# IMPROVING THE STUDENTS' SPEAKING SKILLS BY USING CLASSROOM DEBATE 

Parlindungan<br>mr.parlinsrg@gmail<br>Dosen Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan Universitas Graha Nusantara Padangsidimpuan


#### Abstract

The main purpose of this research is to find out how far the improvement of students' speaking skills after they are taught by using Classroom Debate. The population of this research was the eleventh grade students of SMA Negeri 2 Padangsidimpuan which consist of 335 students as and the writer was taken 67 students as the sample of this research. The research methodology used in this research was a classroom action research method. And as the instrument for collecting the data the writer uses the written test. From the value of average scores got by the students in the pre test, that is 59.78 . In posttest 1 , the average score is 71.94 . In addition, in posttest II, the average score is 79.03 . The percentage improvement of the implementation between pretest and posttest 1 is $20.35 \%$. Moreover, the percentage improvement result of the implementation between pre-test and post-test 2 is $32.21 \%$. It means that there is a significant improvement of the students' skills in speaking after they are taught by using Classroom Debate to the eleventh grade students of SMA Negeri 2 Padangsidimpuan. At the end of cycle two, the result of the posttest showed that there were 60 students or $82.09 \%$ who passed the $K K M$. It was significantly improved from the pretest which gained only $11.94 \%$ and in the posttest 1 which had $56.72 \%$ improvement. Therefore, based on the class percentage result from the pretest to the posttest 2 in the second cycle, it could be seen that there were $52.94 \%$ improvement that this CAR could gain. It was proven that the use Classroom Debate can improve the students' skills in speaking to the eleventh grade students of SMA Negeri 2 Padangsidimpuan From the analysis of the collected data it has been known that there is a significant improvement of the students' skills in speaking after they are taught by using Classroom Debate. It can be seen from the percentage improvement result of the implementation between pre-test and post-test 2 is $32.21 \%$. So that the hypothesis of this research is accepted.
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#### Abstract

ABSTRAK Tujuan utama dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui sejauh mana peningkatan kemampuan berbicara siswa setelah diajar dengan menggunakan classroom debate. Populasi dalam penelitian ini adalah siswa kelas XI SMA Negeri 2 Padangsidimpuan yang berjumlah 335 siswa dan penulis mengambil 67 siswa sebagai sampel penelitian ini. Metodologi penelitian yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah metode penelitian tindakan kelas. Dan sebagai instrumen pengumpulan data penulis menggunakan tes tertulis. Dari nilai rata-rata nilai yang didapat siswa pada saat pre test yaitu 59,78. Pada posttest 1, skor rata-rata adalah 71.94. Sedangkan pada posttest II skor rata-rata 79,03. Persentase peningkatan pelaksanaan pretest dan posttest 1 adalah 20,35\%. Sedangkan persentase peningkatan hasil implementasi antara pre-test dan post-test 2 adalah 32,21\%. Artinya, terdapat peningkatan yang signifikan pada keterampilan berbicara siswa setelah diajar menggunakan debat kelas (classroom debate) pada siswa kelas XI SMA Negeri 2 Padangsidimpuan.


Pada akhir siklus II, hasil posttest didapatkan 60 siswa atau 82,09\% yang dinyatakan lulus KKM. Hal ini meningkat signifikan dari pretest yang hanya memperoleh 11,94\% dan pada posttest 1 yang mengalami peningkatan $56,72 \%$. Oleh karena itu, berdasarkan hasil persentase kelas dari pretest ke posttest 2 pada siklus II terlihat bahwa terdapat peningkatan sebesar 52,94\% yang dapat dicapai penelitian tindakan kelas ini. Penggunaan debat kelas (classroom debate) dapat meningkatkan keterampilan berbicara siswa kelas XI SMA Negeri 2 Padangsidimpuan. Dari analisis data yang terkumpul diketahui bahwa terdapat peningkatan yang signifikan pada keterampilan berbicara siswa setelah mereka diajarkan dengan menggunakan classroom debate. Hal ini terlihat dari persentase peningkatan hasil pelaksanaan antara pre-test dan post-test 2 sebesar 32,21\%. Jadi, hipotesis penelitian ini diterima.

Kata kunci: keterampilan berbicara, classroom debate

## I. THE BACKGROUND OF STUDY

In order to achieve an educational outcome, in teaching and learning English process, teachers are expected to have an ability to create and manage an effective instructional classroom. There are five principles for creating effective language learning environment, such as giving opportunities to use English, drawing the attention of its patterns, giving time use English, noticing their errors and correcting English, and constructing to interact each other in English. Hence, the English teachers are required to create more suitable and efficient use of the classroom to cover four English skills. Those are listening, speaking, reading and writing. The four skills are important but speaking seems intuitively the most important one because speaking skill represents a real challenge to most language learners. (Thornbury, 2002)

Speaking skill serves the students to be able to commuicate their opinion, feeling and expression with no limitation of different native language, culture or country. Students can express themselves and learn how to follow social and cultural rules appropriate in any communicative circumstance. In addition, they can prepare themselves to gain more challange for applying better job, enrolling competitive university, or participating in international communities. By those reasons, the writer assumed that speaking is crucial for English learning.

Students like to evaluate their English ability as they see how well they improve their spoken proficiency. The condition is related to the objective of English learning for students. The objectives of English learning in Indonesia is based on curriculum. One of learning objectives of English subject in curriculum is to improve communicative competence including spoken communication.

It means that speaking skill is needed to measure students' ability for English subject. The objectives of speaking skill can be seen at the indicators of English syllabus. Based on the English syllabus, the objectives of speaking skills are enabling students in : (1)Using and responding expressing of attitude, love, sadness, embarassement, anger, (2) Identifying and responding expression of annoyance, (3) Using past continuos tense in extending narrative and spoof, (4) Doing monolog in narrative form, (5) Using modals auxiliaries "should" in giving suggestion, (6) Debating.

The objectives above allow students to learn expressing of attitude, love, sadness, embarassment, anger, annoyance, functional texts in their daily conversation, and debating.

Based on the writer's observation in research location, he classified the problem into pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension because those are indicators of assessing speaking. (Jose, 2013)

First is comprehension; Students are not able to comprehend the message clearly,
even in the simple English conversation. Second is fluency; Students found that their speech is halting when they speak English. They cannot handle the situation and they find hard to grope the next words to speak. Third is vocabulary; Students feel difficult to choose the correct words to express their mind because English contains many words with different usage. Fourth is pronunciation; Students feel difficult to pronounce many English words since English has a lot of words with no clear rules to pronounce them in one kind. Fifth is grammar; Students feel difficult to use correct English grammatical rules directly when they speak. Since our first language does not have grammatical rules for different situation so it makes students feel confused to use English grammar.

After clasifying the problem, the writer looked for the solution. Based on the writer's experience as a debater, students who joined English debate club would produce better speech and actively involved in discussion. It is because students get more practices, peers, exposures and activities that encourage them to speak up. Classroom debate trains students to have pairs in speaking, group and individual work. It allows students to form groups of two or four in which they will share the responsibility of getting the job done and doing the planning, preparation and presentation of their accumulated information as a team. Students can give the better speech when they can organize their presentation sequentially, chronologically and thematically. Through classroom debate, students will practice to organize their speech including their comprehension, fluency, vocabulary, pronunciation and grammar around problems and solutions, causes and results, and similarities and differences.

Concerning the problems above and the advantages of classroom debate, the writer decided to bring the idea of classroom debate as a treatment to improve the students' speaking skill. The writer only focuses on the five areas of assessing speaking skill that are comprehension, fluency, vocabulary, pronunciation and grammar because those
areas contain indicators of students speaking progress. The researcher hopes to know and get clear description about classroom debate in improving the student speaking skills, and makes the topic of her research as follows : "Improving the students' speaking skills by using classroom debate".

As Arikunto S (1989) states : "The problem is the presented question, in which its answer will be achieved after finishing doing the research".

Based on the above statements the writer can formulate the problem of this research as follows: "can classroom debate improve the skills of the eleventh grade students in speaking?"

As it has been stated in the previous chapter that the main purpose of doing this research is in order to know whether classroom debate can improve the skills of the students in speaking or not. The writer formulates the hypothesis of this research as follows : "There is a significant improvement of the students' speaking skills after they are taught by using Classroom debate to the students".

## II. THE REVIEW OF LITERATURE

## Classroom Debate

Hooley (2017) states that debate is a course for future and an investment in our children as productive and strong world citizens. Debate is an advanced civics and political science class because the debaters must learn exactly how our governance system can help us in securing and maintaining a better life. It means that debate can help the students to learn how to be critical and productive citizens in society. As the goverment side, the positive team is frequently asked to advocate federal action in solving a problem. The students should give their arguments, defend their opinions, and show the evidence to support the solution given. It needs logical and critical consideration to decide in what ways they solve the problem.

Last opinion comes from Osborne (2015), she states that classroom debate is a particularly effective way of working toward the goals of personal development and preparation for citizenship. It helps students learn to participate in the academic conversation and in turn in the public discourse of our democratic society as well. It means that debate effectively helps students to develop their personal characteristic to be better students in the classroom and better prepared citizens. They learn how to be respectful by giving appropriate judgements towards around issues. This statement abviously support the previous opinion from Hooley that debate naturally develop the students' personal ability to be better and strong citizens.

Based on opinions above, the writer assumes that debate is a more communicative interaction that involves opposite point of views and builds critical and strong characteristics. Debate can be an arguing, presenting, and defending point of view and evidence. In the form of classroom debate, it presents opportunities for students to engage and use extended chunks of language for a purpose to convincingly defend one side of an issue. Debate helps students to enrich their vocabulary through criticizing and comprehending the issues. In convicing their ideas, students need to present it fluently and grammatically correct so people can strongly believe and support their ideas.

## Speaking

According to Chaney (2008), speaking is "the process of building and sharing meaning through the use of verbal and non-verbal symbols, in a variety of contexts."

While another expert, Theodore Huebner (2006) says "Language is essentially speech, and speech is basically communication by sounds". And according to him, speaking is a skill used by someone in daily life communication whether at school or outside. The skill is acquired by much repetition; it primarily a neuromuscular and not an
intellectual process. It consists of competence in sending and receiving messages.

From the above definition, it can be inferred that speaking is expressing ideas, opinions, or feelings to others by using words or sounds of articulation in order to inform, to persuade, and to entertain that can be learnt by using some teaching - learning methodologies.

## III. THE METHODOLOGY OF RESEARCH

The problem of this research was focused on the five areas of students speaking skill so the instrument was only used for testing speaking. The oral presentation test in this research was used to measure the students' comprehension, fluency, vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar before the treatment (pre-test) and after the treatment (post-test). The debate indicator was not scored on the test.In appropriate to the topic of this research, in this research the writer applies classroom action research. According to McMillan and Schumacher (2006), Action research is the process of using research principles to provide information that educational professionals use to improve aspect of day to- day practice. It is simply a systematic approach to help professionals change practice, usually using a collaborative model that includes several individuals.

Successful statistical practice is based on focused problem definition. In sampling, this includes defining the population from which our sample is drawn. A population can be defined as including all people or items with the characteristic one wishes to understand. Because there is very rarely enough time or money to gather information from everyone or everything in a population, the goal becomes finding a representative sample (or subset) of that population. (http://en.wikipedia.org/ wiki/Sampling\%28statistics\%29\#Population_d efinition).

The population of this research is the whole number of the eleventh grade students of SMA Negeri 2 Padangsidimpuan. It consists of 335 students. The writer takes only 67
students as the sample of this research. The method which is used by the writer in choosing the sample is the cluster random sampling.

To measure the students average score in every test, the writer used this formula :

$$
\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{X}}=\frac{\Sigma \mathrm{X}}{\mathrm{~N}}
$$

In which :

| $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{X}}$ | $:$ Mean |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\Sigma \mathrm{X}$ | : Sum of Individual Score |
| N | $:$ Number of Students |

For the next, the writer got the class percentage which passed the KKM (minimal completeness criteria) considering English subject gain score 75 by using this formula:

$$
\mathrm{P}=\frac{F}{N} \times 100 \%
$$

In which :

## P : The Class Percentage

F : Total Percentage Score
N : Number of Students
To measure the students' improvement in speaking skills from pre-test 1 up to the post-test 1 in the first cycle, the writer used formula as follow:

$$
P=\frac{y-y 1}{y} \times 100 \%
$$

In which :
P : The Percentage of Students'
Improvement
y : Pre-test result
y1 : Post-test result of $1^{\text {st }}$ cycle
While, to measure the students' improvement in speaking skills from pre-test up to the post-test 2 in the second cycle, the writer used formula as follow:

$$
P=\frac{y-y 2}{y} \times 100 \%
$$

In which :
P : The Percentage of Students' Improvement

Y : Pre-test result
Y2 : Post-test result of $2^{\text {nd }}$ cycle

## IV. THE RESULT OF RESEARCH AND DISCUSSION

## The Result of Pre-test

The pretest had been done before the writer began the teaching learning activity in cycle 1 . It was used in order to measure the students' skills in speaking before they are taught by using Classroom debate.

And through the collected data it can be seen that the lowest score got by the students in pre-test is 45 and highest score is 80 , whereas the mean score of the students in pretest is 59.78 . It means that the students' skills can be categorized into the uncapable category. It shows us that in general the eleventh grade students of SMA Negeri 2 Padangsidimpuan are not able to speak before they are taught by using Classroom debate.

The percentages of the students' scores in speaking before they are taught by using Classroom debate can be seen in the following table :

TABLE I
THE FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE STUDENTS' SCORES IN PRE-TEST

| NO | SCORES | FREQUENCY | PERCENTAGES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 45 | 11 | $16.42 \%$ |
| 2 | 50 | 9 | $13.43 \%$ |
| 3 | 55 | 8 | $11.94 \%$ |
| 4. | 60 | 10 | $14.93 \%$ |
| 5. | 65 | 12 | $17.91 \%$ |
| 6. | 70 | 9 | $13.43 \%$ |
| 7. | 75 | 6 | $8.96 \%$ |
| 8. | 80 | 2 | $2.99 \%$ |
| TOTAL |  | $\mathbf{6 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

From the table above the histogram can be made as following graphic:

Graphic 1. The frequency histogram of the students scores in pre-tes


Based on the calculation it can be concluded that the percentage of the eleventh grade students of SMA Negeri 2 Padangsidimpuan who have succeeded in achieving the Minimum Completeness Criteria (KKM) of speaking before they are taught by using Classroom debate is $11.94 \%$. Whereas the percentage of the students who haven't achieved the Minimum Completeness Criteria (KKM) is $88.06 \%$. It is said so, because the value of the Minimum Completeness Criteria (KKM) in this material is 75 .

## The Result of Post-test

After doing posttest 2, the data of the students' score from pretest, posttest until posttest 2 were input to know the comparison or the improvements from each test. The score was input into a table as follows:

TABLE II
THE STUDENTS' SPEAKING SKILLS SCORE OF PRE-TEST, POST-TEST 1, AND POST-TEST 2

| NUMBER <br> OF <br> SAMPLE | PRE- <br> TEST <br> SCORE | POST- <br> TEST 1 <br> SCORE | POST- <br> TEST 2 <br> SCORE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 50 | 60 | 65 |
| 2. | 75 | 85 | 90 |
| 3. | 75 | 85 | 90 |
| 4. | 65 | 75 | 80 |
| 5. | 65 | 75 | 80 |
| 6. | 75 | 85 | 90 |
| 7. | 65 | 75 | 80 |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { NUMBER } \\ & \text { OF } \\ & \text { SAMPLE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PRE- } \\ \text { TEST } \\ \text { SCORE } \end{gathered}$ | POST- <br> TEST 1 <br> SCORE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8. | 70 | 80 | 85 |
| 9. | 65 | 75 | 80 |
| 10. | 55 | 65 | 70 |
| 11. | 75 | 85 | 80 |
| 12. | 70 | 80 | 85 |
| 13. | 65 | 75 | 80 |
| 14. | 70 | 80 | 85 |
| 15. | 65 | 75 | 80 |
| 16. | 45 | 55 | 60 |
| 17. | 50 | 60 | 60 |
| 18. | 55 | 65 | 70 |
| 19. | 50 | 60 | 60 |
| 20. | 75 | 85 | 80 |
| 21. | 55 | 65 | 70 |
| 22. | 45 | 55 | 85 |
| 23. | 45 | 55 | 80 |
| 24. | 50 | 60 | 80 |
| 25. | 55 | 65 | 75 |
| 26. | 50 | 60 | 75 |
| 27. | 45 | 55 | 80 |
| 28. | 45 | 55 | 80 |
| 29. | 60 | 70 | 80 |
| 30. | 45 | 55 | 80 |
| 31. | 45 | 55 | 80 |
| 32. | 50 | 60 | 80 |
| 33. | 45 | 85 | 80 |
| 34. | 70 | 85 | 80 |
| 35. | 45 | 75 | 85 |
| 36. | 45 | 80 | 80 |
| 37. | 45 | 75 | 85 |
| 38. | 50 | 60 | 80 |
| 39. | 60 | 75 | 85 |
| 40. | 55 | 70 | 75 |
| 41. | 60 | 75 | 80 |
| 42. | 70 | 85 | 85 |
| 43. | 60 | 75 | 80 |
| 44. | 70 | 85 | 80 |
| 45. | 60 | 75 | 85 |
| 46. | 60 | 75 | 85 |
| 47. | 60 | 75 | 85 |
| 48. | 65 | 80 | 85 |
| 49. | 60 | 75 | 80 |
| 50. | 55 | 70 | 85 |
| 51. | 80 | 85 | 90 |
| 52. | 60 | 75 | 85 |
| 53. | 70 | 85 | 80 |
| 54. | 65 | 80 | 85 |
| 55. | 55 | 70 | 75 |
| 56. | 60 | 70 | 70 |
| 57. | 75 | 80 | 80 |


| NUMBER <br> OF <br> SAMPLE | PRE- <br> TEST <br> SCORE | POST- <br> TEST 1 <br> SCORE | POST- <br> TEST 2 <br> SCORE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 58. | 65 | 65 | 65 |
| 59. | 55 | 65 | 65 |
| 60. | 50 | 65 | 75 |
| 61. | 50 | 65 | 70 |
| 62. | 80 | 85 | 90 |
| 63. | 70 | 80 | 85 |
| 64. | 65 | 60 | 65 |
| 65. | 65 | 80 | 85 |
| 66. | 65 | 70 | 80 |
| 67. | 70 | 75 | 75 |
| $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 2 9 5}$ |

From the table above, the writer can calculates the average score of pre test, that is 59.78. In posttest 1 , the average score is 71.94 . In addition, in posttest II, the average score is 79.03. The percentage improvement of the implementation between pretest and posttest 1 is $20.35 \%$. Moreover, the percentage improvement result of the implementation between pre-test and post-test 2 is $32.21 \%$. Therefore, there is a significant improvement of the students' skills in speaking after they are taught by using Classroom debate to the eleventh grade students of SMA Negeri 2 Padangsidimpuan.

By using the collected data the writer can calculate the frequency and percentages of the students' scores in post-test 1 as follows:

TABLE III
THE FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE STUDENTS' SCORES IN POST-TEST 1

| NO | SCORES | FREQUENCY | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 55 | 7 | $10.45 \%$ |
| 2 | 60 | 8 | $11.94 \%$ |
| 3 | 65 | 8 | $11.94 \%$ |
| 4. | 70 | 6 | $8.96 \%$ |
| 5. | 75 | 17 | $25.37 \%$ |
| 6. | 80 | 9 | $13.43 \%$ |
| 7. | 85 | 12 | $17.91 \%$ |
| TOTAL |  | $\mathbf{6 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

From the table above the frequency histogram of the students scores in post- test 1 can be made as following graphic :

Graphic 2. The frequency histogram of the students scores in post-test 1


From the table above, it can be seen there are 38 students who have passed the minimal completeness criteria (KKM), and there are 29 students who have not passed the KKM. If it was calculated into class percentage, it was derived $56.72 \%$.

By using the collected data the writer also can calculate the frequency and percentages of the students' scores in post-test 2 as follows:

TABLE V
THE FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE STUDENTS' SCORES IN POST-TEST 2

| NO | SCORES | FREQUENCY | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 60 | 3 | $4.48 \%$ |
| 2 | 65 | 4 | $5.97 \%$ |
| 3 | 70 | 5 | $7.46 \%$ |
| 4. | 75 | 6 | $8.96 \%$ |
| 5. | 80 | 27 | $40.30 \%$ |
| 6. | 85 | 17 | $25.37 \%$ |
| 7. | 90 | 5 | $7.46 \%$ |
| TOTAL |  | $\mathbf{6 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

From the table above the frequency histogram of the students scores in post- test 2 can be made as following graphic :

Graphic 3. The frequency histogram of the students scores in post-test 2


From the table above, it can be seen there are 60 students who have passed the minimal completeness criteria (KKM), and there are 7 students who have not passed the KKM. If it was calculated into class percentage, it was derived $82.09 \%$.

The class percentage of posttest 2 obviously shows some improvements from the previous test; the improvement is 82.09 \% from the pretest. From that percentage, it can be concluded that the CAR is success because the percentage of students' mean score of post-test 2 could pass the criterion of CAR success, $75 \%$. So, the cycle of CAR is stopped.

From the analysis of the collected data it has been known that there is a significant improvement of the students' skills in speaking after they are taught by using Classroom debate. It can be seen from the percentage improvement result of the implementation between pre-test and post-test 2 is $32.21 \%$. So that the hypothesis of this research is accepted.

## V. THE CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

## The Conclusions

1. There is a significant improvement of the students' skills in speaking after they are taught by using Classroom debate to the eleventh grade students of SMA Negeri 2 Padangsidimpuan. It can be seen from the percentage improvement result of the implementation between pre-test and posttest 2 is $32.21 \%$
2. Classroom debate is good to be applied in teaching speaking. It can be seen from the average score or mean scores got by the
students in post-tes 1 and post-test 2 , they are 71.94 for the postest 1 and 79.03 for posttest 2.
3. The Result of the posttest showed that there were 60 students or $82.35 \%$ who passed the $K K M$. It was significantly improved from the pretest which gained only $11.94 \%$ and in the posttest 1 which had $56.72 \%$ improvement.
4. The hypothesis of this research is accepted.

## The Suggestions

1. Teachers should pay more attention on the progress five speaking components (comprehension, fluency, vocabulary, pronuciation, and grammar) while teaching speaking. Teacher may give feedback to the students intensely by reporting their progress of five speaking components so students will know what to improve more on their speaking. Teacher should also give time for the students to evaluate five speaking components with their partners so it will train the students able to correct their mistakes and create a student centre learning.
2. Students should not depend on the material provided by teacher inside the classroom. It is better for them to try find other related media by themselves outside of the classroom to get a better speaking
3. For Further Researcher about debate, it may be possible to implement debate for junior high school students.
