

Using Teammate to Improve Speaking Skill of 11th Grade Students

Sisvia¹, Utin Mutia², Ihda Husnayaini³, Dina Novrieta³

¹IAIN Syaikh Abdurrahman Siddik Bangka Belitung

²IAIN Syaikh Abdurrahman Siddik Bangka Belitung

³IAIN Syaikh Abdurrahman Siddik Bangka Belitung

⁴IAIN Syaikh Abdurrahman Siddik Bangka Belitung

ABSTRACT

Keywords:

Teammate
Speaking Skill
Procedure Text

This research was carried out to know the implementation of Teammate in improving students' speaking skill of procedure texts and to find out the significant difference between students' speaking ability of procedure texts using Teammate and Non-Teammate. The subjects of this study were students of class XI of one of private senior high school in Toboali. In this study, the researcher used a quantitative approach with a quasi-experimental design. The results showed that the post-test mean score in the experimental group was higher (68.66) compared to the average score in the control group (63.72). Meanwhile, the results of the independent sample test of students' post-test between the experimental and control groups, obtained t in the same variance assumed to be 3.229 and significant (2-tailed) was 0.000. Because the t obtained is greater than the t -table ($(3.229 > 0.0845)$) and significantly (2-tailed) lower than the calculation with a significant level ($.000 < 0.05$), it can be concluded that there was a significant difference between the samples, and Teammate Strategy improves students' speaking ability. Therefore, the results of this study are expected to contribute to the development of the teaching and learning process of English, especially for teaching and learning speaking skills



access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. ©2019 by author.

Correspondence:

Sisvia

Email: sisvia13@gmail.com

Introduction

Speaking is one of the language skills that plays a very important role in everyday life (Richards, Richards, & Renandya, 2002). Speaking is the productive aural/oral skill. We can say that speaker must consider the person they are talking to as listener (Richards et al., 2002). Speaking is the most common and important means of providing communication among human beings (Bailey & Nunan, 2005). The key to successful communication is speaking nicely, efficiently and articulately, as well as using effective voice projection, speaking is linked to success in life, as it occupies an important position both individually and socially (Ulas, 2008). In other words, good speaking is really useful for having good communication with others. Ferdiant stated, "speaking means to express ideas orally, by expressing what is in mind, a speaker can make others understand thing inside his/her mind" (Ferdiant, 2016). It means that speaking is the way to convey what you want to say.

According to Kristi Nuraini, in the teaching and learning process, sometimes several teachers' pay less attention to speaking (Nuraini, 2016). Therefore, if students do not learn how to speak or do not get the opportunity to speak in language class, and they soon lose interest in studying. Students who do not develop strong verbal skill, it will be difficult for them to keep up with their friends in the future. Based on the characteristics of the problem, it can be solved by giving her right technique. Researchers give advice for applying appropriate techniques in reducing these problems, namely through teammates.

Team is grouping that are related not to social structures or social organizations but in relation to interactions or a series of interactions in which the definition of the relevant situation is maintained (Byrnes, 1987). Teams are essential for tasks of high cognitive complexity. They have been defined as heterogeneous and interdependent groups of individuals who interact adaptively, that is to coordinate and communicate to achieve common goals (Demir et al., 2015). Team and teammate are related things that

cannot be separated, as well as the definition of both of them. The definition of teammate itself is a fellow member of a team (Staff, 2004).

According to Merriam Webster Dictionary, “teammate is a fellow member of a team” (Dictionary, 2002). The meaning of the teammate itself is that we can work together by doing certain things or with certain goals. Teammate was done with action and dialogue by the students themselves. Teammate was very much needed in speaking class because based on my observations during Teaching Practice at one of private schools in Toboali, I saw some students were very anxious when they asked to answer the questions given by the teacher and they also felt afraid when they wanted to answer because they thought the answers would be wrong (Susanty, Ritonga, & Tursina, 2017). However, the context was different when they were asked to make a group with their friends and the teacher let them do the exercises with their friends (Bailey & Nunan, 2005). This reduces their level of anxiety and fear. Therefore, teammate can make it easier for teachers to teach speaking in class.

Furthermore, based on the preliminary research at the eleventh gradestudents of one of private schools in Toboali, the writer got the score by doing the test directly with the students in the class. The score of the English speaking test was still low.

The result of the test was that XI IPS 2 class had the highest score, while XI IPS 1 class had the lowest score compared to the other classes. The type of speaking test used in this test was procedure text in the form of a dialogue. The researcher found that most students had low capability in five components of speaking namely pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.

In order to improve the students speaking skill at the school, the researcher intended to apply Teammates Method for teaching speaking. Teammate is a fellow member of a team. There have been studies regarding Teammate, especially on speaking skill. The result showed that the research conducted by Irmawati stated that teammate was suitable for improving speaking skills. In addition, Adyaksa also revealed that teammates could also be used to improve speaking skills (ADYAKSA, 2018).

This study was aimed to find out if there was a significant difference between the students who were taught by teammates and the students who were taught by non-teammate in speaking skill in the eleventh grade of the school.

In a study conducted by Irmawati entitled “Improving students’ ability to speak English using a teammate method in second grade students of one of private school for the 2016/2017 academic year,” it was stated that there was a new method in learning English in school, especially in speaking skill (Irmawati, 2017). The aim of the research was to find out the improvement of the students’ ability in speaking English by using Teammate. This research used classroom action research as the research method. Then, the type of the text used in this research was hortatory exposition text. In this study, it was found that by using the teammate method, students’ speaking skills improved better than before. His strategy of involving them in teammates worked well. Students collaborated with teammates during the learning process.

According to Adyaksa, it was known that Teammate could be used to improve speaking skills of the ten grade students of one of private schools in Gubug in the academic year of 2017/2018 (Adyaksa, 2018). This could be seen in the increase of mean score from cycle to cycle. The aim of this study was to identify the improvement and result of students’ speaking skill through teammate for the second grade students of the private school in Gubug. This research was used quantitative research. The number of sample of the research were 65 students of tenth grade. Then, the type of the text used in this research was narrative text. The findings displayed that the students’ speaking skills increased from pre-test to post-test. The percentages score of the students was also improving from 62,40 % in cycle 1 up to 72,77 % in cycle 2. In addition, the improvement could be seen from the result of mean in all cycle from pre-test to post-test. The result showed that mean of pre-test I was 57,59 and up to 68,33 in post-test, the mean of pre-test II was 68,33 and up to 72,77 for post-test II. It means that using teammate strategy was able to improve the students’ speaking skill.

Besides, Teammate could be used to significantly improve speaking skills of the ten grade students of private senior high school in Gubug in the academic year of 2017/2018. This was proved by calculation that showed better result. The percentages score of the students who had passed the standardized score was really good, those from 51.85 % in cycle I up to 81.48% in cycle II. In addition, the result showed that 72 the mean of post-test findings in cycle I and II were higher than the passing grade (KKM) of English Subject in private senior high school in Gubug because the passing grade was 70. So, there was a significant improvement after using teammate in speaking skills.

The similarities between the two previous related studies with the research that researcher to be carried out used the high school level and the equivalent as the sample where the research was conducted and also equally improved students speaking skills through Teammate.

While the differences of the first previous related studies was used classroom action research as the research method and used hortatory exposition text as the topic/type of text, while the research used Quantitative research as the research method and the type of topic or text used was procedure text in the form of a dialogue.

Then, the differences of the second previous related studies was presented in the number of samples and the type of the text. The sample used by the previous researcher were 65 participants and the type of the text used was narrative text, while the number of research were 58 participants and the research used procedure text as the topic or type of the text.

Method

In implementation of this research, the researcher used Quantitative Research as a method of the research because the purpose of this research was to know whether there was improvement in students speaking skill or not after being taught by Teammate.

For this research, researcher used experimental research. Experimental research was a testing procedure that was carried out by preparing a situation where the strength of the relationship between variables could be tested.

The population in this study included all students in class XI of private senior high school in Toboali which consisted of 5 classes with a total of 155 students. The researcher applied the purposive sampling technique as sample. In this case, the researcher chose class XI IPS 2 as the control class and class XI IPS 1 as the experimental class. The reason that the researcher chose class XI IPS 1 as the experimental class and class XI IPS 2 as the control class was based on the consideration of the English teacher of the school. Each of the classes consisted of 33 and 33 students. Therefore, the total number of students were 66.

The first data collecting technique used by the researcher was observation. The research used the observation sheet by Zulfikar to observe attendance, attention, activeness in asking and answering question and doing all the activities from each student during following the class (Rahman, 2020). Documentation was a record of events that had passed. Documents could be in the form of text, image, or the monumental works of a person. The function of documentation method was to make credible the result of observation and interview. In this study, the researcher used lesson plan, syllabus, students' handbook, students' worksheet, photos, and others as the instruments in collecting the data. In general, test is measuring. Although some forms of test were psychological, especially in personality test, many were descriptive in nature, but descriptive here leads to certain characteristics so that they were similar to the interpretation of the results of a measurement (Johnson & Christensen, 2019). The test used in this study was a learning outcome test that measured the learning outcomes achieved by students.

Pre-test was given at the beginning of the teaching both two classes. After being tested, control group was taught by using non-teammate, while for experimental group, the researcher gave them particular method with teammate solution for improving their speaking skill. At the end of the research, the post-test was given for both classes to see the difference between the experimental and control group speaking achievement. There were two speaking raters here. As for their occupation was an English teacher in this research, the researcher used David P Harris theory about the rating scale of speaking

Oral English Rating Sheet

Aspects	Score	Scale	Explanation
Pronunciation		17-20	5. Speech consists of almost appropriate pronunciation
		13-16	1. Speech consists of hardly incorrect pronunciation
		9-12	3. Speech consists of some inappropriate pronunciation
		5-8	2. Speech consists of mostly inappropriate pronunciation
		1-4	1. Speech consists of very poor pronunciation
Vocabulary		17-20	1. Use of wide range of vocabulary taught previously
		13-16	1. Sometimes uses inappropriate terms

			and/or must rephrase ideas because of lexical inadequacies
		9-12	1. Frequently uses the wrong words; conversation somewhat limited because of inadequate vocabulary
		5-8	1. Miss of words and very limited vocabulary make comprehension quite difficult
		1-4	1. Vocabulary limitation so extreme as to make conversation virtually impossible
Grammar		17-20	1. Makes few (if any) noticeable errors of grammar or word order
		13-16	1. Occasionally makes grammatical and/or word-order errors which do not, however, obscure
		9-12	1. Makes frequent errors of grammar and word order which occasionally obscure meaning
		5-8	1. Grammar and word order errors make comprehension difficult. Must often rephrase sentence and/or restrict himself to basic pattern
		1-4	1. Errors in grammar and word order so severe as to make conversation
Fluency		17-20	1. Speech is quite flowing style, mostly easy to understand
		13-16	1. Speed of speech seems to be slightly affected by language problems
		9-12	1. Speed and fluency are rather strongly affected by language problems
		5-8	1. Usually hesitant; often forced into silence by language limitation
		1-4	1. Speech is so halting and fragmentary as to make conversation virtually impossible
Comprehension		17-20	2. Appears to understand everything without difficulty
		13-16	2. Understands nearly everything at normal speed, although repetition maybe necessary
		9-12	2. Understand most of what is said at slower than normal speed with repetitions
		5-8	2. Has great difficulty following what is said. Can comprehend only "social conversation" spoken slowly and with frequent repetitions
		1-4	1. Cannot be said to understand even simple conversation English

Before conducting research, the researcher gave validity and reliability test to students in other school, which has same level with the sample of research (Muijs, 2004). The sample of research was eleventh grade students, so sample of validity and reliability test had to be students of eleventh grade too. The researcher took sample of validity and reliability test were eleventh grade students of a high school in Toboali, with the total number 66 students. The validity and reliability tests were given to measure validity and reliability of the test items/pre-test and post-test questions would be used in the research, besides to know whether students could understand or not the instructions, could answer or not the test items, test items would be used in the pre-test and post-test for sample research.

Reliability is related to the consistency of a measure. A participant completing an instrument intended to measure motivation should have roughly the same response each time the test was completed. Although it was not possible to provide precise calculations of reliability, estimates of reliability could be achieved

through different measures. Reliability was a necessary characteristic of any good test; a test must first be reliable as a measuring in decision making. If the test measurement in consisted and accurate, it means the test is reliable

Results and Discussions

The Result of Observation in Experimental Group

In this study, the observation was applied by the researcher to know the implementation of Teammate in teaching speaking skill. In the process of learning, there were four indicators to be observed. They were attendant list, attention, activeness in asking and answering question, and doing all the activeness.

The aspect of student attendance from the first to the twelfth meeting was in the very good category. From the aspect of attention, it could be seen that the percentage of the first, second, fourth, fifth, sixth, eighth and twelfth meetings in the very good category. Then, at the tenth and eleventh meetings were in the good category. Meanwhile, in the second meeting, it was in the average category.

The third aspect was students' activeness. In this aspect, it could be seen that the percentage of the first, second and twelfth meetings was in the very good category. Then, for the second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, eighth, ninth, and eleventh meetings were in the good category. While at the seventh and tenth meetings were in the average category.

The last aspect was students doing all the activeness. In this aspect, it could be seen that the percentage of the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, tenth, eleventh and twelfth meetings were in the very good category. Then, for the ninth meeting, it was in the good category.

The Result of Observation in Control Group

In this study, the observation was applied by the researcher to know the implementation of non-Teammate in teaching speaking skill. In the process of learning, there were four indicators to be observed. They were attendant list, attention, activeness in asking and answering question, and doing all the activeness.

The aspect of students attendance from the first to the twelfth meeting was in the very good category, except for the ninth meeting in the average category.

From the aspect of attention, it could be seen that the percentage of the first, second, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, tenth, eleventh and twelfth meetings were in the very good category. Then at the third and eighth meetings were in the good category. Meanwhile, the ninth meeting showed that the students attention was in the average category.

The third aspect was the students' activeness. In this aspect, it could be seen that the percentage of the first, eleventh and twelfth meetings were in the very good category. Then, for the fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth and tenth meetings were in the good category. Meanwhile, at the second, third, fourth, and ninth meetings, they were in the low category.

Furthermore, the last aspect was that students doing all the activeness. In this aspect, it could be seen that the percentage of the first, tenth, eleventh and twelfth meetings were in the very good category. Then, for the second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth were in the good category. While at the ninth meeting, it was in the medium category.

The Statistical Analysis

In this part, the researcher would like to discuss the statistical analysis of the findings.

The Result of Pre-Test and Post-Test in Control Group

In order to see the students' speaking skill after being taught by Non-Teammate in control group which was XI IPS 2, the researcher conducted pre-test and post-test. All of student dialogue with their partners was about *How to Operate or Use Something and How to Make Something*. The scores were given by raters after listening to the students' recording about those topic. The control group scores of pre-test and post-test and the score category were presented in appendix.

The Percentage Score of Control Group

Pre-Test Result		
Number of Students	Percentage	Grade
-	-	Good to excellent
5	14%	Average to good

6	18%	Poor to average
22	67%	Poor
Post-Test Result		
Number of Students	Percentage	Grade
-	-	Good to excellent
30	91%	Average to good
3	9%	Poor to average
-	-	Poor

**Statistical Analysis of Pre-Test and Post-Test Score in Control Group
 Paired Samples Statistics**

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	PRE TEST	46.1515	33	9.60833	1.67260
	POST TEST	63.7273	33	6.00663	1.04562

Based on *paired samples t-test statistic* of the control group above, it described that the mean of post-test was 63.7, the standard of deviation was 6.006, the standard error mean was 1.045, meanwhile the mean of pre-test was 46.1, the standard deviation was 9.608 and the standard error mean was 1.672.

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	PRE TEST & POST TEST	33	.602	.000

Paired samples correlation presented the correlation between pre-test and post-test in control group was .602 with probability (sig) of .000.

Paired Samples Test

		Mean	Paired Differences		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
			Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	PRE TEST	-17.57576	7.67313	1.33572	-	-	-	32	.000
	POST TEST				20.29653	14.85498	13.158		

For paired sample test result, the paired differences could be seen that the mean between pre-test and post-test in the control group was -17.5, standard deviation was 7.67, standard error mean was 1.33, and t-obtained was -13.158, at the significant .000 for two tailed and degree of freedom was 32. Since the p-output .000 was lower than the value of probability .05. It meant that there was significant difference for students' speaking skill in control group.

The Result of Pre-Test and Post-Test in Experimental Group

The result of independent samples test described the score difference between control and experimental group in equal variances assumed or equal variances not assumed. The mean difference of equal variances

assumed and equal variances not assumed were 4.93. For the standard error difference for both equal variances assumed and not assumed was 1.65, and *t-obtained* in equal variances assumed and not assumed was -2.99. at the significant of .004 for two tailed and degree of freedom was 64. Since in equal variances the p-output was .004 higher than probability 0.05 and *t-obtained* was -.2.99, it could be stated that there was significant difference in post-test between control and experimental group. From the explanation above, the researcher could conclude that there was a significant between students who were taught by using Teammate and the students who were taught by using non-Teammate.

In this part, the researcher would like to describe in detail some interpretations of the research results. The experimental group showed an increase during the twelve completed meetings. This class consisted of 33 students who had cooperatively done everything necessary together with research. Research had shown that researchers taught classes using Teammate to improve speaking skills. In almost every meeting, students practiced speaking in front of the class.

After doing the observation, the researcher could interpret that the process of teaching and learning speaking skill of procedure by using Teammate and non-Teammate was running well. There were three aspects to be observed. They were attendant list, attention, and interaction included activeness in asking and answering the questions, and doing all activities during teaching learning process. Experimental group showed an improvement during twelve meetings which had been finished. This class consisted of 33 students who were cooperative working together with the researcher during research. As being explained before, Teammate was applied to give improvement to students' speaking skill.

Based on the observation sheet, the percentage of students in every meeting was unpredictable. The students were practiced to participate in every meeting. They were trained to be brave to talk during research. They had to speak in the chance given. The presence of students was in very good category during meetings, both of classes, control and experimental group. One of meeting had average category in attendance. It was in the ninth meeting of control class. For the attention part, there was very good, good and average category both control and experimental. Students' activeness was good in the eight meetings and average category in two meetings for experimental group. Then, in the control group, there were four in low category. There were some meetings in very good category and five meetings in good category.

The students of experimental group were active enough in asking their partner. However, there were some meetings got average category. It was the seventh and tenth meeting. Others had good category in their activeness. They felt afraid to make mistake. They were not confident saying any words in English. So that, the teacher taught them some expressions before practicing teammate. Then they practiced teammate by trying to use English in the conversation. Everyone was trying in every meeting. For doing all activity, all students were able enough to do the activeness during meetings. The ninth meeting in control group was the lowest. It was average category.

In conclusion, the result of the observation showed that most of students had progress in every aspect. For that reason, the researcher concluded that the treatment of Teammate could develop students speaking skills.

The result of the test showed that there was any significant difference in improving speaking skills between students who were taught by using Teammate and the students who were not taught by using Teammate. The result of t-test analysis, it could be seen that there was any significant difference before and after treatment in experimental group. The mean of pre-test in experimental group was 44.12, and the mean of post-test was 68.66. Meanwhile, the mean of pre-test in control group was 46.15, and the mean of post-test was 63.72. It could be seen that the mean post-test in experimental group was higher than the mean of pre-test in experimental group. Therefore, the researchers hypothesis (H_a) was accepted and null hypothesis (H_o) was rejected.

Afterwards, the researcher concluded that there was a significant difference between the experimental group and the control group in teaching and learning through Teammate, which means that the speaking skills had been improved by using Teammate. The mean of post-test in the experimental group was higher than the mean of the post-test in the control group. It occurred in control group because of some factors:

- a. Students did not focus to answer the question caused the students was afraid to speak.
- b. They did not remember about the material that the teacher taught.
- c. During learning process, the students paid low attention to the teacher.

Therefore, in the post-test, the mean of the control group was lower than the experimental group.

Conclusions

This showed you everything about the result of research finding elaborated in the previous chapter. In experimental group that used Teammate strategy, every student had chance to talk in the class. The

implementation of Teammate to improve students' speaking skill of the eleventh grade of one of private senior high school inToboali was accepted and done well by almost all of students class XI IPS 1. It was proven by the observation sheet analysis. The attendance was in very good category. They did pay attention to the materials and instructions. Then, they were active enough in the class. At least, they did almost all of activities well. In experimental group, their attendance was very good in every meeting. Their attention was average for one meeting, good for two meeting and very good for seven meetings. The activeness during meetings was nine meetings *good* and one meeting *average*, and doing activities were two meetings *good* and other *very good* category. All points were mostly good and very good category during the meetings based on above explanations.

Based on the statistical analysis of the evidence in the previos chapter, the researcher concluded that there was a significant difference of students' speaking skill between students who were taught by using Teammate and those students who were taught by Non-Teammate. The students taught by using Teammate in experimental group got higher score than the students taught by Non-Teammate in control group. Based on the result of statistical analysis, it showed shat *t-obtained* score was 2.99. Then, the *critical value*oft-table was 2.00. The score was clearly higher than *critical value* of t-table. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis (Ha) was accepted and null hypothesis was rejected. It means that there was a significant difference of speaking skill between students who were taught by using Teammate and students who were taught by using Non-Teammate. Based on the evidence above, the research stated that the Teammate was effective to improve students' speaking skill of the eleventh grade of one of private senior high schools in Toboali.

References

- Adyaksa, F. (2018). *The Use of Talking Chips Technique To Improve Students Speaking Skills (A Classroom Action Research at the 10th Grade Students of Senior High*
- ADYAKSA, F. (2018). *THE USE OF TALKING CHIPS TECHNIQUE TO IMPROVE STUDENTS SPEAKING SKILLS (A Classroom Action Research at the Tenth Grade Students of Senior High School (SMA MUH 1) Gubug In Academic Year of 2017/2018)*. IAIN SALATIGA.
- Bailey, K. M., & Nunan, D. (2005). *Practical English language teaching: speaking*.
- Byrnes, J. F. (1987). *Psychology and Religion: Eight Points of View*. JSTOR.
- Demir, M., McNeese, N. J., Cooke, N. J., Ball, J. T., Myers, C., & Frieman, M. (2015). Synthetic teammate communication and coordination with humans. *Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting*, 59(1), 951–955. SAGE Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA.
- Dictionary, M.-W. (2002). Merriam-webster. *On-Line at Http://Www. Mw. Com/Home. Htm*, 8, 2.
- Ferdiant, A. G. (2016). Developing the assessment instrument of speaking. *OKARA: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 10(1), 93–102.
- Irmawati, I. (2017). *Improving students' ability in speaking English by using talking chips strategy at the second grade students of MAS Manba'ul Hidayah Kisaran in 2016/2017 academic year*. Fakultas Ilmu Tarbiyah dan Keguruan, Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara.
- Johnson, R. B., & Christensen, L. (2019). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches*. Sage publications.
- Muijs, D. (2004). *Doing quantitative research in education: With SPSS*. Sage.
- Nuraini, K. (2016). The barriers of teaching speaking English for EFL learners. *ELLITE: Journal of English Language, Literature, and Teaching*, 1(1).
- Rahman, M. S. (2020). *The advantages and disadvantages of using qualitative and quantitative approaches and methods in language "testing and assessment" research: A literature review*.
- Richards, J. C., Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge university press.
- Staff, M.-W. (2004). *Merriam-Webster's collegiate dictionary* (Vol. 2). Merriam-Webster.
- Susanty, H., Ritonga, D., & Tursina, P. (2017). Teaching and Learning Process of Speaking. *Getsempena*

English Education Journal, 4(2), 179–184.

Ulas, A. H. (2008). Effects of creative, educational drama activities on developing oral skills in primary school children. *American Journal of Applied Sciences*, 5(7), 876–880.