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ABSTRACT

Muhajirun. S891202040. 2013. Thesis. The Effectiveness of Inside-Out Circle To Teach Speaking Viewed from Students’ creativity. Consultant I: Dr. Abdul Asib, M.Pd; Consultant II: Dr. Ngadiso, M.Pd. English Education Department of Graduate School, Sebelas Maret University.

The objective of the research is to examine whether: (1) Inside-Out Circle is more effective than Direct Instruction Method to teach speaking at the seventh grade students of SMP N 1 Kerjo, in the academic year of 2012/2013; (2) The students having high creativity have better speaking ability than those having low creativity at the seventh grade students of SMP N 1 Kerjo, in the academic year of 2012/2013; and (3) there is an interaction between teaching methods and students’ creativity in teaching speaking at the seventh grade students of SMP N 1 Kerjo, in the academic year of 2012/2013.

This research was an experimental research conducted at the seventh grade students of SMP N 1 Kerjo, in the academic year of 2012/2013. There were about 7 classes consisting of 224 students, which are divided into class A until class G. The samples of the research were two classes; VIIC consisting of 32 students as an experimental class and VIIE consisting of 32 students as a control class. The sampling technique that was used in this research was cluster random sampling. The data was analyzed by using Multifactor Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test of 2x2 and Tukey test.

The writer got some research finding as follows; (1) Inside-Out Circle is more effective than Direct Instruction Method to teach speaking at the seventh grade students of SMP N 1 Kerjo; (2) The students having high creativity have better speaking ability than that of those having low creativity at the seventh grade students of SMP N 1 Kerjo; and (3) There is an interaction between teaching methods and students’ creativity in teaching speaking at the seventh grade students of SMP N 1 Kerjo. It can be concluded that Inside-Out Circle is an effective method to teach speaking at the seventh grade students of SMP N 1 Kerjo, in the academic year of 2012/2013

Keywords: Inside-Out Circle, Direct Instruction Method, Creativity.
ABSTRAK


Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah: (1) untuk mengetahui apakah Lingkaran Kecil-Besar lebih efektif daripada metode Pengajaran Langsung untuk mengajar bebicara kepada siswa kelas VII SMP N 1 Kerjo pada tahun akademik 2012/2013, (2) untuk mengetahui apakah siswa yang memiliki kreativitas yang tinggi memiliki keterampilan yang lebih baik dalam bebicara daripada siswa yang memiliki kreativitas rendah, dan (3) untuk mengetahui apakah ada interaksi antara metode pengajaran dan kreativitas dalam pengajaran bebicara untuk siswa kelas VII SMP N 1 Kerjo pada tahun akademik 2012/2013.


Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa: (1) Lingkaran Kecil-Besar lebih efektif daripada metode Pengajaran Langsung untuk mengajar bebicara, (2) Siswa yang memiliki kreativitas yang tinggi memiliki keterampilan bebicara yang lebih baik daripada siswa yang memiliki kreativitas yang rendah, dan (3) Ada interaksi antara metode mengajar dan kreativitas siswa untuk mengajar bebicara. Berdasarkan hasil penelitian, secara umum dapat disimpulkan bahwa Lingkaran Dalam-Luar merupakan metode yang efektif untuk mengajar bebicara. Oleh karena itu, para guru disarankan untuk menerapkan Lingkaran Kecil-Besar untuk mengajar bebicara.

Kata Kunci: Lingkaran Kecil-Besar, Pengajaran Langsung, Kreativitas.
MOTTO

It may be that you dislike a thing, which is good for you and like a thing, which is bad for you. Allah SWT knows but you do not know

(Al- Baqoroh: 216)
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