# CUE CARD AS MEDIA FOR TEACHING SPEAKING

**Rika Irawati**
email: rika_irawati04@yahoo.co.id

**Pontianak State Polytechnic, Indonesia**

**Abstract**
The objective of the research is to investigate how significant the improvement of students' speaking skill is by using cue card as media for teaching speaking of third semester Accounting students of Pontianak State Polytechnic in the academic year of 2017/2018. The research methodology applied is pre-experimental study. The techniques of data collecting are pre-test and post-test of speaking. The development of students' speaking can be seen from the interval score of pre-test and post-test. The interval significance is known by applying T-test. The result of data analysis shows that: (1) Pre-test mean score (6.22) is lower than post-test (7.69). The interval score of pre-test and post-test is 1.47; (2) t-obtained (16.3) is higher than t-table (2.045). It indicates the Alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted and Null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected. It can be concluded that the development of students' speaking skill by using cue card is significant.
**Keywords:** cue card, speaking skill, media

## INTRODUCTION

Pontianak State Polytechnic (Polnep) has mission that in 2020 will become the best and reliable vocational education institution in national and international. Referring to the mission, Polnep has to equip the students with the ability of English, especially speaking skill. If they can speak and understand English, they will be able to face a better future and compete in this modern era because English has been used in many kinds of fields such as education, business, and others. Miller, et al (2014) asserts that speaking and understanding English can let a person more easily communicate with others and find more job opportunities not only in his or her home country, but around the world as well. This means that students will get more chances in many parts including communication, education, and career if they are able to speak English well.

Based on the situation above, speaking skill has been clearly stated that it is needed to be mastered. Unfortunately, this speaking skill cannot be easily acquired by the Accounting department students of Polnep. The fact shows that most of the students are not able to show their speaking ability. In the classroom during the teaching and learning process, they tend to be passive because they get difficulty to grow up their idea about the topic discussed. Besides, they sometimes use their mother tongue for communication. This matter makes the students do not maximize the mastery of speaking skill that they learn.

In relation to the situation, the teachers are hoped to create supporting and interesting media of teaching to encourage them to be more active in a classroom interaction so that the learning goal will be achieved. Cue card can be one of the alternative media to cope with the students' speaking difficulty. In this research, the writer focuses on cue card consists of words for guiding speaking topic, which is similar with cue card for IELTS speaking.

Cue card is one of media used in teaching and learning process. The meaning of media is often related with means of communication. Gerlach and Ely (1980) define media as any person, material or event that establishes conditions which enable learners/students to acquire knowledge, skills, and attitudes. According to Daryanto (2013), media is any devices that assist the teacher to transmit the learner's skills, attitudes, knowledge, or

additional materials used to make the learning easy. Learning media includes some devices that are physically used for delivering the content of teaching materials which consist of books, films, videos, televisions, graphics, pictures, etc. In line with Daryanto, Aqib (2013) states that media is anything that can be used to convey a message or idea to stimulate the students in learning process. Media for learning should be visible, interesting, simple, useful, accurate, legitimate, and structured.

Teachers can use cue card as the media to help students in improving their speaking skills abilities. Harmer (2007) defines that cue card is a card with words and pictures on it. He adds that students can use this kind of media in a pair or group work. He argues that cue card will help students to speak up easily in the form of words or phrases even sentences when they are involved in a conversation. Thus, when students are asked to describe something or someone in detail, cue card can help them produce the description easily.

Cue card, also known as note card with word written on it, helps students remember what they have to say (Team coco Podcast, 2011). Cue card is the main way in which the content and structure of the talk can be controlled. Without note cards, most talks are formless ramblings. With note cards can be an orderly set of points, with clear sequence and coherence which the students can rely on. Cue card contains pointers to remind students what they are talking about. According to Mulyana (2009), students use cue card enables to remind them what to say. In addition, cue card should consist of keywords, key facts, thoughts, and headings, not the full sentences.

Turk (2003) explains several advantages of using cue card in teaching speaking, as follows:
1. Cue card makes the students easier to refer to, both while preparing the talk, and in the heat of the moment.
2. Cue card gives the audience hope and confidence when see a rapidly diminishing pile of thick cards, rather than a sheaf of large, thin paper, which never seems to get any smaller.
3. Cue card is its stiffness. Cards are much easier for nervous fingers to hold; paper is flexible, and acts like a sounding board for every shake and tremble of the hands.
4. Cue card can easily be shuffled into a new order, and the ones which are not needed discarded.

## METHOD
The design of this research was pre-experimental by using one group pre-test and post-test design. Pre-experimental design is the designs that are simple and inexpensive to implement and exploratory in nature, but lack control groups to compare with the experimental group (Porte, 2002). Gall, et al. (2003: 389) add that pre-experimental study involves three steps: (1) administration of a pre-test measuring the dependent variable; (2) implementation of the experimental treatment (independent variable); and (3) administration of post-test that measures the dependent variable again. The effects of the experimental treatment are determined by comparing the pre-test and post-test scores.
The procedure of conducting this research is clearly described on a design below:

| Group | Pre-Test | Treatment | Post-Test |
|-------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| E | T1 | X | T2 |

Where :        E  : Experiment Group
               T1 : Pre-test to experiment group
               X  : Treatment by using cue card
               T2 : Post-test to experiment group

The population in this research are all the third semester students of Accounting of Pontianak State Polytechnic in academic year of 2017-2018 which consists of four classes, those are A, B, C and D which each class consists of 30 students. The writer took one class or 30 students from all of population as the sample of this research.

The writer used oral test to measure the student's progress in speaking. Test is an instrument or procedure designed to elicit performance from learners with the purpose of measuring their attainment of specified criteria (Brown, 2001). The tests themselves are divided into two; pre-test and post-test. The tests which evaluated include these aspects: intelligibility (pronunciation), grammatical accuracy, adequacy of vocabulary, fluency, and relevance and adequacy of content with a maximum of three in each aspect, as described by Weir (1998).

**Weir's Speaking Test Scale**

| Score | Intelligibility (Pronunciation) | Grammatical Accuracy | Adequacy of Vocabulary | Fluency | Relevance and Adequacy of Content |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | Articulation is reasonably comprehensible to native speakers; there may be a marked 'foreign accent' but almost no misunderstanding is caused and repetition required only infrequently. | Almost no grammatical inaccuracies; occasional imperfect control of a few patterns. | Almost no inadequacies or inaccuracies in vocabulary for the task. Only rare circumlocution. | Utterances, whilst occasionally hesitant, are characterized by an evenness and flow hindered, very occasionally, by groping, rephrasing and circumlocutions. Inter-sentential connectors are used effectively as fillers. | Relevant and adequate response to the task set. |
| 2 | Rhythm, intonation and pronunciation require concentrate listening, but only occasional misunderstanding is caused or repetition required. | Some grammatical inaccuracies; developing a control of major patterns, but sometimes unable to sustain coherence in longer utterances. | Some misunderstandings may arise through lexical inadequacy or inaccuracy; hesitation and circumlocution are frequent, through there are signs of a developing active vocabulary. | Signs of developing attempt as using cohesive devices, especially conjunctions. Utterances may still be hesitant, but are gaining in coherence, speed and length. | Response for the most part relevant to the task set, though there may be some gaps or redundancy. |
| 1 | Strong interference from L1 in rhythm, intonation and pronunciation; understanding is | Syntax is fragmented and there are frequent grammatical inaccuracies; some patterns | Vocabulary limited to that necessary to express simple elementary needs; inadequacy of | Utterances hesitant and often incomplete except in a few stock remarks and responses. Sentences are, for | Response of limited relevance to the task set; possibly major gaps and/or pointless |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | difficult, and achieved often only after frequent repetition. | may be mastered but speech may be characterized by a telegraphic style and/or confusion of structural elements. | vocabulary restricts topics of interaction to the most basic; perhaps frequent lexical inaccuracies and/or excessive repetition. | the most part, disjointed and restricted in length. | repetition. |
| **0** | Severe and constant rhythm, intonation and pronunciation problems cause almost complete unintelligibility. | Unable to function in the spoken language; almost all grammatical patterns inaccurate, except for a few stock phrases. | Vocabulary inadequate even for the most basic parts of the intended communication. | Utterances halting, fragmentary and incoherent. | Response irrelevant to the task set; totally inadequate response. |

The pretest is done before teaching by using cue card. The treatments of using cue card are three times. Next, the post-test is done after the students have been treated by using cue card. The comparing of the result of pre-test and post-test will be analyzed to find the information whether their speaking ability by using cue card improves or not. Finally, writer found out the significance of the interval score of pre-test and post-test using T-test. To analyze the data, the writer did the steps, as follows:

1. Finding out the mean of students of pre-test and post-test

$$M = \frac{\Sigma x}{N}$$

Where:
M = The mean of students total score in speaking
$\Sigma x$ = The sum of students total score in speaking
N = The number of students being observed

2. Finding out the interval score of pre-test and post-test

$$M_{tot} = X_2 - X_1$$

Where:
$M_{tot}$ = The interval score of pre-test and post-test
$X_2$ = The students total score of post-test
$X_1$ = The students total score of pre-test

3. Finding out the significance of the interval score of pre-test and post-test using T-test.

$$T = \frac{\overline{D}}{\sqrt{(\Sigma D^2 - [(\Sigma D)^2 / N)] / N(N-1)}}$$

Where:
T = The t-obtained for correlated sample
$\Sigma D$ = The sum of difference of students' score between pre-test and posttest
D = The means of the difference
$\Sigma D^2$ = The sum of the squared difference scores
N = The number of students being observed

### FINDING AND DISCUSSION
**A. Research Finding**

The writer obtains two kinds of data after conducting the research; the scores of pre-test and the scores of post-test.

**1. The Analysis of Pre-Test Mean Score**

The researcher did the pre-test on October 2nd, 2017. The result of pre-test can be seen on the table as follow:

| Name | Intelligibility (Pronunciation) | Grammatical Accuracy | Adequacy of Vocabulary | Fluency | Relevance and Adequacy of Content | Raw Score | Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Amru | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 5.33 |
| Adhe | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 5.33 |
| Anung | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 5.33 |
| Arista | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 6.67 |
| Ayu | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 6.67 |
| Cenindiani | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 7.33 |
| Dendi | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 6 |
| Desi | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 5.33 |
| Dila | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 6.67 |
| Elma | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 6 |
| Ema | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 6.67 |
| Ersa | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 6.67 |
| Fedrich | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 6 |
| Ismi | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 6 |
| Khairunisa | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 6.67 |
| Martha | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 7.33 |
| Milna | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 5.33 |
| Mirani | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 5.33 |
| Mutiara | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 5.33 |
| Noviany | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 7.33 |
| Rahmad | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 7.33 |
| Resta | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 6 |
| Rheny | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 6 |
| Riska | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 6 |
| Riyani | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 6 |
| Septiana | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 7.33 |
| Siti | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 6.67 |
| Sy Rizky | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 7.33 |
| Tatang | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 6 |
| Yuli | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.67 |

From the table above, it can be seen that the students' score ranges from the highest score 7.33 to the lowest 5.33. The total score of the students' achievement is 186.65. So, the mean score of the students' achievement is 6.22. The detailed computation is as follows:

$$M = \frac{\Sigma x}{N}$$

$$= \frac{186.65}{30}$$

$$= 6.22$$

## 2. The Analysis of Post-Test Mean Score

After doing pre-test and treatment, the researcher did the post-test on October 23rd, 2017. The result of post-test can be seen on the table as follow:

| Name | Intelligibility (Pronunciation) | Grammatical Accuracy | Adequacy of Vocabulary | Fluency | Relevance and Adequacy of Content | Raw Score | Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Amru | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 6.67 |
| Adhe | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 6 |
| Anung | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 7.33 |
| Arista | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 7.33 |
| Ayu | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 13 | 8.67 |
| Cenindiani | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 13 | 8.67 |
| Dendi | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 7.33 |
| Desi | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 6.67 |
| Dila | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 8 |
| Elma | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 8 |
| Ema | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 13 | 8.67 |
| Ersa | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 13 | 8.67 |
| Fedrich | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 7.33 |
| Ismi | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 7.33 |
| Khairunisa | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 8 |
| Martha | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 14 | 9.33 |
| Milna | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 6.67 |
| Mirani | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 6.67 |
| Mutiara | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 7.33 |
| Noviany | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 13 | 8.67 |
| Rahmad | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 8 |
| Resta | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 7.33 |
| Rheny | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 13 | 8.67 |
| Riska | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 7.33 |
| Riyani | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 7.33 |
| Septiana | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 8 |
| Siti | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 7.33 |
| Sy Rizky | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 13 | 8.67 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Tatang | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 8 |
| Yuli | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 6.67 |

The students' mean score ranges from the highest score 9.33 to the lowest score 6 as seen on the table above. The total score of the students' achievement is 258.28. So, the post-test mean score is 9.22. The detailed computation is as follows:

$$M = \frac{\Sigma x}{N}$$
$$= \frac{230.67}{7.69}$$
$$= \mathbf{7.69}$$

The analysis shows that the treatment changes the students' achievement. The students' score is better at the post-test.

### 3. The Interval Score of Pretest and Posttest

After finding the pre-test and post-test mean score, the writer computated the interval of pre-test and post-test mean score. The computation is as follows:

$$M_{tot} = \mathbf{X_2} - \mathbf{X_1}$$
$$= 7.69 - 6.22$$
$$= 1.47$$

### 4. The Analysis of the Significance of Interval of Pre-Test and Post-Test

To find out the significance of the students' achievement, the writer applied the t-test. The computation is as follows:

| No | Students' name | Pretest $(X_1)$ | Posttest $(X_2)$ | Difference (D) $D = X_1 - X_2$ | Squared Difference $(D^2)$ $D^2 = (X_1 - X_2)^2$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Amru | 5.33 | 6.67 | 1.34 | 1.80 |
| 2 | Adhe | 5.33 | 6 | 0.67 | 0.45 |
| 3 | Anung | 5.33 | 7.33 | 2.00 | 4.00 |
| 4 | Arista | 6.67 | 7.33 | 0.66 | 0.44 |
| 5 | Ayu | 6.67 | 8.67 | 2.00 | 4.00 |
| 6 | Cenindiani | 7.33 | 8.67 | 1.34 | 1.80 |
| 7 | Dendi | 6 | 7.33 | 1.33 | 1.77 |
| 8 | Desi | 5.33 | 6.67 | 1.34 | 1.80 |
| 9 | Dila | 6.67 | 8 | 1.33 | 1.77 |
| 10 | Elma | 6 | 8 | 2.00 | 4.00 |
| 11 | Ema | 6.67 | 8.67 | 2.00 | 4.00 |
| 12 | Ersa | 6.67 | 8.67 | 2.00 | 4.00 |
| 13 | Fedrich | 6 | 7.33 | 1.33 | 1.77 |
| 14 | Ismi | 6 | 7.33 | 1.33 | 1.77 |
| 15 | Khairunisa | 6.67 | 8 | 1.33 | 1.77 |
| 16 | Martha | 7.33 | 9.33 | 2.00 | 4.00 |
| 17 | Milna | 5.33 | 6.67 | 1.34 | 1.80 |
| 18 | Mirani | 5.33 | 6.67 | 1.34 | 1.80 |

| No | Students' name | Pretest (X$_1$) | Posttest (X$_2$) | Difference (D) D= X$_1$ - X$_2$ | Squared Difference (D$^2$) D$^2$= (X$_1$ - X$_2$)$^2$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19 | Mutiara | 5.33 | 7.33 | 2.00 | 4.00 |
| 20 | Noviany | 7.33 | 8.67 | 1.34 | 1.80 |
| 21 | Rahmad | 7.33 | 8 | 0.67 | 0.45 |
| 22 | Resta | 6 | 7.33 | 1.33 | 1.77 |
| 23 | Rheny | 6 | 8.67 | 2.67 | 7.13 |
| 24 | Riska | 6 | 7.33 | 1.33 | 1.77 |
| 25 | Riyani | 6 | 7.33 | 1.33 | 1.77 |
| 26 | Septiana | 7.33 | 8 | 0.67 | 0.45 |
| 24 | Siti | 6.67 | 7.33 | 0.66 | 0.44 |
| 25 | Sy  Rizky | 7.33 | 8.67 | 1.34 | 1.80 |
| 26 | Tatang | 6 | 8 | 2.00 | 4.00 |
| 30 | Yuli | 4.67 | 6.67 | 2.00 | 4.00 |
| | TOTAL | 186.65 | 230.67 | 44.02 | 72.07 |
| | MEAN | 6.22 | 7.69 | | |

$$T = \frac{\overline{D}}{\sqrt{(\Sigma D^2 - [(\Sigma D)^2 / N)]/ N(N-1)}}$$

$$T = \frac{(44.02/30)}{\sqrt{(72.07 - [(44.02)^2 / 30)]/30(30-1)}}$$

$$T = \frac{1.47}{\sqrt{(72.07 - 64.59)/870}}$$

$$T = \frac{1.47}{0.09}$$

$$T = \mathbf{16.3}$$

## 5. The Testing Hypothesis

From the result of data computation, it is obtained that t-obtained is 16.3.  The level of significance ($\alpha$) 0.05 with the degree of freedom (df) =N-1 = 30-1= 29, it is obtained t-table is 2.045. The result indicated that t-obtained (16.3) is higher than t-table (2.045). Then, because t-obtained is higher than t-table (16.3 > 2.045), the result is in the null hypothesis (Ho) rejection area. It means the null hypothesis (Ho) which says "There is no significant development on students' speaking skill by using cue card" is rejected, and the Alternative hypothesis (Ha) which says "There is significant development on students' speaking skill by using cue card" is accepted. It can be said that the development of students' speaking skill by using cue card is significant.

## B. Discussion

Before the students were given a treatment, the students' mean score is 6.22. Then, the scores increase to 7.69 after given a treatment by using cue card. Therefore, the interval score of pre-test and post-test is 1.47. The  result of the data analysis of pre-test and post-test mean score shows that post-test is higher than pre-test.  This finding shows there is an improvement in students' score of post-test after receiving the treatments. The whole data

which students got, are put in t-test in order to prove whether the difference score is significant or not. Based on the result of t-test, it proves that the value of t-obtained is higher than t-table (16.3 > 2.045). It means that the difference between pre-test and post-test is significant.

The factor, why the development of students' speaking skill by using cue card as media in teaching speaking is significant, is the students feel enjoy to speak because cue card helps them to guide what they should talk about and enables to remind them what to say. As the result, the content and structure of their talk can be controlled and well-organized. Besides, the lecturer explains the procedures of how using cue card as media as clear as possible. So, the students are not confused even though this is the first time the lecturer applies this media in teaching learning process and it is successfully applied in the classroom.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the result of the data analysis, the research findings are as follows:

Pretest and posttest mean scores show that posttest (7.69) is higher than pretest (6.22). The interval score of pretest and posttest is 1.47. T-obtained is higher than t-table (t-obtained 16.3 > t-table 2.045). It indicates the Alternative hypothesis (Ha) which says

"There is significant development on students' speaking skill by using cue card" is accepted. It means the students' development in speaking skill by using cue card is significant.

## REFERENCES

Aqib, Zainal. (2013). *Model-Model Media dan Strategi Pembelajaran Kontekstual (Inovatif).* Bandung: Yrama Widya.

Brown, H. Douglas. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language*
 *Pedagogy.* Second Edition. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.

Daryanto. (2013). *Media Pembelajaran Peranannya Sangat Penting Dalam mencapai Tujuan Pembelajaran.* Yogyakarta: Gava Media.

Gall, et al. (2003). *Educational Research*. USA: Person Educational, Inc.

Gerlach Vernon, S and D. P. Ely. (1980). *Teaching and Media: Systematic Approach.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Harmer, Jeremy. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. London: Longman.

Miller, B. (2014). *What Are The Benefit of Learning English*. Retreived from http://www.wisegeek.org/what-are-the-benefits-of-learning-english.htm.

Mulyana, G.H. Yayan. (2009). *A Practical Guide English for Public Speaking.* Edisi Revisi. Jakarta: Kesaint Blanc.

Porte, Graeme Keith. (2002). *Appraising Research in Second Language Learning: A Practical Approach to Critical Analysis of Quantitative Research.* Amsterdam: Jhon Benjamins.

Team coco Podcast. (2011). *Cue Card, in the International Dictionary of Broadcasting and Film*. Retrived from http://itesljorg/Articles/Cue Card.html.

Turk , Christoper. (2003). *Effective Speaking: Communicating in Speech.* French: E and FN Spon.

Weir, Cryril J. (1998). *Communicative Language Testing*. New York: Prentice Hall

93