

***THE EFFECT OF TWO STAY-TWO STRAY METHOD ON THE SPEAKING ABILITY OF THE FIRST YEAR STUDENTS OF SMK TELKOM PEKANBARU***

Poppy Meilani Rizki, Fadly Azhar, Dahnilsyah  
*Poppymeilani16@gmail.com, fadlyazhar57@gmail.com, danil\_71@yahoo.com*  
Contact: 085271066877

*English Study Program  
Language and Arts Department  
Faculty of Teachers Training and Education  
Universitas Riau*

**Abstract :** *This research aimed to discover the effect of Two Stay-Two Stray (TSTS) Method on the speaking ability of the first year students of SMK Telkom Pekanbaru academic year 2018/2019. The selected sample was X TKJ-2 students which consisted of 34 students. The sample was selected by using cluster random sampling technique. This research was pre-experimental and the data were collected by means of pre-test and post-test design in the form of speaking test which focused on describing objects. The data were analyzed using five components of speaking: pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. The results showed that the score of the pretest was 60.47, the post-test was 72.98 while the improvement from both scores was 12.51. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is a significant effect of TSTS Method on the speaking ability of the first year students of SMK Telkom Pekanbaru. In other words, the teaching of speaking by through Two Stay-Two Stray Method, as one of the alternative speaking activities, has an effect on the students' speaking ability.*

**Keywords:** *Two Stay-Two Stray Method, Speaking Ability*

**PENGARUH METODE TWO STAY-TWO STRAY TERHADAP KEMAMPUAN  
BERBICARA SISWA TAHUN PERTAMA  
SMK TELKOM PEKANBARU**

Poppy Meilani Rizki, Fadly Azhar, Dahnilsyah  
Poppymeilani16@gmail.com, fadlyazhar57@gmail.com, danil\_71@yahoo.com  
No Hp: 085271066877

Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris  
Jurusan Bahasa Dan Seni  
Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan  
Universitas Riau

**Abstrak:** Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui pengaruh Metode Two Stay-Two Stray (TSTS) terhadap kemampuan berbicara siswa-siswi tahun pertama SMK Telkom Pekanbaru tahun ajaran 2018/2019. Sampel yang terpilih adalah kelas sepuluh (10) TKJ-2 yang berjumlah 34 siswa. Sample tersebut di pilih menggunakan teknik cluster random sampling. Penelitian ini merupakan pre-experimental dan data di kumpulkan melalui pre-test dan post-test dalam bentuk tes berbicara yang berfokus pada penggambaran objek. Data dianalisis berdasarkan lima komponen berbicara: pelafalan, tata bahasa, kosakata, kelancaran, dan pemahaman. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa skor pada pre-test adalah 60.47, skor pada post-test adalah 72.98 sedangkan kenaikan dari kedua skor adalah 12.51. Oleh karena itu, dapat disimpulkan bahwa adanya pengaruh dari metode TSTS terhadap kemampuan berbicara siswa tahun pertama. Dengan kata lain, mengajar berbicara menggunakan Metode Two Stay-Two Stray, sebagai salah satu kegiatan berbicara alternative, memiliki efek pada kemampuan berbicara siswa.

**Kata Kunci:** Metode Two Stay-Two Stray, Kemampuan Berbicara

## **INTRODUCTION**

Speaking is considered to be one of the most important among the four language skills. During the instructional process, students need to communicate one to another in order to express their ideas and feelings. Richards (2008) states the mastery of speaking skill in English is a priority for both ESL and EFL learners. Then, Luoma (2004) explain that speaking is interaction; speaking is a social and situation-based activity. In other words, oral language is a very important link in the process of students learning and thinking development. So, students including the students of SMK Telkom Pekanbaru need to learn how to organize their thinking and focus on their ideas on speaking ability.

However, the school facilities and teaching strategies at SMK Telkom Pekanbaru need an improvement to support the students to develop their knowledge in learning English especially speaking. This was based on the interview with some students of SMK Telkom Pekanbaru who said that the problem in speaking was as follows: (1) shy and afraid of making mistakes; (2) poor in pronunciation; (3) have no courage to talk in English, especially in front of the teacher and classmates; (4) limited vocabulary and difficulties in comprehending the grammatical rules. In addition to this, the English teacher said that many students at SMK Telkom Pekanbaru had low confidence in speaking English because of anxiety in making mistakes, feel uneasy, nervous and awkward when practicing English. Besides that, limited vocabulary mastery also made them difficult to smoothly keep up a conversation.

In order to motivate students to be able to speak in English properly, fluently and naturally, cooperative learning including Two Stay-Two Stray (TSTS) is a good way to overcome students' problem in speaking. Brady & Tsay (2010) state that TSTS requires students to engage in group activities which increase learning outcomes and interaction among the students. It will encourage them to be brave in speaking even allow them to receive more feedback from their peers. The use of TS-TS in teaching speaking will give the maximum opportunities for students to speak. Moreover, this method helps students to practice speaking more often with others during the teaching-learning process. TS-TS is commonly used for all subjects and students' level. Kagan (1992) said that TSTS Method gives the groups an opportunity to share result and information to other groups, can motivate students to work in a team and collecting many ideas from others to gain various goals. This is supported by Sharan (1990) who said that one of the conclusions that can be gained by using TSTS is that it can be used to activate different groups to achieve different goals, to enhance social and academic development among students even to help them to build their ideas to speak freely during teaching-learning process.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **The Sample of the Research**

The participants of this research were X TKJ - 2 class which consisted of 34 students. They were selected through cluster random sampling technique.

## The Data Collection Technique

The data was quantitative data. To get the quantitative data, the researcher used pre-test and post-test design in the form of oral test. In this research, students' speaking ability was observed and evaluated by the three raters (Yunaldi, S.Pd, Dhewi Astuti S.Pd and Kartika Apriola S.Pd) based on pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension in both pre-test and post-test.

## The Data Analysis Technique

To analyze quantitative data, the researcher used SPSS 23.0, Microsoft Excel and speaking assessment adapted from Harris (1974) as follows:

**Table 1. The Scoring System of Writing**

No.	The Components of Speaking	The score range
1	Pronunciation	5 : 4 : 3 : 2 : 1
2	Grammar	5 : 4 : 3 : 2 : 1
3	Vocabulary	5 : 4 : 3 : 2 : 1
4	Fluency	5 : 4 : 3 : 2 : 1
5	Comprehension	5 : 4 : 3 : 2 : 1

(Adapted from Harris, 1974)

To know the percentage of student's ability in speaking components, the scoring system by Harris (1974) to classify their level of ability was used as in the followings:

**Table 2. The Classification of Student's Scores**

No.	Score	Classification
1	80 – 100	Excellent
2	60 – 79	Good
3	50 – 59	Average
4	0 – 49	Poor

## RESEARCH FINDINGS

### The Result of Pre-Test

The pre-test was conducted to know the ability of the students before the method was applied. After the test scores were collected and calculated by the three raters, it was found that the average score of the students' speaking ability in the pre-test was 60.47.

The data of the students' average score on the five components of speaking can be seen in the following tables:

**Table 3. The Ability in Each Component of Speaking in Pre-test**

No	Component of Speaking	Average (R1+R2+R3)
1	Pronunciation	63.53
2	Grammar	58.24
3	Vocabulary	59.61
4	Fluency	58.63
5	Comprehension	62.35
<b>Average Total Score</b>		<b>60.47</b>

Table 3. shows the average score in the components of speaking. The average score in the component of pronunciation was 63.53, the average score of grammar was 58.24, vocabulary was 59.61, fluency was 58.63 and comprehension was 62.35. Based on Tabel 4.1, the lowest score among the five components of speaking was grammar and the highest one was pronunciation. The percentage of students' ability level can be seen in Table 4.

**Table 4. The Ability Level in Pre-test**

No	Range	Ability Level	Frequency	Percentage
1	80-100	Excellent	1	2.9%
2	60-79	Good	13	38.3%
3	50-59	Average	19	55.9%
4	0-49	Poor	1	2.9%
<b>Total</b>			<b>34</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based on Table 4., only one student got an excellent level. The highest percentage is in average level with 55.9%. There were 13 students reached good level, 19 students reached average level and 1 student reached poor level. Therefore, the result of the pretest was in average level.

### **The Result of Post-Test**

The post-test used the same material as in the pre-test in order to measure the difference before and after treatment that was taught by using Two Stay-Two Stray method. The results were also collected and calculated by the three raters. It was found that the average score of speaking ability in post-test was 72.98. The details can be seen in Table 5.

**Table 5. The Ability in Each Component of Speaking in Post- Test**

No	Component of Speaking	Average (R1+R2+R3)
1	Pronunciation	79.61
2	Grammar	66.86
3	Vocabulary	72.94
4	Fluency	69.80
5	Comprehension	75.69
<b>Average Total Score</b>		<b>72.98</b>

Table 5. shows that the average score of pronunciation in the components of speaking was 79.61. Then, the grammar score was 66.86, vocabulary was 72.94, fluency was 69.80 and comprehension was 75.69. Based on the description above, the lowest score in the component of speaking was still grammar with average score was 66.86. The highest score in the component of the speaking was pronunciation with the score 79.61. The average score of students' ability in speaking was in good level with total score in speaking aspect is 72.98. It increased from average total score in pre-test which is only 60.47. The percentage of the ability level can be seen in Table 6. as in the followings:

**Table 6. The Ability Level in Post- test**

No	Range	Ability Level	Frequency	Percentage
1	80-100	Excellent	5	14.7%
2	60-79	Good	27	79.4%
3	50-59	Average	2	5.9%
4	0-49	Poor	0	0%
<b>Total</b>			<b>34</b>	<b>100%</b>

Speaking ability of the first year students of SMK Telkom Pekanbaru was improved after the treatment was applied. It can be seen from the result of post-test. Table 6. shows that the students' speaking ability level was average to excellent. There were 5 students who got excellent level (14.7%), 27 students got good level (79.4%) and 2 students got average level (5.9%); and there was no student in poor level. Thus, the increase of students score on pre-test to post-test indicated that the treatment given had a significant effect on the students speaking ability on Two Stay-Two Stray method.

### **The Comparison Between the Pre-Test and Post-Test**

The findings show a positive result from the pre-test to the post-test using Two Stay-Two Stray method in students' speaking ability. The comparison of each component in speaking is present in Table 7. below:

**Table 7. The Average Score in Each Component of Speaking**

No	Components of Speaking	Pre- Test	Post- Test	Different Score
1	Pronunciation	63.53	79.61	16.08
2	Grammar	58.24	66.86	8.62
3	Vocabulary	59.61	72.94	13.33
4	Fluency	58.63	69.80	11.17
5	Comprehension	62.35	75.69	13.34

Table 7. shows the average score in each component of speaking significantly increases. It proves that using Two Stay-Two Stray method in speaking improved speaking ability on students' average score in terms of speaking components.

### **The Result of T-Test**

In this research, T-Test formula was used to compare Pre-Test and Post-Test result in determining whether or not the hypothesis is accepted and it also measures whether or not the instrument in the treatment could give an effect on the students' speaking ability. The 't' test formula can be seen in table 8.

**Table 8. Paired Samples Statistics**

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Posttest	72.9804	34	9.30911	1.59650
	Pretest	60.4706	34	7.61980	1.30679

Table 8. shows that the mean score of pre-test was 60.4706 and the mean score of post-test was 72.9804. The difference between the mean score of the pre-test and the post-test was 12.5098. The difference of mean score shows the effect of students' speaking ability after the treatment. So, the spread of values in the sample of pre-test was 7.61980 while standard error of mean was 1.30679. Besides that, the standard deviation for post-test was 9.30911 and standard error for post-test was 1.59650.

**Table 9. Paired Samples Test**

	Paired Differences					t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 1 Posttest – Pretest	12.50980	7.07070	1.21262	10.04272	14.97689	10.316	33	.000

The value of t-test was 10.316, while the value of the t-table was 2.0345. Therefore, it could be concluded that there was a significant difference between the pre-test and the post-test results. In other words, the alternative hypothesis of this research was accepted and the null hypothesis was rejected.

After calculating the mean, the standard deviation and the standard error score, there was paired samples correlation table that explained the correlation of pre-test and post-test. The paired sample correlation can be seen on Table 10. below:

**Table 10. Paired Samples Correlations**

	N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1 Posttest & Pretest	34	.668	.000

Considering the data shown on Table 10, the correlation coefficient was 0.668 with the number of 34 students.

## **DISCUSSION**

After applying the treatment, there was an improvement in students' speaking post-test. The result of the T-test table and the students' average score in each component of speaking shows that the mean score of post-test is higher than pre-test. Then, the difference between before and after treatment reached a significant level after being calculated with t-test. The data analysis showed that t-test was higher than t-table ( $10.316 > 2.0345$ ).

According to the result, the lowest score was grammar while the highest different score in post-test was pronunciation. It increased because of the implementation of Two Stay-Two Stray in teaching-learning process. The activity of what students did during the learning process demanded them to speak English continually. Since the students should describe someone or something in English during the treatment, it makes them habituated to speak English. Also, when the students read a text that was given to them, they would learn new vocabulary words.

This result was in line with the previous study conducted by Dhea Intan Lestari (2014) indicated that using Two Stay-Two Stray method had an effect on students' speaking ability. Furthermore, this is the answer to the formulation of the problem that

there was a significant effect of Two Stay-Two Stray method on the speaking ability of the first year students of SMK Telkom Pekanbaru.

## **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

### **Conclusions**

Based on the result in the previous chapter, it can be concluded that there is an effect on students' speaking ability after being taught by using Two Stay-Two Stray method. It can be seen from the result in pre-test, the average score was 60.47 meanwhile in post-test, the average score was 72.98. It was found out that the t-test score (10.316) is higher than the t-table score (2.0345).

Moreover, the average level was in the Good level. It means that there was a significant difference between the results of pre-test and post-test. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis was accepted and the null hypothesis was rejected. In other words, there was a significant effect of Two Stay-Two Stray method on the speaking ability of the first year students of SMK Telkom Pekanbaru. It also can be concluded that the implementation of Two Stay-Two Stray method can be an alternative activity in teaching speaking. So, the research question is answered that is, Two Stay-Two Stray method has an effect on students' speaking ability.

### **Recommendations**

Based on the results of the research, the researcher would like to offer some recommendations for the following people. These recommendations are expected to be beneficial for teachers and students in teaching and learning English, especially in teaching speaking. They are as follows:

1. **The Students**

Through Two Stay-Two Stray method students can express their opinions, ideas, and feelings and expressions when they are speaking in the class. They also need to pay attention to the teacher's explanation. Therefore, they can understand the language features and social function of a text. They also need to speak more to improve their pronunciation. Two Stay-Two Stray method can help them build up their confidence to speak with someone else without feeling hesitant and afraid.

2. **The Teacher**

The teacher may use Two Stay-Two Stray as an alternative method to improve the student's ability in speaking especially in using descriptive texts. Then, the teacher should control and manage the students when they are working in groups to get an effective learning. The teacher also can give homework for the students. In this way, the students can develop and improve their speaking. Then, all of the students' work should be checked, corrected, and scored; hence, the students' motivation can be built up.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ali, Zuraidah. (2011). *Speaking Skill in the ESL Classroom*. (Online) <http://Ezine Articles.com/?expert=Zuraidah Ali> (22<sup>nd</sup> September 2016)
- Al-Tamimi, Nasser Omer M. (2017). "Improving Speaking Skill: Implications for Using Debatable Topics in English Speaking Classes". *Research Journal of English Language and Literature (RJELAL)* Vol.5.
- Anderson M., Anderson K. (1997) *Text Type in English*. South Yarra: Macmillan Education Australia, p.3
- Boonkit, Kamonpan. (2010). *Enhancing the development of speaking skills for non-native speakers of English*. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 2.
- Brady, M., & Tsay, M. (2010). *A Case Study of Cooperative Learning and Communication Pedagogy: Does Working in Teams Make a Difference?* *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, Vol. 10, No. 2, June 2010, pp. 78 – 89.
- Brown, H.D. (1994). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. United States of America: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Brown, H.D. (1994). *Teaching by principles: an interactive approach to language pedagogy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Burns, A., & Joyce, H. (1997). *Focus on Speaking*. Sydney: National Center for English Language Teaching and Research.
- Cambridge University, *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary (Third Edition)*, (Singapore: Cambridge University Press, 2010). p. 285
- Cameron, L. (2001). *Teaching Languages to Young Learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, L. Manion, L., and Morrison, K. (2000) *Research Method in Education*. Fifth edition. Routledge: Routledge Falmer.
- David, W. J., Roger, T. J., Edythe, J. H. (1999). *Cooperative in the Classroom*. Edina MN: Interaction Book Company.

- Dhea, Intan. L. (2014). Using Two Stay-Two Stray Method to Increase the Speaking Ability in Procedure Text of The first Year Students of SMPN 6 Tambang. Universitas Riau.
- Dina, A. K. (2015). *The Use of Two Stay-Two Stray Method to Improve Students Writing Ability of Recount Text*. Semarang: Universitas Islam Negeri Walisongo.
- English-on-blog.blogspot.co.id/2015/02/scoring-rubric-for-speaking-and-scoring.html?m=1 retrieve on March 11, 2018
- Fadly, Azhar et al. (2006). Panduan Penulisan dan Pelaksanaan Ujian Skripsi pada Program Studi Bahasa Inggris Jurusan Pendidikan Bahasa dan Seni FKIP UNRI. Unpublished.
- Fauzan, Bachrie. (2012). *Increasing Students' Speaking Ability through Board Game for Eight Graders of MTs NW Majidiin the School Year 2012/2013*. <http://fauzanbachrie.blogspot.co.id>
- Gay, R. L and Airasan. (2000). *Educational Research*. New Jersey: Practice Hall.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. (Great Britain: Pearson Education Limited), 4<sup>th</sup> Ed p.35
- Harris, P. D. (1974). *Testing English as a Second Language*. New York. Mc Grow Hill.
- Hartono, Rudi. (2005). *Genres of texts*. Faculty of Language and Art. University of Semarang. Unpublished.
- Hatch and Farhady, H. (1982). *Research Design and Statistic*. Newbury House Publishers INC. Los Angeles.
- Hornby, *Oxford Advance Learner's (Dictionary of Current English)*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), p.296
- Hornby, *Oxford Advance Learner's (Dictionary of Current English)*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), p.651
- Hornby, *Oxford Advance Learner's (Dictionary of Current English)*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), p.1162
- Hornby, *Oxford Advance Learner's (Dictionary of Current English)*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), p.1175

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., (1986). 'Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety', *The Modern Language Journal*, Vol 70 (2), pp. 125-132.

[Http://dwisusanto24.blogspot.co.id/2016/06/procedure-text-senior-high-school.html](http://dwisusanto24.blogspot.co.id/2016/06/procedure-text-senior-high-school.html)  
retrieve on March 20, 2018.

Huebner T. (1960). *Audio Visual Technique in Foreign Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Khoironiyah, K.

Hughes, A. 1989. *Testing for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Kagan, Spencer. (1992). *Cooperative Learning*. California: Kagan Publishing.

Kagan, Spencer. (2009). *Kagan Cooperative Learning*. San Clemente, CA: Kagan Publishing.

Kane, Thomas. S. (2000). *The Oxford Essential Guide to Writing*. New York: Barkley Books.

Kayi, H. (2006). Teaching Speaking: Activities to Promote Speaking in a Second Language. *The Internet TESL Journal*, Vol. XII, No. 11, November 2006. [http://iteslj.org/Articles/Kayi Teaching Speaking.html](http://iteslj.org/Articles/Kayi_Teaching_Speaking.html). Retrieved on February 02, 2018

Lewaherilla, A. (2011). *Improving students' reading competence through two stay two stray technique*.

Lie, Anita. (2002). *Cooperative Learning*. Jakarta: Gramedia.

Louma, Sari. (2004). *Assessing Speaking*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Mettetal, Gwyn. (2001). "The What, Why and How of Classroom Action Research", *JoSoTL* Vol. 2, Number 1.

Nunan, David. (1989). *Understanding language Classroom*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Nunan, David. (2003). *The Impact of English as a Global Language on Educational Policies and Practices in the Asia-Pacific Region* *TESOL Quarterly* 37(4).589-613

- Otong, Djuharie. S. (2007). *Genre Delengkapi 700 soal uji pemahaman*. Bandung: Yrama Widya.
- Richard, J. C. & Renandya, W. (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Richard, J. C. & Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistic*, (London: Pearson), p.222
- Richard, J. C. & Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistic*, (London: Pearson), p.251-252
- Richard, J. C. & Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistic*, (London: Pearson), p.469
- Richard, Jack. (2008). *Teaching Listening and Speaking From Theory to Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sallina. (2012). *Using Two Stay Two Stray to Improve Reading Comprehension Through Descriptive Text of The First Year Students at SMK Telkom Pekanbaru*. Universitas Riau.
- Sharan, S. (1990). *Cooperative Learning: Theory and Research*. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Sianipar, D. M., & Sumarsih. (2013). *Improving students' achievement in speaking through two stay two stray strategy*. Journal of English Language Teaching of fbs unimed. Vol: 2 No. 2. 1-11. Retrieved from <http://jurnal.unimed.ac.id/2012/index.php/eltu/article/view/638>
- Spielberger, C.D. (1983). *Manual for the State-Trait Anxiety (from Y)*. Consulting Press, Palo Alto, CA
- Sugiyono. (2010). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sugiyono. (2012). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R & D*. Alfabeta: Bandung.
- Sukmana, A. (2010). *Cooperative Learning Techniques in Teaching a Second Language*.
- Thornburry, Scott (2005). *How to Teach Speaking*, (Longman), p.6-7

Ur, Penny. (1996). *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Woolfolk, A. E. (2011). *Educational Psychology (11<sup>th</sup> Ed)*. Boston, MA: Pearson.