

# THE IMPLEMENTATION OF “SPEAK ENGLISH WITH ME” PROGRAM ON SPEAKING ABILITY OF STUDENTS OF ENGLISH COURSE AT UPT BAHASA OF IBI DARMAJAYA IN THE ACADEMIC YEAR OF 2014/2015

**Betty Magdalena**

**Lecturer at Informatics and Business Institute Darmajaya Bandar Lampung**

Jalan Z.A. Pagar Alam No.93, Labuhan Ratu, Bandar Lampung, Lampung

Magdalenabetty16@gmail.com

## ABSTRACT

This research is aimed at knowing the implementation of “Speak English with Me” program toward speaking ability of students of English course at UPT Bahasa of IBI Darmajaya. This research uses random sampling technique where there are 50 out of 685 students of Elementary English 2 (level 2) taken as the sample. In the research, there are two kinds of tool used to collect the data; they are questionnaire and documentation. The result of the research shows that “Speak English with Me” program can be implemented to improve speaking ability of students of English course at UPT Bahasa of IBI Darmajaya.

## KEY WORDS

Implementation, “Speak English with Me”, English course

## 1. Introduction

In the era of globalization the ability to communicate in English has become a demand to people from different fields of study, such as education, health, business and technology. English as a language in common used by people all over the world is still a foreign language to the people of Indonesia. In other words, it is neither mother tongue nor the second language of the nation. To be able to communicate in English well, a person must master the four language skills, *listening*, *speaking*, *reading* and *writing* and language components such as grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation.

Speaking ability is one of productive language skills where a speaker can communicate information to a listener. In fact, it is sometimes considered as a parameter of a person’s language competence. On the other side, many learners intensively taking an English lesson at English courses have to feel dissatisfied with their achievement after their study because they cannot get what they expect. This might be caused by some factors such as too big number of students in one course class, limited practice time for learners, and low motivation and unself-confidence. Those problems are, in fact, faced by most students taking English course at UPT Bahasa of IBI Darmajaya that they feel like to have very little time to practice their English. Based on the result of students’ English competence after joining the course, it indicates that their achievement in English is not remarkable yet. Many students still get difficulties in communicating and applying their knowledge and skill of English either orally or in a written form.

The problems of the research can be formulated as follows: (a) Can “Speak English with Me” program be implemented to the students of English course at UPT Bahasa IBI Darmajaya? (b) Is “Speak English with Me” program able to improve the speaking ability of the students of UPT Bahasa IBI Darmajaya?

The objectives of the research are (a) to know how much “Speak English with Me” program can be implemented to the students at UPT Bahasa? (b) find out the correlation between “English English with Me”

program and speaking ability of the students of the English course at UPT Bahasa

Furthermore, this result of the research is expected to be able to be (a) used practically as a reference by English teachers, lecturers or instructors for teaching speaking effectively, and a supporting reference for other researches to conduct further researches, and (b) used theoretically as a supporting theory to enrich former relevant theories, and as a specific concept on learning styles in group learning theories.

## **2. Literature Review and Hypothesis**

### **2.1 Literature Review**

#### **2.1.1 “Speak English with Me” Program**

“Speak English with Me” program is an alternative program to improve languages skills especially speaking ability of students at UPT Bahasa IBI Darmajaya where they have to demonstrate or practice their speaking ability through dialogs or conversations in pairs talking over a topic provided by an instructor. He/she will observe and give scores on a control card for their conversation. This speaking activity is usually done by the end of the class or at the beginning of class as a review. This program can be an alternative solution to help improve speaking ability of the students, encourage them to practice their speaking more. Furthermore, it is a sound solution to the problems faced by the students having difficulties in communicating in English.

#### **2.1.2 Speaking**

Speaking, an important language skill, is an act of expressing thought, feeling, or opinion orally where it involves a speaker and a listener. According to Siahaan (2008: 2) speaking is a productive language skill that a person is able to communicate information to another. In addition, Lado (1991 : 240) defines speaking as (a) an act of expressing oneself to a real world, (b) an ability to tell about actions or situations verbally, and (c) an act of communicating or expressing ideas smoothly. Therefore,

it can be concluded that speaking is a person’s act or ability in expressing ideas, feeling, or experiences to another.

#### **2.1.3 Speaking Ability**

Speaking ability is the ability to express ideas, thought, feelings and opinions orally. Siahaan (2008: 2) states that, the spoken productive language skill is called speaking. It is the skill of speaker to communicate information to listener or group listener. Additionally, speaking ability is one of language abilities to be learned and mastered by the students in learning a foreign language. By practicing speaking the language learned, the students will more easily master it. Speaking is limited to the ability to conduct a simple conversation on some subjects, while speaking skill is a difficult one to access with precision since it is a complex skill to acquire. In communicating with other people, it is important to know the situation whether it is formal or informal. Besides, it is also important to know that the language used, in this case English, can be standard or non-standard so that they can communicate effectively.

According to Littlewood success is measured not only in the functional effectiveness of the language, but also in the terms of the acceptability of the forms that are used. In other words, it can be concluded that students’ speaking ability is their ability to express their ideas, opinion, thought, experiences and feelings using English with good mastery of grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, fluency and comprehension.

#### **2.1.4 Activities to Promote Speaking**

There are many activities to promote speaking. According to Kayi (2006), there are thirteen activities to promote speaking, which are:

- a. Discussions
- b. Role Play
- c. Simulations

- d. Information Gaps
- e. Brain Storming
- f. Storytelling
- g. Interviews
- h. Story completion
- i. Reporting
- j. Playing Cards
- k. Picture Narrating
- l. Picture Describing
- m. Find the Differences

Based on the thirteen activities to promote speaking above, *Role play* is a relevant speaking –promote activity in which students are to work in pairs or in peers playing roles of different characters provided by an instructor. According to Djamarah and Zain (2002 : 67) there are some advantages of role play:

- a. Role play helps students train themselves to understand and memorize the role play material.
- b. It enables students to be initiative and creative.
- c. It is able to help foster students' language competence.
- d. It helps students get accustomed to accepting and sharing responsibilities with others.
- e. It helps students practice using a correct language.

## 2.2 Hypothesis

Based on the formulation of problem, objective of the research, and theoretical framework, the hypothesis can be formulated as follows:

- a. "Speak English with Me" program can be implemented to the students of English course at UPT Bahasa IBI Darmajaya.
- b. "Speak English with Me" program is able to improve the speaking ability of the students of UPT Bahasa IBI Darmajaya.

## 3. Research Method

### 3.1 Population and Sample

Population of the research is all students of level 2 at UPT Bahasa in the period of April-June 2015 with the total number of the students as 685 distributed into 46 classes. The sample taken is students of level 2 because the course material at level 2 is more communicative and the students' speaking ability is better than those at level 1. The sample is taken by using *random sampling* technique, meaning that each has the opportunity to be selected as a sample (Sugiyono : 2003 : 74-78). Further, the sample is 50 students of level 2 taken randomly from 3 classes by picking out 15 to 20 students out of those classes.

### 3.2 Variables of the Research

Sugiyono (2009 : 38) defines research variable as an attribute or characteristics of a person, an object, or an action that has specific variation determined by a researcher to study and then to draw a conclusion. In the research, there are two variables, (a) "Speak English with Me" program as independent variable (X), and Speaking Ability as dependent variable (Y). On "Speak English with Me" program is given 13 question items with 5 dimensions, and at the students' speaking ability is given 7 questions with 5 dimensions.

### 3.3 Location of the Research

There are two techniques used to collect the data of the research. They are:

- (a) Questionnaire. In this research, the researcher uses direct close questionnaire because the respondents just have to give a cross mark (X) on the answer they choose. This technique is applied to obtain qualified descriptive data used to test the hypothesis through *index scale model* with 5 options for each question. The four options are (1) Extremely Agree (*SS*) with score 5, (2) Agree (*S*) with score 4, (3) Neutral (*N*) with score 3, (4) Disagree (*TS*) with score 2, and Strongly



1	4	4	5	5	3	4	4	29
2	3	5	5	5	5	4	5	32
3	4	2	5	5	3	4	5	28
4	4	5	5	5	3	3	5	30
5	1	2	5	5	5	3	3	24
6	1	4	5	5	5	5	5	30
7	2	4	5	5	3	4	4	27
8	2	4	5	5	5	3	3	27
9	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	33
10	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	33
11	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	30
12	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	26
13	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	26
14	4	4	5	5	5	3	3	29
15	4	4	5	5	5	3	3	29
16	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	33
17	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	33
18	4	4	5	5	1	3	3	25
19	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	33
20	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	33
21	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	35
22	2	4	5	5	5	5	5	31
23	5	4	4	4	3	3	5	28
24	4	4	5	5	1	3	3	25
25	2	4	5	5	5	5	5	31
26	4	4	5	5	5	3	3	29
27	4	4	5	5	5	3	3	29
28	4	4	5	5	3	3	3	27
29	4	4	5	5	1	3	3	25
30	4	4	5	5	5	3	3	29
31	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	33
32	4	4	2	3	3	2	2	20
33	4	4	5	5	5	3	3	29
34	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	26
35	4	4	5	5	3	3	3	27
36	5	5	4	4	4	3	3	28
37	4	4	5	5	5	2	2	27
38	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	33
39	4	4	5	5	5	3	3	29
40	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	33
41	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	35
42	4	4	5	5	5	3	3	29
43	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	26

44	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	33
45	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	30
46	2	4	5	5	3	3	3	25
47	4	4	5	5	3	3	3	27
48	4	4	5	5	5	3	3	29
49	4	4	5	5	5	4	4	31
50	4	4	5	5	5	3	3	29

**Recapitulation Table of Variable Data**

Respondent	Variable X	Variable Y
1	52	29
2	47	32
3	47	28
4	42	30
5	52	24
6	45	30
7	28	27
8	42	27
9	45	33
10	44	33
11	52	30
12	53	26
13	54	26
14	56	29
15	53	29
16	47	33
17	48	33
18	54	25
19	26	33
20	42	33
21	41	35
22	41	31
23	50	28
24	57	25
25	48	31
26	44	29
27	45	29
28	50	27
29	51	25
30	49	29
31	43	33
32	43	33
33	45	29
34	54	26
35	49	27
36	52	28
37	45	27
38	49	33
39	47	29
40	43	33
41	44	35
42	43	29
43	56	26
44	52	33
45	26	30
46	51	25
47	52	27

48	49	29
49	46	31
50	45	29

From the data above, it can be seen that 50 respondents for Variable X with the highest score as 56 and the lowest score as 26. On the other side, for Variable Y the highest score is 35 and the lowest score is 25.

#### 4.3 Data Tabulation Table

No	SS (5)	S (4)	N (3)	TS (2)	STS (1)	Score
1	7	8	3	1	1	79
2	7	7	2	4	0	77
3	5	8	3	3	0	72
4	4	9	2	5	0	72
5	5	10	2	2	1	76
6	6	8	2	3	1	75
7	4	8	2	5	1	69
8	5	6	3	5	1	69
9	5	11	1	3	0	78
10	6	10	2	0	2	78
11	6	9	3	2	0	79
12	6	10	2	1	1	79
13	7	9	2	1	1	80
14	7	10	3	0	0	84
15	7	7	3	3	0	78
16	6	10	2	2	0	80
17	7	9	2	2	0	81
18	7	8	2	3	0	79
19	4	7	3	5	1	68
20	7	7	1	4	1	75
21	6	8	1	5	0	75
22	5	8	2	5	0	73
23	7	8	2	2	1	78
24	5	10	4	1	1	80
25	5	10	3	2	0	78
26	6	6	4	3	1	73
27	5	8	3	4	0	74
28	3	10	4	3	0	73
29	6	8	2	3	1	75
30	6	8	4	2	0	78
31	5	10	2	2	1	76
32	5	9	3	3	0	76
33	4	10	3	2	1	74
34	8	8	2	0	2	80
35	6	8	4	2	0	78
36	6	9	2	3	0	78
37	6	7	2	4	1	73
38	7	10	2	0	1	82
39	3	11	5	1	0	76
40	5	10	1	4	0	76
41	5	10	2	3	0	77
42	4	9	2	5	0	72
43	8	8	2	2	0	82
44	5	10	2	3	0	77
45	7	7	0	6	1	76

46	5	9	3	3	0	76
47	6	9	3	2	0	79
48	5	10	4	0	1	78
49	6	9	2	2	1	77
50	7	6	3	4	0	76

From the computation result, it is gained that the highest score is 84 and the lowest score is 68.

#### 4.4 Table of Respondents' Answer Characteristics toward Variable X ('Speak English with Me' Program)

Item	SS		S		N		TS		STS	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
P1	10	10	16	20	7	14	22	44	6	12
P2	18	36	15	30	17	34	0	0	0	0
P3	7	4	15	8	3	6	27	66	8	16
P4	19	38	23	40	8	16	1	2	2	4
P5	8	16	19	38	4	8	17	34	2	4
P6	18	36	23	46	3	6	3	6	36	6
P7	9	8	26	42	14	28	8	16	3	6
P8	18	36	21	42	9	18	0	0	2	4
P9	10	10	40	70	0	0	9	18	1	2
P10	15	20	38	66	0	0	6	12	1	2
P11	12	14	39	68	0	0	9	18	0	0
P12	13	16	41	72	2	4	3	6	1	2
P13	13	16	41	72	0	0	1	2	5	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>170</b>		<b>357</b>		<b>67</b>		<b>106</b>		<b>34</b>	

Based on the result of computing respondents with 13 questions at variable X ('Speak English with Me' Program), it is gained that 170 respondents choose SS, 357 respondents choose S, 67 respondents choose N, 106 respondents choose TS, and 34 respondents choose STS.

#### 4.5 Table of Respondents' Answer Characteristics toward Variable Y (Speaking Ability)

Item	SS		S		N		TS		STS	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
P1	4	8	37	74	1	2	5	10	3	6
P2	5	10	42	84	0	0	3	6	0	0
P3	39	78	9	18	0	0	2	4	0	0
P4	39	78	9	18	2	4	0	0	0	0

P5	30	60	7	14	11	22	1	2	1	2
P6	16	32	5	10	26	52	3	6	0	0
P7	20	40	3	6	24	48	3	6	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>153</b>		<b>112</b>		<b>64</b>		<b>17</b>		<b>4</b>	

Based on the result of computing respondents with 7 questions at variable Y (Speaking Ability) Program), it is gained that 153 respondents choose SS, 112 respondents choose S, 64 respondents choose N, 17 respondents choose TS, and 4 respondents choose TS.

**4.6 Interval Determination**

**4.7.1. Characteristics Interval for Variable X ('Speak English with Me' Program)**

Below is interval determination proposed by Slovin.

$$R = \frac{(\text{Number of Question X}) \times (\text{Highest Score}) - (\text{Number of Question X}) \times (\text{Lowest Score})}{5}$$

$$R = \frac{(13 \times 5) - (13 \times 1)}{5}$$

$$R = \frac{65 - 13}{5}$$

$$R = \frac{52}{5}$$

$$R = 10.4 = 10$$

**4.7.2. Characteristics Interval for Variable Y (Speaking Ability)**

$$R = \frac{(\text{Number of Question X}) \times (\text{Highest Score}) - (\text{Number of Question X}) \times (\text{Lowest Score})}{5}$$

$$R = \frac{(7 \times 5) - (7 \times 1)}{5}$$

$$R = \frac{35 - 7}{5}$$

$$R = \frac{28}{5}$$

$$R = 5.6 = 5.$$

**4.7 Determining the class for Variable X ('Speak English With Me' program) with interval 10**

No.	Range	Scaling Norm
1.	26 - 35	Poor
2.	36 - 45	Bad
3.	46 - 55	Fair
4.	56 - 65	Good
5.	66 - 75	Very Good

**4.8 Determining the class for Variable X (Speaking Ability) interval 5**

No.	Range	Scaling Norm
6.	25 - 29	Poor
7.	30 - 34	Bad
8.	35 - 39	Fair
9.	40 - 49	Good
10.	50 - 55	Very Good

**4.9 Average Scoring Percentage for Variable X ('Speak English with Me' Program)**

Total Questionnaire Questions (PX1 – PX13)

Number of questions

$$\frac{170 + 357 + 67 + 106 + 34}{13}$$

$$\frac{734}{13}$$

$$56$$

Based on the average scoring percentage, it is seen that for Variable X ("Speak English with Me" Program) respondents respond GOOD because it can be used to improve their speaking ability.

**4.10 Average Scoring Percentage for Variable Y (Speaking Ability)**

Total Questionnaire Questions (PY1 – PY7)

Number of questions

$$\frac{153 + 112 + 64 + 17 + 4}{7}$$

$$\frac{350}{7}$$

50

Based on the average scoring percentage, it shows that for Variable Y (Speaking Ability) the speaking ability of the students become VERY GOOD because their speaking becomes well-controlled and their speaking ability gets much improved.

## 5. Conclusion and Suggestion

### a. Conclusion

Based on the result of analysis and discussion, it can be concluded that “Speak English with Me” program can be implemented well to the students of UPT Bahasa IBI Darmajaya since their speaking ability, after joining the program, becomes much improved.

### b. Suggestion

Based on the result of analysis and discussion, it suggested that:

1. Instructors should be to allocate time for students to practice their English. There should be good time management for activities in class. Student talking time and teacher talking time should be properly managed.
2. Instructors should be more selective in providing topics familiar to students in order that they are able to express their opinion or experiences comfortably.

(2) Arikunto, Suharsini. *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*. Yogyakarta. PT. Rineka Cipta. 2010

(3) Djamarah, Syaiful Bahri & Aswan Zain, *Strategi Belajar Mengajar*, Jakarta, Rineka Cipta. 1995

(4) Harmer, Jeremy. *How to teach English*. England: Pearson Longman. 2007.

(5) ————. *Practice of English Language Teaching*. Longman, England. 2003.

(6) Kayi, Hayriye. *Teaching Speaking Activities to Promote Speaking in a Second Language*. The Internet Journal. Vol.XII,no 11 <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Kayi-Teaching Speaking. html>. 2006

(7) Little Wood, William., 2004. *Communicative Language Teaching*, Cambridge University Press.

(8) Siahaan, Sanggam. *The English Paragraph*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.2008.

(9) Setiadi, Ag. Bambang. *Metode Penelitian Untuk Pengajaran Bahasa Asing*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu. 2006.

(10) ————. *Teaching English As a Foreign Language*. Graha Ilmu, Yogyakarta. 2006.

(11) Sugiyono, *Metode Penelitian Bisnis*. Bandung. Pusat Bahasa Depdiknas. 2003.

(12) Sugiyono, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R & D*. Penerbit Alfabeta, Bandung. 2008 - 2012

(13) Suprijono, Agus. *Cooperative Learning Teori dan Aplikasi Paikem*. Pustaka Pelajar. Yogyakarta. 2013.

(14) Wilkins, D.A. *Linguistics in Language Teaching*. London, Edward Arnold Publisher. 1980.

## REFERENCE

(1) Ardhana in Meleong Lexy J., *Metodologi Penelitian Kuantitatif*. Bandung, Rosda Karya. 2002