

IMPLEMENTING DRILL TECHNIQUE IN TEACHING SPEAKING

Fortina Delana, Ag. Bambang Setiyadi, Ramlan Ginting Suka

E-mail : fortina.delana56@gmail.com

Abstract

Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk menemukan (1) masalah yang muncul pada saat proses belajar mengajar berlangsung, (2) implementasi proses belajar mengajar yang efektif dengan menggunakan teknik Drill. Penelitian ini menggunakan desain penelitian tindakan dengan menerapkan siklus-siklus. Data penelitian diperoleh dengan cara observasi, wawancara dan rekaman. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa (1) masalah yang sering muncul berasal dari sulitnya siswa memahami apa yang dikatakan oleh peneliti dalam bahasa Inggris, (2) implementasi belajar semakin baik pada setiap siklusnya, siswa lebih berani dan percaya diri pada siklus selanjutnya daripada pada siklus sebelumnya.

The research aimed at finding (1) the problems occurred during the teaching learning process, (2) the effective implementation in the teaching learning process using Drill Technique. The subject of this action research was the second grade students in class VIII J of SMP N 4 Bandar Lampung, consisting 22 students. This research used action research through cycles. The data were collected through observation sheet, interview and recording. The result showed that (1) the problems faced often by the researcher came from their lack ability in understanding the researcher's speaking, (2) the implementation of the teaching learning process was getting better cycle to cycle, they were more brave and more confident talking English on the next cycle than on the previous.

Keywords: action research, drill technique, effective implementation, learning process, teaching speaking.

INTRODUCTION

The English teachers often faced some common problems, for example, the students are not able to use English even by using the minimum standard of the grammar of English (e.g. speak Indonesian-English), the students' score of English subject always become the lowest score even sometime score didn't reflect their ability in using the language orally, it is difficult for them to speak English orally, and it is very difficult for them to understand the language in written form and so on problems.

There are many factors that make up those problems. There are many possibilities why this problems occurs (1) Students' low motivation (2) teachers' lack of ability (3) inappropriate method (4) students' wrong assumption on learning the language.

Setiyadi (2006:55) says that in Audio Lingual Method, language is the everyday spoken utterance of the average person at normal speed. In the context of traditional language, as usually became the second or the first language of some Indonesian people, let say someone's traditional language will have the same difficulties level to English language because the dialect, structure and the literature are extremely different from Bahasa Indonesia. Fact shows that there are many people who acquire Bahasa Indonesia the same time they acquired their traditional language which is different from Bahasa Indonesia. This condition sometimes because in their home they use their traditional language, but in their school or their work they use Bahasa Indonesia. Means, acquiring some traditional language behind Bahasa Indonesia, is the same way as we acquiring English language. It is in line as according to Setiyadi (2006:55) that he says learning a foreign language is the same as the acquisition of the native language.

Their habits formed this ability (to acquire the traditional language). They often heard the language, they often repeat the language and use the language suitable to the context and how the language is used in that place. Unconsciously, they acquired the language without go to school to learn the language.

In teaching English language as foreign language, the method of course will be much concerning on how the language is used, and what are the samples of the utterance of the language that spoken everyday. The titor need to make the students understand and concern to the context of when and where the language is used.

More listening/ repeating is one of the answer assumed by the writer when she tried to observe someone who easily acquiring some foreign (traditional) language without learn it by going to school. This was the reason why the writer decided to use audio- lingual method in teaching speaking skill. But it might took too long time if the writer applied all the principles of the method, so the writer chose to use the drill technique of audio-lingual method. Language is a process of habit formation is one of many assumptions about language by ALM. Meanwhile, all the four basic language skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing) can't be always taught by using this method where the method only considered to produce oral utterances that is spoken by the native speaker. The important thing in using this method, the teacher must have a good ability in pronouncing the language almost like the native-speaker of the target language because teacher is the main model in the teaching-learning process.

The researcher hoped that, this technique 'brought' the students to be familiar with the utterances of the language, familiar to hear and repeat the utterances/ dialogues, and at the end they unconsciously are able to speak English nearly the way the native-speaker

spoke. Here the writer focused her research on the problems occurred during the teaching-learning process through the technique and saw the effective implementation of the technique.

This research tried to find the students' development and the improvement, and see the problems occurred during the cycle by the cycle and find the suitable treatment to solve the problems occurred.

This research classified as an action research. As suitable to Lewin (1946) in Vasarin (2007), describes action research as proceeding in a spiral of steps, each of which is composed of planning, action and the evaluation of the result of the action. In practice, the process begins with a general idea that some kind of improvement or change is desirable, and according to Setiyadi (2014), he says that an action research conducted by university student is focus-oriented to the development of the teaching-learning process that comes from the reflection of the one cycle to the other cycles.

After considering those explanation, this article analyzes two major issues:

- a. What problems occurred the teaching-learning process using Drill Technique?
- b. How is the implementation of the Drill Technique in the teaching-learning process?

METHOD

In this research the researcher used an action research. It is different with the classroom action research where usually conducted by a teacher, in this research the research conducted by the researcher (university student) as it is stated by Burns in Setiyadi

(2014) that action research for university student is an approach which was done by the students to answer their research problems.

Since the research is focused on the problems that occur in the speaking class through drill technique, in which the problems that occurred are analyzed and revised by the observer. The researcher used more than one cycle of teaching to solve the problems occurred, where the next cycle is reflecting the implementation from the previous cycle.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The following is the result and the discussion of the research.

a) Cycle 1

The following is the description of problems occurred in the learning process and the (effective) implementation of the teaching learning process in the second cycle.

- **Problems Occured in the Teaching-Learning Process**

In the first meeting, they seem very nice and warm with the researcher. They are happy and seem totally appreciated to the writer's research. The researcher didn't told them about the material, the researcher just asked them something that related to the material to check their pronunciation and their grammar. Because the first meeting was about "asking someone", the researcher asked them about where they were usually going when they are hungry. It just as the stimulation to familiarize the pattern of the phrase that will be used by the researcher in the teaching learning process. The researcher began the stage of teaching by telling them a story between two persons. They just asked to listen and see what did the teacher do. They seemed very familiar to the dialogue and mastered the dialogue easily. The teacher drilled them from the whole class then person-to-person. The researcher drilled them to

repeat the phrase that recited by the researcher. Some of them seemed hard to repeat the phrase, because the teacher drilled them randomly.

After drilled them to repeat the phrases, the teacher then show them piece of paper with different written word (pronoun). When the teacher show them a paper with a written pronoun word in the paper, for example “WE”, then said “I am going to the post office”, automatically when the teacher showed them the paper they change the subject to be “we are going to the post office”. Few of them still said with error grammatical sentence by saying “*we going to the post office*”, but when a half class said loudly “we are going to the post office”, the other who made error grammatical sentence followed the major class to say “we are going to the post office”. After that, the teacher changed the paper which was written in the paper pronoun “SHE”. When the teacher said “we are going to the post office” and show the paper (which is written in the paper “SHE”) automatically the students substituted the subject of the sentence to be “she is going to the post office”. Few of the students still made error grammatical sentence, they said “*she go to the post office*” and few of them said “*she going to the post office*”. When the majority of the class said loudly “she is going to the post office”, then the students who made error grammatical sentence pattern followed the major students by saying “she is going to post office” confidently.

The teacher pointed them one by one to change the sentence. An unexpected answer still occurred. Few of them still confused to follow the instruction. But the teacher then asked the smarter students to be the sample so when the teacher back to the “passive” students to follow the instruction, they finally understood.

The teacher first took a picture of school the same time she recited the phrase by saying, "I am going to the post office". About two or three students still saying "school" without following the pattern of the guided phrase.

The teacher then tried to change the technique became oral technique. Without showing them anything, the teacher just pointed one student in the classroom randomly. The researcher made an utterance "she is going to the school" then the teacher pointed one student who usually made mistake and said change the subject to be "he". Confusedly the student can not answer the teacher's command. The researcher then went to an active student, she pointed her and said "She is going to the hospital", the researcher asked her to change the subject to be "he". She simply answer, "he is going to the hospital". Then the researcher went back to the passive student and repeat the command. The researcher said "he is going to the bank" and said "she!". A student unconfidently asked her friend next to her, but the teacher then repeat the command by saying "he is going to the bank" and said "she!".

At the second section of material, the researcher tried to use another type of drill technique. The material is about *My Family*. The researcher recited a dialogue as the media to use the technique.

The dialogue made and developed by the researcher based on the English Conversation Book.

The Second Dialogue :

Ulin : Hi Pangga. What are you doing?

Pangga: Hi Ulin. I am writing a story.

Ulin : Oh really, what the story tells about?

Pangga: It's about my family. By the way, how big is your family?

Ulin : I have two sisters and three brothers. What about you?

Pangga: I have 2 brothers.

By repeating the utterance oftenly, the researcher expected that the students will automatically memorized the dialogue. Even, few of them still didn't understand what is the conversation talking about.

After that the researcher thought that the students were capable to reach the goals of another type of drill technique. The researcher just used Response Drill technique as an introduction and preparation in the second cycle. The researcher tried to use Response Drill Technique. The researcher expected to make students not only can memorized the dialogue then at the end of the learning they will understand what the dialogue was talking about, and the students can also give an answer (response) while the teacher asked them related to the dialogue. So, the researcher asked them "how big is your family?" and they are expected to answer using the guided dialogue based on the fact in their real life. The researcher started from the active students as the sample to be followed by the passive students. The learning became greater, when the researcher found that they are able to answer the questions using the guided dialogue. For example, the researcher asked "how big is your family *Ataya*?", *Ataya* answered "I have no sisters or brothers". To see that they are understood to the dialogue, the researcher went to the passive students and asked them the same questions. It was great to find the students are able to answer the researcher's questions. The researcher then tried to asked them to ask their friend the same question. The researcher said to a student "*ask Sultan, how big is his family*", the students can followed the command and did it well. The students can simply understand the material. The small size of the class, that only consisted of 20 students, also helped the researcher in handling the class.

At the end, the researcher asked the students what they want to say about the learning process, can be in Indonesia. But they didn't say anything may be because the researcher always using English so they were affraid to show up their opinion about the learning.

b) Cycle 2

The following is the description of problems occured in the learning process and the (effective) implementation of the teaching learning process in the second cycle.

- **The Problems Occured in the Teaching-Learning Process**

According to Keiper (2002) in Martin Hanak-Hammerl-David Newby (2003 p. 77) that the teacher can react to the lack of confident by putting more emphasis on talking in the classroom. They seemed more confident when the researcher called their nickname.

In while activity, the researcher began the class as usual. But she asked them first about their hobbies to make them ready to think about hobbies because the material is about "*My Hobby*". The researcher started from the very passive students. From the previous cycle, the researcher still did not pay attention the passive students because the reseracher still felt nervous and only focused on delivering the material. The researcher tried to attract the passive students to be more active. But at the first they still felt shy and just answered shortly, and at the end they can answered the researcher's question related to their hobbies because the researcher helped them how to say in English. They seemed to have bad vocabulary comprehension that was why they were affraid to speak in English.

The researcher then told them a story about two close friends who talked in the school library. It was about *Jane* and *Same*. Around 5 students seemed sleepy and tired, that's why the researcher changed the plan. After repeating the dialogue in three times and the researcher sured enough that they memorized the dialogue, the researcher gave them piece of paper to write down 2 sentences about their hobbies. The researcher only gave them a minute in this activity so did not have chance to talk to their friends and made the class became crowded. It used as the reinforcement for the students because at the end of the learning process the researcher asked to come in front the class to make dialogue with their partner based on their hobbies. It was just to avoid they will be more tired because the researcher always drilled the students to say loudly in repeating the dialogue. After that the researcher asked them to keep the paper and went back to the drilling activity.

After having drilled them the researcher then divided the class into two parts. The left side was *Jane* and the right side was *Same*. Few of them did not follow the instruction to recite the dialogue, they just kept silent. They seemed tired and there was a student who sat in the back busy with her handphone. The researcher then went to her and tried to ask her to repeat utterance in the dialogue more than other students in order to make that student focus to the researcher. In fact she was able to repeat the dialogue in good pronunciation and she memorized the dialogue faster than other students. After applying the repetition drill technique, the researcher then went to the other type of drill technique. The researcher began to use Response Drill by asking the students some questions out of the dialogue. The explanation and sample of the way asking the questions were as follow:

Teacher : Jane likes to read books and sometime she cooks with her mom.
 Students : Jane likes to read books and sometime she cooks with her mom.
 (*repeat*)
 Teacher : (called and went nearly to a student)
 What is Jane another hobby?
 Students : Cook with her mom.

After that the researcher called two students randomly to come and make a dialogue about *My Hobby* as the guided dialogue based on their real hobby. The students were allowed to bring the paper (if necessary). There were 10 couples in the classroom. In this section the researcher knew how far the improvement was and saw per student their ability in speaking English. The researcher placed them in range 5-1 from the best to the worst couple based on their fluency in pronunciation and how they made many grammatical error or even words order.

- **The Effective Implementation**

Few students were greater, even from the first time the researcher realized that they were smart students (good in English) but at the first their pronunciation in some words in the dialogue were wrong, for example, one of them pronounced “badminton” as “batminton” but at the end they pronounced the word “badminton” as “betmint n”. Most students pronounced “hobby” as “hobi” but at the end of the learning they pronounced it better to be “h bbi”.

At the first cycle, there was a students who did not give any response when the researcher asked them to answer the researcher’s question. But in the second cycle, he was able to speak in English even in wrong pronunciation. He was brave enough to answer the researcher’s questions even sometimes he answered in wrong way. For example he pronounced “soon” as “son” and he changed the utterance in the dialogue

“what else that you like to do?” to be “*what you else do?*”. But the reseracher appreciated it.

Another students showed an improvement in her pronunciation. At the first she said “*My hobby is basketball*” but at the end after having memorized the dialogue she herself said “*I like to play basketball*” when the teacher asked her about her hobbies.

Finally the researcher asked them about what they had learned on that day and how their feelings after being taught by the researcher. They seemed happy and said it was fun. As it is according to Setiyadi (2006:128) that having fun makes language learners interested in learning the foreign language. They seemed more brave, more enjoyable and show their confidence in this cycle. But when a couple came infront to perform their dialogue the class was starting to be crowded. The researcher asked them to not talking while their friends performed the dialogue. It was very disturbing because the researcher taught that they will payed their full attention as it was in first cycle. There were 2 couple who did not fluent in their speaking in this simulation.

c) Cycle 3

The following is the description of problems occured in the learning process and the (effective) implementation of the teaching learning process in the second cycle.

- **The Effective Implementation in the Teaching-Learning Process**

The researcher started from the two very passive students. The researcher tried to attract the passive students to be more active. But something ‘untold’ still made them shy and affraid.

The researcher then told them a story about two close friends who talked about the weather. Then the researcher began to deliver the story by reciting the dialogue between that two persons. It was about *Jane* and *Same*. The researcher handled the class better than in the previous cycle because they were more familiar to the researcher. Most of them were more confident to talk in English with the researcher.

After having drilled them the researcher then divided the class into two parts. The left side was *Jane* and the right side was *Same*. After applying the repetition drill technique, the researcher then went to the other type of drill technique. The researcher began to use Response Drill by asking the students some questions out of the dialogue.

After that the researcher called two students randomly to come and re-memorized the dialogue the way as the researcher recited the dialogue. There were 11 couples in the classroom. In this section the researcher knew how far the improvement was and saw per student their ability in speaking English. They were better in pronunciation and grammar. The researcher placed them in range 5-1 from the best to the worst couple to the best couple based on their fluency in pronunciation and how they made any grammatical error or even words order.

They seemed more brave and confident in this cycle. But when a couple came to perform their dialogue the class was starting to be crowded. The researcher asked them to not talking while their friends performed the dialogue. It was very disturbing because the researcher taught that they payed their full attention as it was in first cycle. 2 students still stucked in the 'passive are'. They seemed rarely talked to their friends. They preferred to keep silent. Finally the researcher asked them about what

they had learned on that day and how their feeling was after being taught by the researcher. They seemed happy and said it was fun.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the result of the learning product and learning process, the researcher concludes some conclusions, as follows (1) In learning process, the problems often faced by the researcher was from their understanding, they often didn't know what was the researcher talking about. But the learning process was getting better from cycle to cycle. The researcher tried to improved the way she taught the students based on the observation sheet observed by the researcher's partner and based on the researcher's interview to the students after the class ended, (2) The implementation of the teaching learning process was getting better cycle to cycle too. She changed the material suitable to the data needed by the researcher and suitable to the needs of the students. The students bravery and confidence were getting better from cycle to cycle. At the end majority of the students were brave enough and more confident to speak in English, but the negative side that happened is, the classroom was getting crowded.

REFERENCES

- Hannak, Martin. Hammerl. Newby, David. 2003. *Second Language Acquisition: The Interface Between Theory and Practice*. Graz: The University of Graz.
- Setiyadi, Ag. B. 2006. *Metode Penelitian Pengajaran Bahasa Asing*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Setiyadi, Ag. B. 2006. *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Setiyadi, Ag. B. 2014. *Penelitian Tindakan untuk Guru dan Mahasiswa*. (Forthcoming)
- Varasin, P. 2007. An Action Research Study of Pronunciation Training, Language Learning Strategies and Speaking Confidence.
vuir.vu.edu.au%2F1437%2F1%2FVarasarin.pdf&ei=GTceU7PxPMzGuATv9oGwDA&usg=AFQjCNEWwBoEz6Bf_Jk_Y2Fal-hgye1_fPA retrieved on 16 June 2014 at 08.45 am.