A COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN ''BUZZ GROUP'' AND ''CRITICAL DEBATE'' TOWARD STUDENTS' SPEAKING ACHIEVEMENT

K. Dedy Sandiarsa S.[1], Muhamad Suhaili[2]
Uiversitas Pendidikan Mandalika, Mataram
dedysandiarsa36@gmail.com [1], suhailimuhamad46@gmail.com[2]

ABSTRACT

This research is aimed at finding the comparative study between Buzz Group and Critical Debate toward students' speaking achievement. This research was experimental research. Statistic formula was used as the technique of data analysis. The subject of this research consisted of 44 students at the second grade students of MA Darul Qur'an Bengkel. The technique of collecting data used pre-test and post-test. The mean score of experimental group was 48.72 for pre-test, 66.18 for post-test and control group was 46.18 for pre-test, 63.27 for post-test. Variance of experimental group was 68.21, 62.91 for variance of control group and ttest score was 0.13 and t-table in significance level of 0.05 was 1.682 with degree of freedom was 42. It showed that t-test was higher than t-table, so that way, alternative hypothesis accepted and null hypothesis rejected. Therefore, the writer concluded there was significant compare of Buzz Group and Critical Debate towards students' speaking achievement at the second grade students of MA Darul Qur'an Bengkel in academic year 2017/2018.

Key Words *: Buzz Group, Critical Debate and Speaking Achievement*

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui studi komparatif antara kelompok buzz dan debat kritis terhadap prestasi berbicara siswa. Penelitian ini merupakan penelitian eksperimental Teknik analisis data menggunakan rumus statistik. Subyek penelitian ini terdiri dari 44 siswa pada siswa kelas dua MA Darul Qur'an Bengkel. Teknik pengumpulan data menggunakan pre-test dan post-test. Skor rata-rata dari kelompok eksperimen adalah 48,72 untuk pre-test, 66,18 untuk post-test dan kelompok kontrol 46,18 untuk pre-test, 63,27 untuk post-test. Varian untuk kelompok eksperimen adalah 68,21 dan 62,91 untuk varian kelompok kontrol dan skor t-test adalah 0,13 dan tingkat signifikasi 0,05 dengan derajat kebebasan sebagai 42. Ini menunjukkan bahwa t-test lebih tinggi dari t-tabel, sehingga dengan demikian hipotesis alternatif diterima dan hipotesis nol ditolak. Oleh karena itu, peneliti menyimpulkan ada perbedaan yang signifikan dibandingkan kelompok buzz dan debat kritis terhadap prestasi berbicara siswa pada siswa kelas dua MA Darul Qur'an Bengkel pada tahun pelajaran 2017/2018.

Kata Kunci *: Buzz Group, Critical Debate dan Kemampuan Berbicara.*

INTRODUCTION

Speaking skill is one of the important and essential skill that must be practiced to communicate orally (Hughes, 2002). On the contrary, for most people, speaking is the most difficult part when learners learn a foreign language. There are many obstacles in mastering English. Speaking is the productive skill of a language to express the idea or send message to the hearer. It means that when the students speak they can produce the expressions that should be meaningful.

Based on the school curriculum for English, teaching English is a subject that consists of four skills such as listening, speaking, reading and writing. All of English skills are important but speaking skill is the most important skill that should be mastered by English learner. Speaking ability is able to describe how far the language learner mastered about the language itself. Speaking ability is challenging to master because speaking skill covers all of English elements.

Related to the description above, to overcome the problems of the students, the researcher interested in using Buzz Group and Critical Debate techniques in teaching speaking because Buzz Group and Critical Debate techniques might be able to practice their ability to speak.

Based on the statement above, the researcher interested in investigating a research

entitled ''A Comparative Study between Buzz Group and Critical Debate toward the Students' Speaking Achievement of MA Darul Qur'an Bengkel in Academic Year 2016/2017''.

RESEARCH METHOD

This Research design was Causal-Comparative Research. It was a type of descriptive research since it described conditions that already exist. It was a form of investigation in which the researcher has no direct control over independent variable as its expression has already occurred or because they were essentially non-manipulable. It also attempted to identified reasons or caused of pre existing differences in groups of individuals. if a researcher observed that two or more groups were different on a variable, he tried to identify the main factor that has led to this difference. Causal comparative studies were also called ex post facto because the investigator has no control over the external variable since whatever happened occurred before the researcher arrived there for there was no certainty that the two groups were exactly equal before the difference occurred (Dehejia & Wahba, 2002: 1053-1062). In causal comparative design, two groups that differ were selected and comparison was done. Inferential analysis such as t-test (for two groups) will be used to calculate the result.

Population and Sample

The population of this research was all of the second grade students of MA Darul Qur'an Bengkel in the academic year 2016/2017 in which consisted of 4 classes. The total population of this study was 74 number of the students.

Sample refers to the part of the universe which is selected for the purpose of investigation (Kothari, 2004: 158). In finding the sample of this study, the researcher took 2 classes as the samples, those were XI IPA and XI IPS 2.

Research Instrument

In this research, the researcher used subjective test in order to test speaking achievement of the students of MA Darul Qur'an Bengkel. The kind of subjective task used by the researcher was interaction with fellow candidates. Interaction with fellow candidates was an advantage of having candidates interacting with each other was that it should elicit language that was appropriate to exchanges between equals, which might elicit better performance. In much as the candidates may feel more confident than when dealing with a dominant, seemingly omniscient interviewer, there was problem, however. The performance of one candidate is likely to be affect by that of the others (Hughes, 2002: 121). The assessment was be based on five aspects in speaking, those were; pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension.

Technique of Data Analysis

In analyzing in the data from the post-test, the researcher used the statistical calculation of t-test. T-test was used in order to find out the significant differences of the result/score between students using Buzz Group technique and students using Critical Debate Technique in speaking achievement. To analyze the data, the researcher measured the mean score, variance, and significance deviation of mean score of both experimental and control groups.

RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

The researcher firstly took the score of the students by given pre-test and post-test to both of the group experimental and control group at MA Darul Qur'an Bengkel, then the researcher tabulated the mean score of the students of experimental group and control group. The pre-test; which was conducted in order to know the students' ability before giving the treatment, and the second steps the writer did the post-test as the last of test which also conducted in order to know the students' ability after giving the treatment and the results of both tests were presented below :

Experimental Group (Buzz Group)

The result of the data analysis showed that the highest score of pre-test was 60 and the lowest score was 40 and the highest score of post-test was 80 and the lowest score of post-test was 56. The mean score was 48.72 of pre-test and the mean score of post-test 66.18, and the variance score was 68.21.

Control Group (Critical Debate)

The result of the data analysis showed that the highest score of pre-test was 60 and the

lowest score was 40. The mean score was of pre-test 46.18 and the mean score of posttest63.27, and the variance score was 62.91.

Speaking is the most important skill to be improved by the students in learning English. However, most of the students are hand to speak in English although they can understand what people said. This problem also found by the researcher in MA Darul Qur'an Bengkel, the students were difficult to pronounce the word, less confidence and the afraid to speak in front of the class. Developing curriculum and using many strategies have been done by the English teacher in MA Darul Qur'an Bengkel. However, because there are many characters of the students, it made the English teacher difficult to control them. Based on the problem above, the researcher tried to the experiment Buzz Group and Critical Debate to solve the students' problem. According to the analysis of the researcher, theoretically Buzz Group and Critical Debate were good in teaching speaking. As stated by Sujianto (2009) Buzz Group make the learners who are less likely to express opinion in study group as if forced by situations ton speak in small groups. Moreover as stated by Barkley (2012) Critical Debate can give great contribution of the students to speak.

After implementing both of the strategies, there were different result. The researcher found that Buzz Group and Critical Debate were good in teaching speaking. Generally, however Buzz Group was better than Critical Debate. It was proven by the result of the students' score in speaking that has been described in previous chapter.

Teaching speaking by using Buzz Group could get some information in exploring new ideas or solving problem, develop the ability to think and communicate, increase involvement in planning and decision sharing, faster cooperation in solving a problem and achieving a decision, train express opinion and could confidence. This really be reference for the students who has a problem in speaking. Moreover, debating seeks to explore the reasons understandable and convincing. Debaters should deliver their arguments in good communication skills. However, Buzz Group was better than Critical Debate because Buzz

Group could solve problems by looked at various aspects of the problem and done by exchanging ideas in a focused and focused way. It might be caused by the application of Buzz Group is more easy to understand by the students. Moreover, they can improve their speaking easily when the researcher using Buzz Group in teaching speaking.

CONCLUSSION

Based on the explanation in the previous chapter, here the researcher gives some conclusions of this thesis, it was hoped that the readers will be able to know much about this thesis easily, the conclusion such as; ''Buzz Group'' expressed the students to various point of viewed and to the ways of supporting those viewed point; therefore, it can help students to try speak in the classroom or outside classroom; The effect ''Buzz Group'' in teaching speaking has given positive impact to students. The students were more motivated to speak. It could be seen from the result that ''Buzz Group'' has better than ''Critical Debate''; The speaking skill become very important in educational field, students need to be exercised and trained in order to have a good speaking skill. Speaking was also something crucial and indispensable for the students because the success of their study defends on the greater of their ability to speak; The statistical of the obtained data resulted figures of mean score and the standard variation of two classes. Both of the mean scores and the standard of the Buzz Group showed that the Buzz Group was more successful than the students of Critical Debate. From the explanation of the result above the researcher found: t test = 0.13 while t table 1.682 for 5%; Based on the data analysis above, it was found that the result of t-test was greater than ttable. So, the writer gives the conclusion that the students in Buzz Group were better than who were in Critical Debate.

REFERENCES

Barkley, Elizabeth F., Cross, K. Patricia, Major, Claire H. 2012. Collaborative Learning Techniques: A Handbook for College Faculty 1st Edition. San Francisco, Calif. : Jossey-Bass,

Dehejia, R., & Wahba, S. (2002). Propensity score-matching methods for non-

experimental causal studies. The Review of Economics and Statistics, 84(1), 151-161.

Hughes, Arthur, 2002. *Testing For Language Teachers.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kothari, C.R. 2004. *Research Methodology*. New Delhi: New Age International Publisher.

Sujianto, Agus Eko. 2009. *Aplikasi Statistik dengan SPSS 16.0*. Jakarta: Prestasi Pustaka Publisher.