**CHAPTER III**

**RESEARCH METHOD**

1. **Type of the Research**

In accordance with the objective of the research, the aim of this study is to improve the students’ speaking ability through the use of Think-Pair-Share for the first grade students of MA Miftahun Najah Lamongan. This research will categories as action research. This study is focus on improving the real condition of the English teaching and learning process to reach the improvement of the students’ speaking ability.

According to Nunan 1992 in McKay 2008, action research typically has three major characteristics; it is carried out by practitioners (i.e. classroom teacher), it is collaborative and it is aimed at changing things.[[1]](#footnote-1) This idea is supported by Burns 1999 in McKay 2008 that there are four characteristics of action research. Firstly, action research is contextual, small scale, and localized. Secondly, it is evaluative and reflective. Thirdly, action research is participatory. Lastly, it has changes in practice which are based on the collection of information or data which provides the impetus of change.

The researcher decide to conduct an action research by implementing the model proposed by Kemmis and McTaggart model as cited in Burn. There are four broad phases in a cycle of research using Kemmis and McTaggart model; planning, action, observation, reflection.[[2]](#footnote-2) The research design could be illustrated as follows:



**Figure 1**: Action research cycles by Kemmis and McTaggart Burn, 2010

According to Figure 1, the researcher identified some problems, formulated some actions to overcome the problems, implemented the actions, and reflected the result of the actions. In the action phase, the researcher implemented the TPS technique during the teaching and learning process. These whole steps were conducted in two cycles.

1. **Research Setting**

This research will conduct in MA Miftahun Najah Lamongan. It was located in Kp Lamongan Ds. Tonjong Kec. Kramatwatu Kab. Serang Jl. Banten- Bojonegara. The school has some facilities such as a principal’s room, a vice principals’ room, a teacher’s room, a meeting room, an administration room, a room for guidance and counseling, a library, an OSIS room, a guest room, and other supporting facilities. For teaching and learning process, this school has 6 classrooms with 2 classes for grade X, 2 classes for grade XI, and 2 classes for grade XII.

1. **Research Participants**

The participants are, the English teacher as the collaborator and the students of Class X A in MA Miftahun Najah Lamongan in the academic year of 2016/2017. The class consists of 33 students, 15 of them are male and 18 students are female.

1. **Data Collection**
2. **Types of Data**

The data were in the forms of qualitative and quantitative. Qualitative data will gain by giving the description of the situation in teaching and learning process. Meanwhile, quantitative data were taken from the score of the students’ performances in the end of cycle.

1. **Data Collection Technique and Instrument**

The researcher collect the qualitative data by using some techniques as follows:

1. Observation

Observation allows the researcher to gather the data. It gives the researcher the opportunity to see the situation. Observation guidelines were used as the instrument to collect the data. It was used to enable the observer to record behaviors during sessions of the research quickly and accurately. In completing the observation checklist, the researcher gave a tick to the statements describing the teaching and learning process. Later, the data gathered through observation were presented in the form of field notes.

1. Interview

Interviews will use in the reconnaissance and data gathering step. In the reconnaissance step, the interviews were done to find the existing problem. Lodico, Spaulding, and Voegtle 2010, state that interview can reveal participant’s own perception of their views, feelings, and experiences. The interviews would be done by the researcher to gather the responses, opinions, suggestions, and expectations of the students about the implementation of the technique.

1. Speaking Rubric
2. Teknik : Tes lisan, presentasi, dan TPS
3. Bentuk : Dialog
4. Instrument penilaian:

**Tabel 3.1 Scoring Rubric Adaptation**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Fluency** | **Content** | **Appearance** |
|  | Pronunciation | Intonation &Stress | Comprehension | Grammar | Vocabulary | Body Language | Expression |
| Max.score | 10 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 10 | 10 |

NILAI: Skor Perolehan x 100 = Score

**Tabel 3.2 Instrument of the Research**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Instruments** | **Data** |
| **1** | Observation guideline | Field Note |
| **2** | Interview guideline | Interview Transcripts |
| **3** | Camera | Photographs |
| **4** | Speaking Rubric | Test Scores |

1. **Data Analysis Technique**

The qualitative data will be analysis by following steps proposed by Burns 2010 as follows.

1. Assembling the data

The researcher collect all data that had been got, reviewed the initial or revised questions, and started to look for broad patterns, ideas, or trends that seem to answer the questions.

1. Coding the data

In this step, the data will grouping into more specific categories and identify the data sources that might code as qualitative or quantitative.

1. Comparing the data

The researcher compare the categories across the different sets of data to see whether there will contradictions or not.

1. Building meaning and Interpretations

To make sense of the data, the researcher will analysis the data several times to pose questions, rethought the connections, and developed explanation of the situation.

1. Reporting the outcomes

The researcher describe the context of the research, outlined findings, and organized the whole research not only the analysis and findings.[[3]](#footnote-3)

The results scores of the pre-test and the post-test were compared. The results of the students’ performances were analyzed by using Excel program to find out the mean of the students’ speaking performance. By comparing the students’ means in the first performance and the second performance, the improvement of the students’ speaking ability of X A of MA Miftahun Najah Lamongan through Think-Pair-Share could been seen.

1. **Validity and Reliability of Data**

A research data ought to be valid and reliable. To make the data valid, the researcher used five kinds of validity proposed by Anderson in Burns 1999. They are explained as follows:

1. Democratic validity

It is related to the extent to which the research was truly conducted collaboratively and included multiple voices. This validity was about how the researcher worked together with other parties in the research to get more perspectives and concerned with the topic of the research. To get validity, the researcher interviewed the students of Class X in MA Miftahun Najah Lamongan and discussed the problems with teacher to find out the students’ problem in speaking class.

1. Outcome validity

It is related to the notion of actions leading to outcomes that are “successful” within the research context. The solution of the problem was not only the main goal of this research, but also the reframe of the problem into questions. In this research, the processes were related to the improvement of students’ speaking ability through Think-Pair-Share.

1. Process validity

Process validity is closely related to the dependability and competency of the research itself. In order to get this validity, the researcher observed the teaching and learning process by using observation checklist, field notes, interview the students and the teacher, and also the teacher had discussions with the collaborator.

1. Catalytic validity

It is related to the extent to which the researcher allows participants to deepen their understanding of the social realities of the context and how they can make changes in within it. To achieve this validity, the researcher asked the students and the teacher’s response after the implementation of the actions.

1. Dialogic validity

It parallels the process collaborative enquiry or reflective dialogue with “critical friends” or other practitioners. It was obtained by conducting dialogues with the English teacher and the collaborator. The dialogues used to get the comments about the implementation of the technique in every meeting. The results of the dialogues were used to find out the strengths and weaknesses of the action to make a better action in the next meeting.

Meanwhile, the trustworthiness was obtained from the triangulation technique. The aim of triangulation was to gather multiple perspectives on the situation being studied (Burns, 1999: 164). Burns proposes three forms of triangulations.

The first form is time triangulation. It means that the data are collected at one point in time or over a period of time to get sense of what are involved in the processes of the changes.

The second form is investigator triangulation. It means that more than one observer is used in the same research setting. The purpose of this triangulation is to avoid bias or subjective observations. In this research, the researcher worked with the English teacher as the collaborator.

The third form of the triangulation is theoretical triangulation. It means that the data are analyzed using more than one perspective of some theoretical reviews. The researcher reviewed theories using some books to obtain this form of triangulation.[[4]](#footnote-4)
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