

Research Article

The improving speaking skills through role playing strategies in students at muhammadiyah university of palangkaraya

A R Khunaifi* and A Supriyadi

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Muhammadiyah University of Palangkaraya, Palangkaraya, Indonesia

Abstract.

There are four basic skills in English, namely Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing, speaking skills are still not maximally spared by students. [1]which states that speaking is an event of conveying one's intentions (ideas, thoughts, heart contents) to others using spoken language so that the meaning is understood by others. Not a few students of Universitas Muhammadiyah Palangkaraya still cannot understand well and do not understand the sentences spoken by the interlocutors who use English. Role playing is one of the strategies recently seen as very useful and effective in learning speaking because role playing can arouse enthusiasm and motivate students and provide an injection to speak in English. This study aims to determine student activities during training and to find out whether the use of role playing strategies can improve students' speaking skills. This Classroom Action Research was designed and implemented in the Study Program at the Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry, Farmacy and the Islamic Faculty of Universitas Muhammadiyah Palangkaraya. The research subjects were 30 students of the Universitas Muhammadiyah Palangkaraya S1 Program. who take English courses. The stages of this research consisted of planning, implementing the action, observing and reflecting. The results obtained from this activity based on the reflection stage were that the average score of students was 7.5 on the speaking ability test where in the initial test the average student score was below 70. Student activities in role playing activities also increased where they could speak using English with a predetermined theme although there are still some vocabulary and grammar that need to be improved.

Keywords: Speaking skills; role playing; basic skills; English

 Corresponding Author: A R
 Khunaifi; email:
 aamrifaldi@gmail.com

Published 03 March 2023

 Publishing services provided by
Knowledge E

© A R Khunaifi and A
 Supriyadi. This article is
 distributed under the terms of
 the [Creative Commons
 Attribution License](#), which
 permits unrestricted use and
 redistribution provided that the
 original author and source are
 credited.

 Selection and Peer-review under
 the responsibility of the
 PVJ-ISHESSH 2021 Conference
 Committee.

1. Introduction

The English has four basic skills, namely Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing. And has three additional abilities, namely Grammar, Vocabulary and Pronunciation. All components are very important and must be learned if you want to master English well[1].


OPEN ACCESS

In the English education study program, the speaking subject is often considered a scary and difficult subject for students to learn, because in English, pronunciation and speaking are different. Besides, students often have difficulty speaking (speaking) due to first, difficulty expressing ideas; so that students are confused about what they are going to convey. Second, limited vocabulary (vocabulary) and grammar (grammar); so that students find it difficult to speak fluently. The third limitation of pronouncing / pronouncing words (pronunciation); so it is difficult to pronounce the word correctly and the fourth is not having the courage to speak for fear of being wrong. From this problem resulted in unsatisfactory results of students' speaking learning

Of the four basic skills in English, namely the four basic skills, namely Listening (listening / listening), Speaking (speaking), Reading (reading) and Writing (writing), the speaking skill (speaking) is still not maximally provided to students. Not a few students of UM Palangkaraya are still unable to understand well and do not understand the sentences spoken by the interlocutors who use English. Listening and reading are both language skills, but have different levels of difficulty. If in reading we still don't understand the meaning, we can read it again until we understand the meaning. It is different from the ability to hear and speak, because it can only be done on one occasion and cannot be repeated. If you are unable to grasp the meaning of the conversation, you will not understand what is being said at all. Students told that they could not understand what other people said in English as a whole, they experienced a lot of confusion when the speech made by the other party used a fairly fast speech speed, so it was difficult to understand what the other person was saying

In this case, on campus students are expected to be able to speak English in front of the class, in front of many people, with careful preparation through reading, analyzing, connecting with everyday life, and presenting arguments on a topic. Second, students' opportunities to speak during the learning process are very limited. If per-student is given the opportunity to speak for 5 minutes, then it takes 150 minutes for 30 students just to talk, and that is less effective time management. Third, the feedback given is ineffective because it tends to be broad, in accordance with student mistakes and does not provide opportunities for a grammar exercise to occur. The purpose of this research is to find the students' activities while participating in the speaking skills training which is designed using the Role Playing technique and to find out whether the use of the Role Playing strategy can improve the speaking skills of students.

2. Methods

2.1. ResearchTechniques

This Classroom Action Research was designed and implemented in the Study Program at the Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry and the Islamic Faculty of UM Palangkaraya. The research subjects were students of the Undergraduate Program in the Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry and the Islamic Faculty of UM Palangkaraya. who take English courses Overall, the action research designed consists of two cycles. This research was developed with a spiral classroom action research procedure which includes the phases: planning, taking action, observing, and reflecting. In more detail this action research can be described as follows

2.1.1. Planning

The activities carried out at this planning stage are as follows: preparing learning scenarios according to research implementation procedures, preparing learning plans, learning materials, preparing instruments for pretest and post-test, and preparing observation sheets.

2.1.2. Execution of Actions

The plan that has been prepared is tried out in accordance with the steps that have been made, namely the process of increasing student achievement and learning passion in the speaking subject. The activities carried out in this stage are conducting a pre-test, implementing a learning scenario using the Role Playing strategy, which has been planned, and at the end the action is given a post-test.

2.1.3. Observation

At this stage, observations are carried out on the implementation of actions to observe the implementation of learning with the Role Playing strategy. This observation is carried out to see whether all the plans that have been made properly are not deviations that can give less than optimal results in increasing student achievement and enthusiasm for learning in the speaking subject.

2.1.4. Reflection.

In the reflection stage, a discussion of the results of the activities from the first and second cycle is carried out. Then analyzed to find out about the conditions of learning using the Role Playing technique, and also their reflections on students. The results of the analysis were compared with the established success criteria, namely $\geq 70\%$. This means, this classroom action research is considered successful if at least 70% of students have reached a value of ≥ 70 (grade B). If the results of the analysis have not reached the specified success criteria, then the strategy of using Role Playing will be analyzed in learning the name of speaking. The analysis at this stage will be used to carry out the next cycle.

2.2. Investigated variables

The variables investigated to answer the problems of this study included the components in speaking, namely: Students' ability in Grammar, Vocabulary, Pronunciation and Fluency or the fluency of students in speaking.

2.3. Data Collection Techniques

The data in this study were collected using observation sheets and speaking test results. Observations were made on the activities carried out by lecturers and students during the learning process. The data collection technique uses the following instruments :

2.3.1. Observation sheet

to collect data about student learning situations.

2.3.2. Speaking test results

to collect data about the students' ability to speak in English.

2.3.3. The criteria for success in this study are seen from the results of observations

if the average quality is sufficient or capable of greater than 70%, and the test results also reach a competency of at least 70%. The minimum competency in question is the average value obtained by students where if their average score has reached 70 then the value is considered to have met the success criteria.

3. Result and Discussion

3.1. Pre-test result

The pre-test was carried out at the first meeting. This pretest was carried out to determine the students' speaking skills before the drama technique was applied. From the pre-test results, the average score of students was 45. This means that the level of student mastery in the pre- test reached 45%.

3.2. Research CycleI

From the observation result, it can be seen that the students' ability to speak in English (speaking) using drama techniques can be analyzed that students are still hesitant in speaking English and students do not have the courage to say or express their opinions and ideas when having dialogue with their friends. In the first cycle the average student was able to use grammar well amounted to 14%, while students who were able to use good vocabulary were 14.8%, and students who were able to pronounce words with correct pronunciation were 13.20% . Judging from the speed and fluency of students in speaking, students' ability in fluency amounted to 10%.

From the results of the analysis above, it can be argued that the results of the research in cycle 1 using the application of drama techniques to improve students' ability to speak in English were not satisfactory. This can be seen from the ability of students to take part in lecture activities by applying the Drama technique has not been satisfactory, it has only reached an average of 52% and the average post-test score in cycle 1 is 60.24%. This means that the average level of mastery of new students reaches 60.24%.

From the results of the analysis, the question that is reflected is: Why by using the Drama technique in teaching speaking the student learning outcomes have not reached

a score of 70? The results of reflection in the form of actions that will be implemented in cycle II are as follows:

1. Keeping the action in cycle I.
2. Provide guidance to students who appear less confident when speaking correctly spoken English.
3. Motivating students to be more active in participating in drama games and keep away shyness and lack of self-confidence. Helping students who have difficulty in pronouncing, choosing vocabulary, and proper sentence structure when they want to say it.

3.3. Research Cycle II

By applying the results of reflection in cycle 1, the results of observations in cycle 2 showed that the students had been able to improve their speaking skills by following drama playing techniques. In cycle 1, only 52% of students were able to attend lectures with the application of drama techniques, while in cycle II it increased to 76.7%.

From the observation of cycle II, it was found that students who were able to speak English using drama techniques when viewed from the components contained in the speaking were. The ability of students to use grammar well was 16.2%, while students who were able to use good vocabulary were 19.5%, and students who were able to pronounce words with good pronunciation amounted to 23%. Judging from the speed and fluency of students in speaking (students' ability in fluency) amounted to 18%.

The results of the post-test cycle 2 showed that the mean score of students was 78.32 (the mean score of students in cycle 1 was 60.24). If it is related to the success criteria, it is clear that the observation results and the post-test results in cycle 2 have met these criteria. Thus it can be concluded that the application of the Drama technique in the speaking subject can improve students' ability to speak in English besides that it can also foster students' confidence.

4. Conclusion

The results of classroom action research by applying drama techniques in speaking learning which consisted of 2 cycles turned out to be able to answer the research objectives previously presented. In other words, the students' ability to speak English had significantly improved after the drama technique was applied in lectures. This can

TABLE 1: Records of data from observations of cycles 1 and 2.

No	Observed variables	Cycle I	Cycle II
1	The ability of students to speak with	14%	16,2%
2	Use the correct grammar	14,8%	19,5%
3.	Students' ability to speak with good	13,20%	23%
4.	Vocabulary selection.	10%	18%

be proven by the results of the observation and the results of the post-test in cycle 2. For more details, the following shows the results of the observations in cycles 1 and 2 and the results of the post-test cycles 1 & 2.

References

- [1] Kundharu SS. Meningkatkan keterampilan berbahasa Indonesia. Bandung: Karya Putra Darwati; 2012.
- [2] Syukur G. Pemerolehan dan pengajaran bahasa kedua. Proyek pengembangan Guru Sekolah Menengah, Dirjen Pendidikan Tinggi. Jakarta: Diknas; 2010.
- [3] Brown DH. Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc; 2011.
- [4] Burns A. Doing action research in English language teaching. New York: Cambridge University press; 2010.
- [5] Eggins S. An introduction to systematic Functional Linguistic. London: St. Martin Press; 1994.
- [6] Fleming M. Starting drama teaching. London: David Fulton; 2014.
- [7] Gerot, Wignell. Making sense of functional grammar. Sydney; 1994.
- [8] Harmer J. The practice of english language teaching. 3rd ed. New York: Addison Wesley Longman Limited; 2002.
- [9] Healy C. Drama in education for language learning in humanising language teaching. 2000.
- [10] James M, Michael S, David. Inclusion effective practices for all students. Pearson: United State America; 2013.
- [11] Kundharu SS. Meningkatkan keterampilan berbahasa Indonesia. Bandung: Karya Putra Darwati; 2012.

- [12] Nellie M. Creative drama in the classroom and beyond, 8/E. New York: New York University; 2006
- [13] Oradee T. Developing speaking skills using three communicative activities (discussion, problem-solving, and role playing). *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*. 2012;2.
- [14] Pollard L. Teaching English. UK: Longman; 2008.
- [15] Routledge FY. From text to stage: Improving students' english through drama education. Paper 53rd TEFLIN International Seminar. Yogyakarta: Ahmad Dahlan University; 2005.
- [16] Ur P. A course in language teaching. Practice and theory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2006.
- [17] Vygotsky LS. Mind in society: The development of higher Psychological processes. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; 2017.