

DEVELOPING SPEAKING FLUENCY OF GRADEVII STUDENTS THROUGH GUESSING GAMES AT SMP AL-AZHAR PALU

Yusri

yusri77_besusu@yahoo.com

(Mahasiswa Program Studi Magister Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Pascasarjana Universitas Tadulako)

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk memecahkan permasalahan kelancaran berbicara siswa kelas VII SMP Al-Azhar Palu dengan menggunakan teknik permainan menerka. Subyek penelitian ini adalah siswa kelas VII C SMP Al-Azhar Palu yang berjumlah 32 orang. Peneliti menerapkan penelitian tindakan kelas dengan dua siklus. Siklus 1 dilaksanakan dengan 4 (empat) pertemuan dan siklus 2 dilaksanakan dengan 2 (dua) pertemuan. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa pencapaian siswa dalam berbicara meningkat perlahan-lahan dari nilai rata-rata: 72.82 di siklus 1 dan 78.85 di siklus 2. Nilai tersebut mengalami peningkatan sebanyak 6.03 poin. Jumlah siswa yang mencapai kriteria ketuntasan berjumlah 12 orang dari 32 siswa (37.50%) pada siklus 1 menjadi 27 orang (84.38%) di siklus 2. Hasil ini menunjukkan bahwa keberhasilan klasikal mencapai 80% (delapan puluh persen) dari 32 siswa di kelas tersebut yang mencapai nilai kriteria ketuntasan minimal sebesar 80 (delapan puluh) sesuai dengan indikator kriteria pencapaian dalam penelitian tindakan kelas ini. Hasil ini menunjukkan bahwa tindakan yang diterapkan dalam dua siklus melalui permainan menerka telah berhasil dalam memecahkan permasalahan berbicara siswa dan secara efektif mampu mengembangkan kelancaran mereka.

Katakunci: *Mengembangkan, Berbicara, Kelancaran, Permainan, dan Menebak.*

According to English Curriculum 2006 and its supplement, the emphasis is that the students are able to communicate in English. The communication does not only occur in the classroom but also out of the classroom either between teacher and students or students and students. However, having low motivation in learning English, particularly in speaking, is one of the big problems occur at school. Most students still consider that learning English is only an obligation from school. So, they tend to use Indonesia in communication. As the result, they get problems in speaking fluency in English.

Most students speak more than they write. Speaking takes an important role in their communication when they interact with each other. The interaction relates to as Widowson (1995: 58) states "An act of communication through speaking is commonly performed in face to face interaction and occurs as part of dialogue or rather forms of verbal exchange".

Many students are still lack using English in communication at school. This is influenced by an atmosphere which is not created in English either in the classroom or out of classroom. As the effect, the students become passive speakers and influenced to their speaking fluency because seldom to speak. Richard, et al. (1986: 23) remark that fluency is the features which give speech the qualities being natural and normal, including native-like use of pausing, rhythm, intonation, stress, rate of speaking, and use interjections and interruptions. By having that, fluency will help the students to deliver their messages since the words that they use will be addressed well and speaker will understand what they convey easily. However, fluency will be reached when students do more practices not only in the classroom but also when they want to do such kinds of communication out of classroom.

Another problem which occurs in the classroom is the class activities are boring and not interesting. Students are not motivated by

an interesting materials or asked to take an active part in the classroom. As the effect, The students do not get involved actively in the learning process and required to answer 'yes' or 'no' so as the result the students are intended to be the students silence in English or talk noisily in their L1.

Nowadays, there are many ways to motivate the students to speak English and one of them is through a guessing game. The game is interesting and challenging the students since it demands the students to compete as well as win from one to another. Allen (1983: 52) points out "guessing games, for example, create conditions in which the use of the target language is necessary for leading players to the correct guess."

There are some advantages in guessing game, one of them is the students should use English in communication or when they want to guess the things or objects in the game. According to Klippel (1994: 13), "The basic rule of guessing games is eminently simple; one person knows something that another one wants to find out." Wright, et al. (1989: 93) state, "Essentially, in guessing and speculating games, someone knows something and the others must find out what it is." In addition, according to Merriem Webster (1986: 1008), "Guessing games is a game in which the participants compete individually or teams in the identification of something indicate obscurely (as in riddles or charades)."

The other advantage is the game is very easy to understand and interesting to play because it asks the students to give simple questions while recognizing the objects. So, the game can control the students to use their English and it is expected to motivate as well as to solve the problems of their speaking fluency. Furthermore, objects or things which are taken to play are kinds of information about a person, a place, a thing, or the location of an object that are familiar with the students. By doing this, they will have

curiosity to give their sounds, be confidence, be creative, and be active orally.

Grade VII students of SMP Al-Azhar Palu need a game like a guessing game to develop their speaking fluency. This is considered since they are still teenagers as well as lack of ideas in speaking English. They get difficult in speaking since in bahasa Indonesia some words are different but same meaning in English such as "*mengerjakan* and *melakukan*, *mengunjungi* and *mendatangi*, or *mengadakan* and *melaksanakan* and so on. As the effect, they tend to mix the English and Indonesia when they are communicating. They are also lazy to speak what is in their mind into English since the process of it will spend the time of communication. As the fact, they tend to use their Indonesia to convey their messages and it is influenced to their speaking fluency.

Based on the above problems, the researcher decides to apply guessing games to investigate whether speaking fluency can be developed through guessing games or not. It is expected that it will motivate the students to use their English. It will also help the students to be creative in giving ideas since the game is played to guess an object or things. Furthermore, the guessing game will stimulate the students to be active in speaking as the game is played in a competition.

METHOD

This research employed Classroom Action Research. The data were analysed quantitatively and qualitatively. The researcher involved actively in the activities of the class together with his collaborator teacher who was also one of the English teachers in SMP Al-Azhar Palu. The researcher acted as the teacher who guided the students to play the guessing games. Meanwhile, his collaborator acted as an observer who observed the teacher and the students' activities during the process of guessing games conducted. Furthermore, the

teacher and his collaborator discussed the students' activities when the meeting was over.

To conduct the research, researcher chose 7c classroom which consisted of 32 students as the subject of his research. He focused his research on this class due to two main reasons: firstly, many students in this class found it difficult to express their ideas. Secondly, he is teaching in this class in which he has responsibility to solve his students' speaking problem. Hence, he applied guessing games technique to develop the students' speaking fluency.

The research was done in two cycles with four phases: planning, action, observation and reflection. Kemmis Stephen and McTaggart (1988: 25) state "Action research starts with small cycles of planning, acting, observing, and reflecting which can help to define issues, ideas, and assumptions more clearly so that those involved can define more powerful questions from themselves as their work progresses". Furthermore, the researcher employed observation, questionnaire, and field notes to collect data. These data were analyzed. In addition, he also gathered data using test to measure the students' speaking performance.

This research employed two types of analysis namely descriptive analysis and simple statistical one. The descriptive analysis was used to descriptively analyze the data from observation, questionnaire, and field note. It was presented in narrative form. Then, data from the test was employed the simple statistical analysis.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Cycle 1

Findings from the Test

In finding out the students' speaking performances, researcher assigned a speaking test in cycle 1. This spoken test was intended to know the students' speaking skill after they involved in guessing game activities as the

researcher's way of solving their speaking problems as well as whether or not in this cycle 1 the use of guessing games successfully solved the students' problem. The test was administered on 8th October 2012.

In cycle 1 the students' speaking achievement mean was 72.82 (2.330:32). This result reflected that most of the students got score <75 (categorized in which if we consult with the criteria of success such score was categorized as poor). The highest score was 86 obtained by three students (NA, NFO, and UM) and the lowest score was 62 obtained by one student (SY). This result was also in line with the frequency of the students who success the speaking test.

None (0%) of students got score ranged from 95-100. There were 3 (three) students or 9.38 percent obtained score in the range of 85-94 and only 9 students (28.13%) got score ranged from 75-84 which is classified as *successful*. However, the numbers of students got score range from 60-74 were 20 students (52.50%); this score range is classified as *failed*. This means that in cycle 1 the vast majority of students were failed (62.50%) which also depicted that classically the teaching speaking through guessing games had not yet solved the students in improving their speaking fluency. In addition, It was only 12 students (37.50%) achieved the minimum criteria of success score of 75; classically, this result had not yet achieved the criteria of success of 80%. There was a huge gap of this result. Hence, it was likely the researcher needed to reflect on this result analysis and prompted him to revise the plan for the successfulness of this study.

Observation

The observation was focused on how the application of guessing games in the process of learning and teaching conducted. The purpose of observation was to collect data related to the criteria of success that were decided in the planning stage. It was collaboratively done by the researcher and his

collaborator. They observed the implementation of guessing games in each meeting. In cycle 1, the researcher implemented four actions and each action was observed by using observation checklist and field notes. In addition, test was also used to observe the progress of their speaking skill after getting involved in a sequence of action through guessing games.

The observation of the four actions in cycle 1 was conducted by using observation checklist. The researcher and his collaborator observed the students' active participation in learning and teaching process from preactivity to postactivity. The observation was also addressed to the teacher's performance in teaching speaking through guessing games whether they had followed the lesson plan that had been designed or not. Some points of activities revealed high participation of the students, but some others showed gradual progress from medium to high participation.

In the preactivity, it revealed students pay high attention to the instruction or rules of the games as well as understand how to play games. This was in line with the high frequency of them in playing the guessing picture games as indicated in the first meeting up to final meeting. In this activity, students showed high frequency in paying attention to the games in all meetings. Although, students did not all participate in giving comments as well as discussing the pictures given in the first and second meeting. They, however, could all involved in meeting 3 and 4. This progress was due to shifting of arranging class initiated by the researcher (explained more in reflection). Students showed medium participation in doing last activity that was expressing their ideas about the games. Overall, this observation data revealed that students participated actively and showed their enthusiasm in involving guessing game activities in cycle 1.

In learning and teaching process, the researcher was also observed by his collaborator. It was intended to obtain data on

how the researcher implemented the lesson plans based on computer assisted language learning. The observation was conducted during the English classroom activities. It was done by using checklist. For this, the collaborator just put a tick on observation sheet.

Findings from Field Notes

As a supporting data, the researcher also used field notes that function record his thoughts or to note some important things happened in learning and teaching process. It recorded some aspects related to teacher's and students' performance in English classroom activities. In line with this, the researcher could say that the application of guessing games in the classroom motivated the students to speak. However, not all students were able to provide comment or discuss based on the topic given in the games. This made the researcher to reflect on this condition and prompted him and his collaborator to revise the plan. This result also accorded with the result of test that is presented in the last section.

Reflection

Having presented the data analysis from cycle 1, the researcher found that the teaching speaking in developing students' speaking achievement had not been yet satisfied. It was evident by the speaking achievement in cycle 1 only classically got 37.50%. This result demanded the researcher to reflect on this result by seeing the record from observation checklist, field notes, and speaking test. The reflection was conducted at the final stage of cycle 1.

During the teaching process, the students were actively participated in any games given by the researcher. They paid attention to his instruction as well as being able to guess pictures given by him. However, during the follow-up of the activities not all students were likely to participate. The above facts were shown by the data analysis from observation checklist. On the last evident, the data showed their participation was in the

medium frequency. Hence, cycle 2 focused on encouraging more students to participate providing comment and in the discussion of the guessing games activities (is discussed more in revised plan).

The result of cycle 1 was likely also caused by the process of playing the game. In my notes, I found that most students got no much time to speak since the teacher dominated the process of playing game. It was proven when he gave some information about the guessing picture while the students only waited for guessing it. Otherwise, some students whose skill were high took an active parts of giving ideas or opinion in discussion session. In fact, those who were low in speaking just kept silent or less of participation. Even though, I had tried to encourage them to be more active during meeting 3 and 4, yet the condition did not show any significant development.

Hence, this finding led him to reflect that he must revise his action plan by slightly modifying the procedure of playing the game such as asking them to be more active by giving questions to the teacher to get more information about the guessing picture, giving additional time in discussion session, and asked each student in the groups to give comments or opinions about the guessing pictures (individual expression) before presenting the result in the group presentation. Further to this revision, the researcher discussed it in the revision plan and in the implementation of his action.

Cycle 2

Having reflected the result from cycle 1 gathered from the data, the researcher decided to do cycle 2. It was the revision of cycle 1. It was conducted in two meetings for presenting the revised plan and one meeting was particularly used for testing the students in speaking. In this cycle, the researcher implemented the revised plans. The procedure of cycle 2 followed four main stages: planning (revising the plans,

acting/implementing, observing, and reflection).

Findings from the Test

In finding out the students' speaking performances in cycle 2, he assigned a speaking test. This spoken test was intended to know the students' speaking achievement after they involved in guessing game activities following the less satisfied result in cycle 1. It was also intended to find out the effectiveness the revised plan implemented in cycle 2 to meet with the purpose to achieve 80% criteria of success. The test was administered on 13th November 2012.

In cycle 2 the students' speaking achievement mean was 78.85 (2.523:32). This result reflected that most of the students got score >75 (categorized in which if we consult with the criteria of success such score was categorized as good). The highest score was 90 obtained by four students (NA, NFO, NT, and UM) and the lowest score was 70 obtained by four students. Overall, the number of students got score >75 was 27 students or 84.38%. This result depicted that in cycle the action conducted had achieved the criteria of success of 80% in which classically the action was regarded successful if the students' achievement result had met with such criteria. None (0%) of students got score ranged from 95-100. There were 4 (four) students or (12.5%) obtained score in the range of 85-94. In addition, most of students got score (71.88%) ranged from 75-84 which is classified as *successful*. There were only 5 (five) students (15.63) got score range from 51-74; this score range is classified as *failed*. This result revealed that in cycle 2, the vast majority of students were success (27 students or 84.38%) which also depicted that classically the teaching speaking through guessing games had solved the students problem in improving their speaking fluency. Classically, this result had achieved the criteria of success of 80%. This result provided description that the revision of plan in teaching and learning process in cycle 2

successfully improve the students speaking achievement.

Observation

In this stage the observation was to collect data related to the criteria of success that were decided in the planning stage. For this purpose, the data from observation checklist, field note, and test were used. Questionnaire was also used in the end of meeting to support data needed in this research. It was collaboratively done by the researcher and his collaborator.

In cycle 1, the researcher implemented four actions and each action was observed by using observation checklist and field notes to get some information about the implementation of the game in each action. In addition, test was also used to observe the progress of their speaking skill after getting involved in a sequence of action through guessing games.

Observation checklist was used to observe the teacher's performance as well as the students' active participation during the learning and teaching process. It was the collaborator who did this activity in teaching learning process from preactivity to postactivity. For students, the observation was addressed to observe their participation during the classroom activities. In addition, it was addressed to the teacher's performance in teaching speaking through guessing games whether he had followed the lesson plan that had been designed or not. The observation data were presented firstly and then analyzed descriptively. The analysis dealt with the finding toward the students' participation in teaching learning process (meeting 1-2) from the second cycle which indicated gradual progress after revising the learning and teaching activities. It is likely that students performed high participation in all activities from meeting 1 to 2.

In the preactivity, it revealed students pay high attention to the instruction or rules of the games as well as understand how to play games. This was in line with the high

frequency of them in playing the guessing picture games as indicated in the first meeting up to final meeting. In this activity, students showed high frequency in paying attention to the games in all meetings. Similarly, students participated highly in giving comments as well as discussing the pictures given in all meetings. This progress was due to shifting of his teaching procedures in presenting guessing games initiated by the researcher. Furthermore, students showed active participation in doing last activity that was expressing their ideas about the games. Overall, this observation data revealed that students participated actively and showed their enthusiasm in involving guessing game activities in cycle 2. This progress reflected that the researcher's revised plan showed significant change to students' participation.

In learning and teaching process, the researcher was also observed by his collaborator. It was intended to obtain data on how the researcher implemented the lesson plans based on computer assisted language learning. The observation was conducted during the English classroom activities. It was done by using checklist. For this, the collaborator just put a tick on observation sheet.

Findings from Field Notes

The data from field notes were used to give input for the researcher to reflect on his teaching as well as the condition on the classroom. He noted that after did some revision on teaching as well as managing the classroom in collaborative ways, there was a significant progress on the students' speaking performance. For instance, he used more group works to motivate the students to speak. In his notes too, the researcher saw that the application of guessing games in the classroom motivated the students to speak. They engaged more in guessing games activities. This result also accorded with the result of test that is presented in the last section.

Findings from Questionnaire

The researcher distributed questionnaire to the students in the last meeting at the cycle 2. It was handed out to students on 12th November 2012. It aims at finding out the students' perception about guessing games toward their English speaking ability. This questionnaire provided supporting data that was then triangulated with their speaking achievement score.

The questionnaire consists of 10 items. The researcher asked the students to fill in the blank questionnaire freely based on their own opinion. They had to choose one of the three alternatives given (*agree*, *disagree*, or *strongly disagree*). The researcher and his collaborator collected the questionnaire sheets after were filled in by the students.

Item number 1-2 elicits the students' response about their feeling toward the guessing games technique. The item number 1 reveals the students' response on the use of guessing games that may make them enthusiastic in learning English. Vast majority students (30 students responded *agree* or 96.88%. The rest two students provided *Strongly disagree* answer, 2 students or 6.25%. Item 2 elicits the students' response about their motivation in speaking after involving in guessing games activities during teaching learning process. All students responded *agree* or 100% that student had positive opinion toward guessing games since it increased their enthusiasm and motivation to learn English as well as in speaking in English.

Item number 3-4 asked students' responses on how their involvement in guessing games could impact on their vocabulary possession and pronunciation. The result from item 3 indicates that mostly students or 29 students (90.63%) gave *agree* response to the statement that involving in guessing games activity increased their vocabulary possession. None of the students provided *disagree* response. The other two students responded *Strongly disagree* or 9.38%. Meanwhile, the result from item 4

provided the similar result as of item 3. Hence, we may conclude the use of guessing games in speaking activities affected the students' vocabulary possession as well as improving their pronunciation ability.

Item 5 and 6 asked students' opinion whether or not guessing games can be used in developing the students' speaking ability in English in the learning and teaching process and it helped students to express their ideas in English. From the table, it can be seen that for item 5 all students (100%) agreed with the statement. Similarly, mostly students (31 students or 96.88%) also responded that they *agree* with the statement. The results revealed that students had positive opinion about the use of guessing games in the classroom. These answer may be driven of their English got improved after engaging in the guessing games activities.

Item 7 and 8 elicited the students' perception about their feeling toward the guessing games. For item 7, most of the students (30 students or 96.88) admitted they can express their ideas due to guessing game motivated them to speak, while for item 8 all students without doubt expressed that they felt more interested to learn English through English games.

Similar to those items, item 9 which asked students' opinion of guessing games improve their English ability indicated similar result that all students agreed that their English ability are getting improved as guessing games increase their self confidence in using English. Moreover, last item (item 10) indicated similar response that all students (100%) admitted that when the use English they were not afraid since guessing games are presented in fun way.

The result from the four items clearly indicates that guessing games could be applied to motivate students to speak, make them feel free to speak, and most importantly develop their speaking ability.

Reflection

Having presented the data analysis from cycle 2, the writer found that the teaching speaking in developing students' speaking achievement had achieved the planned target. It was evident by the speaking achievement in cycle 2 classically got 84.38% or 27 students out 32 students got score >75. This result made the researcher to reflect on this result by seeing the record from observation checklist, field notes, questionnaire and speaking test. The reflection was conducted at the final stage of cycle 2.

During the teaching process, the students were actively participated in any games given by the researcher. They paid attention to the game since they were asked to give questions to get more information about the guessing picture. As result, they were curious to the game by participating in giving the questions.

Given the fact that in cycle 1, many students did not have opportunity to engage in the follow-up of the activities, the researcher modified the learning and teaching process by asking them to do individual comment or expression about the guessing pictures. This was intended to let all members to speak in the group discussion. By doing this, students could participate fully in this activity even only giving a bit opinion about the guessing picture. This fact was also shown by the data analysis from observation checklist. On the last evident, the data showed their participation was in the high frequency.

The result was likely also caused by the game procedure which was different from the previous one. In cycle 1, the teacher showed some parts of guessing picture while giving some information about the guessing picture. By having this way, the students were only having a bit time to participate in the game because they just paid attention to the teacher's information to guess the game. Furthermore, the group discussion was allocated by 15 minutes in cycle 1. As the fact, it was not enough to be used by all members.

By considering the results of cycle 1 included the activities, the researcher did some modification in particular with the implementation of the game. In cycle 2, he asked the students to give yes/no questions to get some responses from the teacher. The responses were only *yes, no, or maybe yes and maybe no to the students*. The response of "yes" meant the question connected to the guessing picture. The responses of "no" meant the question disconnected to the guessing picture. The last response was maybe yes and maybe no, it was meant if the question was almost connected to the guessing picture.

Furthermore, the other modification of game implementation in cycle 2 was group discussion. It was allocated much longer 10 minutes than in cycle 1. It was intended to give more time to all members expressing their opinions or ideas about the pictures. At last, he asked each member to speak in the group. It was like individual presentation even though only expressing their feeling about the guessing pictures.

By modifying the implementation of playing the game as well as encouraging the students to participate in group work, students performed good achievement. Hence, the action had come to the end of conclusion that through guessing games activities, the students' speaking achievement could be developed.

CONCLUSION

Implementation of the actions in cycle 1 and cycle 2 influenced the students with motivation to learn English through engaging in games activities. The students' achievement of speaking gradually developed from the mean score: 72.82 in cycle 1 and 78.85 in cycle 2. The result was likely caused by the game procedure which was different from cycle 1 to cycle 2. In cycle 1, teacher showed some parts of guessing picture while giving some information about the guessing

picture. By having this way, the students were only having a bit time to participate in the game because they just paid attention to the teacher's information to guess the game. Furthermore, the group discussion was allocated by 15 minutes in cycle 1. As the fact, it was not enough to be used by all members.

In cycle 2, the researcher did some modification in particular with the implementation of the game. He asked the students to give yes/no questions to get some responses from the teacher. The responses were only *yes, no, or maybe yes and maybe no to the students*. The response of "yes" meant the question connected to the guessing picture. The responses of "no" meant the question disconnected to the guessing picture. The last response was maybe yes and maybe no, it was meant if the question was almost connected to the guessing picture. Furthermore, the other modification was in group discussion. It was allocated much longer 10 minutes than in cycle 1. It was intended to give more time to all members expressing their opinions or ideas about the pictures. At last, he asked each member to speak in the group. It was like individual presentation even though only expressing their feeling about the guessing pictures.

By modifying the implementation of playing the game as well as encouraging the students to participate in group work, students performed good achievement. Hence, the action had come to the end of conclusion that

through guessing games activities, the students' speaking achievement could be developed.

The result indicated that the actions implemented in two cycles through guessing games were successful to solve the students' speaking problem and effective to develop their fluency. It can be also inferred from the result of non-test data that the students' motivation in speaking activity was higher when involving in games activities as shown by their active participation in the class.

REFERENCES

- Allen, V. 1983. *Techniques in Teaching Vocabulary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Klippel, F. 1994. *Keep Talking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. and Rodgers, T. S. 1986. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stephen, K. and McTaggart, R. 1988. *The Action Research Planner*. Los Angeles: Deakin University.
- Widowson P. 1995. *Common Errors in English*. Pullman: Washington State University.
- Webster, M. 1986. *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*. Washington: Merriem Webster Inc.
- Wright, A., Betteridge, D. and Buckby, M. 1989. *Games for Language Learning*. Sidney: Cambridge University Press.