

## CHAPTER III

### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1 Research Design

This research was experimental study in which the experimental class and controlled class. In this research, the researcher teach the students in experimental class by using Think-Pair-Share technique and controlled class by using traditional Method.

**Table 3.1 Research Design**

| Class | Pre-Test | Independent Variable | Post-Test |
|-------|----------|----------------------|-----------|
| E     | Y1       | X                    | Y2        |
| C     | Y1       | -                    | Y2        |

Note :

E : Experimental Group

C : Control Group

X : Treatment on the Experimental Group

Y1 : The Pre test

Y2 : The Post Test

### 3.2 Location and Time of the Research

This research was conducted at the first grade students of SMPN 7 which located on Jalan Lokomotif Pekanbaru. The time of the research was held in January 2018. The reason for selecting this location was to facilitated the researcher to acquire the data.

### 3.3 Population and Sample of the Research

#### 3.3.1 Population

Population of this research were all of the first grade students of SMPN 7 Pekanbaru. The total population of the first grade students were 197 students. They consisted of six classes.

**Table 3.2 The Distribution of Population of The First Grade Students of SMPN 7 Pekanbaru**

| Class        | Number of Students |
|--------------|--------------------|
| 7.1          | 25                 |
| 7.2          | 20                 |
| 7.3          | 23                 |
| 7.4          | 24                 |
| 7.5          | 20                 |
| 7.6          | 22                 |
| <b>TOTAL</b> | <b>134</b>         |

### 3.3.2 Sample

Gay in Janna Murissa (2012:26) states sample is the process of selecting individuals for a study. Suharsimi (2006) stated that if the subject is less than one hundred it is better to take the entire subject. Furthermore, if the subject is more than one hundred it can be taken between 10-15% or 20-25% or more that it. In this research the reasearcher takes 40 samples. There are 20 students in Class 7.2 who join in experimental group and 20 students from Class 7.5 as a control group. The researcher selected the sample by using purposive sampling, because the researcher took the sample based on the students that have same ability in speaking.

**Table 3.3 Sample of Research**

| Group        | Class | Number of Students |
|--------------|-------|--------------------|
| Experimental | 7.2   | 20                 |
| Control      | 7.5   | 20                 |

### 3.4 Instrument

The instrument of research is used to collect the data from sample of the research.

#### a. Speaking Test

The researcher used speaking test as the instrument in this research. The researcher asked the students to speak about the topic that was given by the researcher. In this research, the students were asked to speak about the descriptive text.

## b. Video Recording and Camera

The researcher recorded the English teaching-learning process by using a handycam while doing the observation. Video recording helped the researcher to record the activity that the students do in the teaching learning process. Through video recording, the researcher can play video recording again to know the lack of teaching and learning process.

### 3.5 Research Material

The researcher provided the sample with pre-test and post-test. The materials are taken from Scaffolding English for Junior High School English Books. The researcher used Think-Pair-Share to teach speaking in treatment in experimental class, while in control class the researcher did not apply any strategy. The materials in experimental class as follows;



**Table 3.5 The Blue Print of Materials**

| Meeting | Topic                                              | Indicators             |
|---------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 1       | Animals, Things,<br>People, Places ( Pre-<br>Test) | Describing Information |
| 2       | Animals                                            | Describing Information |
| 3       | Things                                             | Describing Information |
| 4       | Peoples                                            | Describing Information |
| 5       | Places                                             | Describing Information |
| 6       | Animals, Things,<br>People, Places (Post-<br>Test) | Describing Information |

### 3.6 Data Collection Technique

The data of this study was obtained by using a type of test. It is speaking test. The researcher gave tests to the students. The form of the test in this research is pre-test and post-test of speaking oral presentation.

The data collection technique used in this research was speaking recording video of students. The students were asked to present in front of the class. The researcher gave and analyzes the score to measure the students' speaking ability based on the indicators of speaking evaluation or scoring rubrics of speaking.

There were several phrases which involved to acquire the accurate data for this study:

### **1. Pre-Test**

Before conducted the treatments, in the first meeting the researcher was held a pre-test. Pre-test was conducted to know the students' previous ability in speaking English before using Think-Pair-Share.

The researcher asked the students to describe about the topic that the researcher given. The topics were about animals, things, peoples and places. The students were asked to choose one of the topic that was provided by the researcher. The researcher recorded the students' speaking and evaluate based on the indicators of speaking assessment.

### **2. Treatments**

The researcher conducted the teaching English speaking using Think-Pair-Share for a four meetings. Since the second until the fifth meetings, the researcher introduced and explained the material and how to learn English speaking using Think-Pair-Share.

Before applied Think Pair Shared strategy, the researcher explained the material about descriptive text. The researcher taught how to describing something or giving information. The researcher gave the different topic in each meeting. The procedures of the treatments can be seen in the paragraph below;

#### **a. Meeting 1**

The first meeting in the treatment was the second meeting in the research procedures. Before the researcher applied the think pair share strategy, the researcher explained the material about descriptive text and how to describing something. After explained the material, the researcher gave the topic. In the first meeting, the topic was about animal. The researcher asked the student to choose freely about kinds of animal that want to be discussed by the students. After that, the students were asked to make a group in pair. And then they were asked to discuss the topic. The students described about the topic that had given by the researcher. Last, the researcher asked the students to present about their topic that had been discussed in front of the class.

#### **b. Meeting 2**

In the second meeting, the topic was about things. The researcher asked the student to choose freely about kinds of things that want to be discussed by the students. After that, the students were asked to make a group in pair. And then they were asked to discuss the topic. The students described about the topic that had given by the researcher. Last, the researcher asked the students to present about their topic that had been discussed in front of the class.

#### **c. Meeting 3**

In the third meeting, the topic was about peoples. The researcher asked the student to choose freely about kinds of people or people profession that want to be discussed by the students. After that, the students were asked to make a group in pair. And then they were asked to discuss the topic. The students described about

the topic that had given by the researcher. Last, the researcher asked the students to present about their topic that had been discussed in front of the class.

#### **d. Meeting 4**

In the fourth meeting, the topic was about places. The researcher asked the student to choose freely about kinds of place that want to be discussed by the students. After that, the students were asked to make a group in pair. And then they were asked to discuss the topic. The students described about the topic that had given by the researcher. Last, the researcher asked the students to present about their topic that had been discussed in front of the class.

#### **3. Post-Test**

After the researcher applied the treatment for four meetings, the researcher gave the post test in order to know the result of students after giving the treatments by using Think Pair Share Strategy. The procedure of post-test was same with the pre-test. The topic that the students tell is the topic that the students tell in pre-test. After that the researcher compared the result of pre test and post test to know there is significant improvement of Think Pair Share Strategy towards students' speaking ability. The data was calculated by using SPSS. Then, the researcher used the paired sample test to know there is significant effect or not about think pair share strategy towards students' speaking ability.

#### **3.7 Data Analysis Technique**

After the researcher collected the data, the researcher gave the score to the students. The score of students were evaluated by rater. The rater evaluated the



students' speaking data by using speaking scoring rubric. The speaking criteria were; grammar, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, and pronunciation. Furthermore, after the researcher got the students' score by the rater, the researcher analyzed the data by using SPSS Version 22 to know whether there is significant effect of Think Pair Share Strategy towards student's speaking ability or not.

**Table 3.6 Scoring Rubric of Speaking Ability**

| No | Criteria      | Rating<br>Score | Description                                                                                          |
|----|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1  | Pronunciation | 5               | Has few traces of foreign language.                                                                  |
|    |               | 4               | Always intelligible, though one is conscious of a definite accent.                                   |
|    |               | 3               | Pronunciation problem necessitates concentrated listening and occasionally lead to misunderstanding. |
|    |               | 2               | Very hard to understand because of pronunciation problem, most frequently be asked to repeat.        |
|    |               | 1               | Pronunciation problem to serve as to make speech virtually unintelligible.                           |
| 2  | Grammar       | 5               | Make few (if any) noticeable errors of grammar and word order.                                       |

|   |                   |   |                                                                                                 |
|---|-------------------|---|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|   |                   |   |                                                                                                 |
|   |                   | 4 | Occasionally makes grammatical and or word orders errors that do not, however obscure meaning.  |
|   |                   | 3 | Make frequent errors of grammar and word order, which occasionally obscure meaning.             |
|   |                   | 2 | Grammar and word order errors make comprehension difficult, must often rephrases sentence.      |
|   |                   | 1 | Errors in grammar and word order, so, serve as to make speech virtually unintelligible          |
| 3 | <b>Vocabulary</b> | 5 | Use of vocabulary and idioms is virtually that of native speaker.                               |
|   |                   | 4 | Sometimes uses inappropriate terms and must rephrases ideas because of lexical and equities.    |
|   |                   | 3 | Frequently uses the wrong words conversation somewhat limited because of inadequate vocabulary. |
|   |                   | 2 | Misuse of words and very limited vocabulary makes comprehension quite difficult.                |

|          |                      |          |                                                                                                |
|----------|----------------------|----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|          |                      | <b>1</b> | Vocabulary limitation so extreme as to make conversation virtually impossible                  |
| <b>4</b> | <b>Fluency</b>       | <b>5</b> | Speech as fluent and efforts less as that of native speaker.                                   |
|          |                      | <b>4</b> | Speed of speech seems to be slightly affected by language problem.                             |
|          |                      | <b>3</b> | Speed and fluency are rather strongly affected by language problem.                            |
|          |                      | <b>2</b> | Usually hesitant, often forced into silence by language limitation.                            |
|          |                      | <b>1</b> | Speech is so halting and fragmentary as to make conversation virtually impossible.             |
| <b>5</b> | <b>Comprehension</b> | <b>5</b> | Appears to understand everything without difficulty                                            |
|          |                      | <b>4</b> | Understand nearly everything at normal speed although occasionally repetition may be necessary |
|          |                      | <b>3</b> | Understand most of what is said at slower than normal speed without repetition                 |

|  |  |          |                                                                                                                                     |
|--|--|----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|  |  | <b>2</b> | Has great difficulty following what is said. Can comprehend only “social conversation” spoken slowly and with frequent repetitions. |
|  |  | <b>1</b> | Cannot be said to understand even simple conversation.                                                                              |

( David.P.Haris in Meilyaningsih (2013: 24)

The scoring rubric is used to assess the students’ speaking. The students’ score were evaluated by raters. Then, the speaking evaluation system based on the five writing components included pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, fluency, comprehension.

### 3.8 Formula of Speaking Assessment

To get the description of the total score of the aspects of speaking by the students, the researcher use the following formula.

$$TS= P+G+V+F+C$$

**TS** : Total score

**P** : Pronunciation

**G** : Grammar

**V** : Vocabulary

**F** : Fluency



**C** : Comprehension

To know the final score of each student, it was calculated by:

$$FS = \frac{TS}{25} \times 100$$

FS : Final score of each student

TS : Total score of the aspects of speaking

After the raters got the total score each students, the researcher collected each score from the rater. The next step to do was to know the real score of each student by using the formula below :

$$RS = \frac{Rater\ 1 + Rater\ 2}{2}$$

To know the level of the student' ability, the researcher used the following clasification:

**Table 3.7 The classification of the Students' Score**

| Level of the Ability | Score  |
|----------------------|--------|
| Good to excellent    | 80-100 |
| Avarage to Good      | 60-79  |
| Fair                 | 50-59  |
| Poor                 | 0-49   |

The researcher used paired sample t test to test the hypothesis. If the value  $t_{calculated}$  is equal or lower than the value  $t_{test}$  on the degree of freedom (df) at  $\alpha=$

0.05 for two-tailed test, the null hypothesis is accepted. On the other hand, if the  $t_{calculated}$  is great than value t-table, the null hyhotesis is rejected. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis is accepted.

$t_{calculated} > t_{table}$   $H_a$ : Hypothesis is accepted

$t_{calculated} < t_{table}$   $H_a$ : Hypothesis is rejected

