



The Use of Group Discussions to Improve the Achievement in Speaking Skill

Erna Maya Manafe

Kupang, Indonesia

Ernamanafe213@gmail.com

Article info

Received Date: March 11, 2020

Accepted Date: March 12, 2020

Published Date: July 31, 2020

Keywords:*

Group Discussion, Speaking Ability, Independent variable

Abstract*

This is a pre- experimental research which used one group pre- test and post-test design. The objective of this research was to know the effectiveness of group discussion in improving the students' English language learning using group discussion. The populations of this research were the ninth grade students of SMPN 13 Maulafa Kupang numbering 233 students. The samples of this research were 35 students. The variables of the research were the students' achievement, as depend on variable, and the use of group discussion as the independent variable. The method of collecting data used in this research was pre-test that was given before treatment and post-test that was given after treatment to analyzed the data, the writer used t-test formula. the result of the research showed that the score of the t-test in the first session was 11.15, while in the second session was 14. The score of t-table for level of significant for df 34 in level 0.05 is 2.30 and in level 0.01 is 2.73. After comparing the score of t-test and t-table, it means that group discussion can significantly improve the students' achievement in English speaking ability. Besides, it also can make the class active, alive, and motivate student to work together to develop and share ideas more freely. The problems that make the students were difficult in speaking was the lack of vocabulary mastery.

1. Introduction

In this globalization era, the role of English in various aspects of life becomes more dominant and very important. The use of this language has touched all fields of science, technology, culture, and commerce. Other than that, this language is also used as a communication tool to

conduct relations between countries around the world. Whether it is bilateral or multilateral cooperation. In other words, English has become the international language used throughout the world. Seeing such important role, the government issues a policy to implement English language learning activities to learners in various educational institutions, particularly at high school level. Currently English language learning has reached a high level. It is characterized by the decision of the government as one of the core subjects in national examinations. This fact prosecutes those responsible for education, in this case the teacher, to do a lot of breakthroughs in the learning process. The breakthroughs should certainly be innovative and creative ones, for example by the use of interesting teaching methods and techniques. The aim is that students are motivated to engage in learning activities undertaken by teachers in classroom. With the motivation in the learner sides, it is expected that English language skills of the students will continue improving. Based on the school-based level curriculum (KTSP), the purpose of English language learning at junior high school is to develop the language skills, involved written and oral communication dealing with the development of science technology in this globalization era (Hasan, 2000) and means that the learners are required to have the integrated English language skills, whether aspects of listening, speaking, reading or writing.

The four skills, speaking become the most dominant and important in communication activities. The reason is that people with physical and mental limitations can talk without having to master other aspects. Moreover, speaking activity trains the learners to be able to communicate properly in accordance with the existing context and culture. Polite or not of a person, can also be seen from the way he/she speaks. That is why speaking becomes the most dominant aspect of the other aspects and the main focus in the learning activities.

Nevertheless, the fact shows that most junior high school students have not been able to speak English well. One reason is that English is not the language of instruction as well as Malaysia which has had English as a language of instruction in the country (Alwasilah, 1985). This makes the learners only learn the language at school during English lessons take place. After the lesson, they re-use Indonesian language or their local language to communicate. Besides, with a monotonous learning method, then English becomes a boring subject for them.

The phenomena above also occurred in the ninth grade students of SMPN 13 Kupang. English speaking ability of these students from year to year is still low. This can be seen in such cases like when students try to express their ideas in English orally, they often stop in the middle of the conversation, because they have very limited vocabulary and most of them have lack of the courage to talk in English to their teacher and classmates. Therefore, the writer would try to improve their English language skills through group discussion activities

Slavin (1995) states that learning in group can develop self-confidence, sympathy, and love. In small groups, learners can participate actively in speaking and group dynamics are increasingly developing (Gotebiowska. 1998). Therefore, teacher can form small groups that consist of active and passive learners to practice working together with mutual respect, so that group members have the courage to express themselves and communicate in the target language fluently. In a line with the above descriptions, Weissberg (1988) asserts that by dividing the class to small discussion groups is the most effective form to develop oral language skills. It is expected that by using oral communication in group, students' English speaking skill can be improved.

2. Research Methods

In this study the writer presents some points related to the method of the research, that research design, population and samples. Research procedure, research instrument and technique of data analysis

2.1. Type of Research

The research is basically pre-experimental research which uses only one group to be treated, to find out the effectiveness of using group discussion in improving the speaking skill of the research subjects. The design that is used in this research is one group pre-test and post-test design. In this research the students were tested twice. First was pre-test which was done before the treatment and then post-test which is done after the treatment (Nazir, 1988:279). The design can be seen as follows:

Pre Test	Treatment	Post Test
To	X	T1

Note:

To : Pre Test

T1 : Posttest

x : The treatment in teaching speaking

2.2 Types of variables

There were two variables involved in this research, they are dependent variable and independent variable. The dependent variable is the variable that depends on other variable. While independent variable is a free variable or the variable that does not depend on other variable. This variable affects the existence of the dependent variable. In this research, the dependent variable is the students' achievement in speaking ability, while independent variable is the use of group discussion.

2.3 Population and Sample

According to Arikunto (2009:130), Population is the entire subjects of research, while sample is the part of the population that can represent and describe the character of the actual population. If the number of the population is less than 100, then all the population can be taken as the sample, but if the number is more than 100, then the research can take 10-15% of population to be the samples.

Based on the statements above, the population of this research were all the ninth grade students of SMP Negeri 13 Kupang in the Academic year 2010/2011, amounting to 233 people. While the samples were 15% from the total population. So the number of sample of this research were 35 students.

To facilitate the implementation of the study, the researcher chose a class to be used as the research sample. In this case, the researcher chose class XIA which consisted of 35 students as objects of research. This reason also accords to the design of the study, that was pre-experimental study which used one group pre test and post-test design.

2.4 Research Procedures

To obtain the accurate data, the writer used the following procedures in conducting the research

1. Preparation

In this stage, the writer prepared the entire instruments such as the test (Pre-Test and Post-Test) and the lesson plans for teaching speaking by applying group discussion.

2. Pre-test

In this stage, the writer gave a pre-test to the students the teacher distributed them a set of pictures about public service and asked them some questions that had to be answered spontaneously and individually. Each student got one picture to be described. They were given 30 minutes to prepare themselves for the pre-test. Then the rest time about 60 minutes was used to conduct pre-test.

3. Giving Treatment

For the treatment, the writer used the meeting of the next day, The purpose of this way is in order that the treatment can be applied optimally, To apply the treatment, the students were divided into seven small groups consisted of five students as members of each group The materials to be discussed were the pictures that were used in the pre-test The students were given time about 30 minutes to discuss their material, and the rest time was used to present the result of their discussion.

4. Post-Test

A post-test was given to know the improvement of the students in speaking ability after the treatment. The questions of this post-test were similar to those of the pre-test. The test was conducted individually because it needed much time to asses each student, then the writer used the next meeting to conduct post-test.

5. Collecting Data

The writer collected the data from the pre-test and post- test by using an observation form which adapted from David P. Harris (1984)in Ratminingsih (www.undiksha.ac.id) about the criteria of evaluation speaking ability. The form is as follows:

No	Name	Pronuciation					Grammar					Vocabullary					Fluency					Comprehension					Total Score					
1	A	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
2	B	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
3	C	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
4	D	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
5	E	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
6	F	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
...	G	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
35																																

Each criterion was scored by using rating scale I to 5, in which 1 is worst, 2 is worse, 3 is enough, 4 is good, 5 is best. All scores were summed to get total scores that were used to count the mean.

6. Analyzing data

In analysing data, the writer counted the mean of the pre-test and post- test, then compared them whether or not group discussion was effective in improving speaking skill of the students of the second grade of SMP N 13 Kupang.

2.5 Research Instrument

The instrument used in this research is an achievement test. It consists of a chain of questions or exercises to measure the students' skill in speaking English, both before and after treatment.

2.6 Technique of Data Analysis

To know whether group discussion is effective in improving speaking skill or not, the writer used t-test formula (Arikunto, 2009) to compare the result of pre-test and post-test so the steps to analyze the data are as follows:

1. Counting the mean of pre-test and the mean of post-test, by using this formula as stated by Arikunto 2009:284):

$$\bar{x} = \frac{\sum X_i}{n}$$

In which

\bar{x} = the mean

n = the total number of sample

X_i = total score

2. Counting the means difference by using t-test formula(Arikunto,2009:395)

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum D^2 - \frac{(\sum D)^2}{N}}{N(N-1)}}$$

In which

T = the score of t-test form sample

\bar{X} = the difference between the mean score of pre-test and post-test

D = the difference between the score of pre-test and post-test of each student

D^2 = the quadrant of the difference between the score of pre-test and post-test of each student

N = the total of sample

3. Theoretical Framework

In this study the theory used by Weissberg (1988) asserts that by dividing the class to small discussion groups is the most effective form to develop oral language skills.

4. Discussion

In this research presents the finding and discussions of this study. In this case the writer involves the results of research, analyzes the result then draws conclusion of the research. To find the data accurately, the writer treated the students in two different sessions. In the first sessions, the writer conducted pre-test before treatment. To begin the research, the writer gave the students some pictures related tu public service. Each student got one picture. After that the writer asked them to tell the picture by using their own words individually. This was the pre-test. All students had opportunity to explain their pictures. The writer took their score which are presented in table 1. Then the writer gave them a treatment, that is group discussion. In this treatment, the students were divided into seven small groups, because their number is 35 students. In this treatment, the material is the material that was given before pre-test. After the treatment the writer gave a post-

test. The questions of this post-test are dealing with the material discussed in group. The two tables below show the score of the pre-test conducted before treatment and post-test conducted after treatment in speaking achievement to all the students of class IX of SMP Negeri 13 Kupang.

Table 1. The score of pre-test in speaking achievement of the first session

No	Name	Pronunciation	Grammar	Vocabulary	Fluency	Comprehension	Total Score (X ₁)
1	A	2	2	2	2	2	10
2	B	2	2	3	2	2	11
3	C	2	2	3	2	2	11
4	D	2	2	2	2	2	10
5	E	1	1	1	1	1	5
6	F	1	1	1	1	1	5
7	G	3	3	3	3	4	16
8	H	1	1	1	1	1	5
9	I	2	2	2	2	2	10
10	J	1	1	1	1	1	5
11	K	2	2	2	2	2	10
12	L	2	2	2	2	2	10
13	M	1	1	1	1	1	5
14	N	2	2	2	2	2	10
15	O	3	3	3	3	4	16
16	P	2	2	2	2	2	10
17	Q	1	1	1	1	1	5
18	R	2	2	2	2	2	10
19	S	2	2	2	2	2	10
20	T	2	2	2	2	2	10
21	U	2	2	2	2	2	10
22	V	2	2	2	2	2	10
23	W	1	1	1	1	1	5
24	X	2	2	2	2	2	10
25	Y	3	2	3	3	4	15
26	Z	1	1	1	1	1	5
27	AA	1	1	1	1	1	5
28	BB	4	3	3	4	4	18
29	CC	1	1	1	1	1	5
30	DD	1	1	1	1	1	5
31	EE	1	1	1	1	1	5
32	FF	4	3	3	4	3	17
33	GG	1	1	1	1	1	5
34	HH	1	1	1	1	1	5
35	II	2	2	2	2	2	10
	Total	63	60	63	63	65	314

Based on the data above, the writer counted the mean score of the pre-test of the first session using formula $\bar{x}_1 = \frac{\sum X_1}{N}$ in which \bar{x}_1 is the mean of the pre-test, $\sum X_1$ is the total scores of the pre-test, and N is the total numbers of the samples.

$$\bar{x}_1 = \frac{314}{35}$$

$$\bar{x}_1 = 8.97$$

So the mean of the pre-test of the first sessions is 8.97

Table 2. The score of post-test in speaking achievement of the first session

No	Name	Pronunciation	Grammar	Vocabulary	Fluency	Comprehension	Total Score (X ₂)
1	A	2	3	3	3	3	14
2	B	3	3	3	3	3	15
3	C	2	3	3	3	3	14
4	D	3	3	3	3	3	15
5	E	2	2	3	3	3	13
6	F	2	2	3	3	3	13
7	G	3	3	3	3	3	15
8	H	3	2	3	3	3	14
9	I	3	3	3	3	3	15
10	J	3	2	3	3	3	14
11	K	3	3	3	3	3	15
12	L	3	2	3	3	3	14
13	M	3	2	3	3	3	14
14	N	3	3	3	3	3	15
15	O	4	3	3	4	4	18
16	P	3	2	3	3	3	14
17	Q	3	2	3	3	3	14
18	R	3	3	3	3	3	15
19	S	3	3	3	3	3	15
20	T	3	3	3	3	3	15
21	U	3	3	3	3	3	15
22	V	3	3	3	3	3	15
23	W	3	3	3	3	3	15
24	X	3	3	3	3	3	15
25	Y	4	3	3	4	4	18
26	Z	3	2	3	3	3	14
27	AA	3	2	3	3	3	14
28	BB	4	3	3	3	3	16
29	CC	2	3	3	3	3	14
30	DD	3	3	3	3	3	15
31	EE	3	3	3	3	3	15
32	FF	4	3	4	4	4	19
33	GG	2	3	3	3	3	14
34	HH	2	2	3	3	3	13
35	II	3	2	3	3	3	14
	Total	102	93	106	108	108	517

To count the mean of the post-test, the writer used formula $\bar{x}_2 = \frac{\sum X_2}{N}$ in which \bar{X}_2 is the mean of the post-test, $\sum X_2$ is the total scores of the post-test, and N is the total numbers of the samples.

$$\bar{x}_2 = \frac{517}{35}$$

$$\bar{x}_2 = 14.77$$

So the mean of the post-test of the second sessions is 14.77

The next step is putting the total scores of the two tests above in a new table to provide data for counting the t-test observation scores. Below is the table 3 that shows the comparison of total

scores of the pre-test and post-test, the differences between the total scores of the two tests, and the quadrates of the differencess of the two tests.

Table 3. The compasrison between the pre-test and post-test scores of the first session

Name	X1	X2	D1 (X1-X2)	D ₁ ²
A	10	14	-4	16
B	11	15	-4	16
C	11	14	-3	9
D	10	15	-5	25
E	5	13	-8	64
F	5	13	-8	64
G	16	15	1	1
H	5	14	-9	81
I	10	15	-5	25
J	5	14	-9	81
K	10	15	-5	25
L	10	14	-4	16
M	5	14	-9	81
N	10	15	-5	25
O	16	18	-2	4
P	10	14	-4	16
Q	5	14	-9	81
R	10	15	-5	25
S	10	15	-5	25
T	10	15	-5	25
U	10	15	-5	25
V	10	15	-5	25
W	5	15	-10	100
X	10	15	-5	25
Y	15	18	-3	9
Z	5	14	-9	81
AA	5	14	-9	81
BB	18	16	2	4
CC	5	14	-9	81
DD	5	15	-10	100
EE	5	15	-10	100
FF	17	19	-2	4
GG	5	14	-9	81
HH	5	13	-8	64
II	10	14	-4	16
Total	314	517	-203	1501

From the table 3 above the writer counts the score of t observation (t_0) of the first session. The formula is:

$$t_0 = \frac{\bar{X}_D}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum D_1^2 - \frac{(\sum D_1)^2}{N}}{N(N-1)}}$$

To count the t observation, it is needed to count the mean differences of the two tests. For this, the writer uses the formula: $\bar{X}_D = \frac{\sum X_D}{N}$, in which \bar{X}_D is the mean differences of the pre-test and post-test, $\sum X_D$ is the total score of the differences between pre-test and post-test, and N is the total number of the samples.

$$\bar{X}_D = \frac{-203}{35}$$

$$\bar{X}_D = -5.8$$

So the writer has got the score of \bar{X}_D . It is (-5.8)

$$\sum D = -203$$

$$\sum D^2 = 1501$$

$$N = 35$$

Now the writer inserts the score to the formula of t-test to gain the t-observation score.

$$t_0 = \frac{-5.8}{\sqrt{\frac{1501 - \frac{(-203)^2}{35}}{35(35-1)}}}$$

$$t_0 = \frac{-5.8}{\sqrt{\frac{1501 - 1174.4}{35(34)}}}$$

$$t_0 = \frac{-5.8}{\sqrt{0.27}}$$

$$t_0 = \frac{-5.8}{0.52}$$

$$t_0 = -11.15$$

Although the score of t observation is minus, the score does not mean negative score. Based on the t observation score above, it means that there is as much as 11.15 differences in speaking achievement between the learning which used group discussion and the learning before using group discussion. Then the writer finds out the score of t table for df 34 at the significance of 0.05 and 0.10. At the 0.05, the score of t table is 2.03, while for level 0.01, the score of t-table is 2.73. From the result, the writer gets that $2.03 < 11.15 > 2.73$. This indicates that there is a significant achievement in speaking ability in learning using group discussion. To assure the result of the data, the writer designed another learning activity by using discussion. This is to assure that the group discussion is really effective to improve the students' achievement in speaking ability. The material is still same as the first session. The difference is if in first session, the teacher used pictures, then in the second session, the writer used text. Below are the tables that show the pre-test and post-test of the second session.

Table 4. The score of pre-test in speaking achievement of the second session

No	Name	Pronunciation	Grammar	Vocabulary	Fluency	Comprehension	Total Score (X ₂)
1	A	3	2	3	3	3	14
2	B	2	2	2	3	3	12
3	C	2	2	2	3	3	12
4	D	3	2	2	3	3	13
5	E	2	3	2	2	2	11
6	F	2	3	2	3	3	13
7	G	3	3	3	3	4	16
8	H	2	3	2	3	2	12
9	I	3	2	2	3	2	12
10	J	2	2	3	2	2	11
11	K	3	3	3	3	2	14
12	L	3	3	3	3	3	15
13	M	2	2	3	3	2	12

14	N	3	3	3	2	3	14
15	O	3	3	3	4	4	17
16	P	3	3	3	2	3	14
17	Q	3	3	3	3	3	15
18	R	3	3	2	2	3	14
19	S	2	2	2	2	3	11
20	T	2	3	3	2	3	12
21	U	2	3	2	3	3	14
22	V	2	3	2	2	3	12
23	W	3	3	3	2	2	12
24	X	3	3	3	2	2	13
25	Y	3	3	2	3	4	16
26	Z	3	3	2	3	2	13
27	AA	2	2	3	3	2	11
28	BB	3	3	3	4	4	17
29	CC	2	2	3	3	3	13
30	DD	3	3	3	3	3	15
31	EE	3	3	4	3	3	15
32	FF	3	3	3	3	4	17
33	GG	2	3	3	3	3	14
34	HH	3	3	3	3	2	14
35	II	3	3	3	3	2	14
Total		91	95	93	97	98	474

Based on the data above, the writer counted the mean score of the pre-test of the first session using formula: $\bar{Y}_1 = \frac{\sum Y_1}{N}$ in which \bar{Y}_1 is the mean of the pre-test, $\sum Y_1$ is the total scores of the pre-test, and N is the total number of samples.

$$\bar{Y}_1 = \frac{474}{35} = 13.54$$

So the mean score of the pre-test of the first session is 13.54

Table 5. The score of post-test in speaking achievement of the second session

No	Name	Pronunciation	Grammar	Vocabulary	Fluency	Comprehension	Total Score (X ₂)
1	A	3	3	3	3	3	15
2	B	3	3	4	3	3	16
3	C	3	3	3	3	3	15
4	D	3	3	3	3	3	15
5	E	3	3	3	3	4	16
6	F	3	3	3	3	4	16
7	G	4	4	4	4	4	20
8	H	3	3	3	3	3	15
9	I	3	3	3	3	4	16
10	J	3	2	4	4	4	17
11	K	3	3	3	3	4	16
12	L	3	3	3	4	4	17
13	M	3	3	3	3	3	15
14	N	3	3	3	4	3	16
15	O	4	4	4	4	4	20
16	P	3	3	3	3	4	16
17	Q	3	3	3	3	4	16
18	R	3	3	3	3	4	16
19	S	3	2	3	4	3	15
20	T	3	3	3	3	3	15
21	U	3	3	4	4	3	17
22	V	3	3	3	4	3	16
23	W	3	2	3	3	4	15
24	X	3	3	4	4	4	18

25	Y	4	3	4	4	4	19
26	Z	3	3	3	3	3	15
27	AA	3	3	3	4	3	16
28	BB	4	3	4	4	4	19
29	CC	3	3	3	4	4	17
30	DD	3	3	3	4	4	17
31	EE	3	3	3	3	4	16
32	FF	4	3	4	4	4	19
33	GG	3	3	4	3	3	16
34	HH	3	3	4	3	3	16
35	II	3	4	4	4	4	18
Total		110	104	117	121	125	577

To count the mean of the post-test, the writer uses formula $\bar{Y}_2 = \frac{\sum Y_2}{N}$, in which \bar{Y}_2 is the mean of the post-test, $\sum Y_2$ is the total scores of the post-test, and N is the total number of samples.

$$\bar{Y}_2 = \frac{577}{35} = 16.49$$

So the mean score of the post-test of the second session is 16.49

From the two tables of the second session above, the writer make a new tables (tables 6) that shows the differences between the pre-test and the post-test, and their quadrates. This table is needed to prepare data to calculate the t observation for the second session.

Table 6. The comparision between the pre-test and post-test scores of the second session

Name	Y ₁	Y ₂	D ₂ (Y ₁ -Y ₂)	D ₂ ²
A	14	15	-1	1
B	12	16	-4	16
C	12	15	-3	9
D	13	15	-2	4
E	11	16	-5	25
F	13	16	-3	9
G	16	20	-4	16
H	12	15	-3	9
I	12	16	-4	16
J	11	17	-6	36
K	14	16	-2	4
L	15	17	-2	4
M	12	15	-3	9
N	14	16	-2	4
O	17	20	-3	9
P	14	16	-2	4
Q	15	16	-1	1
R	14	16	-2	4
S	11	15	-4	16
T	12	15	-3	9
U	14	17	-3	9
V	12	16	-4	16
W	12	15	-3	9
X	13	18	-5	25
Y	16	19	-3	9
Z	13	15	-2	4

Name	Y ₁	Y ₂	D ₂ (Y ₁ -Y ₂)	D ₂ ²
AA	11	16	-5	25
BB	17	19	-2	4
CC	13	17	-4	16
DD	15	17	-2	4
EE	15	16	-1	1
FF	17	19	-2	4
GG	14	16	-2	4
HH	14	16	-2	4
II	14	18	-4	16
Total	474	577	-103	355

By using the first formula as the first session, the writer also calculates the mean of the difference between the pre-test and post-test of this second session.

After calculating the data by using the formulas as presented before, the writer gets that mean difference of two test session is -2.94, $\sum D_2$ is -103, $\sum D_2^2$ is 355 and N 35. The next is put the scores in the t observation formula

$$t_0 = \frac{-2.94}{\sqrt{\frac{355 - \frac{(-103)^2}{35}}{35(35-1)}}$$

$$t_0 = \frac{-2.94}{\sqrt{\frac{355 - 303.11}{35(34)}}$$

$$t_0 = \frac{-2.94}{\sqrt{0.044}}$$

$$t_0 = \frac{-2.94}{0.21}$$

$$t_0 = -14$$

The same as the first session, the score of t observation of the first session is also minus, but it does not mean the score is negative. The score of t observation is higher than t table. It means that there is as much as 14 significant improvement in speaking skill by using group discussion in learning. The score of t table for level of significance for df 34 in level 0.05 is 2.03 and for level 0.01 is 2.73. For this, the writer got that t observation is higher than t table. This indicates that the use of group discussion in session two also showed a significant improvement to the speaking achievements of the students of class IX of SMP Negeri 13 Kupang. After analyzing the data both the first and second sessions, the writer concludes that alternative hypotheses (H_a) that said that the use of group discussion can improve the students' achievement in speaking ability is accepted and rejects the hypothesis null that said that the use of group discussion cannot improve the students' achievement in speaking ability. The conclusion above is based on the scores of t observations (t₀) of the two sessions. The formula to accept the H_a is t_{0.05} < t₀ > t_{0.01}. The first session shows that 2.03 < 11.15 > 2.73, and for the second session 2.03 < 14 > 2.73. These scores indicated that there was a significant improvement in students' speaking ability as much as 11.15 point in the first session and 14 point in the second session through the use of group discussion in learning compared to the individually learning.

Besides calculating the scores of the observation of the two tests, the writer also saw that in the pre-test of the second session, the score is higher than the pre-test in the first session. It was indicated by the mean score of the first pre-test which is only 8.97 while the second pre-test is 13.54. It also happened to the post-test of the second session which gained mean as much as 16.49. This score is higher than the first session which gained mean as much as 14.77. These results indicate that the students show an improvement in English learning from day to day. Besides scoring the pre-test and post-test, actually the writer also observed the process of the application of the treatment. The students showed a positive response when the teacher asked them to present the result of their discussion in front of the class. In this treatment, the writer actually tried to train them to work together in developing ideas about the material, be braver in speaking, and so on. Before the first treatment, the writer found most students had difficulties in stating their ideas. But after the treatment, these difficulties were quite reduced. This was indicated by the students' participation in class activities when the teacher asked them to describe the pictures they have. In the second pre-test and post-test, the writer found that the score was more increasingly. This is possibly caused by the topic of the second session still related to the topic of the first session. Although the results show positive improvement, but there were also some weaknesses that need more controls when applying this treatment for examples noise of the students' voice when they are discussing. Sometimes there were one or two students of a group tried to annoy the members of other group, and this invited the noise that disturbed the group discussion. But this was still under controlled in sense that they show a good attitude when teacher asked them to discuss their material.

5. Novelty

The novelty in this study the process of studying English in the classroom shows that the applied of group discussion more effective, because the situation in the classroom more active and all the student have the opportunity to share all their ideas. Beside that there are some new vocabularies that student can use and get during the process of group discussion.

6. Conclusion

Based on the data presented in the previous chapter, the writer concludes that the use of group discussion can improve the achievement in speaking ability of the ninth grade students of sMP Negeri 13 Kupang. This is proven by the score of the t observation of the two sessions which are higher than t table. The group discussion is an interesting activity which makes the class more active and alive. In this situation, the students can work together to develop and share the ideas more freely. In their attempts to learn English, unavoidable that some students of the observed class still had. It was difficulties in speaking English. Their difficulties among others due to the lack of English vocabulary mastery. This caused they were difficult to state ideas and of course this affected their pronunciation, grammar, diction or vocabulary choice, fluency, and comprehension dealing with the material given by the teacher.

7. Acknowledgements

I would like to dedicate my best thanks to Dr. Ni Luh Nyoman Seri Malini, S.S., M.Hum, as my research supervisor who always leads and encourages me to get the best critical thoughts and ideas in finishing this article.

References

- Ahmad A. 1986. *Metode Khusus Pendidikan Agama*, Armico, Bandung
 Alwasilah A. C. 1985. *Sosiologi Bahasa*. Angkasa, Bandung

- Arikunto, S. 1989. *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktis*. Bina Aksara Jakarta
- Arikunto, S. 2009. *Manajemen Penelitian*. Rineka Cipta, Jakarta
- Brown, G., Yule, G. 1983, *Teaching the Spoken Language*. Cambridge University Press. New York
- Dharma, S., et al. 2008. *Strategi Pembelajaran dan Pemilihannya*. Depdiknas. Jakarta
- Gotebiowska, A. 1998. *Getting Students to Talk: Resource Book for Teacher with Role-Plays, Simulation and Discussion*. Prentice Hall. New York
- Hasan., U. M., Dra. 2006. *Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan*. MTs Nusantara. Probolingo
- Hornby, A. S. 1995. *Oxford Advanced Learners Disctionary*. Oxford University Press
- Moeliyono, A. M., et al. 1990. *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia*. Balai Pustaka. Jakarta
- Mudini, et al. 2009. *Pembelajaran Berbicara*. Depdiknas. Jakarta
- Mudjiastuti, S. 2006. *Penggunaan Metode Diskusi pada Mata Pelajaran IPS*. UNS. Semarang
- Nawawi, H. 1993. *Pendidikan Dalam Islam*. Usaha Nasional, Surabaya
- Nazir, M. 1998. *Metode Penelitian*. Ghalia Indonesia. Jakarta
- Rakhmad, J. 1998. *Metode Penelitian Komunikasi*. Rosda Karya. Bandung
- Ratminingsih, N. M., *Drills and Tota Physical Response; An Attempt to Enchance Young Learners' Oral Communication Comptence.*, www.undiksha.ac.id, download on August 22nd, 2001
- Richards, J. C. 2008, *Teaching Listening and Speaking from Theory to Practice*. Cambride University Press. New York
- Riduwan, 2006. *Belajar Mudah Penelitian*. Alfabeta. Bandung
- Roestiyah, NK, 1991. *Strategi Belajar Mengajar*, Rineka Cipta. Jakarta
- Salvin, R. E. 1995. *Cooperative Learning: Theory, Research and Practive*. Allyn and Bacon. Boston
- Surakhmad, W. 1996. *Pengantar Interaksi Mengajar Belajar (Dasar dan Teknik Metodologi Pengajaran)*, Tarsito. Bandung
- Tarigan, H. G. 1983, *Berbicara Sebagai Suatu Ketrampilan Berbahasa*. Angkasa. Bandung
- UNESCO. 2006. *Practical Tips for Teaching Large Classes: A Teacher's Guide*, Bangkok
- Vadnay, M. 2006. *Aplied Linguistic I*. Bolcsesz. Konzorcium
- Weissberg, R. 1998. *Promoting Acquisition in the Conversation Class*
- Zuhairini, et all. 1993. *Metodik Khusus Pendidikan Agama*. Usahan Nasional. Surabaya

Biography of Authors



Erna Maya Manafe, SPd. was born in Kupang on Mei 15th, 1978. She graduated her bachelor degree at Undana University 2011.

Email: ernamanafe213@gmail.com