

## IMPROVING STUDENTS' SPEAKING ABILITY THROUGH DRILL TECHNIQUE

Mohammad Fikri Nugraha Kholid, Hery Yufrizal, Patuan Raja

Email: [fikrinugraha52@gmail.com](mailto:fikrinugraha52@gmail.com)

**Abstrak:** Tujuan penelitian ini adalah (1) untuk meneliti apakah ada perubahan signifikan pada kemampuan berbicara siswa sebelum dan setelah menemukan pengajaran melalui teknik drill; (2) aspek berbicara manakah yang paling mengalami peningkatan sebelum dan setelah pengajaran melalui teknik drill. Penelitian ini menggunakan *one group time series design*. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa: (1) Terdapat perubahan signifikan antara kemampuan berbicara siswa sebelum dan setelah pengajaran melalui teknik drill; (2) kelancaran adalah aspek berbicara yang mengalami peningkatan paling tinggi pada kemampuan berbicara siswa. Nilai signifikan (*2-tailed*) adalah ( $p=0.000$ ,  $p<0.05$ ), menunjukkan bahwa hipotesa diterima. Oleh karena itu, drill dapat diaplikasikan sebagai materi untuk meningkatkan bahasa Inggris siswa dalam kelas lisan.

**Abstract:** The objectives of the research are (1) to investigate whether there is any significant difference between students' speaking ability before and after being taught through drill technique; (2) to find out which aspect of speaking ability is the most improved. This research applied one group time series design. The results show that: (1) there is a significant difference between the students' speaking ability before and after being taught through drill technique; (2) Fluency is the most improved aspect in the students' speaking ability. The significant (*2-tailed*) value was ( $p=0.000$ ,  $p<0.05$ ), it showed that the hypothesis was accepted. Therefore, drill can be applied as a technique to improve the students' speaking ability.

**Keywords:** drill technique, speaking ability, teaching speaking

## **INTRODUCTION**

Speaking is communication process between at least two people and speaking is a way to express someone's idea. However, today's world requires that goal of teaching speaking should improve student's communicative skill because only on that way students can express their argument and opinion, and learn how to follow the social and cultural rules appropriate in each communicative circumstance.

It is the duty of the teacher to use suitable teaching methods and technique. There is no bad students, if the teacher teach them well. So good teachers deliver their material, good students learn the language. English is the language that has four skills; listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Every skill has its own difficulties which make the students think that English is the difficult and boring subject.

This is also supported by the researcher's experience when teaching at SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Purbolinggo Lampung Timur in 2012 , where the majority of the students get difficulties to express their ideas orally. This might be due to a number of factors, one of which was the inappropriate technique used in the classroom. The teachers were often found to use traditional way of teaching.

The other reason causing the failure was the teacher's tendency to stress their teaching the form of language rather than on the use of language. The students lack of practice in using the language. And an English teacher should understand and think of an interesting and practical technique which gave challenges and opportunities for students to practice their English in the classroom.

As the function of language is to communicate with others, the teacher's challenge is to make students communicate with others in English. In fact in teaching learning process the teachers rarely use good technique for teaching speaking, consequently there is only little improvement in student's speaking ability. This is the chance for the teacher to overcome this problem by providing some creative activities in the classroom.

Huebner (1960: 5) says that speaking is a skill used by someone in daily life communication whether at school or outside. The skill is required by much repetition, it primarily neuromuscular and not an intellectual process. It contents of competence in sending and receiving message. By this theory drill technique is one of the technique that can be used to improve students' speaking ability because repetition is the central in this technique.

Based on the facts stated above, the researcher was intended to use Audio Lingual Method (ALM) to improve the students' speaking ability. ALM assumes that language learning is a process of habit formation. Since ALM focuses on listening and speaking ability, thus, listening and speaking come first, and reading and writing come later. Drill techniques such as repetition drill, substitution drill, transformation drill, replacement drill, response drill, cued response drill, rejoinder drill, restatement drill, completion drill, expansion drill, contraction drill, and integration drill are used in the form of target language dialogue. By drilling the students, it will be easier for them to remember and learn; since the more often English is repeated, the stronger the habit and the greater learning will be achieved. As in the process of a child for example, who learns his/her mother

tongue, a child always begins with hearing first what his/her parents speak, then he/she tries to speak afterward. Thus, ALM believes that learning a foreign language is the same as the acquisition of the native language (Larsen-Freeman, 2000: 43). Actually ALM is the old method, many language researcher said that this method is not effective anymore to be used in English teaching. But, the writer use ALM in this research because the material in this research is dialog which is one of microskills, this method is still effective in English teaching especially in micro skills. Therefore the objectives of this research are to find out whether there is a significant difference of the students' speaking ability before and after being taught through drill technique and to find out which aspect of speaking is the most improved before and after being thought through drill technique.

## **METHOD**

This research was intended to find out whether drill technique could improve students' speaking ability. Therefore, the researcher conducted this quantitative research by using time series design. The researcher used one class where the students were given three times pre-test, three times treatment, and three times post-test.

The research design was described as follows:

T1 T2 T3 X T4 T5 T6

Note: T1 T2 T3 :Pre-test

X :Treatment (Using Drill Technique)

T4 T5 T6 :Post-test (Setiyadi,2006: 131)

This research was conducted at the second grade students of MAN 1 Bandar Lampung, in which XIA<sub>2</sub> class consisted of 32 students was chosen as the sample of the research where selected through lottery drawing.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

In achieving the reliability of scoring the three pretests and three posttests, *inter – rater reliability* was applied in this research. It has a purpose to avoid the subjectivity in judging the students' speaking ability. The reliability's value of the pretest 1 was 0.92, pretest 2 was 0.91, and pretest 3 was 0.92. While the reliability's value of the posttest 1 was 0.93, posttest 2 was 0.94 and posttest 3 was 0.94. The criteria of reliability in both pretest and posttest shows the highest reliability because the score in each reached more than 0.80.

The purpose of conducting pretest was to know how far the students' ability in their oral production before the treatment. The result shows that the mean score of pretest 1 was 68.87 with the highest score was 86; the lowest score was 52; the median was 69; and the mode was 66. The mean score of pretest 2 was 69.81 with the highest score was 86; the lowest score was 60; the median was 68; and the mode was 62. The mean score of pretest 3 was 72.12 with the highest score was 86; the lowest score was 60; the median was 70; and the mode was 70.

After implementing three times of treatment using drill technique, the posttests were conducted to measure the improvement of the students' speaking skill. The result shows that the mean score of posttest 1 was 84 with the highest score was 96; the lowest score was 76; the median was 82; and the mode was 82. The mean

score of posttest 2 was 83.50 with the highest score was 96; the lowest score was 76; the median was 82; the mode was 82. The mean score of posttest 3 was 84.68 with the highest score was 96; the lowest score was 76; the median was 84.68; and the mode was 84.

**Table 1 Mean Scores of Three Pretests and Three Posttests**

<b>Mean</b>	<b>Pretest 1</b>	<b>Posttest 1</b>	<b>Gain</b>
	68,88	84,00	15,12
<b>Mean</b>	<b>Pretest 2</b>	<b>Posttest 2</b>	<b>Gain</b>
	69,24	83,59	14,35
<b>Mean</b>	<b>Pretest 3</b>	<b>Posttest 3</b>	<b>Gain</b>
	72,13	84,69	12,56

By comparing the three different gain of both pretests and posttests, it was found that the first pretest posttest get the highest gain from the learning that was 15.12 point. However, the gain from the first pretest posttest to the second pretest posttest has decreased to 14.35 point, and the gain from the second pretest posttest to the third pretest posttest has decreased to 12.56 point.

In the first treatment the students performed the dialog with the title “breakfasting together”. In this treatment the students were still had some mistakes, in pronunciation there were some words that were pronounced by the students “Wold you lek follow me”, it should be “would you like follow me”. In grammar there was the wrong sentence that prevered by the students “ I will waiting for you, it should be “I will be waiting for you”. In vocabulary and fluency there was no obstacle that students faced. They delivered their dialog fluently and used the right vocabulary in every sentences. But in comprehension there were some mistakes that students did. There were some dialogs that were not suitable with

the instructions. The students still had an obstacle to understand the instructions of the dialog.

In the second treatment the instructions was same as the first treatment. The title was “ Inviting for Playing Futsal”. In this treatment the students still did some mistakes. In grammar students still made wrong sentence like “ I want to playing futsal” , is should be “I want to play football. The second mistakes is “ I am not disagree with you”, it should be “ I am disagree with you”. And the last mistakes is “ We can playing together”, it should be be “We can play together”. In comprehension was also same as in the first treatment, there were some dialogs were not suitable with the instructions from the teacher. In vocabulary there were some students still used bahasa to change the words that they want to say. In pronunciation and fluency the students had no problems, they were easy to do that.

In the last treatment the instructions was same as the first and second treatment. The title was “ Going to Swimming Pool “. In this treatment some of the students were easy to perform their dialog they had no mistakes in fluency and pronunciation but they still had mistakes in grammar and comprehension. In grammar some students still had an incorrect grammar, like “ I can not swimming”. They also still had mistakes in making the dialog, the content of the dialog was not suitable with the instructions of the dialog.

Based on the above treatment the researcher can conclude that there were still some problems occurred in the learning proses of speaking with drill technique.

According to Harris (1974), the teacher must involve some aspects that are really essential in speaking skill in order to know the students' speaking ability. They are *pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension*.

**Table 2. The Improvement of the Students' Score in Five Aspects of Speaking**

Aspects of Oral Production	Pretest 1	Posttest 1	Gain
Pronunciation	13.68	18.25	4.57
	<b>Pretest 2</b>	<b>Posttest 2</b>	
	14.40	18.25	3.80
	<b>Pretest 3</b>	<b>Posttest 3</b>	
	15.18	18.81	3.63
	<b>Final Gain</b>		<b>4.00</b>
Grammar	<b>Pretest 1</b>	<b>Posttest 1</b>	
	12.12	14.31	2.19
	<b>Pretest 2</b>	<b>Posttest 2</b>	
	12.81	14.43	1.62
	<b>Pretest 3</b>	<b>Posttest 3</b>	
	13.06	17.48	4.42
	<b>Final Gain</b>		<b>2.74</b>
Vocabulary	<b>Pretest 1</b>	<b>Posttest 1</b>	
	13.75	15.81	2.06
	<b>Posttest 2</b>	<b>Posttest 2</b>	
	13.31	15.81	2.50
	<b>Pretest 3</b>	<b>Posttest 3</b>	
	13.81	15.81	2.00
	<b>Final Gain</b>		<b>2.18</b>
Fluency	<b>Pretest 1</b>	<b>Posttest 1</b>	
	24.87	18.25	6.62
	<b>Pretest 2</b>	<b>Posttest 2</b>	
	14.75	17.81	3.06
	<b>Pretest 3</b>	<b>Posttest 3</b>	
	15.12	17.68	2.56
	<b>Final Gain</b>		<b>4.08</b>
Comprehension	<b>Pretest 1</b>	<b>Posttest 1</b>	
	14.37	17.37	3.00
	<b>Pretest 2</b>	<b>Posttest 2</b>	
	14.43	17.31	2.88
	<b>Pretest 3</b>	<b>Posttest 3</b>	
	14.75	17.00	2.25
	<b>Final Gain</b>		<b>2.71</b>

From the table above, it can be seen that the highest gain and the most improved is on *fluency* aspect, with the final gain of 4.08. According to Harris (1974) states



**Table 3. Descriptives T-test of Pretest – Posttest 1**

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 Pretest 1 – posttest 1	15.125	6.116	1.081	-17.330	-12.920	-13.990	3	.000	

Besides that, it also shows that *pronunciation* has the lowest gain of all with the final gain of 1.83. According to Harris (1974) states that pronunciation is the intonation patterns, where it is also the ability to produce easily comprehensible articulation. In term of pronunciation, some students are slightly influenced by their mother tongue. They also have made some mispronounce of several words in each treatment. In this aspect, they seems difficult in pronounce some words into the correct articulation because they are rare of practice by using English in communicating each others.

Null hypothesis is rejected if t-value > t-table with the level of significance at <0.05. From the data above, it could be seen that 13.990 > 2.045 and 0.00 < 0.05. Therefore, for the hypothesis, the null hypothesis was rejected and the research hypothesis was accepted. It means that there is an increasing of the students ability in speaking after being taught by using drill as the teaching technique.

**Table 4. Descriptives T-test of Pretest – Posttest 2**

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 2 pretest2 - posttest2	-13.68750	5.33060	.94233	-15.60939	-11.76561	-14.525	31	.000

Null hypothesis is rejected if t-value > t-table with the level of significance at <0.05. From the data above, it could be seen that 14.525 > 2.045 and 0.00 < 0.05. Therefore, for the hypothesis, the null hypothesis was rejected and the research hypothesis was accepted. It means that there is an increasing of the students ability in speaking after being taught by using drill as the teaching technique.

**Table 5. Descriptives T-test of Pretest – Posttest 3**

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 3 PRETEST3 - POSTTEST3	-12.563	5.639	.997	-14.596	-10.529	-12.601	31	.000

Null hypothesis is rejected if  $t\text{-value} > t\text{-table}$  with the level of significance at  $<0.05$ . From the data above, it could be seen that  $12.601 > 2.045$  and  $0.00 < 0.05$ . Therefore, for the hypothesis, the null hypothesis was rejected and the research hypothesis was accepted. It means that there is an increasing of the students ability in speaking after being taught by using drill as the teaching technique.

## **DISCUSSIONS**

The research was started by administering pretest. It was administered to know how far the students' ability in their speaking skill before they were given the treatment by the researcher. The researcher administered three times of pretest with the same material but different topic in each pretest. The material of the dialog was about agreement and disagreement expressions. In the first pretest, the students were asked to perform the dialog about going to holiday place, in the second pretest they were asked to perform the dialog about transaction booking room in a hotel, and in the third pretest they were asked to perform a dialog about going to restaurant. Some of them still made many mistakes in performing their dialog, for example the incorrect sentence, pronunciation, and grammar.

In this research the researcher used drill as the teaching technique. In order to make the students always use English the teacher asked the students to make some dialogs. According to Brown (2001: 250) says that much of our language-teaching energy is devoted to instruction in mastering English conversation. One of the instruction that he classify is dialog.

From the final result of the improvement scores in pretest and posttest of the students' speaking skill that had been explained in the previous pages, the researcher assumed that drill technique could improve the students' speaking ability. This means that this technique gives a good contribution to the teaching learning of speaking. It helps the English teacher arise the students' interest and motivation in learning speaking. In other words, the students' have improved their performance in speaking helped by drill technique. Therefore, it can be concluded that this technique makes the students' speaking ability improved. This result is proved by the level of significant in both pretest and posttest, where  $p=0.000$  ( $p<0.005$ ). Besides of that, drill technique can also improve all aspects of speaking in terms of pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. From the result of the research, it can be concluded that if the students have good habit a good learning will be achieved.

## **CONCLUSION**

Based on the findings in the fields and from the statistical report in the last chapter, some of conclusion can be drawn as follows:

1. There were significant improvements because t-value (7.177) is higher than t-table (2.045) and the significance value is less that 0.05
2. There were significant improvements in all of aspects of speaking. It can be seen from the t-table of every aspect which has bigger value than t-table (2.045) and the significance was less than 0.05.

3. Drill technique can improve students' speaking ability in all aspects of speaking so it could be said that drill technique is a suitable technique in improving students' speaking ability.

## REFERENCES

- Brown, H.D. 2001. *Teaching by principle: An interactive Approach to Language pedagogy*. New York: Longman.
- Harris, David. 1974. *Testing English as Second language*. New York: MC. Graw Hill Book Company.
- Huebener, Theodore. 1969. *How to Teach Foreign Languages Effectively*. New York: New York University Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, Diane. 2000. *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Setiyadi, Bambang Ag. 2006. *Teaching English as Foreign Language*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.