improve their score or not, the writer used formula as shown in figure 3.4. Based on the calculation above, the writer concludes that the improvement of students’ score speaking from pre-test to post-test 1 was still not enough yet, since the target of action success was 75% passed the KKM. Based on the post-test given by the writer, there are only 15 students (45.45%) passing KKM. However, there is also a slight different findings when the post-test was given by the collaborator, since there are 16 students (48.48%) passed the KKM.
Based on the results from the implementation in first cycle, there were some positive and negative results, the results are:

4.2.1.1 The Aspects have been Achieved Already

Based on the results of post-test 1, the use Think-Pair-Share in the first cycle has succeeded in enhancing the students’ speaking skill although the increasing was not significant. It could be seen by comparing the results of pre-test which was evaluated by the first assessor. The results shows that the mean score was 56.96 and the results of post test 1 in the first cycle was 63.93. While score from the second assessor, the collaborator, the results shown that the mean score of pre-test was 56.96 and the result of post test I was 65.30. It can be concluded the students have made a progress.

The influences of using Think-Pair-Share to enhance students’ speaking skill in the first cycle were as follows: (1) Students were interested to improve their speaking skill, (2) The students completed all task given well, (3) The students asked for help to teacher about their difficulties, (4) The students are confident enough to speak up in front of the class and they do not bring their notes.

4.2.1.2 The Aspects have not been Achieved Yet

The use of Think-Pair-Share in speaking class leads to a new problem which had to be anticipated by the writer (1) The students’ grammar are still low in speaking, (2) Some students
still had difficulties in pronouncing some words related to the topic, (3) Some students were still nervous, confused and they did not know what they had to do and doubtful to express their idea, (4) Many students answered the question in a grumble without raising their hands and (5) The classroom conditions was still uncontrolled yet.

### 4.2.1.3 The Cause Why Some Aspects have not been Achieved

Based on the reflection and analysis of implementation of action in cycle 1, there are some factors that caused those problems: (1) The role of the writer in managing the class had not been optimal yet (2) The exercises of vocabulary and pronunciation too few. It made students’ vocabulary and pronunciation were not trained well.

### 4.2.2 The Results of Post-test in Cycle 2

The results of the students’ speaking of the second post-test assessed by the writer is presented in table 4.7 and the one which is assessed by the collaborator is in table 4.8.
Table 4.7 The Students’ Post-test Score Assessed in Cycle 2 by the Writer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ASPECT</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>Maximum score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Vocab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>023</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>024</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>025</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>026B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>027</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>030</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>032</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>033</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total score | 118 | 116 | 115 | 114 | 2315 |

- : Students who pass KKM
- : Students who do not pass KKM
Table 4.8 The Students’ Post-test Score Assessed in Cycle 2 by the Collaborator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ASPECT</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>023</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>024</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>025</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>026B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>027</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>030</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>032</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>033</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Students who pass KKM
- Students who do not pass KKM
Table 4.7 and 4.8 show the results of the second post-test both by the writer and collaborator. With 33 students, the total scores given by the writer and collaborator is different, (2315 and 2355). This difference will probably lead to different results of mean score, class percentage of KKM and students improvement. The writer presents the results of these three aspects to the following table.

**Table 4.9 The Results of Three Aspects in the Post-test in Cycle 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Writer</th>
<th>Collaborator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td>70.15</td>
<td>71.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The class percentages of KKM</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The students improvement</td>
<td>23.15%</td>
<td>25.28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9 demonstrates the results of the second speaking post-test given by the writer and the collaborator. There is a slight different mean score given by the writer and collaborator (71.36-70.15 = 148). On the other hand, the class percentages of KKM both from writer and collaborator is the same. Similar to the students mean score, the students improvement seen by the collaborator is higher than the one seen by the writer.

Though different, there is one important thing the writer can demonstrate from table 4.9. It is clearly seen that the improvement of students’ score speaking from pre-test to second post-test score showed the success of the classroom action research toward students of second grade in SMK Diponegoro Salatiga. The target of action success was 75% passed the KKM. Here, the students who passed KKM by the
writer and the collaborator was 26 (78%) students. Based on the results from the implementation in cycle 2, there were some positive and negative results, the results are:

**4.2.2.1 The Aspects have been Achieved Already**

Based on the results of post-test 2, using Think-Pair-Share in the second cycle has succeeded because the students who passed KKM fulfilled on the target of action success was 75% passed the minimal mastery level criterion. It could be seen by comparing the results of post-test 1 which was evaluated by the first assessor, the writer’s in which the mean score result in post-test 1 was 63.93 and the results of post test 2 in the second cycle was 70.15 While the second assessor, the collaborator, the results in which the mean of post-test I was 65.30 and the results of post test 2 was 71.36 It could be concluded that there was an improvement of the students speaking mastery.

Based on the observation, it is seen that Think-Pair-Share has also led the students to improve their activities related to speaking skill. For example, (1) Students enjoyed the activities during the learning process, (2) Students could manage the time and task, so they finished their task on time, (3) All students paid attention to the teacher when the writer explained the material, (4) Students were interested in the topic given, (5)
Most students were fluent in delivering their arguments, (6) The students did not get deadlock in delivering arguments, like in cycle I and (7) The students looked brave when they speak English and the quality of responses increased.

4.2.2.2 The Aspects have not been Achieved Yet

In conducting the action in cycle 2, the writer still faced a problem related to the students. The students sitting in the back rows were still noisy during the class. The writer assumes that problem is caused by lack of control from the writer while teaching in the class.

In addition, limited time also causes the writer to control the students. The writer as a teacher at that time, finish the material as the expected time in a limited time. Then, to overcome the problem, a teacher should really prepare and organize the setting of the class and also time management. So, teacher will be able to control the class well.

4.3 Results of the Assessment

In this section, the writer demonstrates the results of pre-test, post-test in cycle 1 and post-test in cycle 2. As the preview sections, the writer will presents both results given by the writer as the first assessor in table 4.9 and figure 4.1. On the other hand, table 4.10 and figure 4.2 shows the results given by the collaborator as the second assessor.
Table 4.10 The Students’ Score of Speaking Aspects Assessed by the Writer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Vocab</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test in cycle 1</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test in cycle 2</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.1 The Students’ Score of Speaking Aspects Assessed by the Writer

Table 4.11 The Students’ Score of Speaking Aspects Assessed by the Collaborator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Vocab</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test in cycle 1</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test in cycle 2</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.2 The Students’ Score of Speaking Aspects Assessed by the Collaborator

The improvement can also be seen from the increasing of mean scores in the pre-test, post-test in cycle 1 and post-test in cycle 2 assessed by both the writer and the collaborator. Table 4.11 and figure 4.3 shows the improvement of the mean scores from the different assessments (pre-test, post-test in cycle 1 and post-test in cycle 2) assessed by the writer as a researcher. The same improvement is also shown in figure 4.4 which there is an improvement from the results of pre-test to the post-test in cycle 1 and post-test in cycle 2. The results in figure 4.4 is from the assessment given by the collaborator both from the writer or the collaborator, it can be seen that there is a table improvement though the scores are slight different.
Table 4.12 The Improvement of Students Mean Score Assessed by the Writer and the Collaborator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>By the writer</th>
<th>By the collaborator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>56.96</td>
<td>56.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test 1</td>
<td>63.93</td>
<td>65.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test 2</td>
<td>70.15</td>
<td>71.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.3 The Improvement of Students Mean Score by the Writer

![Bar Chart showing improvement in scores](chart1.png)

Figure 4.4 The Improvement of Students Mean score by the Collaborator

![Bar Chart showing improvement in scores](chart2.png)
Figure 4.3 shows the increasing of mean score assessed by the writer. The mean score increased from pre-test which was 56.96 became 63.93 in cycle 1 and improved to be 70.15 in cycle 2. While from the collaborator’s assessment in figure 4.4, the mean score of pre-test which was 56.96, became 65.30 in cycle 1 and was improved to be 71.36.

The students’ improvement in their speaking skill can also be demonstrated by the number of students who passed the KKM in pre-test, post-test in cycle 1 and post-test in cycle 2. The writer presents the results in table 4.12 and figure 4.5.

Table 4.12 The Class Percentage of the Students’ Score who pass KKM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessed by:</th>
<th>Cycle 1</th>
<th>Cycle 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Post-test in cycle 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No of Students</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The writer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The collaborator</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.5 The Class Percentage of the Students’ Class who Passed KKM

From the table 4.12 and figure 4.5, the writer calculated the percentage of students’ speaking score in order to know the students who passed the KKM. In the pre-test, it can be seen the percentage which passed the KKM increased from pre-test which was 30.30% became 45.45% in cycle 1 and was improved to be 78% in cycle 2. While from the collaborator’s assessment, the percentage of students who passed the KKM of pre-test which was 27.27% became 48.48% in cycle I and was improved to be 78%. So, it has met a criterion of action success.

Based on the discussion above, it can be summarized that the implementation of Think-Pair-Share in the classroom leads to some good effects in the process of teaching and learning. For example, the students are stimulated to participate actively in the class. Thus, the students’ achievement and motivation increased. Time to think and to work in pair make the students are more enjoyable and confident in delivering their ideas in the class. Time
to share in a pair work provides equal chance for the students to contribute as many ideas as possible. Therefore, the situation became conducive. Speaking skill including pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary and fluency also improved. This improvement can be seen from the increasing of mean score.

4.4 Results of Questionnaire

To get more data on how positive the students respond to Think-Pair-Share, the writer also undertook a questionnaire to the students after the post-test in cycle 2. Based on the questionnaire after the implementation of classroom action research, the writer would like to give some explanations: from the first question, there are 30 (90.91%) students felt that their speaking ability in giving interpersonal response was better than before the implementation of Think-Pair-Share and only 3 (9.09%) students who did not find any difference with the implementation of Think-Pair-Share. The question number 2 shows that 20 (60.60%) students than the other method. However 13 (39.40%) students did not find any difference with the implementation of steps in Think-Pair-Share. From question number 3, there are 29 (87.88%) students answered that Think-Pair-Share has made actively learning but only 4 (12.12%) students answered that Think-Pair-Share did not make them to be more active. The question number 4 shows that 29 (87.88%) students enjoyed the class with implementation of Think-Pair-Share and only 4 (12.12%) students do not enjoy. From question number 5, 33 (100%) students answered that the implementation of Think-Pair-Share helped them in learning speaking English.
Based on the results of questionnaire after implementation of Think-Pair-Share it can be concluded that most of students gave a positive response in their speaking teaching learning process and applying Think-Pair-Share in SMK Diponegoro Salatiga can develop students’ speaking ability in teaching learning process.

4.5 Results of Interview

The writer also conducted an interview to the teacher to know the respond of the implementation of Think-Pair-Share to the students in speaking class. The second interview was conducted after implementation of Think-Pair-Share on Thursday, May 6, 2014. The question was about the use of Think-Pair-Share in class and the students’ response toward speaking class. The results of the interview are: (1) The students were enthusiastic and more bravely when they speak English, (2) The students did the tasks from teacher well and Think-Pair-Share made them actively in class and (3) The teacher said that Think-Pair-Share was a good method in teaching speaking and can motivate the other English teachers to use Think-Pair-Share.

Based on the teacher’s interview above, the writer can conclude that the teacher gave a positive response toward the implementation of Think-Pair-Share.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This chapter presents the conclusion and suggestions for the English teachers and other researchers.

5.1 Conclusions

The point of this study is enhancing the students’ speaking skill using Think-Pair-Share on the eleventh grade of SMK Diponegoro Salatiga. The writer conducts an classroom action research collaboratively with the English teacher, M. Abdul Gafur, S.PdI. The writer is as the teacher who implements the action while the teacher is as the observer to observe the learning process, classroom situation and students’ condition. From the results of observation, evaluation and reflection of the action, the writer concluded that conducive situation occured when implementing Think-Pair-Share in the teaching-learning process. The students were more active and cooperative during the speaking class. They were interested in the material given. Their enthusiasm and motivation to learn English especially improving speaking skill increased. They also got adequate opportunities to practice speaking with equitable participation of all students.

It was also supported by the results of the improvement of students’ speaking mean score assessed both by the writer and the collaborator before action in pre-test and after action in each cycle that was increased (Table 4.11). The activities were designed to practice vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation and fluency.
Finally, the teacher’s response about the implementation of Think-Pair-Share was positive and it would be alternative strategy in teaching speaking. Think-Pair-Share could improve the students speaking skill in eleventh grade, D class of marketing program.

5.2 Suggestions

There are suggestions to the English teachers and the other researchers based on the research findings as follow:

1. The teacher can use Think-Pair-Share in teaching English especially in the speaking class in order to make the students more active in joining the lesson while their speaking skill also improve.

2. In Think-Pair-Share, it is better for teacher not to give long time in the think and pair stages because it will make the class noisy. The teacher also should ask them to write down their thoughts in some notes, so they will not forget the idea. In addition, in the share stage, the teacher should motivate the students to share their ideas bravely and help them when they present their ideas if they get deadlock and some pauses. By giving feedbacks, comments or suggestion, the students will be aware of their mistakes.

3. It is also recommended that the students use Think-Pair-Share as one of their learning strategies to practice and improve their speaking skill.

4. To the future researcher, the findings of this study can be a reference to other researchers to develop new methods of teaching English especially
in teaching speaking to improve students’ speaking skill. The results of the study can be used as additional reference for other researchers to improve other skills such as listening and reading by using the Think-Pair Share.
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APPENDIXES
A. The 1st interview

The first interview conducted before classroom action research. The writer was interviewed for the sake of finding the further information on the general condition of class, the difficulty in speaking skill and the strategy used by the teacher in teaching learning processes conducted in SMK Diponegoro Salatiga. Here are the questions and the answer given by the teacher:

1. Bagaimana kondisi kelas XI SMK Diponegoro Salatiga khususnya dalam belajar speaking class?
   
   Jawab: Banyak siswa tidak menyukai pelajaran bahasa inggris karena mereka menganggap bahasa Inggris itu sulit. Apalagi ketika guru meminta mereka untuk berbicara, siswa selalu beralasan tidak bisa. Setiap meminta mereka untuk berbicara Inggris saya harus memberi warming up dulu.

2. Dari seluruh kelas XI tahun ajaran 2013/2014, kelas manakah yang paling sulit untuk diajarkan berbicara bahasa Inggris?
   
   Jawab: Kemauan siswa dalam berbicara yang paling rendah berada dikelas XI D Marketing. Banyak dari mereka selalu mendapatkan nilai dibawah standar kelulusan.

3. Dalam belajar speaking, kesulitan apa yang sering dihadapi siswa XI D Marketing?
   
   Jawab: Pronunciation yang tidak jelas sehingga menyebabkan mereka tidak percaya diri untuk berbicara, rangkaian kata ke kalimat sering tidak tepat. Mereka juga kesulitan di grammar.

4. Strategi pengajaran yang seperti apa, yang sering anda gunakan dalam mengajar berbicara bahasa Inggris?
   
   Jawab: Saya tidak pernah menggunakan Think-Pair-Share dikelas. Kalau untuk speaking saya selalu menggunakan dialogue-based learning technique. saya juga sering menyuruh siswa untuk selalu membawa
kamus setiap jam pelajaran saya. Karena saya banyak meminta mereka untuk mentranslate.

B. The 2nd interview

The second interview was conducted after implementing classroom action research for the sake of finding the further information on Think-Pair-Share method used in class and students response toward speaking class after implementation Think-Pair-Share. Here are the questions and the answer given by the teacher:

1. Bagaimana tanggapan anda tentang metode Think-Pair-Share?

2. Menurut anda apakah setelah diterapkannya metode Think-Pair-Share, kemampuan berbicara siswa meningkat?
QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire before implementation of Think-Pair-Share

A. Petunjuk Pengisian Questionnaire
1. Baca dan pahami tiap-tiap pertanyaan yang tersedia
2. Jawablah pertanyaan dibawah ini sesuai dengan pertanyaan yang diberikan
3. Berilah tanda check list ( √ ) pada kolom yang telah disediakan untuk jawaban yang sesuai dengan tanggapan kalian

B. Daftar Pertanyaan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Pertanyaan</th>
<th>Ya</th>
<th>Tidak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Apakah kalian merasa kesulitan ketika belajar bahasa Inggris?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Apakah kalian senang belajar bahasa Inggris khususnya dalam speaking skill?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Apakah kalian merasa lancar dalam berbicara bahasa Inggris?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Apakah guru bahasa Inggris memberi kesempatan untuk berbicara Inggris di kelas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Apakah guru bahasa Inggris memberi kesempatan untuk bertanya ketika kalian tidak paham dengan materi?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Dalam mengajar, pernahkah guru bahasa Inggris meminta untuk berdiskusi dengan kelompok?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Apakah guru bahasa Inggris memberi kesempatan pada siswa untuk aktif (bertanya, mengungkapkan ide dan berargumen) didalam kelas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Dalam pembelajaran speaking, apakah kalian sering memperbanyak kosa kata bahasa Inggris?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Apakah guru dalam mengajar selalu menggunakan cara mengajar yang sama (monoton)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Apakah pembelajaran bahasa Inggris dikelas menyenangkan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jawaban anda merupakan partisipasi bagi kami, Terimakasih...

Responden,

( ........................................)
QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire after implementation of Think-Pair-Share

C. Petunjuk Pengisian Questionnaire
   4. Baca dan pahami tiap-tiap pertanyaan yang tersedia
   5. Jawablah pertanyaan dibawah ini sesuai dengan pertanyaan yang diberikan
   6. Jawablah seluruh pertanyaan dengan lengkap, jujur dan terbuka

D. Daftar Pertanyaan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Pertanyaan</th>
<th>Ya</th>
<th>Tidak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Apakah dengan metode <em>Think-Pair-Share</em>, kemampuan berbicara kalian lebih baik dari sebelumnya?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Apakah dengan berfikir secara individual kemudian berpasangan dengan teman kalian lebih mudah mengerjakan tugas dari guru?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Apakah <em>Think-Pair-Share</em> menjadikan kalian lebih aktif berbicara dikelas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Apakah dengan metode <em>Think-Pair-Share</em> pembelajaran dikelas lebih menyenangkan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Apakah metode <em>Think-Pair-Share</em> dapat membantu kalian dalam belajar berbicara <em>English</em>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jawaban anda merupakan partisipasi bagi kami, Terimakasih...

Responden,

(........................................)
RENCANA PELAKSANAAN PEMBELAJARAN

Sekolah : SMK Diponegoro Salatiga
Mata Pelajaran : Bahasa Inggris
Kelas/ Semester : XI / D Marketing
Pertemuan ke : 27-28
Alokasi waktu : 2 x 45 menit

A. Standar Kompetensi
   Berkomunikasi dengan Bahasa Inggris setara Level Elementary

B. Kompetensi Dasar
   2.6 Memahami instruksi-instruksi sederhana.

C. Indikator Pencapaian Kompetensi
   1. Ungkapan-ungkapan untuk menggambarkan proses kerja dan atau berfungsi\n   suatu alat dikemukakan dengan benar.
   2. Merespon tujuan penggunaan dari expressions used in describing processes.
   3. Menunjukkan expressions used in describing processes secara oral.

D. Tujuan Pembelajaran
   1. Siswa mampu mengungkapkan ungkapan-ungkapan untuk menggambarkan proses kerja dan atau berfungsi suatu alat dikemukakan dengan benar.
   2. Siswa mampu merespon tujuan penggunaan dari expressions used in describing processes.
   3. Siswa mampu menunjukkan expressions used in describing processes secara oral.

E. Karakter Peserta Didik yang diharapkan :
   Siswa dapat bekerja sama (cooperative), aktif (active), kreatif (creative), perhatian (respect), berani (bravery) dan tanggung jawab (responsibility)
F. Materi Pembelajaran

Expressions used in describing processes

The expressions:

- **Beginning**
  - The first thing you do is..
  - To begin with...
  - To start with...
  - First...

- **Continuing**
  - And...
  - Then...
  - And then...
  - Next... + verb in imperative form
  - After this... (infinitive without to)
  - Following this
  - When (this done)/ (you’ve done this)...  
  - Once (this done)/ (you’ve done this)...  
  - While (something else is happening)...  

- **Ending**
  - Finally
  - Lastly
  - To finish

How to make instant pudding

**Ingredients:** 1-1/2 cups of milk, desired pudding mix

**Steps:**
1. First get a bowl and measuring cup
2. Then pour 1-1/2 cups of milk into the bowl
3. And then open the pudding mix and pour it into the bowl
4. Next stir the milk and pudding mix for 1-3 minutes with a spoon, until the pudding is well blended
5. Chill the pudding in a refrigerator for five minutes to an hour, then remove and finally enjoy!

**Worksheet 1:** make steps how to make a omelette

**Worksheet 2:** make daily activities from on the expressions used in describing processes
G. Metode Pembelajaran

Strategi Pembelajaran : Think Pairs Share (TPS)

H. Langkah- Langkah Kegiatan Pembelajaran

Kegiatan Awal (5 menit)
- Mengucapkan salam dengan ramah kepada siswa ketika memasuki ruang kelas
- Mengecek kehadiran siswa
- Warming up: Guru mengajukan pertanyaan kepada siswa
  Have you ever make a pudding?
  What to make instant pudding?
- Memberikan pengertian mengenai expressions used in describing processes kepada siswa.

Kegiatan Inti (80 menit)
Eksplorasi
- Siswa mendapatkan pengertian dan tujuan mengenai expressions used in describing processes
- Siswa mendapat expression used in describing processes dan contoh sebuah text, kemudian dibantu dengan mengartikan beberapa arti vocabulary.
- Siswa diberi kesempatan untuk bertanya.
- Guru mengajukan pertanyaan dari sebuah gambar “omelette”, kemudian guru bertanya “gambar apakah ini?”. Siswa diminta berfikir secara individu bagaimana langkah membuat omelette.
- Hasil dari pemikiran individu, siswa diminta mendiskusikan secara berpasangan dan meminta untuk share didepan kelas.
Elaborasi

- Siswa diminta untuk membuat daily activities meliputi expressions used in describing processes dan diminta untuk memahaminya, berfikir secara individu
- Siswa diminta bersama pasangannya untuk bertukar pendapat tentang aktivitas sehari-harinya.

Konfirmasi

- Siswa diminta untuk menceritakan aktivitas sehari-harinya di depan kelas bersama pasangannya (post-test).
- Siswa diminta mengumpulkan hasil kerja mereka, dan kemudian guru bersama-sama dengan siswa memberi feedback atas hasil dari siswa.

Kegiatan Akhir (5 menit)

- Siswa mendapat kesimpulan atas apa yang telah mereka pelajari di hari itu mengenai expressions used in describing processes.
- Guru mengulas kembali materi yang telah diberikan.
- Siswa diberikan kesempatan untuk bertanya mengenai materi yang telah diberikan yaitu mengenai expressions used in describing processes.

I. Alat dan Media Belajar:

- Fotocopy Foto copy materi
- Foto copy text expressions used in describing processes
- Picture about omelette
- Worksheet

J. Penilaian

Oral Rubric
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 points</th>
<th>4 points</th>
<th>3 points</th>
<th>2 points</th>
<th>1 point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pronunciation</strong></td>
<td>virtually no grammar mistakes</td>
<td>Produces words with mostly correct pronunciation but sometimes there is any error</td>
<td>Produces words with some errors pronunciation</td>
<td>May have many strong foreign accents or produces words with too many errors pronunciation and unintelligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammar</strong></td>
<td>Uses grammatical sentences or expressions or virtually no grammar mistakes</td>
<td>Uses a slightly incorrect grammatical sentences or expressions or occasional grammar slips</td>
<td>Makes obvious grammar mistakes or makes some grammar mistakes</td>
<td>Makes mistakes in basic grammar or no correct grammatical sentences or expressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocabulary</strong></td>
<td>Uses wide vocabulary appropriately</td>
<td>Uses good range of vocabulary</td>
<td>Uses adequate but not rich vocabulary</td>
<td>Uses adequate but not rich vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fluency</strong></td>
<td>Speaks fluently with rare repetition and uses long turns easily and effectively</td>
<td>Speaks with occasional repetition and uses short turns in speaking</td>
<td>Gets idea across but hesitantly and briefly with some repetition</td>
<td>Speaks slowly and very hesitant with frequent repetition and sometimes difficult to understand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum score = 20  
Score = the results of score x 100  
Maximum score

Salatiga, 24 April 2014

Mengetahui,

Guru Mapel Bahasa Inggris

Peneliti

M. Abdul Gafur, S.Pdi

Siti Ani Nur Fauziyah

NIP.-

NIM. 11310031
RENCANA PELAKSANAAN PEMBELAJARAN

Sekolah : SMK Diponegoro Salatiga
Mata Pelajaran : Bahasa Inggris
Kelas/ Semester : XI / D Marketing
Pertemuan ke : 29-30
Alokasi waktu : 2 x 45 menit

B. Standar Kompetensi

Berkomunikasi dengan Bahasa Inggris setara Level Elementary

B. Kompetensi Dasar

7.1. Mengungkapkan makna dalam teks fungsional pendek resmi dan tak resmi dengan menggunakan ragam bahasa lisan secara akurat, lancar dan berterima dalam konteks kehidupan sehari-hari

C. Indikator Pencapaian Kompetensi

1. Kata-kata dipilih dengan tepat dan dirangkai menjadi pesan pendek petunjuk atau daftar.
2. Kesimpulan dari suatu pembicaraan ditulis dengan benar menjadi suatu pesan pendek, petunjuk, atau daftar.

D. Tujuan Pembelajaran

1. Siswa dapat menggunakan kata-kata yang dipilih dengan tepat dan dirangkai menjadi pesan pendek, petunjuk atau daftar.
2. Siswa dapat membuat kesimpulan dari suatu pembicaraan ditulis dengan benar menjadi suatu pesan pendek, petunjuk, atau daftar.

E. Karakter Peserta Didik yang diharapkan :

Siswa dapat bekerja sama (cooperative), aktif (active), kreatif (creative), perhatian (respect), berani (bravery) dan tanggung jawab (responsibility)
Kesimpulan adalah suatu preposisi (kalimat yang disampaikan) yang diambil dari beberapa premis (ide pemikiran) dengan aturan-aturan inferensi (yang berlaku). Kesimpulan dapat diartikan sebuah gagasan yang tercapai pada akhir pembicaraan.

Dibawah ini adalah ciri-ciri kesimpulan yang baik:
a. Materi dan isi

- Kesimpulan dapat berupa interpretasi atas hasil analisis, dapat berupa kesimpulan berdasarkan referensi (tidak melibatkan data secara langsung) dan kesimpulan dapat berupa implikasi (melibatkan data).
- Kesimpulan menyajikan isi Karya Tulis text yang dapat diuraikan (membahas sesuai kontext).
- Kesimpulan disertai saran-saran yang ditujukan secara jelas kepada pembaca.
- Uraianya singkat dan jelas.
- Tidak menyajikan kutipan atau dermisi (referensi).
- Kesimpulan tidak menyajikan hal-hal yang tidak diuraikan sebelumnya (pembahasan kesimpulannya nyambung).

b. Bahasa yang digunakan

Secara umum, persyaratan ejaan, pilihan kata, kalimat dan paragraf serupa dengan persyaratan bahasa pada naskah utama. Perbedaan terdapat pada pilihan kata transisi yang cenderung menunjukkan hubungan penegas, misalnya: Dengan demikian, Jadi, Dapat disimpulkan bahwa, Fakta menunjukkan adanya kecenderungan, Hasilnya.

c. Penyajian

Kesimpulan dapat disajikan dalam bentuk paragraf semacam essay dan dapat pula berupa susunan kalimat yang berkaitan dengan topik.

d. Ciri informasi yang baik

- Aktual yaitu informasi yang dibicarakan terkini.
- Faktual yaitu informasi yang didukung dengan fakta sehingga kebenrannya terjamin.
- Menarik, kesimpulan yang memiliki daya pikat.

1. Berikan conclusion sesuai dengan contoh text dibawah ini:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Computer gaming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Computer gaming is a computer specially used for gaming only, on his general gaming computers equipped with high specification with 4 gb ram and graphics cards is high, computer gaming can be found diwarnet Indonesia is specially gaming, computer gaming is different from a regular computer, if his usual low computer specs, but contrary to his gaming computer.
2. Tugas dan materi Post-test

### Dialogue 1
**Situation:** Ayu found a book. She intends to take it to the owner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ayu</td>
<td>Excuse me, is this your book?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retno</td>
<td>Oh, yes, thank you. I didn't realize that I left it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayu</td>
<td>Don't mention it. By the way, what is this book about?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retno</td>
<td>this book about ra. Kartini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayu</td>
<td>what's the story?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retno</td>
<td>April 21 is beatiful day. Everyone knows who kartini is. She is our national heroine and a great lady with the bright idea. What can you conclude about ra.Kartini?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayu</td>
<td>yes, ra.Kartini fact is............................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retno</td>
<td>waw.. it's true.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Story about Kartini**
Kartini was born in 1879 april 21 in Mayong jepara. Her father was Rama Sosroningrat Wedana. She got better education than other children. In november 12 1903 she married Adipati Djuyodiningrat, the head of Rembang regency. According to javanese tradition kartini had to follow her husband. Then she moved to Rembang. Now kartini has gone but her spirit and dream will always be in our heart. nowadays indonesian women progress is influenced by kartini's spirit stated on collection of letter habis gelap terbitlah terang from the dusk to the dawn.

### G. Metode Pembelajaran

**Strategi Pembelajaran** : Think Pairs Share (TPS)

### H. Langkah- Langkah Kegiatan Pembelajaran

**Kegiatan Awal (5 menit)**
- Mengucapkan salam dengan ramah kepada siswa ketika memasuki ruang kelas
- Mengecek kehadiran siswa
- Menjelaskan materi mengenai conclusion kepada siswa.

**Kegiatan Inti (80 menit)**

**Eksplorasi**
- Guru memberi contoh cara membuat kesimpulan
- Guru memberi kesempatan kepada siswa untuk bertanya jawab mengenai kesulitan dalam menarik kesimpulan.
- Guru memberi feedback dan pemecahan masalah terhadap kesulitan siswa.
- Guru memberi gambar secara acak dan siswa diminta untuk mengurutkan serta memberi kesimpulan tentang cerita gambar tersebut.
- Guru meminta siswa untuk maju didepan kelas secara sukarela.

Elaborasi

- Guru memberi worksheet dan diminta untuk berfikir secara individu
- Siswa diminta bersama pasangannya untuk bertukar pendapat dan diminta untuk mengisi dialog yang kosong (menyimpulkan pernyataan partnernya).
- Siswa diminta untuk berbagi conclusion didepan kelas bersama pasangannya (post-test).

Konfirmasi

- Guru bersama dengan siswa membahas jawaban-jawaban dari hasil presentasi membuat sebuah conclusion dari setiap kelompok.

Kegiatan Akhir (5 menit)

- Siswa mendapat hasil dari nilai yang telah dpresentasikan.
- Siswa diminta mengisi questionnaire tentang penerapan metode think-pair-share apakah dapat menjadikan berbicara lebih baik atau tidak.

K. Alat dan Media Belajar :

- Fotocopy lembar questionnaire
- Worksheet
- Picture series

L. Penilaian

Oral Rubric
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5 points</th>
<th>4 points</th>
<th>3 points</th>
<th>2 points</th>
<th>1 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pronunciation</strong></td>
<td>virtually no grammar mistakes</td>
<td>Produces words with mostly correct pronunciation but sometimes there is any error</td>
<td>Produces words with some errors pronunciation</td>
<td>May have many strong foreign accents or produces words with too many errors pronunciation and unintelligible</td>
<td>Little or no language produces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammar</strong></td>
<td>Uses grammatical sentences or expressions or virtually no grammar mistakes</td>
<td>Uses a slightly incorrect grammatical sentences or expressions or occasional grammar slips</td>
<td>Makes obvious grammar mistakes or makes some grammar mistakes</td>
<td>Makes mistakes in basic grammar or no correct grammatical sentences or expressions</td>
<td>Little or no language produces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocabulary</strong></td>
<td>Uses wide vocabulary appropriately</td>
<td>Uses good range of vocabulary</td>
<td>Uses adequate but not rich vocabulary</td>
<td>Uses adequate but not rich vocabulary</td>
<td>Little or no language produces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fluency</strong></td>
<td>Speaks fluently with rare repetition and uses long turns easily and effectively</td>
<td>Speaks with occasional repetition and uses short turns in speaking</td>
<td>Gets idea across but hesitantly and briefly with some repetition</td>
<td>Speaks slowly and very hesitant with frequent repetition and sometimes difficult to understand</td>
<td>Little or no communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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