

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF POWER TEACHING TECHNIQUE TO TEACH SPEAKING VIEWED FROM STUDENTS' SELF-ACTUALIZATION

Eka Yuniasih

Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Negeri (STAIN) Jurai Siwo Metro

E-mail: xk_zoe@yahoo.co.id

Abstract: The objectives of the research was finding out whether: (1) Power Teaching Technique is more effective than Drilling Technique to teach speaking at the Eleventh Graders of SMA N 1 Metro; (2) the students having high self-actualization have better speaking skill than those having low self-actualization; and (3) there is an interaction between teaching techniques and students' self-actualization in teaching speaking. The method which was applied in this research was experimental study. It was conducted at the eleventh graders of SMA N 1 Metro. It consists of 11 classes, the total number of population is 325 students. The sample of the research were two classes. The sampling technique used was cluster random sampling. Each class was divided into two groups (the students having low and high self-actualization). The data were analyzed by using ANOVA 2 x 2 and Tukey test. The data analysis shows the following findings: (1) Power Teaching Technique is more effective than Drilling Technique in teaching speaking to the eleventh graders of SMAN 1 Metro; (2) the students having high self-actualization have better speaking skill than those having low self-actualization; and (3) there is an interaction between teaching techniques and students self-actualization in teaching speaking. It can be concluded that Power Teaching Technique is an effective technique to teach speaking at the eleventh graders of SMA N 1 Metro.

Keywords: Power Teaching, Drilling Technique, Self-Actualization

INTRODUCTION

There are four skills in teaching and learning a language: listening, reading, speaking, and writing, but out of the four skills, speaking is considered as the most essential skill to be mastered. Speaking is an essential tool for communicating, thinking, and learning. Speaking skill in learning English is a priority for many second language or foreign language learners.

To master speaking skill, students must be trained to use English in communication orally. Speaking English is not easy for

learners especially for students SMA. It is because the learners should also master several important elements, such as pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. Besides that, the use of proper teaching technique will influence students' speaking skill.

For many years, teaching speaking has been undervalued and English language teachers have continued to teach speaking just as a repetition of drills or memorization. However, today's world requires that teaching speaking should improve students' communicative

skill, because the students can express themselves.

There are many techniques of language teaching that may be selected for teaching speaking. Two of them that are appropriate in developing speaking skill are Power Teaching and Drilling Technique. Power Teaching or Whole Brain Technique is a technique from Power Teachers of America. Power Teaching was created in 1999 by Chris Biffle, a college philosophy professor, and two elementary school teachers. This technique may be used on students in kindergarten through college. The objectives of this technique are to get the attention of the class, to give students the opportunity to learn something and teach it to a peer.

On the opposite, Drilling Technique is a type of highly controlled oral practice in which the students respond to a given cue. The response varies according to the type of drill (Matthews, Spratt, and Dangerfield, 1991: 210). Drills are used usually at the controlled practice stage of language learning so that students have the opportunity to accurately try out what they have learned. Drills help students to develop quick, automatic responses using a specific formulaic expression or structure, such as a tag ending, verb form, or transformation.

Students' speaking skill is also influenced by their self-actualization. Self-actualization is the tendency to actualize, as little as possible, individual capacities in the world. Maslow (1970: 149) defines self-actualization as the desire for self-fulfillment, namely the tendency for him (the individual) to become actualized in what he is potential. This tendency might be phrased as

the desire to become more and more what one is, to become everything that one is capable of becoming. Based on these definitions, it can be stated that self-actualization is driving life force that will ultimately lead to maximize one's abilities and determine the path of one's life. Students who have high self-actualization realize that they have talent and the students want to try something they do not know, the students are also brave to explore their knowledge creatively. As the result, the students will get a fast progress in speaking.

Meanwhile, students having low self-actualization tend to be silent and passive in the classroom. They are reluctant and shy to practice their speaking in the classroom. Low self-actualization students need the intensive guidance from their teacher. Therefore, they are assumed as learners who are able to master speaking skill in slow progress.

The objectives of this research to find out whether; (1) Power Teaching Technique is more effective than Drilling Technique to teach speaking; (2) The students of the eleventh grade of SMA N 1 Metro in the Academic Year of 2012/2013 who have high self-actualization have better speaking skill than those who have low self-actualization; (3) There is an interaction between teaching techniques and self-actualization to teach speaking.

DISCUSSION

There are many definition of speaking have been proposed. The following are the definition of speaking proposed some expert. Florez (1999: 1) states that speaking is an interactive process of

constructing meaning that involves producing and receiving and processing information. Speaking requires learners not only to know how to produce specific points of language such as grammar, pronunciation, or vocabulary (linguistic competence), but also to understand when, why, and in what ways to produce language (sociolinguistic competence).

Bailey (2005: 2) defines speaking as a productive skill, which consists of producing systematic verbal utterances to convey meaning. Someone who can speak English well is able to use the language both accurately and fluently. Accurate speakers do not make mistakes in grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation, while fluent speakers can express themselves appropriately and without hesitation.

From the theories written above, it can be concluded that speaking skill is an interactive process between speaker and listener in conveying and interpreting meaning that requires speakers to be able to use some elements of speaking skill. Speaking is also a language skill that enables the speakers not only to produce words and utter ideas in their mind but also deliver and present information and share feeling to other people.

(Syakur, 1987: 3) in Nurilam (2011: 10) states that generally, there are at least four components of speaking skill: comprehension, grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and fluency.

Micro skills and macro skills are the skills of oral production. The micro skills refer to producing the smaller chunks of language such as phoneme, morphemes, words, collocation, and phrasal units. The

macro skills imply the speaker's focus on the larger elements: fluency, discourse, function, style, cohesion, nonverbal communication, and strategic options.

Power teaching is a technique which is developed by Western, as Healey (2009: 4) state that Power Teaching is a technique from Power Teachers of America. This is an interesting technique which can increase students' attention and concentration. Moreover, according to Arthur (2009: 3) Power Teaching is a grassroots educational reform that is based on interactive teaching strategies. In other words this technique requires students to be active in the class.

According to Battle (2009: 6) "Power Teaching is educational tomfoolery based on brain based learning". It means that this technique uses whole brain to share and utter their idea.

Based in the definition above, it can be concluded that power teaching is the teaching technique demanding students to notice and concern on what they are learning, so they can understand what teacher gives and teach their friends based on their own comprehension.

Biffle (2008: 4) Power Teaching consists of six techniques which are called "the big six", they are class-yes, classroom rules, teach-okay, scoreboard, Hand and eyes, and the last is switch. There are some advantages of applying Power Teaching Technique in the class activities. Arthur (2009: 6) states that the benefits of Power Teaching technique are Teachers feel empowered, arsenal of teaching strategies make their students succeed, can build a sense of community and a family feeling for

students and teachers alike, it makes the most challenging students sit in the class and allows the teacher to teach and the students to learn.

In addition, from you tube in script form mention that the benefit of whole brain teaching are stimulating and motivating struggling learners to use whole brain and promote good behavior.

There is no perfect or the best technique in teaching learning process, therefore this technique has the weakness too. Jensen (2012) in his journal describes that this technique potentially makes noise and attracts students to play themselves, because there are elements of the game. This technique can interfere with any other class during the lesson. This technique is more emphasized on pronunciation and fluency. Students don't have a lot of notes of subject matter.

Drilling is a technique that has been used in foreign language class rooms for many years. In the decades of the 1940's through 1960's, language pedagogy was obsessed with the drill. According to Brown (2001: 131), a drill may be defined as a technique that focuses on a minimal number of language forms (grammatical or phonological structures) throughout some type of repetition. Based on the Behaviorists view, learning to speak a foreign language was simply a correct habit formation, it was thought that repeating phrases correctly lots of times would lead to mastery of the language. From the definition above it can be concluded that drilling means listening to a model, provided by the teacher, or a tape or another student, and repeating what is heard.

Auckland and Christchurch (1999: 8) in their journal states that

there are eight steps of drilling; (a) Once students give you the word or utterance, provide your own oral model at a natural speed; (b) Students repeat the language together as a group; (c) Having broken down the oral model of the language, repeat it again at a more natural speed; (d) If the word or utterance you want to drill is on the white board, start by wiping it off; (e) Re-elicite the language you want to drill using the prompts; (f) Nominate individual students and get them to repeat the word or utterance; (g) Show students a prompt-a picture or some key words that relate to the language you want to drill; (h) Highlight any key pronunciation features of the new language – demonstrate these orally rather than using the white board.

Word press (2010: 10) states that drilling help our learners memorise language by the teacher's control and the teacher can correct any mistakes that students make and encourage them to focus on difficulties at the sometime.

Word press (2010: 10) states that drilling often makes the students not creative. In all drills learners have no little choice over what is said so drills are form of very controlled practice. The teacher needs to handle the drills, so that the students are not over used and they don't go on far too long. One of the problems about drills is that they are fairly monotonous.

Maslow (1970: 150) defines that self-actualizations "the full use and exploitation of talents, capacities, potentialities, etc." It means that self-actualization is instinctive in humans needs to do the best that he can or the process of being your self and develop the properties and potential of the unique

psychological, the desire to become more and more what one is, to become everything that one is capable of becoming (Goble, 1970). In addition, Maslow (1970: 177) states that self-actualization is fundamentally equivalent to the goals for education, learning environments, and creativity. So, there is correlation between self-actualization and education. Self-actualization can be defined as the development of the most height to fall the talents, fulfilling quality and capacity.

Based on the explanation above it can be inferred that self-actualization is a natural process for almost all humans to being themselves and develop the properties and potential of the unique psychological in order to explore all of the talents, fulfill all quality and capacity to be perfect person or in other words self-actualization is a psychological need to increase, to develop, and also to make use of their talent to be themselves based on their ability.

People are able to actualizet hem sel ves and fully aware that there are barriers to the existence or control their behavior and actions to do something. According to Friedman and Schustack (2008: 352), there are three factors influencing self-actualization: internal factor, external factor, and parenting.

A person who has reached self-actualization to be optimal has a different personality with humans in general. According to Maslow (1970: 165) there are some characteristics that indicate a person's self-actualized; (1)Perceiving reality more accurately and objectively; (2) being spontaneous, natural, and genuine; (3) being problem-centered, not self-centered or egotistical;

(4) can concentrate intensely; (5) being independent, self-sufficient, and autonomous; (6) have the capacity to appreciate again and again simple and common-place experiences; (7) have (and are aware of) their rich, alive, and intensely enjoyable "peak experiences"—moments of intense enjoyment; (8) have a high sense of humor, which tends to be thoughtful, philosophical, and constructive (not destructive); (9) form strong friendship ties with relatively few people, yet are capable of greater love; (10) accept themselves, others, and human nature; (11) being strongly ethical and moral in individual (not necessarily conventional) ways; (12) being democratic and unprejudiced in the deepest possible sense; (13) enjoy the work in achieving a goal as much as the goal itself; (14) being capable of detachment from their culture, and can objectively compare cultures; (15) being creative, original, and inventive, with a fresh, naive, simple, and direct way of looking at life.

Based on the theoretical review, the hypotheses are: (1) Power Teaching Technique is more effective than Drilling Technique to teach speaking at the eleventh grader of SMA N 1 Metro; (2) The students with high self-actualization have better speaking skill than the students with low self-actualization; (3)There is an interaction between teaching techniques and the students' self-actualization in teaching speaking.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research was conducted at SMA N 1 Metro, which is located on A.H Nasution street Metro Timur Kota Metro Lampung for the eleventh

grader. Related to this study, the writer used experimental study. According to Creswell (2008: 60), the experimental study is procedure in quantitative research in which the investigator determines whether an activity or material makes difference in results for participants. A factorial design is used to analyze the main effects for both experimental variables as well as an analysis of the interaction between treatments.

The population of this research was the students of eleventh grader of SMA N 1 Metro . In this research the total population is 325 students. The samples of this research were two classes of the eleventh graders AP1 and AP2 of SMA N 1 Metro,

The writer used cluster random sampling. Creswell (2003: 156) argues that cluster random sampling is ideal when it is impossible or impractical to compile a list of the elements composing the population. The writer used cluster random sampling because the population in this research consisted of some classes and each class was relatively homo-geneous. It means that each class in population has an equal chance of being included in the sample, so that it can be used to produce representative sample (Burke, 2000: 183). The classes were divided into two groups, group 1 as the control class and group 2 as an experimental class. The writer set the experimental and control classes randomly using lottery. Furthermore, based on the students' self-actualization, median used to divide both experiment class and control class into two groups (high and low self-actualization).

The data that the writer needs in this research are the result of

questionnaire of self-actualization and score of speaking test. Creswell (2008: 394) defines questionnaire as a form used in survey design that participants in a study complete and return to the research. The purpose of using questionnaire is to get information from research participants or respondents about their self-actualization

The speaking test is used to know the students speaking skill. The test was conducted at the end of treatment. The aim of this test is to know the difference of the students' speaking skill after they were taught by using Power Teaching and Drilling Technique. The instruction in the speaking test was written in a piece of paper. Before administering a test to the students, the writer should firstly check the readability of the instrument. Richard (1985: 233) states that readability is written materials that can be easily read and understood.

The techniques used in analyzing the data were descriptive analysis and inferential analysis. Descriptive analysis is used to know the mean, median mode, and standard deviation of the score of the speaking test. The normality and homogeneity of the data should also be known, it was done before testing the hypothesis using ANOVA test. *Lilifors* is used to examine the normality test to know whether the sample distributes normally or not. The data are normal if L_o is lower than L_t . Meanwhile, *Barlet* test is used to examine the homogeneity test. Homogeneity test is used to know whether the data are homogeneous or not. If the values of χ_0^2 are smaller than χ_t^2 the data are homogeneous. In this research, the inferential analysis used is

multifactor analysis of variance 2x2. H_0 is rejected if F_o is higher than F_t . If H_0 is rejected, the analysis is continued to know the significant difference between the cells by using Tukey test. Furthermore, ANOVA is also used to examine the significant interaction between the two independent variables to the dependent variable. Before applying ANOVA, the writer conducted the prerequisite test which consists of normality and homogeneity tests.

THE RESULT AND DISCUSSION OF THE RESEARCH

Based on the calculation result of score of students who are taught using Power Teaching Technique, the highest score achieved by students is 85 and the lowest one is 53. The range is 32, the number of classes used is 6, and the class width (interval) is 6. The mean is 68.57, the mode is 67.93, the median is 68.25, and the standard deviation is 9.10. the highest value of L_o (L obtained) is 0.0978 and L_t (L table) is 0.161 at the significance level $\alpha = 0.05$. Because L_o is lower than L_t (L_o 0.0978 < L_t 0.161), it can be concluded that the data are in normal distribution.

Based on the calculation result of score of students who were taught using Drilling Technique, the highest score achieved by students is 78 and the lowest one is 53. The range is 25, the number of classes used is 6, and the class width (interval) is 5. The mean is 65.35 the mode is 56.00, the median is 64.50, and the standard deviation is 9.02. the highest value of L_o (L obtained) is 0.0973 and L_t (L table) is 0.161 at the significance level $\alpha = 0.05$. Because L_o is lower

than L_t (L_o 0.0973 < L_t 0.161), it can be concluded that the data are in normal distribution.

Based on the calculation result of score of students who have high self-actualization, the highest score achieved by students is 85 and the lowest one is 53. The range is 32, the number of classes used is 6, and the class width (interval) is 6. The mean is 68.78, the mode is 57.00, the median is 69.50, and the standard deviation is 9.85. the highest value of L_o (L obtained) is 0.1197 and L_t (L table) is 0.161 at the significance level $\alpha = 0.05$. Because L_o is lower than L_t (L_o 0.1197 < L_t 0.161), it can be concluded that the data are in normal distribution.

Based on the calculation result of score of students who have low self-actualization, the highest score achieved by students is 78 and the lowest one is 53. The range is 25, the number of classes used is 6, and the class width (interval) is 5. The mean is 65.53, the mode is 65.36, the median is 65.00, and the standard deviation is 8.20. the highest value of L_o (L obtained) is 0.0835 and L_t (L table) is 0.161 at the significance level $\alpha = 0.05$. Because L_o is lower than L_t (L_o 0.0835 < L_t 0.161), it can be concluded that the data are in normal distribution.

Based on the calculation result of score of students having high self-actualization who were taught using Power Teaching Technique, the highest score achieved by students is 85 and the lowest one is 65. The range is 20, the number of classes used is 5, and the class width (interval) is 5. The mean is 75.64, the mode is 79.17, and the standard deviation is 5.56. the highest value of L_o (L obtained) is 0.1409 and L_t (L

table) is 0.227 at the significance level $\alpha = 0.05$. Because L_o is lower than L_t (L_o 0.1409 < L_t 0.227), it can be concluded that the data are in normal distribution.

Based on the calculation result of score of students having low self-actualization who were taught using Power Teaching Technique, the highest score achieved by students is 76 and the lowest one is 53. The range is 23, the number of classes used is 5, and the class width (interval) is 5. The mean is 61.71, the mode is 54.38, and the standard deviation is 7.75. the highest value of L_o (L obtained) is 0.1587 and L_t (L table) is 0.227 at the significance level $\alpha = 0.05$. Because L_o is lower than L_t (L_o 0.1587 < L_t 0.227), it can be concluded that the data are in normal distribution.

Based on the calculation result of score of students having high self-actualization who were taught using Drilling Technique, the highest score achieved by students is 70 and the lowest one is 53. The range is 17, the number of classes used is 5, and the class width (interval) is 4. The mean is 61.35, the mode is 57.83, and the standard deviation is 5.30. the highest value of L_o (L obtained) is 0.1197 and L_t (L table) is 0.227 at the significance level $\alpha = 0.05$. Because L_o is lower than L_t (L_o 0.1197 < L_t 0.227), it can be concluded that the data are in normal distribution.

Based on the calculation result of score of students having low self-actualization who were taught using Drilling Technique, the highest score achieved by students is 78 and the lowest one is 55. The range is 23, the number of classes used is 5, and the class width (interval) is 5. The mean is 68.78, the mode is 76.72, and the standard deviation is 7.50. the highest value of L_o (L obtained) is

0.1687 and L_t (L table) is 0.227 at the significance level $\alpha = 0.05$. Because L_o is lower than L_t (L_o 0.1687 < L_t 0.227), it can be concluded that the data are in normal distribution.

Homogeneity test is conducted to know whether the data are homogeneous or not. The data can be said as homogeneous if χ_o^2 is lower than χ_t^2 at the level significance $\alpha = 0.05$. Based on the result of homogeneity test, it can be seen that the score of $\chi_o^2 = 2.53$. From the table *Chi-Square* distribution with the significant level $\alpha = 0.05$ the score of χ_t^2 is 7.813. Because χ_o^2 (2.53) is lower than χ_t^2 (7.813) or $\chi_o^2 < \chi_t^2$ (2.53 < 7.813), it can be concluded that the data are homogeneous.

Multifactor analysis of variance (ANOVA) is used to calculate the data. In ANOVA, H_o is rejected if F_o is higher than F_t ($F_o > F_t$). it means that there is significant difference. Furthermore, after using ANOVA, Tuckey's HSD test is used. The test is conducted to know the difference of each cell. From the computation result of ANOVA test, it can be concluded that: The score of F_o between columns (teaching technique) is 5.094 and the score of F_t at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ is 4. Because F_o (5.094) is higher than F_t at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (4.00), H_o stating that there is no difference in the effectiveness between rows is significant. In other words, there is a significant difference on the students speaking skill between those who have high self-actualization and those who have low self-actualization.

The score of F_o columns by rows (interaction) is 33.127 and

the score of F_t at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ is 4. Because F_o (33.127) is higher than F_t at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (4.00), H_o stating that there is no interaction between teaching techniques and self-actualization in teaching speaking is rejected, and there is an interaction between two variables, teaching techniques and students self-actualization. In other words, it can be said that the effect of teaching techniques on the students' speaking skills depends on the students' degree of self-actualization.

Furthermore, in order to find out whether the mean difference between the cells is significant or not. Tuckey's HSD test is used. The following is the result of analysis of the data using Tuckey's HSD test: The Result of Tukey's HSD Test.

N	Data	Sample	q_o	q_t	A	Status
1	A1 dan A2	28	3.192	2.89	0.05	Significant
2	B1 and B2	28	2.98	2.89	0.05	Significant
3	A1B1 and A2B1	14	8.012	3.03	0.05	Significant
4	A1B2 and A2B2	14	3.686	3.03	0.05	Significant

Power Teaching and Drill in teaching speaking is rejected and the difference between columns is significant. In other words, there is a significant difference on the students speaking skill between those who were taught using Power Teaching Technique and those who were taught using Drilling Technique.

The score of F_o between rows (self-actualization) is 4.126 and the score of F_t at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ is 4. Because F_o (4.126) is higher than F_t at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (4.00), H_o stating that there is no difference in

speaking skill between the students having high self-actualization and those having low self-actualization is rejected and the difference between

Based on the table above. it can be seen that:

The score of q_o between columns is 3.192 and the score of q_t of Tukey's table at the level significance of $\alpha = 0.05$ is 2.89. Because $q_o > q_t$ or q_o (3.192) is higher than q_t (2.89). it can be concluded that there is a significant difference on the speaking skill between those who were taught using Power Teaching and those who were taught using Drilling Technique .The score of q_o between rows is 2.98 and the score of q_t of Tukey's table at the level significance of $\alpha = 0.05$ is 2.89. Because $q_o > q_t$ or q_o (2.98) is higher than q_t (2.89). it can be concluded that there is a significant difference on the speaking skill between those who have high self-actualization and those who have low self-actualization.

The score of q_o between cells A1B1 and A2B1 is 8.012 and the score of q_t of Tukey's table at the level significance of $\alpha = 0.05$ is 3.03. Because $q_o > q_t$ or q_o (8.012) is higher than q_t (3.03). it can be concluded that using Power Teaching Technique differs significantly from Drilling Technique for teaching speaking to the students who have high self-actualization.

The score of q_o between cells A1B2 and A2B2 is 3.686 and the score of q_t of Tukey's table at the level significance of $\alpha = 0.05$ is 3.03. Because $q_o > q_t$ or q_o (3.686) is higher than q_t (3.03).it can be concluded that using Power Teaching Technique differs significantly from Drilling Technique for teaching

speaking to the students having low self-actualization.

Based on the Tukey number 3 and 4, for the students having high self-actualization, using Power Teaching is more effective than Drilling Technique, and for the students having low self-actualization, using Drilling Technique is more effective than Power Teaching, it means that there is an interaction between teaching techniques and students self-actualization in teaching speaking.

Based on the calculation result of hypothesis testing, it can be explained that: (a) Power Teaching is more effective than Drilling Technique in teaching speaking. Power Teaching is a teaching technique in which the activities focus on fluency and use the brain as a who let convey ideas or information knowledge to others. This technique also requires students to be more active, concentration the material, and deliver on what they understand to her friend with their own language and without sticking to the text or manuscript. Besides that, the objectives of this technique is to get the attention of the class and to give students opportunity to learn something and teach it to a peer. It is in line with statement from Prasetyono (2012) in his journal entitled "*Teaching Students to Speak with Power. first English*

Community Journal. June 28. 2012" stating that Power Teaching offers better opportunities for learning. Some of the learners have the opportunity to develop their idea, fluency, and accuracy through meaningful communication. The students are able to deliver the information which is received based on their comprehension knowledge.

The students cannot find the same situation if they are taught using Drilling Technique, because this technique does not need students to be active, they just repeat and follow what the teacher asks them too. In Drilling Technique, lessons in the classroom focus on the correct imitation of the teacher by the students. According to Brown (2001:131) a drill may be defined as a technique that focuses on minimal number of language forms (grammatical and phonological structures) throughout some type of repetition. It can be concluded that Power Teaching Technique is more effective than Drilling Technique to teach speaking; (b) The students having high self-actualization have better speaking skill than those having low self-actualization. The students who have high self-actualization do not have problem to utter opinion. The students are brave to express their ideas, ask question, and deliver information. They are not afraid to make little mistakes or errors when they are speaking. It is in line with statement from Heylighen (1992: 43) stating that "the behavior of self-actualizer is characterized by spontaneity, they are not afraid that what they are doing might be wrong or that other people might be think so".

On the opposite, students who have low level of self-actualization, speaking and uttering opinion is nightmare, because they do not have courage to speak, they are afraid to make mistake, they are worried about the performance in front of class, they are ashamed that their bad performance will be laughed by their friend. The students lacking self-actualization might not stand up and ask the teacher to explain one more

event though he is struggling to get a concept right. In other words, the students having low self-actualization tend to be silent and passive in the classroom. They are reluctant, unhappy, anxious, and shy to practice their speaking in the classroom. It is in line with statement from Heylighen (1992: 43) in his journal stating that the general attitude of lack self-actualization: “they feel unhappy, anxious, ashamed or guilty”.

From the explanation above it can be inferred that students having high self-actualization have better speaking skill than those having low self-actualization; (c) There is an interaction between teaching techniques and students’ degree of self-actualization in teaching speaking. Power Teaching Technique focuses on natural communication rather than linguistics form. The students learn language through natural process aiming at the real communication. The teaching activities of Power Teaching gives students high self-actualization opportunity to express themselves, shared their knowledge about what they learn based on their comprehension to their friends. Battle (2009: 14) states that Power Teaching provides maximum opportunity to students to speak the target language by providing a rich environment that contains collaborative work, authentic material and task, and shared knowledge. It allows the learners to express themselves. Students who have high self-actualization tend to be active in the class. They do not have problem to utter opinion. The students are brave to express their ideas, ask question, and deliver information. They are not afraid to make little mistakes or errors when

they are speaking. It is in line with statement from

Heylighen (1992: 43) stating that “the behavior of self-actualizer is characterized by spontaneity, they are not afraid that what they are doing might be wrong or that other people might be think so”. Thus, it is clear that power teaching is more effective to teach speaking for the students having high self-actualization.

On the contrary, Drilling Technique focuses on linguistics form of language or accuracy. Drilling Technique is basic technique of teaching repetition, speech is standardised and students can reproduce many things but never create anything new or spontaneous. Drilling technique can help the students in memorizing of common language patterns. This technique is also teacher-centered meaning that teacher is active during the teaching and learning process and the students just become the passive learners. According to Brooks (1964: 143). The teacher models the target language, controls the direction and pace of learning, and monitors and corrects the students’ performance.

The students having low self-actualization, speaking and uttering opinion is nightmare, because they do not have courage to speak, they are afraid to make mistake, they are worried about the performance in front of class, they are ashamed that their bad performance will be laughed by their friend. In other words, the students having low self-actualization tend to be silent and passive in the classroom. They are reluctant, unhappy, anxious, and shy to practice their speaking in the classroom. It is in line with statement from Heylighen (1992: 43) stating

that the general attitude of lack self-actualization: “ they feel unhappy, anxious, ashamed or guilty”. Therefore, it is clear that Drilling Technique is more appropriate to teach speaking for the students who have low self-actualization.

From the explanation above, it can be concluded that, for the students having high self-actualization, using Power Teaching is more effective than Drilling Technique, and for the students having low self-actualization, using Drilling Technique is more effective than Power Teaching, it means that there is an interaction between teaching techniques and students’ self-actualization in teaching speaking.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Based on the result of the data analysis, the research findings are: (1) Power Teaching technique is more effective than Drilling technique to teach speaking to the eleventh grade of SMA N 1 Metro; (2) the students having high self-actualization have better speaking skill than those having low self-actualization of the eleventh grade of SMA N 1 Metro; (3) there is an interaction between teaching techniques and students’ self-actualization in teaching speaking for the eleventh grade of SMA N 1 Metro in the academic year. From the research findings, it can be concluded that Power Teaching technique is an effective technique in teaching speaking for the eleventh grade of SMA N 1 Metro in the academic year of. Because there is interaction between teaching techniques and students’ self-actualization, the effectiveness of the

technique is influenced by the students’ self-actualization.

The research findings imply that Power Teaching Technique is effective to increase the students’ speaking skills of the eleventh grade of SMA N 1 Metro. Since power teaching is proved to be effective, the use of power teaching is recommended in teaching speaking. Power teaching must be applied well in teaching speaking because the aim of this technique is in line with the aim of speaking skill that is to make a meaningful communication. The teachers have to create some activities in which the students have more chance to speak up more. Power Teaching consists of six techniques which are called “the big six”, they are class-yes, classroom rules, teach-okay, scoreboard, hand and eyes, and the last is switch.

Based on the research, the writer will give the suggestion to the teacher, students, and the other researcher; (1) For the teacher, the teacher should give the guidance to the students in learning speaking, the teacher should use an appropriate technique to teach speaking, the teacher should use Power Teaching in teaching speaking, the teacher should give consideration for the students having high self-actualization; (2) For the students, the students should realize that they have important roles in teaching-learning process and the students having low self-actualization should practice more and participate actively in the learning process in order to improve their speaking skill; (3) For the future researchers, this research can be used as a reference for the future research and This research can be used as the starting point in the

similar subject to conduct other research.

REFERENCES

- Arthur, W. 2009. *Power Teaching* 2678190. Retrieved from <http://www.powerteachers.net/in dex.php?/First-Step/focuser-hands-andeyes.html>. accessed on May 13,2012
- Auckland & Crhistchruch 1999. *Drilling Technique*. New Zealand. Retrieved from. <http://www.languages.ac.nz>. Accessed on June 20,2012.
- Bailey, Kathleen. M. 2005. *Practical English Language Teaching: Speaking*. New York. McGraw- Hill
- Battle, J. 2009. Attention Getter: Class-Yes. Online document at <http://www.powerteachers.net/in dex.php?/First -Steps/attention - getter- class - yes.html>. Accessed on May 13, 2012
- Biffle, C. 2008. *Power teacher training manual*. California: Yucaipa.
- Brown, H.D. 2001. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- , 2004. *Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices*. White Plains, NY: Longman
- Creswell, John W. (2008). *Educational Research : Planning conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative, and Qualitative Research* New Jersey : Person Education, Inc.
- Donn Byrne, 1998. *Teaching Oral English* New York: Longman,
- Florez, M.A.C. 1999. Improving Adult Language Learners' Speaking Skills. Eric Digest ED435204.Retrieved in Juny 7,2012. From ERIC Database.
- Friedmand and Schustack 2008. *Kepribadian Teori klasik dan Riset Moderen* (Jilid 1). Jakarta. Erlangga.
- Goble, F. 1970. *The Third Force: The Psychology of Abraham Maslow A Revolutionary New View of Man*. Pocket Books, New York, NY.
- Healey, D. 2009. Power teaching. <http://.power teacher.org>. Accessed on May 13.2012
- Heru Prasetyono 2012, Teaching Students to Speak with Power, first English Community, Retrieved from <http://english-text.blogspot.com/2012/06/po wer -teaching.html>. Accessed on September 3, 2012.
- Heylighen, Francis. 1992. A Cognitive Systemic Reconstruction of Maslow's Theory of Self-

- actualization, PESP, Free University of Brussels, Pleinlaan 2, B-1050 Brussels, Belgium, Volum 37.
- Jensen 2012. *Practical Teaching With the Brain in Mind*. New York. Jensen Learning Corporation
- Johnson, Burke and Christensen, Larry. 2000. *Educational Research*. Quantitative and Qualitative Approach. USA: A Pearson Education Company
- Maslow, A. H. 1970. *Motivation and Personality*. (2nd ed.) New York: Harper & Row.
- , 1971. *The Farther Reaches of Human Nature*. New York: Viking Press.
- Matthews, A., M. Spratt, and L. Dangerfield. At the Chalkface. 1991. *Practical Techniques in Language Teaching*. Walton-on-Thames, UK: Thomas Nelson
- Siti Nurilam. 2011. *The Effectiveness of Functional-Notional Method to Teach Speaking viewed from Students' Creativity*. Thesis unpublished. Surakarta. Sebelas Maret University
- Tuckman. Bruce.W. 1978. *Conducting Educational Research*. Second edition .New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, inc.
- Underwood, Mary. 1997. *Teaching Listening*. New York: Longman Inc.
- Wordpress, 2010, *Teaching English for Foreign Language. Blogroll*. Retrieved from <http://teffl.wordpress.com/2010/06/13/drilling/>