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Abstract

This study is aimed at finding out the effectiveness of Mix Pair Share Strategy in teaching speaking skill at school. The study was an experimental design. The number of the sample was 48 students taken from the total number of the population which consisted of 176 students. Meanwhile, it was taken through cluster random sampling technique. The sample was also divided into two groups; experimental and control group. Each group was treated by different treatment; Mix Pair Share Strategy for the experimental group and Discussion method for the control group. The data of this study was collected through pre-test and post-test. The collected data then analyzed thoroughly. It was found that the mean score of experimental groups was higher than the score of control group (11.83>8.88), the deviation score of experimental groups was higher than the deviation of control group (2.96>2.83), and the value of t-test is higher than t-table, where t-test 5.88> t-table 2.000 for confidence level 0.05. Therefore, it is concluded that the implementation of Mix-Pair Share Strategy in teaching speaking skill at school amid Covid-19 pandemic was effective.
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Introduction

The idea of conducting this study rose from the phenomenon that the researcher found within teaching and learning process in one of schools in Central Lombok, West Nusa Tenggara amid covid-19 pandemic. The researcher found that lot of the students were not able to and difficult at speaking English properly even at least for their simple daily communication at school. Afraid of making mistake, less vocabulary items, the teacher only gives the learning materials such as completing reading dialogues and written from textbook, and dominantly teaches the students using Indonesian language cause the students also difficult to speak.

Teacher oriented technique in which students are required to create dialogue based on the text book, and asked to present the conversation in front of the class create the students bored at learning English, especially speaking skill. As the result, the students are uninterested, lack of vocabulary, lack of self-confidence and low of motivation, as well as lazy at practicing English speaking when their teacher ask them to practice it. Such result may be affected by the unconstructive teacher in selecting the teaching method particularly in teaching speaking skill.

To be active an active speaker, student musts have partner to cooperate, share work together in order to practice their English-speaking competency. Such togetherness may be called “cooperative”. And cooperative learning may bring students to be more active. Macpherson, (2008) revealed that cooperative learning is part of a group of teaching/learning techniques where students interact with each other to acquire and practice the elements of a subject matter and to meet common learning goals. It is much more than just putting students into groups and hoping for the best.

To help and solve such problem, the researcher applied the new method of teaching in the process of teaching and learning speaking skill as the solution amid the covid-19 pandemic; it is “Mix-Pair-Share” strategy. Mix- Pair-Share strategy is a type of cooperative learning that was firstly developed by Kagan, (1992). It is a group of study that students interdependently learn from one another. Mix-Pair-Share strategy is also a technique in teaching speaking which
make the students interested in speaking English. It is because this technique encourages the students to be active in the classroom and learn about cooperation in group. Furthermore, this technique makes the students have chance to speak English because they are divided into several groups and each member of group will have a role to speak English. So, there is no gap between students who active to speak and those who are not. In this case, the researcher consistently applied covid-19 protoclar within implementing the Mix-Pair-Share strategy in the teaching and learning process at school.

Literature Review
A. Speaking Skill

Speaking is the most difficult language skill to assess reliably, Louma, (2004). A person’s speaking ability is usually judge during a face-to-face interaction, in real time, between an interlocutor and a candidate. The assessor has to make instantaneous judgments about a range of aspects of what is being say, as it is being say. This means that the assessment might depend not only upon which particular features of speech (e.g., pronunciation, accuracy, fluency) the interlocutor pays attention to at any point in time, but upon a host of other factors such as the language level, gender, and status of the interlocutor, his or her familiarity to the candidate and the personal characteristics of the interlocutor and candidate. Moreover, the nature of the interaction, the sorts of tasks that are presented to the candidate, the questions asked, the topics broached, and the opportunities that are provided to show his or her ability to speak in a foreign language will all have an impact on the candidate’s performance.

Furthermore, the command of speaking skills in English is a precedence for many second-language or foreign-language apprentices. Subsequently, students often assess their achievement in language learning as well as the effectiveness of their English progression on the basis of how much they feel they have upgraded in their speaking language proficiency, Richards (1990).
B. Cooperative Learning Mix-Pair-Share

1. Definition of Cooperative Learning

Macpherson, (2008) reveals that Cooperative Learning is part of a group of teaching/learning techniques where students interact with each other to acquire and practice the elements of a subject matter and to meet common learning goals. It is much more than just putting students into groups and hoping for the best. Cooperative Learning is a very formal way of structuring activities in a learning environment that includes specific elements intended to increase the potential for rich and deep learning by the participants. Thus, Cooperative learning is a technique to teaching or formal way of structuring activities in a learning environment. z’/z/zz///, that used by teacher to make students active in learning with word together in small group to discuss about specific task.

2. Definition of Mix-Pair-Share

Kagan (1992) reveals that the class “mixes” until the teacher calls, “pair.” Students find a new partner to discuss or answer the teacher’s question. Mix-Pair-Share is one of cooperative learning strategy in teaching and learning that make students as learning centered. In this method the teacher as facilitator because the students who interact with their classmates to get information. In this case, the students will get more information from their classmates than the teacher because there are many students in classroom while the teacher just alone.

C. Process of Mix-Pair-Share

Mix-Pair-Share strategy is done in these steps:

1. Student mix around the room
2. Teacher calls “pair”
3. Student pair up with the person closest to them and give a high five. Student who haven’t found a partner raise their hand to find each other
4. Teacher ask a question and give think time
5. Students share with their partners

D. The Advantages and Disadvantages of Using Cooperative Learning Mix-Pair-Share

Each approach surely has the advantages and disadvantages. Here, the Cooperative Learning Mix-Pair-Share has some advantages instead of its disadvantages.

   a. Every student orally answers every question
   b. Automatic wait time is embedded
   c. Listening and Speaking is included
   d. Student engagement improves
   e. Student remembers more. Mix-Pair-Share is also a cognitive strategy.

   As students discuss information they are also facilitating remembering the information.

2. The Disadvantages of Using Cooperative Learning Mix-Pair-Share, Conwin, (2013):

   Mix-Pair-Share as the strategy which offers the better approaches is not always good as usual there are some difficulties and the disadvantages that cover the advantages of it. There are minimally four problems which should be faced by the teacher when they teach using cooperative learning Mix-Pair-Share, such as:
   a. There is students’ misbehavior
   b. Classroom noise
   c. Students’ absence
   d. The time that is used is not effective

   Also, there is too great a range of performance level in a group. There, some difficulties which faced by the teachers are like students’ noise, then the great range of students in a group are being the most important thing which should be overcame, because the time that is used maybe insufficient.

   From some weaknesses that are given above by the experts, the writer can review that the disadvantages of using cooperative learning Mix-Pair-Share are
Cooperative Learning Mix-Pair-Share takes much time to organize the groups. Then, there is insufficient time for the teacher to divide and manage groups well. Moreover, the students’ tendency for making noise is opened. In the end, the students’ attention is divided into some parts, not only to the teacher’s material, but also to the group’s member.

Research Method

A. Research Design

This study used experimental research method with quasi experimental design of non equivalent control group design. Kothari, (2004) revealed that Experimental approach is characterized by much greater control over the research environment and in this case some variables are manipulated to observe their effect on other variables.

Some procedures were used; divided the respondents into two groups namely experimental group and control group. The experimental group was treated by Mix- Pair-Share strategy and the control group was treated by Discussion Method.

B. The Population and Sample of the Study

1. Population

Dowdy, (2004) defined that population is commonly understood to be a natural, geographical, or political collection of people, animals, plants, or objects. The population of this study Junior High School students which consisted of 6 classes with the total number of the population was 176 students.

2. Sample

Sprinthall, (1991) revealed that sample is a smaller number of observations taken from the total number making up a given population. This study used random sampling technique; lottery technique and took 2 classes; VIII F class consists of 23 students as experiment group, and VIII E class consists of 25 students as the control group. So, the total numbers of sample were 48 students.
C. Research Instrument.

This study used speaking test as the research instrument. Brown’s (2004) band scale for speaking score was used in order to know the effectiveness of Mix-Pair-Share in teaching speaking for the students. The band scale indicators consisted of grammar, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension, and pronunciation. And the score criteria classification was poor, average, and excellent.

D. Procedures of Data Collection

To gain the data needed, this study applied some procedures of collecting the data, they were:

1. Pre-test

   Pre test is a test that the researcher gave to the students to know the ability of the students in English Speaking before teaching and learning process was conducted by the researcher.

2. Post-test

   The post-test is a test that the researcher gave to the students to know the effect of Mix Pair Share Strategy in teaching speaking after teaching and learning process was conducted by the researcher. The post-test was given after the researcher thought the experimental group with Mix Pair Share Strategy in teaching speaking and the control group was thought with Discussion Method.

E. Technique of Data Analysis

After conducting the whole procedures of the data collection, it was then conducting the data analysis under the main patterns, they are;

1. Identifying the mean scores of experimental and control group

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

   Where:
   \[ \bar{x} \] = the mean
$$\Sigma = \text{the sum of}$$
$$X = \text{any score}$$
$$N = \text{the number of students}$$

Miller (1984)

2. Calculating the standard deviation of the two scores by using the following formula:

$$S^2 = \frac{\Sigma X^2}{N} - \bar{X}^2$$

Where:
$$S^2 = \text{the Variance of a set of scores}$$
$$S = \text{Standard Deviation}$$
$$\bar{X} = \text{the mean}$$
$$X = \text{any score in the set}$$
$$\sqrt[2]{\text{the roof of}}$$
$$\Sigma = \text{the sum of}$$

Miller, (1984)

3. From the results of the students’ mean score and the standard deviation of two groups, it is then continued to find out the t-test.

$$t = \frac{(X_1 - X_2)\sqrt{(N_1 + N_2 - 2)N_1N_2}}{\sqrt{(N_1S_1^2 + N_2S_2^2)(N_1 + N_2)}}$$

Where:
$$S = \text{is the Standard deviation score}$$
$$N = \text{the total of students}$$
$$\sqrt[2]{\text{is the roof of}}$$
$$X = \text{any score in the set}$$
$$\bar{X} = \text{the mean.}$$

Miller, (1984)

**Finding And Discussion**

This part deals with finding and discussion of the implementation of Mix-Pair-Share Strategy in teaching speaking skill at school amid Covid-19 pandemic.

1. Finding.
After conducting the research, it was found that the experimental group was higher than the control group. Here are two tables of the data found in post-test of experimental group result and control group. The score is tabled in the table below:

Table 1: Score of post test of experimental group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of students</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAIL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMKH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LWR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNJ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table above shows the result of post-test of experimental group which indicates that Pronunciation score was 55, grammar 49, vocabulary 65, fluency 51, and comprehension 52. Meanwhile, X1 was 272, and X2 was 3420.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YW</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Score of post test of control group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of students</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table above shows the result of post-test of control group indicates that pronunciation score was 46, grammar 50, vocabulary 48, fluency 40, and comprehension 38. Meanwhile, $X_1$ was 222, and $X_2$ was 2172.

a. The computation of mean score

1. The mean score of Experimental groups

   \[
   \bar{X} = \frac{\sum X}{N} \\
   = \frac{272}{23} = 11.83
   \]

2. The mean score of Control group

   \[
   \bar{X} = \frac{\sum X}{N} \\
   = \frac{222}{25} = 8.88
   \]

b. The computation of deviation

1. Deviation of Experimental group

   \[
   S^2 = \frac{\sum x^2}{N} - \bar{X}^2 \\
   = \frac{3420}{23} - 11.83
   \]

   \[
   S^2 = 148.69-139.95 = 8.74
   \]

   \[
   \sqrt{8.74} = 2.96
   \]

2. Standard deviation of control group
\[ S^2 = \frac{\Sigma X^2}{N} - \chi^2 \]

\[
\frac{2172}{25} - 8.88^2 = 86.88 - 78.85 = 8.03
\]

\[ S^2 = \sqrt{8.03} = 2.83 \]

c. Finding the standard deviation scores of the two group, the researcher continued to find out the t-test.

\[
t = \frac{(X_1 - X_2)\sqrt{(N_1 + N_2 - 2)N_1N_2}}{\sqrt{(N_1S_1^2 + N_2S_2^2)(N_1 + N_2)}}
\]

\[
= (11.83 - 8.88) \sqrt{(23 + 25 - 2)\times23\times25}
\]

\[
\sqrt{(23\times2.96 + 25\times2.83) (23 + 25)}
\]

\[
= 2.95\sqrt{46\times575}
\]

\[
\sqrt{(68.08 + 70.75) (48)}
\]

\[
= 2.95\sqrt{46\times575}
\]

\[
\sqrt{138.83(48)}
\]

\[
= 2.86\times162.63
\]

\[
\sqrt{663.84}
\]

\[
= 479.76
\]

\[
81.63
\]

\[
= 5.88
\]

2. Discussion

The mean score of experimental groups was 11.83, and the mean score of control group was 8.88. It means that the experimental group was successful in using Mix Pair Share strategy in teaching speaking skill rather than the control group which applied Discussion learning method. Moreover, the standard deviation of the experimental group was 2.96, and the control group was 2.83.

Although the score for experimental group was higher than control group, but it was not guarantee significance of the result. Therefore, the t-test score was 5.88, and then being compared by t-table in order to know whether it had positive effect or not. In this case, the t-table used \((N^1+N^3)-2\) as degree freedom (df). The df was \((23+25)-2 = 46\).
Furthermore, the researcher took the confidence level of 46. Lastly, the researcher found as what it was called confidence level of students in using the Mix Pair Share strategy was in 2.000 confidence level 0.05 %.

Thus, seeing the result of the study, it is found that t-test was higher than t-table. It indicates that Mix Pair Share strategy was effective in teaching speaking skill at school amid Covid-19 pandemic.

**Conclusions And Suggestion**

After analyzing the data derived from both groups; experimental and control group. It was found that the mean score of experimental groups was higher than the score of control group (11.83>8.88), the deviation score of experimental groups was higher than the deviation of control group (2.96>2.83), and the value of t-test is higher than t-table, where t-test 5.88> t-table 2.000 for confidence level 0.05. Therefore, it is concluded that the implementation of Mix-Pair Share Strategy was effective in teaching speaking at school amid covid-19 pandemic.

It is suggested that successful learning and teaching at English speaking skill doesn’t depend on the lesson program only, but also more important is how the teacher presents the lesson and uses various techniques to manage the class livelier and more enjoyable. Hence, the Mix-Pair-Share strategy is one of the best methods that the teacher or students may use for teaching and learning English speaking skill particularly at school.
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