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Abstract
This research aimed to improve students’ speaking skill for the 8th grade students of MTs Syekh Yusuf Sungguminasa by applying group work activities (Think Pair Share, Snowball and Jigsaw) in teaching English and to find out whether Group Work Activities is more effective than the conventional method in improving students speaking skills. A quasi-experimental research method was used and a number of 40 students participated in this research. These students were divided into the Experimental Group (EG) and Control Group (CG), with each group consisted of 20 students. The instrument used for this study was speaking test and recording which were conducted as a pretest before the application of group work activities and a posttest after it. The students’ scores, as data of this research were analyzed by using SPSS 24. This research indicated significant improving of the students speaking skill by using group works activities than using conventional method. The posttest mean score: pronunciation EC (6.490) > CC (3.070), grammar EC (6.830) > CC (3.905), vocabulary EC (7.075) > CC (3.740) and fluency EC (6.670) > CC (3.915). The results of this research by using group work activities showed that the students speaking accuracy consisting of vocabulary, pronunciation and grammar and fluency was effectively improving students speaking skill than conventional method.
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Table 1: The Students’ Mean Score on Pronunciation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Improvement (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>3.825</td>
<td>6.490</td>
<td>69.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>2.340</td>
<td>3.070</td>
<td>58.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 after calculating the students’ mean score between pretest and posttest for both experimental and control class, the students’ mean score in EC which is pretest is 3.825 and posttest is 6.490 and the students’ improvement is 69.67%. While, the students’ mean score in CC shows pretest is 2.340 and posttest is 3.070 and the improvement of students’ speaking skill in term using pronunciation is 58.12%. The findings proved that there was significant difference between students’ score in experimental and control class after using Group work activities in teaching and learning process.”

Table 2: The Students’ Mean Score on Grammar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Improvement (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>4.495</td>
<td>6.830</td>
<td>51.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>2.585</td>
<td>3.905</td>
<td>51.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 After calculating the students’ mean score between pretest and posttest for both class experimental and control, the students’ mean score in experimental class which is pretest is 4.495 and posttest is 6.830 and the students’ improvement is 51.95%. While, the students’ mean score in control class shows pretest is 2.585 and posttest is 3.905 and the improvement of students’ speaking skill in term using grammar is 51.06%. Comparing those classes, the findings prove that there is no significant difference between students’ score in experimental and control class after using Group work activities in teaching and learning process.

Table 3: The Students’ Mean Score on Vocabulary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Improvement (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>4.410</td>
<td>7.075</td>
<td>60.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>3.740</td>
<td>49.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 After calculating the students’ mean score between pretest and posttest for both class experimental and control, the students’ mean score in experimental class which is pretest is 4.410 and posttest is 7.075 and the students’ improvement is 60.43%. While, the students’ mean score in control class shows pretest is 2.500 and posttest is 3.740 and the improvement of students’ speaking skill in term using
grammar is 49.60%. Comparing those classes, the findings proved that there was significant difference between students’ score in experimental and control class after using Group work activities in teaching and learning process.

Table 4: The Students’ Mean Score on Fluency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Improvement (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>4.070</td>
<td>6.670</td>
<td>63.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>2.665</td>
<td>3.915</td>
<td>46.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 After calculating the students’ mean score between pretest and posttest for both class experimental and control, the students’ mean score in experimental class which is pretest is 4.070 and posttest is 6.670 and the students’ improvement is 63.88%. While, the students’ mean score in control class shows pretest is 2.665 and posttest is 3.915 and the improvement of students’ speaking skill in term using grammar is 46.90%. Comparing those classes, the findings proved that there was significant difference between students’ score in experimental and control class after using Group work activities in teaching and learning process.

From the findings above, it could be concluded that the students’ speaking accuracy and fluency improved by using group work activities and it is more effective.

Discussion

In this section discussed about the result of the data collected and analysis through a testing explained in the previous section showed about the improvement students’ speaking accuracy and fluency. Also in this research used the same material but different strategy; experimental class used group work activities while control class used conventional method.

Group work activities like think-pair-share, snowball groups, and jigsaw strategy, the students could gain a significant progress in improvement their speaking accuracy covering vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar; and fluency. And the results showed that the use of think pair, snowball groups and jigsaw in learning integrated skills improved significantly the students’ speaking skill. This means that there is a good applicable strategy in teaching speaking skills.

Most of the students do active participation in applying group work activities because it can develop the students’ speaking accuracy, and fluency. It was supported what Frank Lyman said. According to Frank lyman (1981) think-pair-share is a group work that takes three steps of activities, namely to think individually, to discuss in pair, and to share ideas in a large class discussion. So, this type of group forces all students to attempt an initial response to a given question, which they can clarify and expand as they collaborate. It also gives them a chance to validate their ideas in a small group before mentioning them to the
large group, which may help shy students feel more confident to participate in the learning activities. So, the purpose of this group is to increase students’ confidence in their answers and to encourage broad participation in plenary session.

After applying group work activities, the researcher had assumption that these activities are a way to assist the students to practice language skills, as the researcher explained at the previous chapter that there are some advantages of this strategy (Brown, 2001: 177) gives some advantages of group work activities as follows:

a) Group work generates interactive language.
b) Group work offers an embracing affective climate.
c) Group work promotes learners’ responsibility and autonomy.

Group work is a step toward individualized instructions.

Conclusion

Students’ speaking accuracy and fluency improved after being thought by using group work with think-pair-share, snowball, and jigsaw it proved that the mean score on pronunciation in EC, pretest was 3.825, posttest was 6.490 while in CC pretest was 2.340, posttest was 3.070, the mean score on grammar in EC was 4.495, posttest was 6.830 while in CC pretest was 2.585, posttest was 3.905, and the mean score on fluency in EC, pretest was 4.070, posttest was 6.670 while in CC pretest was 2.665, posttest was 3.915.

Group work with think pair share, snowball and jigsaw improved more students’ speaking accuracy (pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary) and fluency in MTs Syeh Yusuf Sungguminasa, than applied conventional strategy. This result appeared in the means score analysis.
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