

EFFECT OF USING DIALOGUE TECHNIQUE IN TEACHING SPEAKING AT EIGHTH GRADE OF MTs N 7 PASAMAN BARAT

Sovia Desantri¹, Merry Prima Dewi², Syahrul³, Eliza⁴
UIN Sjech M. Djamil Djambek Bukittinggi
soviadesantri23@gmail.com ; merryprimadewi@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this research was to determine the effect of using dialogue technique in teaching speaking. The researcher has done at MTsN 7 Pasaman Barat. This research was carried out because the students had some problems in speaking English. It was caused by several factors there were the students had difficulties to say something or express their idea. Then, the students had limited vocabulary, so the students did not speak English well. Besides that the students lack of confidence in speaking and have low pronunciation ability. In addition the teacher used monotonous ways in students speaking practice. In this research a quasi-experimental design was used by the researcher. The researcher used pre-test and post-test to experimental class and control class. The population of this research was the eighth grade students of MTsN 7 Pasaman Barat. The sample was 8B as experimental class taught by using dialogue technique and 8A as control class and taught without using dialogue technique. To determine the sample, the experimental and control class, the researcher utilized SPSS 20 to examine the data and check for normality and homogeneity. The researcher utilized the t-test formula to test the hypothesis and consulted the results in a t-table with level of significance of 0.05. From the calculation of the research the pre-test and post-test score in experiment class, it was found that there was a significant effect of using dialogue technique in teaching speaking. It was proven by the value t-calculated of experimental class in pre-test and post-test was higher than t-table ($6.042 > 2.021$). Then there was a significant difference between students who were taught using dialogue technique and those who were taught without them. The value of t-calculated in post-test from the experimental and control classes was greater than t-table ($5.883 > 2.021$). The last hypothesis was that teaching with dialogue technique was higher than teaching without dialogue technique in terms of improving students speaking skill. In the post-test, the mean score of the experimental class was greater than the control class ($14.174 > 0.174$).

Keywords: *Speaking Skill, Dialogue Technique*

INTRODUCTION

The ability to speak English is very important in this era. English is known as an international language. Aye and Phyu state that we need an effective English speaking skill in the whole life aspects in this globalization era. As a global language, it is clear that English plays an important role in the international world interaction (Aye, K. K., Phyu, K. L, 2015). English is also the primary language used in international business, diplomacy, sciences and professions. As stated by Baker and Westrup who say that students who speak English very well can have greater opportunities for better education, finding good jobs, and getting promotions (J, Baker, H, Westrup, 2003). So speaking English is very important, as an international language it also very useful for education and profession.

In learning English, there are 4 language skills that must be mastered, one of them is speaking. According to Ur, of all the four language skills called listening, speaking, reading and writing, speaking is the most important one that is very necessary for the effective communication. Speaking helps the learners to express the idea, share information and make the communication to another people. The learners make the communication when they are going to inform something. Therefore speaking is an oral interaction with someone.

In speaking, the students often find some problems. The causes of students problems is the students lack confidence during speaking. Moreover, English is a foreign language in Indonesia, so the students feel difficult to speak and afraid to make mistake in speak. Event thought students difficult to speak, but the teacher must be able to improve students speaking in various ways. Harmer states there are three main reasons to make students speak in class. First, speaking activity, provide practice opportunities, opportunities to practice real-life speaking in classroom safety. Second, speaking tasks in which students try to use one or all of the languages they know provide feedback for both teacher and students. The last, the more students have the opportunity to activate the various elements of language that they have stored in their brains, the more automatic the use of these elements become (Jeremy Harmer, 2007). So the teacher should provide more interesting ways to improve students speaking skill.

The teacher should give the interesting activity to improve students speaking skill. One of the various activities is using dialogue technique. Dialogue gives opportunity for students

to express the ideas and it can also practice their critical thinking. According to William these are the advantages of using dialogue in teaching speaking: students target of communication skill can be developed, dialogue is a technique which is the closest to the reality, it practices students natural and spontaneous in speaking, students have interest in learning because the exercises are realistic and meaningful, communicative ability of students can be practiced regularly, and the last in classroom, students have chance to practice communication by their own self (William Littlewood, 1981). So in teaching speaking the teacher should make the students more interest in speaking, because speaking is one of the skills that should be master by every student in school.

The researcher had done preliminary research by doing observation on March 28th 2022 the researcher found that the students speaking skill at the school was still quite low. The students had difficulty to say something or express their idea. Then, from the observation that the researchers has done, the teacher only used question and word repetition in teaching speaking. Then, the teacher only asked students to repeat the sentences delivered not from the students' sentences. Based on the students' repetition the researcher discovered that the students could not say the word clearly. Therefore the researcher found that students' vocabulary and pronunciation in this school is quite low.

Beside the observation the researchers have conducted interview on March 29th 2022 with English teacher who teach in eighth grade related to students' English skill, especially in speaking skill. Based on the interview, the teacher said that students' speaking was very low. Related to vocabulary and students' pronunciation are also still low so that students have difficulty in speaking. In addition the teacher mention she used repetition technique, answer and asking question in teaching speaking (Jeremy Harmer, 2007). And then the teacher said that most of students were still difficult to achieve the minimal mastery level criterion or Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal (KKM) for English speaking. The KKM that must be achieved by students is 75, but in reality the average speaking score obtained by students is 60.

Researchers had also conducted direct interviews with five students from eighth grade students on March 29th 2022. Based on the interviews that have been conducted, the student said that speaking English was very difficult because the students have difficult in pronunciation. Besides, students said that the teacher never used learning media during

learning process. The teacher only used the textbook. In the other hand the students have limited vocabulary, so the students cannot speak English well. And students difficult in make the sentence because of the vocabulary that they have still limited. So when students are asked to speak, students are more likely to be silent.

Based on preliminary research the researcher found there are many problems in students speaking. So the researchers want to conduct the concerning research students speaking skill of second grade students of MTsN 7 Pasaman Barat through dialogue technique. According to Harmer, Dialogue helps the students practice in speech, pronunciation, intonation, and stress. The primary objective of using dialogue is developing students' competence (pronunciation, intonation, stress) in teaching speaking like native speaker. Therefore, in teaching learning using dialogue (short and long), the students are motivated by the teachers' question. Additionally, Richards and Rogers mentioned "dialogue as one of the examples of social interaction activities compatible with a communicative approach which fluency and acceptable language is the primary goal" (Jack, Richards, C. And Rodgers, Tehodore S, 1986). Based on the opinion above, the researcher concludes that using dialogue technique the students can practice their speaking skill.

METHOD

The researcher used the quantitative research. The quantitative research is a kind of research that collects the data in the form of numerical. According to Sugiono, a research is called as quantitative because of the data of the research is use numeric and using statistic analysis (Sugiono, 2009). The total number of students was 46 and they were divided into two classes. It means that all of them as the population of this research.

Class	Number Of Students
A	23
B	23

In the research, The researcher took all students in the experimental class and the control class. Because the school just have two classes of the eleven grade. Class 8 B as experiment class and class 8 A as control class. To determine a sample in this research used total sampling. According to Sugiyono total sampling is a sampling technique where the number of samples is equal to the population. In this research, the researcher chooses the class 8 B

as experiment class and 8 A as control class. The researcher collecting the data by using the following procedures: Pre-test in experimental and control class, Treatment, Post-test in experimental and control class.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Normality Test of Post-Test For Both Classes

A. Normalitas test

1. Normality test of pre-test for both classes

Table 1 Normality test of pre-test experimental and control class

Tests of Normality						
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
PRE_EXPERIMENT	.108	23	.200*	.953	23	.331
PRE_CONTROL	.136	23	.200*	.935	23	.140
*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.						
a. Lilliefors Significance Correction						

Based on the result above the significant value showed that the result of control class and experimental class is normal in Kolmogorov-Smirnov (0.200) and also in Shapiro-Wilk (0.331 and 0.140) test since it all is higher than alpha value (0.05).

2. Normality test of post-test for both classes

Table 2 Normality test of post-test experimental and control class

Tests of Normality						
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
POST_EXP	.198	23	.020	.885	23	.013
POST_CONTROL	.199	23	.019	.936	23	.147
a. Lilliefors Significance Correction						

Based on the result above, the significant value showed that result of control and experimental class is normal in Kolmogorov-Smirnov (0.020) then also in Shapiro-Wilk (0.013 and 0.147) test since it all is higher than alpha (0.05).

B. Homogeneity Test

1. Homogeneity test of pre-test for both classes

Table 3 Homogeneity test of pre-test experimental and control class

Test of Homogeneity of Variance

B

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Nilai_pretest	Based on Mean	.056	1	44	.814
	Based on Median	.058	1	44	.811
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.058	1	42.430	.811
	Based on trimmed mean	.058	1	44	.811

Based on the result above the result of homogeneity test showed that the pre-test of both classes is homogeneity which has significant value is bigger than alpha ($0.814 > 0.05$).

2. Homogeneity test of post-test for both classes

Table 4 Homogeneity test of post-test experimental and control class

Test of Homogeneity of Variance					
		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Nilai_posttest	Based on Mean	.267	1	44	.608
	Based on Median	.236	1	44	.629
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.236	1	39.016	.629
	Based on trimmed mean	.300	1	44	.587

The result above the result of homogeneity test showed that the post-test of both classes is homogeneity which has significant value bigger than alpha ($0.608 > 0.05$).

Hypothesis Testing

This research was done by giving the speaking test to the students in experiment and control class. The speaking test was given in order to see the students speaking skill. The researcher had seen in there any significant effect of using dialogue technique in teaching speaking. In this research the researcher divided

the classes into two, experimental class and control class. The researcher taught both classes for four meeting for each class. The experimental class was taught by using dialogue technique and control class without dialogue technique. During the teaching and learning process in the classroom the researcher taught both classes the same material namely Recount Text. The first thing that the researcher did was giving the pre-test to both classes then taught them for four meeting. After that, the researcher tested the material that had been taught in the post-test. In conducting this research there were 23 students included in the experimental class and 23 students who were included in control class. In this research, the researcher had seen the effect of using dialogue technique in teaching speaking, it can be seen from the data that gained by experimental class in pre-test and post-test were different. The mean score of experimental in pre-test was 49.52 while the mean score after treatment in the post-test were 63.69. After calculating the both pre-test and post-test mean score by using t-test, it showed that the value was bigger than t-table in the level significance 0.05 ($6.042 > 2.021$). On the other hand, students who were taught by using dialogue technique was better in speaking skill than students who were not taught without dialogue technique. We can see it from the result that gained by the experimental class. The improvement of the mean score of experimental class was 14.17 while the control class was 0.17 this result can be achieved because dialogue technique was a good technique in teaching speaking. It was proven by the greater result of the experimental class. It can be concluded that there was a significant effect by using dialogue technique in teaching speaking and the speaking skill of the experimental class is better than control class. And then we say the alternative hypothesis of the first and third hypothesis is accepted. The researcher also found that there was significant difference between speaking skill who were taught by using dialogue technique and the students who were taught without dialogue technique. It can be seen from t-test from the post-test of experimental class and control class. The value analysis shows that the t-calculated was bigger than t-table ($5.88 > 2.021$). It means that the second alternative hypothesis is accepted.

Based on the data analysis above, the researcher has found that there is significant effect of using dialogue technique in teaching speaking at MTsN 7 Pasaman Barat. The oxford

English dictionary defines dialogue as “the conversation written for and spoken by actor on a stage” or a conversation carried on between two or more person. Then Richard and Rogers mentioned dialogue as one of the examples of social interaction activities compatible with a communicative approach which fluency and acceptable language is the primary goal. It means that using dialogue in teaching speaking will be better because the students can make interaction which other and make good fluency during the speaking.

Beside that Cakir states that one of the reasons for using dialogues, most probably the underlying purpose is to enable learners to promote their communicative competence through which they can get the ability to be able to use target language appropriately. Beside that Wood states that dialogue present spoken language within a context and rare thus typically longer and drills. However, those used for oral practice should be short so students remember them. According to Alexander, dialog is indicated by teacher pupil interaction in which children have the confidence to make mistakes, and understand that mistakes are viewed as something to learn from, not be ashamed. So the students not be ashamed in speaking English because, the students make interaction with their friend and students more confidence in speaking English.

In addition Paul believed that when learning any aspect of English, it is important for children to practice dialogue in ways that are meaningful and stimulating genuine feeling. Its means that with the dialogue the students can express their feeling adan share the idea with other friend. So, using dialogue technique in teaching speaking is better because, the students can more active and helps the students confidence in speaking. it can be concluded that with the dialogue technique can improve the students speaking skill.

CONCLUSION

Based on finding and also discussion of the research about the effect of using dialogue technique in teaching speaking, the researcher concluded that: 1) There was a significant effect of using dialogue technique in teaching speaking at MTsN 7 Pasaman Barat. It can be seen from the score improvement in experimental class after teaching by using dialogue technique in four meetings. On the other hand it was also proven by the value t-calculated of experimental class in post-test and pre-test was higher than t-table ($6.042 > 2.02$). In short, the first hypothesis of this research could be accepted that there is

a significant effect of students speaking skill by using dialogue technique. So, it can be said that the dialogue technique can increase students speaking skill. 2) There was a significant difference between the students who were taught by using dialogue technique and the students who were taught without using dialogue technique. This is known from the mean score of post-test of the students in experimental class was higher than students in control class. In the experimental class obtained a mean score 63.69 while the students in the control class got a mean score 54.4. On the other hand the result of the t-test showed that the t-calculated was greater than t-table ($5.88 > 2.021$). It means that there any significant difference of students speaking skill by using dialogue technique and conventional technique. 3) The students speaking skill which were taught by using dialogue technique better than students who were taught without dialogue technique. It can be seen from the improvement score that made by experimental class was greater than control class ($14.17 > 0.17$). Its means that the speaking skill of students who were taught by using dialogue technique is better than the speaking skill of the students who do not teach by using dialogue technique.

In conclusion, dialogue technique was an effective technique in teaching speaking at eight grade of MtsN 7 Pasaman Barat. This conclusion gathered not only from the experts and previous researcher ideas but also from the empirical data that had been found by researcher itself.

REFERENCES

- Aye kk, Phyu kl. 2015. Developing Students Speaking Skills through Short Stories. Yangon University of Education Research Journal.
- Baker, H, Westrup. 2003. Essential Speaking Skills: A Handbook for English Language Teachers. London: Continuum.
- Harmer, Jeremy. 2007. The Practice of English Language Teaching (4th Edition). Edinburg Gate: Pearson Longman.
- Jack. C. Richard, Renandya. 2012. Methodology In Language Teaching, Cambridge: University
- Jhon W Creswell. 2012. "Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research" (Boston: Pearson Education, Inc)
- Sugiono. 2009. Metode Penelitian Pendidikan (Pendekatan, Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D). Bandung: Alfabeta.

Ur, Penny. 1996. *A Course in Language Teaching Practice and Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Williams littlewood. 1981. *Communicative Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Express.

Wilson And Carroll. C. 2000. *Arnold, Public Speaking As A Liberal Art*. Boston:Allyn And Bacon

Winston, Mark L. 2011. *Engaging Through Dialogue*. Cambridge University Press