

IMPROVING SPEAKING SKILL OF THE GRADE X STUDENTS THROUGH EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

Anasthasia B. Watun¹, Konder Manurung², Darmawan³

Abstract

The objective of this research was to prove that the implementation of experiential learning could improve the speaking skill of the grade X students at SMA Katolik St. Andreas Palu. The research design was pre-experimental research. The population of this research was the tenth grade students at SMA Katolik St. Andreas Palu and the sample was class XC. The number of the sample was 28 students. The researcher employed cluster random sampling and adopted one group pre-test and post-test design. The pre-test was used to measure the students' skill in speaking before the treatment, and post-test was used to measure the students' skill after the treatment. Based on the result of both tests, the researcher found that the t-counted value is 13.01. The level of significance counted is set up at 0.05 and the degree of freedom (df) of the table value is $28 - 1 = 27$. The researcher found that t-table was 2.052. It showed that t-counted was higher than the t-table. It means that the hypothesis of this research is accepted. In conclusion, the use of experiential learning was effective to improve the students' skill in speaking.

Keywords: Speaking Skill; Experiential Learning.

INTRODUCTION

English is a global language that is used by human being to communicate in many different nations all over the world. It is because English is an official language to be used internationally. There have been many international conferences or meetings where English is the language used to communicate. Furthermore, English is the most learnt language around the world. Shortly, English is very important for everybody who involves in international events or activities. English is used as an instrument of communication. English has four skills and three components. They are: listening, speaking, reading, writing, grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation. Speaking is one of English skill that must be mastered in communication competence. Like the other skills, it is more complicated than it seems at first and involves more than just pronouncing words.

¹ Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris FKIP Universitas Tadulako – email: anasthasiawatun@ymail.com

² Email: Kmanurung@hotmail.com

³ Email:

Speaking is one of important parts in teaching language because it includes one of four basic language skills. Speaking is one of English skills that must be mastered in communication competence. We need to speak to each other in order to get information. It is widely known that there are four skills that one has to master in order to communicate in English. Those skills are reading, writing, listening and speaking. Harmer (2001) notes down:

From the communicative point of view, speaking has many different aspects including two major categories – accuracy, involving the correct use of vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation practiced through controlled and guided activities; and fluency, considered to be the ability to keep going when speaking spontaneously.

In simple definition, speaking is an activity involving two or more people which the participants are both the listeners and the speakers having to act what they listen and to make their contribution at high speed. In learning speaking, we have to pay attention on its component to make us be able to speak spontaneously fluently in order to improve our skill in speaking.

Based on preliminary research at the grade ten students of SMA Katolik St. Andreas Palu, when they were studying English, the researcher identified some problems. Firstly, most of them have lack of vocabulary. Secondly, they cannot pronounce English words in a good pronunciation. Thirdly, they cannot speak in front of people even only telling their daily activity. Finally, students always feel difficult to speak in English well.

Related to the effective way in teaching speaking skill, experiential learning was one of the alternative ways that could be used to help the students to speak well. Kolb (1984:3) states “Experiential learning is the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience”. Cantor (1995:1) defines “Experiential learning as both a “process of learning and a method of instruction”. Based on those statements above, the researcher concludes that experiential learning is a process of solving students problem in learning and reflecting by experiences.

The experiential learning process is conceptualized as a cycle incorporating sensing the environment, reflecting on the information, and acting on the reflections. The learning cycle begins with sensing the environment-accumulating and collecting information by attending to what one absorbs from seeing, hearing, touching, smelling, or tasting (Weick, 1995). Learners vary in what they perceive in a situation because what one perceives is influenced by what has been previously learned. (Boud et al, 1985:6) states “In reflecting, one ponders what has been sensed, then distills the experiences into patterns, theories, or

principles for action. Reflection turns experience in to learning”. (Elmore, 1986:8) states “Acting provides feedback”. From those statements above, the researcher conclude that reflecting is a step which reflect on what happened in order to distill principles or theories for action.

The teacher role in the experiential learning process is to present an initial situation for sensing, to ask students to study and to reflect on what is sensed from that initial situation, and to allow students and to practice their learning.

Using the experiential learning model in the classroom requires that the students carry out assignments, and then reflect on what happened in order to distill principles or theories for action. Practicing the theories or principles in the classroom setting or society at large allows a spiraling of the learning process to a higher level of understanding.

Based on the statement above, the researcher formulated a research question as follows:

Can the application of experiential learning improve the students' speaking skill of the tenth grade students at SMA Katolik St. Andreas Palu? It was to find out the application of experiential learning can improve skill achievement of the grade ten students at SMA Katolik St. Andreas Palu.

METHODOLOGY

In conducting this research, the researcher used pre-experimental research design. This research was conducted based on the following research design proposed by Arikunto (2001:85) as follows:

$$01 \quad \times \quad 02$$

Where :

O1 : pre-test

X : treatment

O2 : post-test

The population of this research was the grade ten students of SMA Katolik St. Andreas Palu. It consisted of three parallel classes and the total number of the population was 89 students. The sample of this research was chosen through cluster random sampling. Referring to the title of the research, there were two variables presented. A dependent variable is an attribute or characteristic that is dependent or influenced by the independent variable, while independent variable is an attribute or characteristic that influences or

affects an outcome or dependent variable (Creswell, 2005). Furthermore, the independent variable was the experiential learning and the dependent variable was the speaking skill.

In conducting this research, the researcher administered test. Before conducting treatment, the researcher distributed pre-test. She had prepared the pre-test in oral test. The explanation about scoring system is elaborated in the following table:

Table 1
The Speaking Scoring System

Rating	Fluency	Accuracy	Comprehensibility
6	Speaks without too great an effort with a fairly wide range of expression. Searches for words occasionally but only one or two unnatural pauses.	Pronunciation is only very slightly in the mother tongue. Two or three minor grammatical and lexical errors.	Easy for the listener to understand speaker's intention and general meaning. Very few interruptions or clarifications required.
5	Has to make an effort at times to search for words. Nevertheless, smooth delivery on the whole and only a few unnatural pauses.	Pronunciation is slightly influenced by the mother tongue. A few minor grammatical and lexical errors but most utterances are correct.	The speaker's intention and general meaning are fairly clear. A few interruptions by the listener for the sake of clarifications are necessary.
4	Although he has to make an effort and search for words, there are not too many unnatural pauses, mostly. Occasionally fragmentary but succeeded in conveying the general meaning. Fair range of expression.	Pronunciation is still moderately influenced by the mother tongue but no serious phonological errors. A few grammatical and lexical errors but only one or two major errors causing confusion.	Most of what the speaker's says is easy to follow. His intention is always clear but several interruptions are necessary to help him to convey the message or to seek clarification.
3	Has to make an effort for much of the time. Often has to search for the desired meaning. Rather halting delivery and fragmentary. Range of expression often limited.	Pronunciation is influenced by the mother tongue but only a few phonological errors. Several grammatical and lexical errors, some of which causes confusion.	The listener can understand a lot of what is said, but he must constantly seek clarification. Cannot understand many of the speaker's more complex or longer sentences.

Adopted from Heaton (1988:100)

After giving pre-test, the researcher applied treatment. The treatment was conducted for eight times excluding pre-test and post-test. In order to assess the progress of the

students' skill after the treatment, the researcher gave post-test at the last meeting. The aim of doing is used to measure students' progress in speaking skill and to know whether the treatment was effective or not. The post-test consisted of the same test in the pre-test.

The result of test was analyzed statistically. The researcher firstly computed the individual score by using formula proposed by Arikunto (2006:276):

$$\Sigma = \frac{x}{N} \times 100$$

Where:

Σ = standard Score
 X = sum of correct answer
 N = maximum score
 100 = fixed score

The researcher calculated the mean score of students in each test. Then the researcher computed the mean deviation between pre-test and post-test. She employed the formula proposed by Arikunto (2006 : 307) as follows:

$$Md = \frac{\Sigma d}{N}$$

Where:

Md = mean score
 Σd = the total score of deviation.
 N = number of students

Next, the researcher computed the square deviation by using formula proposed by Arikunto (2006: 308) as follows:

$$\sum x^2 d = \sum d^2 - \frac{(\sum d)^2}{N}$$

Where:

$\sum x^2 d$ = the sum of squared deviation
 $\sum^2 d$ = the sum of deviation

In order to know whether the students pre-test and post-test have significant difference, the researcher used the formula proposed by Arikunto (2010:349) as follows:

$$t = \frac{Md}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum x^2 d}{N(N-1)}}}$$

Where:

t = t-test score

Md = mean from pre-test and post-test

$\sum x^2 d$ = sum of squared deviation

N = number of students

FINDING

The researcher counted the mean score of the students by applying formula which is proposed previously. The mean computation is as follows:

$$M_{pre} = \frac{\sum x}{N}$$

$$M = \frac{1650.01}{28}$$

$$M = 58.92$$

The representation of test result can be seen in the following table:

Table 2
The Result of Students Pre-test

No.	Initial	Fluency	Accuracy	Comprehensibility	Total Score	Students' Score
1.	ARW	3	3	3	9	50
2.	ARW	4	4	3	11	61,11
3.	ACM	3	3	3	9	50
4.	CNA	3	4	4	11	61,11
5.	EDR	4	3	4	11	61,11
6.	EYS	3	3	3	9	50
7.	FFS	4	3	3	10	55,56
8.	FT	4	3	3	10	55,56
9.	FAW	3	4	4	11	61,11
10.	HSA	5	4	4	13	72,22
11.	HCP	5	4	4	13	72,22
12.	JT	3	3	3	9	50
13.	JDR	3	5	3	11	61,11
14.	LT	3	3	3	9	50
15.	LMG	4	3	3	10	55,56
16.	MO	5	4	3	12	66,67
17.	MMR	3	3	3	9	50
18.	MJT	4	3	3	10	55,56
19.	NRS	3	3	3	9	50
20.	NNT	4	3	3	10	55,56
21.	PL	3	4	4	11	61,11
22.	RNC	3	3	3	9	50
23.	SOK	5	4	4	13	72,22
24.	SBL	5	4	4	13	72,22
25.	VRW	6	5	5	16	88,89
26.	VMR	4	4	3	11	61,11
27.	YL	3	3	3	9	50
28.	AAR	3	3	3	9	50
Total		105	98	94	297	1650,01

From the representation above, the highest score was 88.89 which were gotten by one student and the lowest score was 50 which were gotten by ten students in that class. The mean score of pre-test was 58.92. From the score which was got by the students, it can be concluded that the ability of the grade ten students' speaking skill of SMA Katolik St.Andreas Palu was very poor.

After giving the treatment, the researcher administered test to the students. This test was called post-test. The post-test was conducted on February 21st, 2014. After computing the mean score of the students' post-test, the researcher total the students mean score in post-test. The formula used is the same as in pre-test.

$$M_{\text{post}} = \frac{\sum x}{N}$$

$$M = \frac{1999.99}{28}$$

$$M = 71.42$$

The result of the computation of post-test obviously showed that there was a progress which show the difference between the students' mean score in pre-test and in post-test. The students' mean score at post-test was 71.42 and the students mean score at pre-test was 58.92 The result presentation of the test can be seen in the following table:

Table 3
The Result of Students Post-test

No.	Initial	Fluency	Accuracy	Comprehensibility	Total Score	Students' Score
1.	ARW	3	5	3	11	61,11
2.	ARW	5	4	4	13	72,22
3.	ACM	3	4	5	12	66,67
4.	CNA	4	5	3	12	66,67
5.	EDR	5	4	4	13	72,22
6.	EYS	3	4	3	10	55,56
7.	FFS	4	4	4	12	66,67
8.	FT	3	5	4	12	66,67
9.	FAW	4	4	5	13	72,22
10.	HSA	6	6	4	16	88,89
11.	HCP	6	6	5	17	94,44
12.	JT	3	4	4	11	61,11
13.	JDR	4	5	5	14	77,78
14.	LT	4	4	3	11	61,11
15.	LMG	4	4	5	13	72,22
16.	MO	4	6	5	15	83,33
17.	MMR	3	4	3	10	55,56
18.	MJT	4	5	4	13	72,22
19.	NRS	4	3	4	11	61,11
20.	NNT	4	3	4	11	61,11
21.	PL	5	5	5	15	83,33
22.	RNC	3	4	4	11	61,11
23.	SOK	6	6	5	17	94,44
24.	SBL	6	5	5	16	88,89
25.	VRW	6	6	5	17	94,44
26.	VMR	3	4	5	12	66,67
27.	YL	3	4	4	11	61,11
28.	AAR	3	4	4	11	61,11
Total		115	127	118	360	1999,99

It proved that the students' achievement in the post-test or after treatment was improved. In other words, experiential learning was effective in teaching speaking skill to the students.

After calculating the mean score of the students pre-test and post-test, the researcher computed the deviation and square deviation of the students score in pre-test and post-test. The result was presented on the table below:

Table 4
Deviation of the Pre-test and Post-test

No.	Initial	Students Score		Deviation	D ²
		Pre-test (X ₁)	Post-test (X ₂)	D = (X ₂ - X ₁)	
1.	ARW	50	61,11	11,11	123,43
2.	ARW	61,11	72,22	11,11	123,43
3.	ACM	50	66,67	16,67	277,89
4.	CNA	61,11	66,67	5,56	30,91
5.	EDR	61,11	72,22	11,11	123,43
6.	EYS	50	55,56	5,56	30,91
7.	FFS	55,56	66,67	11,11	123,43
8.	FT	55,56	66,67	11,11	123,43
9.	FAW	61,11	72,22	11,11	123,43
10.	HSA	72,22	88,89	16,67	277,89
11.	HCP	72,22	94,44	22,22	493,72
12.	JT	50	61,11	11,11	123,43
13.	JDR	61,11	77,78	16,67	277,89
14.	LT	50	61,11	11,11	123,43
15.	LMG	55,56	72,22	16,66	277,56
16.	MO	66,67	83,33	16,66	277,56
17.	MMR	50	55,56	5,56	30,91
18.	MJT	55,56	72,22	16,66	277,56
19.	NRS	50	61,11	11,11	123,43
20.	NNT	55,56	61,11	5,55	30,80
21.	PL	61,11	83,33	22,22	493,72
22.	RNC	50	61,11	11,11	123,43
23.	SOK	72,22	94,44	22,22	493,72
24.	SBL	72,22	88,89	16,67	277,89
25.	VRW	88,89	94,44	5,55	30,80
26.	VMR	61,11	66,67	5,56	30,91
27.	YL	50	61,11	11,11	123,43
28.	AAR	50	61,11	11,11	123,43
Total		1650,01	1999,99	349,98	5091,8

Before continuing the t-test, the researcher firstly needed to find both the mean X and Y in table 4. It is seen as follows:

The mean X:

$$M = \frac{\sum X}{N} = \frac{1650,01}{28} = 58,92$$

The mean Y:

$$M = \frac{\sum Y}{N} = \frac{1999,99}{28} = 71,42$$

After having the sum of square deviation of the group, the researcher needs to analyze the data statistically in order to know the significant difference of the pre-test and post-test by using t-test formula as follows:

$$t = \frac{Md}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum d^2}{N(N-1)}}}$$

$$Md = \sum y - \sum x$$

$$= 71.42 - 58.92$$

$$= 12.49$$

$$t = \frac{12.49}{\sqrt{\frac{717.3}{28(28-1)}}}$$

$$t = \frac{12.49}{\sqrt{\frac{717.3}{28(27)}}}$$

$$t = \frac{12.49}{\sqrt{\frac{717.3}{756}}}$$

$$t = \frac{12.49}{\sqrt{0.94}}$$

$$t = \frac{12.49}{0.96}$$

$$t = 13.01 \text{ (t}_{\text{counted value}})$$

From the above computation, the researcher found that the significant difference between the result of the pre-test and the post-test of the students was 13.01.

DISCUSSION

Related to the result of students' pre-test, only 5 students passed the test from twenty-eight. The standard score at SMA Katolik St. Andreas Palu was 70. Here the researcher asked the students to introduce themselves and to tell one of their interesting experiences one by one as the pre-test firstly. Regarding the result of pre-test score, the researcher assumed that the students had some difficulties in doing the test. Firstly, they spoke with wrong pronunciation. Secondly, they could not introduce themselves well. Finally, they could not tell their experience in front of their friends. It happened because they had lack of vocabulary and did not know how to speak with a good grammatically. Also they had not

known much about tenses. Meanwhile, the highest score in pre-test was 88,89 which was gotten by one student. The percentage of students who got lower score than 70 was 82%.

Referring to the obtained score, it could be seen that most of the students got low score in their accuracy 92.8%, fluency 78.5%, and comprehensibility 96.4%. Incidentally, the researcher compared the result of the pre-test with the standard score of the school which was 70. Indeed, it can be said that the students' speaking ability was very poor.

After knowing the result of the pre-test, the researcher wanted to improve the students speaking skill of the grade ten students of SMA Katolik St. Andreas Palu through experiential learning. Consequently, the researcher conducted the teaching speaking which focused on fluency, accuracy, and comprehensibility.

To solve the problem, the researcher applied experiential learning which has three steps on it. First is sensing, the second is reflecting, and the last step is acting. These steps are used to improve students speaking skill. The statement above was supported by Kolb (1984) who states that the sensing-reflecting-acting model is one of several ways to frame the process offers a four-stage model; Hutchings and Wurtzdorff (1988) use a "knowing-doing" spiral, a two-stage model. The issue is not whether the process is conceptualized in two, three, or four stages. Each model reflects experiential learning. All are based on the following principles:

- Sensing is selective.
- Reflecting involves distilling rather than inferring.
- Acting rather than thinking is the appropriate test of one's reflections.
- The process is both simultaneous and continuous

In conducting the treatment, there are 3 steps in experiential learning. Firstly, there was a step which is called as sensing in which the researcher gave some short stories which were familiar to students in order to improve their vocabulary, asked them to read and pronounced those words on that story in a good intonation after the researcher modeled it, asked them whether they feel sad, happy, or fun while reading the stories given. Secondly, the other step is called as reflecting in which the researcher asked students to retell the story by using their own words. Finally, another step is called as an acting in which the researcher asked students to tell about their experience which had the same to the stories given in front of their friends. The other students were able to ask a question to the students who was telling his/her experience. The students who told his/her experience had to answer the question from his/her friends. So here the researcher took eight meetings to apply her

treatment in class. In giving the treatment, most of students still have lack of vocabulary. Also, they could not read the text with a good pronunciation and retell the stories given on the first and the second meeting. When the writer taught them about the tenses on the stories given, the students gave many responses on it. Most of them took a chance to answer questions came from the writer. Furthermore, the students can get easy to retell the stories for third until the last meeting and to tell one of their interesting experiences on post-test.

After conducting the treatment to the students, the researcher gave post-test. The researcher found that several students have improvement in speaking skill and there are some students who have no improvement or the progress after obtaining treatment. The percentage of students who got low score in their accuracy 71.4%, fluency 57.1%, and comprehensibility 60.7%. By seeing at the result percentage from pre-test and post-test, the researcher found that by applying experiential learning in teaching speaking, the students can improve their skill in speaking as well.

There is a difference between previous studies and the current one. Firstly, the previous researcher applied experiential learning in experimental class and control class where the researcher took the students in English department of teacher training and education PGRI West Sumatera. Similar to the researcher, this previous researcher used experiential learning to improve students speaking ability. Then, another researcher used experiential learning to improve students' vocabulary mastery where the researcher took students in SDN Banaran 01 Sukoharjo as sample. On the other hand, the current researcher took tenth grade students of SMA Katolik St. Andreas Palu as her sample of research. By looking at these previous study, the researcher believes that experiential learning can improve students speaking skill in SMA Katolik St. Andreas Palu. Based on the previous studies above, the researcher might conclude that experiential learning was not only used to teach the students at the elementary school, but also applied to solve the students' problem in speaking ability at the high level of Education Degree. Finally, based on the research findings, the researcher believes that the application of experiential learning has given big contribution to the improvement of students' speaking skill.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

After discussing and analyzing the data, the researcher finally draws conclusion that the application of experiential learning can improve the students' speaking skill of the tenth grade students at SMA Katolik St. Andreas Palu. It is proven by the result of t-counted value

(13.01) which is greater than t-table value (2.052). It means that the implementation of experiential learning is effective. This is supported by proper and comfortable atmosphere in which students were given inputs and support so that they enjoyed the teaching and learning activities.

In order to develop the English teaching quality, the researcher would like to share the suggestions for the development of teaching and learning speaking. The researcher would like to share the suggestions for students, English teachers, and further researchers.

The students should be given more exercises to make them speak with a grammatically good structure by connecting them with some expressions. It is suggested that teachers should provide learning experience to the students by using a good approach such as experiential learning to improve their skill in speaking. In teaching speaking, teachers should be a model before the students try to speak firstly. Therefore, students can get easier to speak and to express what they are going to tell. Vocabulary mastery will affect students' ability in a conversation. Students will be able to speak well when they have enough stock of vocabularies in their mind. So, when teachers ask students to speak well every student can have dictionary to make them easy to find out difficult word during the lesson.

For the further researcher, he or she should observe the students' difficulties in learning English before doing the research at the school in order to help the writer to find out the appropriate technique to help the students in solving their problem.

REFERENCES

- Arikunto, S. (2006). *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktis*. Jakarta: P.T. Rineka Cipta
- Boud. (1985). *Turning Experience into Learning*. New York: Nichols Publishing Company.
- Cantor, J. A. (1995). *Experiential Learning in Higher Education: Linking Classroom and Community*. Washington, D.C: The George Washington University
- Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research (2ed)*. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Elmore. (1986). *Graduate Education in Public Management; Working in the Seams of Government*. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management (Retrieved on November, 11, 2013, from <http://web.utk.edu/~bobc/document/experiential%20learning.pdf>)
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Heaton, J. B. (1988). *Aspect of Speaking Ability*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Hutchings, P. & Wutzdorff, A. (1988) *Knowing and Doing; Learning through Experience*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential Learning: Eperience as the Source of Learning and Development*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall
- Weick, K. (1995) *Sense Making in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA:Sage.