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ABSTRACT

This study aims at showing the contribution of pair and group work activities to the improvement of students’ speaking performance.

The data were obtained by giving pre-test and post-test to the students both control and experimental class. In the experimental class, the students were given treatment by using pair and group work activities in teaching-learning process. After that, they were given questionnaire to know their motivation in learning English by using pair and group work activities. The data were analyzed by using t-test.

The result of this study shows that there is an improvement from the pre-test to the post-test for the students who use pair and group work activities in teaching and learning process. Generally, they are well-motivated in learning English by using pair and group work activities.

BACKGROUND

Teaching English to large classes seems to be a big deal for teachers. It is difficult for them to guide each student to use the target language. This phenomenon becomes a problem for both teachers and students in reaching the target of learning a foreign language. Based on the length of time in learning English, from Elementary school to Junior and Senior High School, it is expected that the students should have been able to use English well. However, the fact shows that the students cannot perform it.

According to Gabriela Bunga Pramudhita (2008), it is very difficult for the teacher to make an effective class. The teachers usually give lectures. Everyday, the teachers always give theory. The students are not often given a chance to put theory into practice. It always happens in every school in Indonesia. It can be said that the way of teaching is monotonous. The results are that students are not confident to orally communicate in English.

These problems and results are really contrasted with the method of CLT. There should be a motivation either from the students or the teachers of English as a Foreign Language (EFL teachers). There is no problem with CLT, but the problem is in the way of teaching and learning activities by the Indonesian students and teachers. It should be changed to the other way such as teaching by using CLT approach.

In CLT, there are a lot of activities to do in gaining active classroom; in this case is EFL classroom in Indonesia. Indonesian students tend to be passive, therefore teacher should have a skill of creating fun atmosphere in the classroom, so that it can prevent the students from fatigue and boredom. It would be better if teachers are not only lecturing but also interacting with their students. It is difficult for students to be active in the classroom. To
build the atmosphere, teacher can create some activities. The activity types that are applied in CLT classroom are as follows:

- **Role Play.** In this activity, students can explore their abilities through speaking and making or developing a short situational play.
- **Games.** This activity helps students to develop their psychology and psychomotoric aspect so that they can grow normally.
- **Pair Work & Group Work.** These activities provide the students a media to exchange their thoughts and establish a good communication between or among the students.
- **Learning by teaching.** This activity gives the students a chance to speak in front of the class to gain their confidence. David Nunan (1991:279),

Pair/group work is one of the activities in CLT which the writer would like to apply in teaching English to the classroom. The writer would like to see the contribution of the pair and group work activities in improving the students’ speaking performance.

This research will be held in Senior High School two Maros and in this research the writer would propose one learning style called “pair and group activities”.

**Statement of the Problem**

Based on the description above, the problems of this research are stated as follows:

- What are the effects of pair and group work activities in improving the students’ speaking performance?
- How effective are the pair and group work activities in improving the students’ speaking performance?
- How do the pair and group work activities motivate the students to improve their speaking performance?

**Objective Of Research**

There are several objectives of this research, those are:

- To investigate whether the pair and group work activities can help and facilitate on the students’ speaking performance.
- To recognize the effectiveness of the Pair Work and Group Work in improving the student’s speaking performance.
- To find out the attitude of the students toward the use of pair and group work activities in learning English.

**Method of Research**

The method which was used in this research was an experimental method, which had a pre-test, treatment and post-test. The experimental class received a new treatment under an investigation. After the treatment was given, a post-test was administered to the experimental class to see the impact and the contribution of pair and group work activities to the students’ speaking performance’.
Research Design

Experimental method used in this research with a non equivalent control design with the pretest, treatment and post test (Gay, 1981:227). It involved two classes of same levels. The pretest was administered in order to know the students prior knowledge while the post test score was to find out the effectiveness of teaching English by using pair and group work activities, the following diagram clarified the research design.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>O2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>O2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where:
- E = Experimental class
- C = Control class
- 01 = Pre test
- X1 = Treatment
- O2 = Post test

Population and Sample

The population of this research was the first year students of SMAN 2 Maros and the writer took 60 students as sample, 30 students for control class and 30 students for experimental class.

Technique of Collecting the Data

The data collected by giving pre-test to both groups, treatment to experimental group by using Pair and Group Work Activities and post test to both groups. They were also given questionnaire to elaborate their motivation in using Pair and Group work activities.

Techniques of the data analysis

The data obtained from the test were analyzed quantitatively by using T-test and the data from the questionnaire were analyzed by Likert-scale system.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Finding.

1. The Description of the Data Collected Through Test.

The results of the students’ mean score in pre test and post test are as follows:

Table 1: The mean score of the student’s pre test and post test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental class</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control class</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 indicates that the mean score of the students’ pre test in experimental class is 4.20 and 3.57 for control class, and the difference of the mean score between the two classes is only 0.63. Meanwhile the mean score of the students’ post test in experimental class is 7.05 and for control class is 6.21 and the difference of the post test between the two classes is 0.84. It means that the use of pair and group work activities are useful in improving the students’ speaking performance compared to the conventional method.

2. The Description of the Result of the t-Test Analysis in Post Test

The result of the t-Test analysis is shown in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The difference tested</th>
<th>Calculated “t”</th>
<th>t-table at p=0.05; df =58 (n1+n2-2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>2.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 indicates that the variable tested in the t-Test analysis is the difference of the post test, the result which shows that the value of the calculated t is 3.36 and the value of the t-table at the level of significance 0.05 and the degree of freedom 58 (n1 + n2 – 2) is 2.021. It means that 2.021 is lower than calculated t 3.36 and the hypothesis said that if calculated t is higher than t-table, the use of pair and group work activities are better than using conventional method in improving the students’ speaking performance.

3. The comparison between the calculated t and t-table for the hypothesis testing.

For the hypothesis testing, the comparison between the calculated t and t-table is presented as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calculated “t” (t-cal)</th>
<th>t-table</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Reject</th>
<th>Accept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>2.021</td>
<td>t-cal &gt; t-table</td>
<td>H0</td>
<td>H1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 3 clearly indicates that the value of the calculated t (t-cal) is greater than the value of t-table. Thus. The null hypothesis (H0) is rejected meanwhile the alternative hypothesis (H1) is accepted.

4. The Result of the Questionnaire.

The scores of the students’ response towards the use of pair/group works activities in teaching English specially speaking are presented in the following table:

Table 4: The score of the students’ responses toward the use of pair/group works activities in teaching English specially speaking.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Total scores</th>
<th>Mean scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2805</td>
<td>93.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 4 indicates that the total scores of the students responses were given by 30 students are 2805, and the mean score of the students is 93.50. This score represents such an intensity of attitude as strongly positive. And the detail explanation about the result of the questionnaire is stated in the discussion sections.

Discussions.

1. The Description of the Data through Test.

As presented on the findings section, the pre test for the experimental class reached the mean score 4.00, and the control class reached score 3.57 and the difference mean score between them reached only 0.63, and the difference was not significant. This means that the speaking performance between the two classes were almost equal before the treatment of this research was given to the experimental class.

Meanwhile, the data analysis indicated that the result of the mean score in post test of experimental class was 7.05 and the mean score for control class was 6.21, and the difference was 0.84, in which experimental class was 0.84 points higher than the control class after the treatment was given to them and it could give a prove that the speaking performance of the two classes were different after the treatment was given to the experimental class.

The comparison between the pre-test and the post-test for each classes, it was found that both classes basically reached progress in speaking performance. Their speaking progresses, however different one to another. The experimental class reached progress as high as 2.85 points, meanwhile the progress of the control class reached as high as 2.64 points only. Thus, the progress was reached by the experimental class was higher than the progress which was reached by the control class after the treatment.

The data analysis indicated that the achievement of the two classes were almost equal before the treatment. They were different after the treatment was given to the experimental class. We could see that the speaking performance which was reached by the students in the experimental class were better than the control class.

2. The Result of the t-Test Analysis and Hypothesis Testing.

The difference of the post test between the experimental and control class had been put into t-Test analysis for the hypothesis testing, that is, to see whether it was significant or not. The result of the t-Test analysis indicated that the value of the calculated t (3.36) is greater than the value of the t-test (2.021) at the level of significance 0.05 and the degree of freedom (df) 58 (n1 + n2 – 2). This proves that the null hypothesis (H0) was rejected meanwhile the alternative hypothesis (H1) was accepted.

It is then inferred that there was a significant difference of the speaking performance between the students who were taught English by using pair/group work activities and those who were taught through conventional method. Since the result of the experimental class was higher than the control class, we can then say that the use of pair/group work activities in teaching English specially speaking could make the students learn more successfully than using conventional method.
As presented in the earlier part of this chapter, the pretest of the two classes were almost the same, which means that the result of the pre-test of the two classes were equal each other before the treatment. It is believed that, before the treatment, the experimental and control class were taught English under the same method, and therefore, the equality of their pretests result was believed to be the result of the treatment which was given to them. Thus, it is believed also that the difference of their speaking performance of the treatments in experimental and control class of this research is influenced by the different treatment which was given to them.

3. The Attitude of the Students Toward the Use of Pair/Group Works Activities.

The students’ attitudes were assessed through the use of attitude scale questionnaire consisted of 20 items. 10 items were favorable and 10 others were unfavorable. Each item was provided with 5 alternatives of attitude scale categories namely, strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, and strongly disagree to indicate such attitude intensities as strongly positive, positive, neutral, negative and strongly negative, respectively. The questionnaire was successfully answered by 30 students/respondents.

The students’ answers to the questionnaire were analyzed by using Likert-scale model. The scale categories were scored. The score were 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 for the favorable items, and 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 for the unfavorable items for such scale categories as strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree and strongly disagree, respectively.

As presented in the table 4 above, it was found that the mean score of the students’ responses to the questionnaire was 83.96 based on the score classification which is presented in chapter III. The mean score above between 81 and 100 indicates such attitude intensity as strongly positive. Hence, it is inferred that the students had favorable attitude toward the use of pair/group work activities in improving students’ speaking performance.

To know the students’ attitude towards the use of pair and group work activities to improve the students’ speaking performance, the writer uses percentage formulation to analyze the data.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Conclusions

Based on the findings and discussions, the writer concludes that:

1. The use of pair/work group activities is better in teaching English to increase the students’ performance in speaking English. It was proved by the mean score of the students in post test 7.05.

2. The null hypothesis is rejected meanwhile the alternative hypothesis is accepted, there is a significant difference of the speaking performance between the students who were taught by using pair/work group activities and those who were taught through conventional method.

3. The students had favorable attitude towards the use of pair/work group activities in learning English to increase their speaking performance. The intensity of their attitude is categorized as strongly positive. It means that the students get improvement in speaking performance if they are taught English by using pair/work group activities, because they can directly practice their English with their friends and they have self confidence in speaking English.
Suggestions
Based on the conclusions above, here the writer would like to suggest some points as follows:

1. English teachers had better apply pair/group work activities to develop their students’ speaking performance.
2. English teachers had better encourage students to speak English frequently both in and out of the class
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