

THE USE OF “IDENTITY PARADE” GAME AS A STRATEGY TO IMPROVE STUDENTS’ SPEAKING SKILL IN DESCRIBING PEOPLE AT SECOND GRADE STUDENTS OF SMPI HASANUDDIN DAU MALANG

Rizky Fitri Lestari

rizkyfitlest@gmail.com

Universitas Gadjah Mada Yogyakarta

Abstract

Speaking is the most fundamental skill in learning language. Unfortunately the researcher found the students’ speaking problem when she conducted *preliminary study* in SMP Hasanuddin. Therefore, the researcher decided to solve the problem by conducting Classroom Action Research (CAR) using “Identity Parade” game technique. It consists of four steps in 2 cycles, there are: planning of the action, implementing, observing, and reflecting of the action. The subject of this research were 17 students at eighth grade (VIII^B). The instruments of this research were *speaking test*, *observation check-list* and *questionnaire*. The result of the *speaking test* in this study described as; the students who passed the standard score in the *preliminary study* improved from 43.75% to 71.43% at the *cycle 1* and 86.67% at the end of *cycle 2*. This case shows that there are significant improvement in students’ speaking skill and the learning process was stopped, because the score had met the minimum passing grade which is 75 %. Therefore, “Identity Parade” game had been proved that it could be one of teaching technique to improve the eighth graders’ speaking skill in describing people at SMPI Hasanuddin Dau Malang.

Key words: speaking skill, “Identity Parade” game, describing people appearance

©Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris FPISH IKIP BU Malang

Introduction

Teaching English starts from Elementary School up to Higher Education in order to have distinctive generations that can deal and compete internationally. In fact, students in Indonesia, like others, face difficulties in speaking English. After conducting observation and giving assignment at SMPI Hassanuddin Dau, researcher found that a lot of students of second grade cannot produce a complete dialogue with others without making mistakes. They really lack self-confidence as a result of failure to master speaking English.

Learning a second language also has been known to cause anxiety in language learners, which in turn can negatively affect the language learning process (Pichette, 2009: 77). Numerous research studies of foreign and second language classrooms have

found a significant negative correlation between anxiety and language performance generally, and more specifically, with speaking (Woodrow, 2006: 308). Therefore, teacher has to choose right strategy to teach speaking which avoid stressful learning atmosphere in the class. One of the strategies has fulfilled the criteria above is Games. Games, which are task-based and have a purpose beyond the production of correct speech, serve as excellent communicative activities (Saricoban & Metin, 2000). Accordingly, the researcher tries to use a game named “Identity Parade” as a teaching method in order to improve speaking skills and to help reduce students’ anxiety to speak English; the main concentration of this method is on an active and interactive learning environment.

This study proposed to facilitate practicing speaking by means of developing eighth graders' speaking skill. The "Identity Parade" game is encouraging because of many reasons: it is learner centered, promotes communicative competence, creates a meaningful context for language use, increases learning motivation, reduces learning anxiety, integrates various linguistic skills, encourages creative and spontaneous use of language, constructs a cooperative learning environment, and foster participatory attitudes of the students (Hadfield, 1999).

Methodology

To achieve the aim of this study, the researcher adopted the Classroom Action Research (CAR). According Kemmis & Taggart (in Burns 1999: 32), an action research occurs through a dynamic and complements processes which consist of four essential steps; those are planning, acting, observing and reflecting. In this case, the target community is one class of eighth

grader at SMPI Hasanuddin Dau. The study was held from May. It was done at the eighth graders at the SMPI Hasanuddin Dau enrolled in the second semester of the school year (2014-2015).

The subject of the study consists of a class of eighth graders (VIII^B) at SMPI Hasanuddin Dau enrolled in the second semester of the school year (2014-2015). This class was taken as a subject because from the results of the questionnaire the researcher distributed showed that most of the students faced problem in learning speaking. The researcher uses design of Kemmis and Mc Taggart. There are some steps and those are; (1) Planning of the Action, (2) Implementing the Action, (3) Observing of the Action and (4) Reflecting of the Action. These steps will be happened in each cycle, they are useful to make the reserach systematic. There is a visualization design arranged by Kemmis and Taggart (cited in Arikunto, 2002: 84), presented in Chart 1:

Chart 1 Kemmis and Mc Taggart Action Research Model

Related to the research, the researcher uses some techniques for collecting the data. They are: observation, questionnaire, test and documentation. The researcher used quantitative data to support the research result especially for the students' speaking results. The quantitative data were the students' speaking score in speaking assignment

and speaking evaluation. To measure scoring system in speaking competence, the researcher used five components of language proficiency. They are fluency, grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and comprehension. And the criteria components are applied by point 1-5.

Table 1. Five Components of Language Proficiencies:

No	Aspect	Score
1.	Fluency	12
2.	Grammar	36
3.	Vocabulary	24
4.	Pronunciation	4
5.	Comprehension	23
	T o t a l	100

Table 2. Conversion of Speaking Proficiency

Number Of Score	Proficiency Level
16-25	0+
26-32	1
33-42	1+
42-52	2
53-62	2+
63-71	3
73-82	3+
83-92	4
93-99	4+
100	5

The proficiency level of students' then described as follows:

1. Able to speak for traveling and use the language minimally.
2. Able to speak for requirement of work by having limitedness.
3. Able to speak by using appropriate grammar and vocabulary both in formal and non-formal conversation in practical, social, and professional case.
4. Able to use the language fluently and in exact words in every level in accordance with professional requirement.
5. Able to use the language smoothly and frequently without any grooving like native speaker.

(Nurgiyantoro, 1994: 284-288)

To know each students activity in the class percentage, the researcher used the following formula:

$$P = FN \times 100\%$$

Where:

P : Percentage

F : Number of each indicator of students' participation

N : Total number of students

Besides, the data from questionnaire used the following formula:

$$P = nN \times 100\%$$

Where:

P : Number of percentage

n : Number of students who answer

N : Number all of the students
(Arikunto, 1998: 246)

According to Sumarno (2002) in the evaluation, criteria have function as standard of comparison to determine the level of the action success based on the consideration that have been agreed by the teacher and the researcher. In this research, the researcher and the teacher as collaborator had determined

criteria of the action success. The action was called success, when the mean of the students score more than or equal to 75% or got mark 75 based on the minimum passing grade of the school. And the criteria of success for classical when a class got completeness minimal 75% from total of students so the next action would be stopped.

Research Finding and Discussion Preliminary Study

Table 3. Assignment Speaking Scoring Sheet

No	Name	Indicator					Score	Pass	Fail
		Fluency	Grammar	Vocabulary	Pronunciation	Comprehension			
1	A F	10	36	16	2	12	76	√	
2	AAGR	6	30	12	2	8	58		√
3	AQA	8	36	16	2	15	77	√	
4	DA	6	30	12	2	12	62		√
5	EED.	10	36	16	2	15	79	√	
6	FY	8	18	8	2	8	44		√
7	FNM	8	30	16	2	15	71		√
8	LEF.	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
9	I	6	30	16	1	12	66		√
10	M\R\	10	36	16	2	12	76	√	
11	MS	10	36	16	2	12	76	√	
12	RDP.	6	18	12	1	8	45		√
13	SIA.	10	36	16	2	15	79	√	
14	SP	6	18	8	1	8	41		√
15	SA	10	36	16	2	12	76	√	
16	SR	6	30	16	2	12	66		√
17	YDM.	4	18	8	2	8	40		√
	Total						1032		

Mean score of the *assignment*:

$$\begin{aligned}
 X &= \frac{\sum x}{n} \\
 &= \frac{1032}{16} \\
 &= 64.5
 \end{aligned}$$

Table 4. Students' Observation Checklist Sheet

No.	Name	Indicator		
		Motivation	Class Participation	Lesson Acceptance
1	A. F.			√
2	A. G. R.			
3	A. Q. A.			
4	D. A.		√	√
5	E. E. D.	√	√	√
6	F. Y.			
7	F. N. M.	√		

8	L. E. F.	-	-	-
9	I.	√	√	
10	M. R.			
11	M. S.	√		
12	R. D. P.	√	√	√
13	S. I. A.	√	√	√
14	S. P.			
15	S. A.		√	
16	S. R.			
17	Y. D. M.	√		√
Total		7	6	6

Questionnaire

Table 5. Questionnaire Sheet of Students' Difficulties Faced in Speaking

No.	Difficulty Frequency	Never	Sometimes	Always	Total
1	Fear of people responses	0	5	11	16
2	Low vocabulary	0	8	8	16
3	Lack of competence of constructing sentence	0	4	12	16
4	Lack of courage to speak	0	8	8	16
5	Do not know how to pronounce some words in English	0	10	6	16
6	Lack of comprehension	0	7	9	16

Cycle 1

Evaluation 1 (Quantitative Data)

Table 6. Evaluation 1 Speaking Scoring Sheet

No	Name	Indicator					Score	Pass	Fail
		Fluency	Grammar	Vocabulary	Pronunciation	Comprehension			
1	A. F.	10	36	16	2	12	76	√	
2	A. G. R.	10	36	12	3	15	76	√	
3	A. Q. A.	10	36	16	2	19	83	√	
4	D. A.	8	30	20	2	15	75	√	
5	E. E. D.	10	36	16	2	15	79	√	
6	F. Y.	8	24	12	2	15	66		√
7	F. N. M.	8	36	16	2	15	77	√	
8	L. E. F.	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
9	I.	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
10	M. R.	8	30	16	2	15	76	√	
11	M. S.	10	36	12	3	15	76	√	
12	R. D. P.	8	24	12	2	15	66		√
13	S. I. A.	10	36	16	2	15	79	√	
14	S. P.	8	24	12	2	15	66		√
15	S. A.	10	36	16	2	12	76	√	
16	S. R.	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
17	Y. D. M.	8	24	12	2	15	66		√
Total							1037		

Mean score of evaluation:

$$\begin{aligned}
 X &= \frac{\sum X}{n} \\
 &= \frac{1037}{14} \\
 &= 74.07
 \end{aligned}$$

Observation Checklist

Table 7. Students' Observation Checklist Sheet

No.	Name	Indicator		
		Motivation	Class Participation	Lesson Acceptance
1	A. F.		√	
2	A. G. R.	√	√	√
3	A. Q. A.	√		√
4	D. A.	√	√	
5	E. E. D.	√	√	√
6	F. Y.		√	
7	F. N. M.	√	√	√
8	L. E. F.	-	-	-
9	I.	-	-	-
10	M. R.		√	
11	M. S.	√	√	√
12	R. D. P.	√		√
13	S. I. A.	√	√	√
14	S. P.	√		
15	S. A.	√	√	√
16	S. R.	-	-	-
17	Y. D. M.	√		
Total		11	10	8

Cycle 2

Evaluation 2 (Quantitative Data)

Table 8. Evaluation 2 Speaking Scoring Sheet

No	Name	Indicator					Score	Pass	Fail
		Fluency	Grammar	Vocabulary	Pronunciation	Comprehension			
1	A. F.	10	36	16	3	12	77	√	
2	A. G. R.	10	36	12	3	15	76	√	
3	A. Q. A.	10	36	16	3	19	84	√	
4	D. A.	8	30	20	3	15	76	√	
5	E. E. D.	10	36	16	3	15	80	√	
6	F. Y.	10	36	12	3	15	76	√	
7	F. N. M.	10	36	16	2	15	79	√	
8	L. E. F.	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
9	I.	8	30	20	3	15	76	√	
10	M. R.	10	24	12	2	15	66		√
11	M. S.	10	36	12	3	15	76	√	
12	R. D. P.	8	24	12	2	15	66		√
13	S. I. A.	10	36	16	2	15	79	√	
14	S. P.	10	36	16	3	12	77	√	
15	S. A.	10	36	16	2	12	76	√	
16	S. R.	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
17	Y. D. M.	10	36	16	2	15	79	√	
Total							1143		

Mean score of *evaluation*:

$$\begin{aligned} X &= xn \\ &= 114315 \\ &= 76.2 \end{aligned}$$

Observation Checklist

Table 9. Students’ Observation Checklist Sheet

No.	Name	Indicator		
		Motivation	Class Participation	Lesson Acceptance
1	A. F.		√	
2	A. G. R.	√	√	√
3	A. Q. A.	√		√
4	D. A.	√	√	
5	E. E. D.	√	√	√
6	F. Y.		√	
7	F. N. M.	√	√	√
8	L. E. F.	-	-	-
9	I.	√	√	√
10	M. R.	√	√	√
11	M. S.	√	√	√
12	R. D. P.	√		√
13	S. I. A.	√	√	√
14	S. P.	√		√
15	S. A.	√	√	√
16	S. R.	-	-	-
17	Y. D. M.	√	√	
Total		13	12	11

The researcher began the first meeting by giving *test* and *questionnaire* related to students’ problem in speaking then explaining the objectives of the study in order to give them understanding how to follow the next meeting and to give the researcher information about their difficulties that should be overcome in speaking English. From the result of the questionnaire the researcher found that all of the students have difficulties in Grammar, Vocabulary, Pronunciation and Comprehension.

In cycle 1, the researcher implemented “Identity Parade” game Part 1 to teach speaking. In the first meeting of cycle 1 the students looked anxious and afraid to speak louder, they still shy and hesitated to express their ideas. Meanwhile in the second meeting the students looked more relaxed to follow the lesson. From the cycle 1

it can be concluded that most of students found it difficult to answer the questions given by the researcher and to make some questions related to describing people. Though the students faced difficulties in describing people they looked more motivated to speak English while playing “Identity Parade” game Part 1; furthermore the researcher had to make the students familiar with “Identity Parade” game Part 2.

In cycle 2, the researcher implemented “Identity Parade” game Part 2 to teach speaking in order to avoid boredom. In this section the students did not anxious anymore, spoke loudly and enjoyed the lesson. So it was supporting the theory of Huyen and Nga (2003) said that students liked the relaxed atmosphere, the competitiveness, and the motivation that games brought to the

classroom. Most all of the students raise their hand enthusiastically and wanted to try to answer the questions. They also had known the role of each player on the game and played it without being commanded by the researcher also had familiar with the strategy.

Based on the quantitative data was taken from *assignment* before the implementation of the action,

evaluation in cycle 1 and *evaluation* in cycle 2. The score of the students *assignment* only 43.75% that pass, in the cycle 1 the students only got 71.43%, differently in the cycle 2 the score increased to be 86.67%, This finding had met the school minimum passing grade which is 75%. It means the students achievement on speaking had improved significantly:

Table 10. The Percentage of Classical Success

No	Test	Total Individual Success	Percentage (%)
1	Assignment	7/16	43.75
2	Evaluation 1	10/14	71,43
3	Evaluation 2	13/15	86,67

The result of the above analysis showed that “Identity Parade” game as a teaching speaking strategy could be implemented in the class since it helped students to reduce the students’ anxiety to speak English and helped the students to increase their motivation to learn speaking English. This was related to the theory of Huyen & Nga's (2003) who reported that students seem to learn more quickly and retain the learned materials better in a stress-free and comfortable environment. Thus, the quality of their speaking skill had been improved. Using “Identity Parade” game as a strategy to teach speaking was suitable to help the 8th grade students in SMPI Hasanuddin Dau Malang.

Conclusion and Suggestion

It could be concluded that through the “Identity Parade” game the second year students’ speaking skill of describing people in SMPI Hasanuddin Dau Malang can be improve. There are some suggestion: (1) English teacher are suggested to implement the procedure developed in this study. However, some parts of the procedure need to be adjusted in order to suit the students’ level of ability and also the existing conditions. In addition, teachers should also explore many different techniques to help students to speak English enjoyably without being anxious; (2) For the stake holders including head masters and government, this study suggests that they can facilitate the implementation of “Identity Parade” game to practice speaking English. Moreover, they can enroll the teacher to conduct seminar related to the using of “Identity Parade” game as a strategy in teaching English so the teachers can update their knowledge

dealing with teaching technique; (3) The use of “Identity Parade” game improves the students’ skill in speaking about other specification (other than describing people) are the area that needs to be explored further. In addition, future researchers are suggested to use more respondents in different setting and conditions to see whether the strategy can be implemented effectively.

References

- Arikunto, S. (1998). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*. Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta.
- Arikunto, S. (2002). *Prosedur Penelitian, Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*. Jakarta: PT Rineka Cipta.
- Burns, Anne. (1999). *Collaborative Action Research for English Language Teacher*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Hadfield, Jill. (1999). *Beginners Communication Games*. England: Addison Wesley Longman Ltd. Harlow.
- Huyen, N.T.T. & Nga, K.T.T. (2003). “Learning Vocabulary Through Games”. [Online]: *Asian EFL Journal*. Available: www.262-games-in-the-esl-and-efl-classroom.html. [21 April 2015]
- Nurgiyantoro, Burhan. (1994). *Penilaian dalam Pengajaran Bahasa dan Sastra*. Yogyakarta: BPFY Yogyakarta

- Pichette, F. (2009). "Second language anxiety and distance language learning". *Foreign Language Annals*, 42, (1), 77-93.
- Saricoban, Arif. & Metin, Esen. (2000). "Songs Verse and Games for Teaching Grammar". [Online]: *The Internet TESL Journal*. Available: <http://iteslj.org/techniques/saricoban-songs.html> [21 April 2015]
- Sumarno. (2002). *Memadu Metode Penelitian Kualitatif & Kuantitatif*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Woodrow, L. (2006). "Anxiety and Speaking English as a Second Language". [Online]: *RELC Journal*. 37; 308. Available: <http://rel.sagepub.com>. [21 April 2015]