

JELE

Journal of English Language and Education

Editorial Board

Chairperson : Dr. Hermayawati, M.Pd.

Editorial Staff : Elysa Hartati, S.Pd., M.Pd.
Restu Arini, S.Pd., M.Pd.
Agustinus Hary Setyawan, S.Pd., M.A.
Wilujeng Asih Purwani, S.Pd., M.A.
Ika Kurniawati, S.Pd., M.Pd.

Language Consultant : Prof. Dr. Soepomo Poedjosoedarmo (Gadjah Mada University)
Dr. Issy Yuliasri, M.Pd. (State University of Semarang)
Drs. Barli Bram, M.Ed, Ph.D (Sanata Dharma University)
Dr. Dwi Anggani L.B., M.Pd. (State University of Semarang)
Sayit Abdul Karim, M.Pd. (Technology University of Yogyakarta)

ISSN : 2460 - 7142

Address : English Education Study Program
Faculty of Teachers Training and Education
Mercu Buana University of Yogyakarta
Jl. Wates Km.10 Yogyakarta 55753

Phones : (0274) 6498211, 6498212

Fax : (0274) 6498213

Email : jurnal.umby@gmail.com

Journal of English Language and Education (JELE), to appear twice a year (in June and December) for lecturers, teachers and students, is published by the Unit of Scientific Publishing and Intellectual Property Rights, Mercu Buana University of Yogyakarta. This journal welcomes articles which have never been published elsewhere and are not under consideration for publication in other journals at the same time. Articles should be original and typed, 1.5 spaced, about 10-20 pages of quarto-sized (A4), and written in English. For the brief guidelines, it is attached in the end of this journal.

PREFACE

We proudly present the *Journal of English Language and Education (JELE)* Vol.1, No.2 which is presented for practitioners and researchers in accommodating their findings of research. By sharing the idea through this journal, it is expected that issues dealing with the English language and teaching can be overcome as it can be a reference to conduct a new research in the future.

This journal comprises seven articles concerning on linguistics and English language teaching. They are categorized into discourse analysis, syllabus design and techniques to teach English that aim to improve the quality of English learning.

We would like to thank to the contributors who have already participated in sharing the ideas towards the content of this journal. We would like also to express our sincere thanks to all members of editorial board who have worked hand in hand in creating this journal. We hope that this fine collection of articles will be beneficial and valuable to stimulate a further research.

Yogyakarta, December 2015

Editor

TABLE OF CONTENT
Vol.1 No.2, December 2015

Editorial board	ii
Preface	iii
Table of content	iv
“THE USE OF RECAST IN TEACHING OF GRAMMAR FOR HIGH AND LOW ACHIEVERS” <i>Olyvia Revalita Candraloka</i>	108-118
“PROJECT-BASED COLLABORATIVE WRITING IN TEACHING GRAMMAR FOR STUDENTS WITH HIGH AND LOW MOTIVATION” <i>KuntoNurcahyoko</i>	119-135
“INTEGRATIVE GRAMMAR IN TEACHING ACADEMIC WRITING” <i>Nicolas Lodawik Ouwpoly</i>	136-150
“THE REALIZATION OF INTERPERSONAL NEGOTIATION IN THE CONVERSATION” <i>Elysa Hartati</i>	151-169
“DISCOURSE AS SOCIAL PRACTICE ON ABDUL QODIR JAELANI (AQJ) CASE” <i>SuhartiniSyukri dan Isna Humaerah</i>	170-183
“THE EFFECTIVENESS OF CLASSROOM DISCUSSION IN IMPROVING ENGLISH SPEAKING SKILL AMONG THE STUDENTS OF SMP N 3 DEPOK” <i>Agustinus Hary Setyawan</i>	184-202
“THE 2013 CURRICULUM BASED SYLLABUS FOR SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL’S ENGLISH EXTRACURRICULAR PROGRAM” <i>Masrur Mustolih</i>	203-215
Notes for contributors	216

The Effectiveness of Classroom Discussion in Improving English Speaking Skill among The Students of SMP N 3 Depok

Agustinus Hary Setyawan

English Education Department, Faculty of Teachers Training and Education, University of Mercu Buana Yogyakarta
Email: agustinushary@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The objective of the research is to investigate whether or not there is a significant difference in the mastery of the speaking skill between the students who are taught by using classroom discussion and those who are taught without using classroom discussion. This study is a quasi-experimental study employing two groups. The experimental group is 8A and the control group is 8C. The data were collected by using an achievement test. The data of both pre-test and post-test scores from the control and experimental groups were analyzed by using inferential statistics. To test the hypothesis, the researcher used t-test to find out the differences of speaking skill mastery achievement between control and experimental groups. The result of post-test indicates that t_o is higher than the t value at the significance level of 5%, i.e. $2.106 < 2.000$. The level significance is 0.037. It is lower than 0.05. It was found that the mean of the post-test scores and gained scores of the experimental group were higher than that of the control group. The standard deviation of the experimental group decreases from 7.30 to 6.92 or the scores of the experimental group from pre-test to post-test are more homogenous. While, the standard deviation of the control group increases from 7.53 to 8.36 or the scores of the control group from pre-test to post-test are more heterogeneous. Besides, the mean of experimental group increases 207% from the standard deviation of the pre-test. While the mean of the control group also increases 147% from the standard deviation of the pre-test. It is found that classroom discussion is effective in improving English learning achievement in student's mastery of speaking and there is a significant difference between both classes.

Keywords : discussion, speaking, learning achievement

INTRODUCTION

The activities done in the classroom should facilitate and ensure learning. Because the students are learning, they need more time to use English in the classroom than the teacher. The teacher uses English as models of language exposure so that the students learn real language use,

but the students need much more time to practice. Based on the result of the research conducted by Ghozali (1999) and Andrianto (2000) as quoted by Ekomunajat (2004:2), it indicates that the students at junior high schools are still unable to communicate in English although they have been learning English for more than six years. It is because they do not have adequate

time to practice their language in the class and outside of the class. The earlier observation also shows that the usual speaking approach at SMP N 3 Depok is always non-classroom discussion techniques. Therefore, the students are prepared to learn speaking within the texts available in the student's book. These models of dialog of course are limited because the students have no chance to express their own ideas, and they have no challenge to create new situations. So, it is necessary for the teacher to have a method which has an effective way in the communicative speaking activities. Students must be given opportunities to practice the language they are learning. In other words, teacher's talk time should be minimized and students' talk time must be maximized. Teachers should decide the suitable method which can meet learners' characteristics.

There are various types of method in English teaching such as grammar translation method, direct method, audio lingual method, Communicative language teaching, Silent way, suggestopedia, total physical response, and natural approach (Brown, 2001:24).

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), meanwhile, is an approach in which many kinds of methods and technique can be developed so that they can be conducted directly in the teaching learning activity. CLT is an approach in which many kinds of methods and techniques can be developed so that they can be conducted directly in the teaching learning activity. There are many activities like discussions, role plays, interviews, information gap activities, games, language exchanges, surveys, pair works. One of them is discussion.

Discussion creates an effective and efficient teaching and learning program. It also creates active participation of the students as the subject and object of teaching and learning program. Ideally, students come to class with great motivation, that is, the willingness to learn. Students are expected to possess reasonable English skills in order to cope with the course. In addition, they must bring their knowledge of the world to play to ensure that learning is an active process, not a passive one (Chayanuvat, 1996:7) Discussion is the appropriate method to cope with this problem.

In the learning process, discussion is also used as a stimulus to grow students' interest, enthusiasm, motivation on what is being presented in a particular lesson. Classroom discussion technique hopefully can reduce the student's feeling of being burdened with the English learning process in the classroom and encourage better speaking performance in communicative contexts. A number of research studies related to discussion had shown that discussion approaches produced strong increases in the amount of student talk and concomitant reductions in teacher talk, as well as substantial improvements in text comprehension (Murphy, 2009). Few approaches to discussion were effective at increasing students' literal or inferential comprehension and critical thinking and reasoning. It is also suggested to be used in the class for teachers (Howard, 2004).

In classroom discussions,

students are creating positive peer relationship. According to Jones (1998; 93), peer relationships influence students' achievement in several ways. First, peer attitudes toward achievement affect students' academic aspirations and school behavior. Second, the quality of peer relationships and personal support in classroom affects the degree to which students' personal needs are met and, subsequently, their ability to be productively involved in the learning process. Third, peer relationship can directly affect achievement through cooperative learning activities.

There are some criteria for good discussions. The discussions will run well and reach the aim if they fulfill some requirements. The supporting and interesting situation must be created in order to achieve the good discussions. It is in line with the principle of students taking responsibility for their own learning (Celce-Murcia, 2000:106).

Harmer (1991:124) states that there are three types of discussion activity. They are buzz group, controversial topic, and debate. First, buzz group is discussion where the students are in loose groups of three or

four (the number is unimportant). Frequently the teacher may ask them to think all possible things that they are discussing. The example might be the students are going to read a text about hobbies. The teacher puts them into groups for a session about two minutes. They should think about kinds of hobbies that they can figure out. They could be put into buzz discussion to think of as many activities as possible. It can form the prelude to a larger discussion session.

Second, controversial statements are good discussion provokers. The students are given the following statements about smoking and told that they have to circle the number which best reflects their agreement or disagreement with the statement (0 = totally disagree, 5 = totally agree). When they have done the activity, they compare their answers in pairs and then groups. They have to agree a score. It is for consensus activity. This technique is a good example of using a small task to provoke discussion.

Third, debate is suitable for more advanced classes. Students are given a controversial proposition such as *Yogyakarta must be free from*

beggars. They are then put into two groups which have to prepare arguments either in favor of the proposition or against the proposition. When the arguments are ready, the teams elect a first and second person who makes formal speeches to argue their case. All the other students can then take part with short interventions. At the end of the discussion, the teacher can organize a free vote to see whether the proposition wins or not.

According to Arends (1997:211) there are also other types of discussion and the approach chosen that are included in the effective classroom discussion. The first approach is recitation exchange. It uses direct instruction. It has a brief question and answer session about assigning task. The teacher gives specific instruction first to the students. The second approach is problem-based discussion. It is about memorizing and understanding some materials. The next step is the teacher provides a question and answer session about assigning task. It engages students in higher and order thinking. It motivates their intellectual investigation. The last approach is sharing-based discussion. It is about

sharing the student's common experiences. They must have different opinions based on their experiences.

The reason why the writer chose discussion is because facilitating more effective classroom discussions constitutes a fundamental first step toward helping the students simply shouting at each other as a means of "communication". The most natural and effective way for learners to practice talking freely in English is by thinking out some problems or situations together through verbal interchange of ideas or to discuss. It can make the students use their language by building sense of community in the classroom. Discussion can also be an alternative solution to the problem of how to encourage students to speak because when they are asked to express themselves in a foreign language, they may find some difficulties to express their intentions. Furthermore the problems in this research can be formulated as follows: (1) How is the English learning achievement of student's speaking mastery of the students who are taught by using classroom discussion? (2) How is the English learning achievement of

student's speaking mastery of the students who are taught without using classroom discussion? and (3) Is the classroom discussion effective for improving the English speaking skill of the second year students of SMP N 3 Depok? On the basis of what is discussed in the theoretical review and the conceptual framework, the writer proposes a research hypothesis: "There is a significant difference in the English speaking skill mastery between the students who are given classroom discussion activities and those who are not."

METHODS

This study is categorized as a quasi-experimental research design. It uses classical pretest-post-tests. There are two variables in this study: dependent and independent variables. The independent variable is the way of testing. The dependent variable is the students' speaking mastery. The setting of the study is in SMP N 3 Depok, Yogyakarta. It is located in Sopalan, Maguwoharjo, Depok, Sleman, Yogyakarta Special Territory. There are four classes in the second grade. The numbers of the students are

146. Every class has 36 students. They are all students of the second grade in the 2009/2010 academic year. The samples of this study are the second grade students of SMP N 3 Depok. The number of students is the same. The setting is in an educational institution which already has composition of the students in each class. The distribution has all been set by the school. So, the technique of sampling is judgment sampling. The researcher chose two classes of second grade in SMP N 3 Depok on the basis of their characteristics. They should fulfill the same requirements to be the students of SMP N 3 Depok in 2009/2010 academic year. Besides, there are still some other requirements to be fulfilled. They are of the same age. They are the first grade graduates of SMP N 3 Depok, and they are in the same school environment. The classes are 8 A and 8 C. These are the classes that have the same characteristics in learning English because of the same teacher in their second year in SMP N 3 Depok. Class 8 A has 36 students and 8 C has 35 students. So, the number of the sample is 71. The random assignment resulted in class 8A as the experimental group and 8C

as the control group. Meanwhile, class 8B is a sample class of the try-out before the research was applied. The research instruments which are used in this study are pretest -post-tests.

The validity of the instrument used content validity with the blueprint of the instrument, construct validity established through 'expert judgment' and item validity by the product moment correlation. The test was tried out on 36 students in class 8B. The tests were held on the February 15th and 18th 2010. The scores were analyzed by using the SPS computer program of Sutrisno Hadi and Yuni Pamardiningsih, 2000 edition. The result of the computation shows that all of the item numbers were valid. To know the reliability of the research, the KR-20 formula is applied (Hatch and Farhady, 1982: 247). The researcher also employed the SPS computer program of Sutrisno Hadi and Yuni Pamardiningsih, 2000 edition to analyze the reliability of the test. The computation showed that the reliability coefficient for pre-test of try out I is 0.891, the reliability coefficient for post-test of try out II is 0.898, if the instrument test refers to the value of reliability coefficient (α

>r table), the research instrument can be regarded as reliable.

The sources of data were two classes in the second year of SMP N 3 Depok, Yogyakarta. There were two tests given, pre-test and post-test. The first was pre-test. It was conducted to know the speaking mastery of the students before they were given the treatment. The second was post-test. It was conducted to know the speaking skill of the students after they got the treatment. The treatment was conducted in six meetings for the experimental group and control group. The treatment had three meetings per week. The duration of each meeting was eighty minutes. The researcher discussed the schedule with Mrs. Ardaniyah, the English teacher of SMP N 3 Depok. The experimental group was on Monday and Tuesday while the control group was on Tuesday, Friday and Saturday. The researcher followed the school schedule in conducting the treatment. Table 2 outlines the time schedule of the study.

The pre-achievement measurement was conducted on Wednesday, 19th of January 2010 for the experimental group and on Friday,

22th of January 2010 for the control group. The implementation of the treatment to the experimental group was done in January and February 2010. It took place according to the time schedules of the school. Meanwhile, the pre-achievement measurement was conducted on Wednesday, 16th of February 2010 for the experimental group and on Friday, 19th of February 2010 for the control group. Both classes had different time schedules for the English subject.

To find out the category of learning achievement for the pre- and the post-test results, the researcher used the ideal mean and the ideal standard deviation. Nurgiyantoro (2009: 395) states that for the achievement test, the ideal mean is 60% from the highest score and the ideal standard deviation is 25% from the ideal mean.

There were 10 items in the test. It is a test which has the value 10 for the correct answer or based on the rubric of the speaking performance. So, in this research the highest score for the test is 100. The ideal mean is $60\% \times 100 = 60$. The ideal standard deviation is 25% of 60 equal to 15. Thus the category of students'

speaking mastery can be put according to:

Table 1. The Category of Students' Learning Achievement

Score range	Category
90 <	excellent
75 – 89	very good
60 – 74	good
45 – 59	poor
30 – 44	very poor
> 29	extremely poor

The data from the procedure of data collection show the score of test before the treatment and after the treatment. The score of test made after the treatment indicates the progress in the speaking skill. These are subjected to the data analysis. The statistics used in the data analysis in the quantitative research are descriptive and inferential analyses.

The descriptive analysis discussion of the variables under this study is based on their computation of the mean, standard deviation, and the lowest and highest scores (Suharto, 2002: 17), normality test (Weinbergh and Schumaker, 1969: 212), homogeneity test (SutrisnoHadi, 2004: 312) and the inferential statistics with statistical t-test. The test is utilized to uncover the difference between the scores of the speaking skill test

obtained in the pre-test and those in the post-test and to determine if there has been any improvement in the students' speaking skill after the treatment is given (Suharto, 2002:70).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The table below describes the statistical data of the pre-test and post-test scores of the students speaking mastery of the experimental group. The statistical data consist of the information about the number of cases, the sum of scores, mean, and standard deviation.

Table 2. Statistical data of the Pre-test and Post-test Score of the Experimental Group

Data	Pre-test	Post-test
Number of cases	36	36
Sum of scores	2153	2697
Mean	59.80	74.92
SD	7.30	6.92

The mean of pre-test and post-test increases from 59.80 to 74.92. If it is consulted to the table of categorization, it is clear that the students' speaking mastery improves from the poor to the good category because after applying the classroom discussion method, the mean of the

post-test scores lies between the numbers of 60 – 74.9.

The standard deviation of pre-test in the experimental group is 7.30 and the standard deviation of post-test in the experimental group is 6.92. It decreases from 7.30 to 6.92. It can be concluded that the scores of the experimental group from pre-test to post-test are more homogenous. The mean also increases 207% of standard deviation of the pre-test.

The data of the pre-test and post-test of the control group were obtained by using the same test as the data from the achievement pre-test and post-test of the experimental group. The table below illustrates the statistical data in the pre-test and post-test scores of the students' speaking mastery in the control group. The statistical data consist of the information about the number of cases, sum of scores, mean, and standard deviation.

Table 3. The Statistical Data of the Pre-test and Post-test Scores of the Control Group

Data	Pre-test	Post-test
Number of cases	35	35
Sum of scores	2102	2488
Mean	60.06	71.09
SD	7.53	8.36

The mean of pre-test and post-test increases from 60.06 to 71.09. If it is consulted to the table of categorization, it is clear that the students' speaking mastery stays in the good category because the mean of the post-test scores still lies between the numbers of 60 – 74.9.

The standard deviation of pre-test in the control group is 7.53 and the standard deviation of post-test in the control group is 8.36. It increases from 7.53 to 8.36. It can be concluded that the scores of the control group from pre-test to post-test are more heterogeneous. The mean also increases 147% of standard deviation of the pre-test.

Statistical Data of the Effectiveness of Classroom Discussion in Improving the Students' Speaking Mastery between the Experimental Group and the Control Group is described by the following statistical data:

Table 4. Statistical Data of the Effectiveness of Classroom Discussion

Data	Experimen- -tal Group	Control Group
Number of cases	36	35
Sum of score	2697	2488
Mean	74.92	71.09
SD	6.92	8.36

The table above shows that there is a difference between the scores of the experimental and the control group. The mean of the students who were taught by using classroom discussions is 74.92, while the mean of the students who were not taught by using classroom discussions is 71.09. It confirms that the mean and the improvement of the effectiveness of classroom discussions in improving students' speaking mastery in the experimental group is higher than that without using classroom discussions in the control group.

The number of the students of the experimental group in the good category increases 36.1%, while the number of the students of the control group in the good category increases 25.7%. It confirms that the increasing number of the students in the good category in the experimental group is higher than that of the control group.

The standard deviation of the experimental group decreases from 7.30 to 6.92 or the scores of the experimental group from pre-test to post-test are more homogenous. While, the standard deviation of the control group increases from 7.53 to 8.36 or the scores of the control group

from pre-test to post-test are more heterogeneous. It can be concluded that the scores of the experimental group become homogenous while the scores of the control group become heterogeneous.

Besides, the mean of experimental group increases 207% from the standard deviation of the pre-test. While the mean of the control group also increases 147% from the standard deviation of the pre-test. It can be concluded that the increase of the mean in experimental group is higher than that of the control group.

To find out whether or not there is a significant difference of the students' speaking mastery between the students' who were taught using classroom discussions and those who were not taught using classroom discussions, the t-test was applied. Before the t-test was operated, the pre analysis testing was applied in this research. The pre analysis testing included test of normality and test of homogeneity. The discussion of the pre analysis testing is as follows.

The normality test is used to know whether or not the distribution of scores is normal. In this case, the chi – square technique was employed.

The test of normality was applied to the pre-test of the experimental group. The distribution is said to be normal if the obtained Chi-square value (χ^2) is lower than the critical value ($\chi^2_{t(2)}$)

with the significance level of 5% and (df) equals with $n - 1$. The following table confirms the summary of the normality test result.

Table 5. Result of the Test of Normality

Variable	χ^2	$\chi^2_{5\%}$	df	p	Statement	Test
Experimental Group (X_1)	11.843	12.592	6	0.07	Normal	Pre-test
Experimental Group (X_2)	7.479	16.919	9	0.59	Normal	Post-test
Control Group (X_1)	13.776	14.067	7	0.05	Normal	Pre-test
Control Group (X_2)	8.628	16.919	9	0.47	Normal	Post-test

χ^2 = The Chi-square of the observation.

$\chi^2_{5\%}$ = The Chi-square of the table in the significance level of 5%.

df = Degree of freedom

p = Degree of significance ($p > 0.05$ = normal).

In terms of the pre-test, Table 19 above shows that χ^2 value of the pre-test of two groups (the experimental and control groups) is lower than $\chi^2_{t(5\%)}$ value, i.e., $11.843 < 12.592$ and $13.776 < 14.067$. Thus, it can be stated the data tend to be normal. The level of significance of the groups is also higher than 0.05, i.e. $0.066 > 0.05$ and $0.055 > 0.05$. Therefore, the pre-test data of the

groups is once again, proved to be normal.

In relation to the post-test, Table 23 above shows that χ^2 value of the post-test of two groups (the experimental and control groups) is lower than $\chi^2_{t(5\%)}$ value, i.e., $7.479 < 16.919$ and $8.628 < 16.919$. So, it is clear that the data are normal. The level of significance of the groups is also higher than 0.05, i.e. $0.587 > 0.05$ and $0.472 > 0.05$. Once again, the post-test data of the groups are proved to be normal.

The homogeneity test is applied to know whether or not the two groups are in the same condition or whether the sample variance is homogeneous

or not. The analysis technique employed to analyze whether the sample variance is homogeneous or

not is the F-test. The table below describes the descriptive analysis of the homogeneity test result.

Table6. Descriptive Analysis of the Homogeneity Test Result

Variable	Var– max	Var - min	F _o	F _t 5%	P	Statement
X	56.644	53.247	1.064	1.760	0.428	homogeneous

F_o = F value on the observation.

F_t 5% = F value of the table in the significance level of 5%.

Var-max = The maximum variance result.

Var-min = The minimum variance result.

p = Degree of significance ($p > 0.05 = \text{normal}$).

It can be seen from the table that the value of Fo is less than Ft, i.e. $1.064 < 1.770$ (the complete computation is enclosed in Appendix V). So, it can be declared that the sample of variance is homogeneous. The level of significance is more than 0.05, i.e. $0,428 > 0.05$. Therefore, the sample of variance is, once again confirmed to be homogeneous.

Hypothesis Test

After describing the data of the variables, the normality test and the homogeneity test, the researcher then did the analysis to the test of hypothesis. The test of hypothesis aims at revealing whether or not there is a significant difference between the

two groups in their mean scores of the English speaking mastery test. The hypothesis of this research is “There is a significant difference in the English speaking skill mastery between the students who are given classroom discussion activities and those who are not.”

The table below describes the scores of the tests of the experimental group and control group. It gives details about the pre-test and post-test scores of the students’ speaking test of both groups.

The table below shows that the mean of the post-test scores of the experimental group is higher than that of the control group i.e., $74.92 > 71.09$. Then, the mean score of the gain

scores of the experimental group is also higher than that of the control group i.e., 15.11 > 11.03.

Table 7. The Score of the Speaking Test

Variable	N	Pre-test		Post-test		Gain	
		X1	SD1	X2	SD2	X3	SD3
A1	36	59.80	7.30	74.92	6.92	15.11	6.32
A2	35	60.06	7.53	71.09	8.36	11.03	5.17

- A1 = The experimental group
- A2 = The control group
- N = Number of the students
- X1 = Mean of the pre- test score
- X2 = Mean of the post- test score
- X3 = Mean of the gain score
- SD1 = Standard deviation of pre-test
- SD2 = Standard deviation of post-test
- SD3 = Standard deviation of gain

more homogenous. While, the standard deviation of the control group increases from 7.53 to 8.36 or it is more heterogeneous. It can be concluded that the scores of the experimental group become homogenous while the scores of the control group become heterogeneous. Besides, the mean of experimental group increases 207% from the standard deviation of the pre-test.

While the mean of the control group also increases 147% from the standard deviation of the pre-test. It can be concluded that the increasing mean in the experimental group is higher than that in the control group. Table 21 confirms the summary of the t- test analysis result of the students' speaking mastery.

The table below indicates that t_o is lower than the t value at the significance level of 5%, i.e. - 0.143 < 2.000. It is higher than 0.05.

It confirms that the mean and the improvement of the effectiveness of classroom discussions in improving students' speaking mastery in the experimental group is higher than that without using classroom discussions in the control group. The standard deviation of the experimental group decreases from 7.30 to 6.92 or it is

Table 8. T-test Result of the Pre-Test

Variable	t_o	t_t 5%	df	P	Conclusion
A1- A2	-0.143	2.000	69	0.882	$t_o < t_t$

A1 = The experimental group

A2 = The control group

t_o = t value on the observation

df = Degree of freedom (n - 2)

t_t 5% = t value of the table in the significance level of 5%.

p = Degree of significance ($p < 0.05$ = normal).

Therefore, it can be stated that the pre-test scores of the experimental group is not significantly different from that of the control group. It means that in the beginning, the students' speaking ability of the pre-test between students who are taught with classroom discussion in the English teaching and learning process and those who are not taught with classroom discussion in the English teaching and learning process is not significantly different.

Table 9. T-test Result of the Post-Test

Variable	t_o	t_t 5%	df	P	Conclusion
A1- A2	2.106	2.000	69	0.037	$t_o > t_t$

The table indicates that t_o is higher than the t value at the significance level of 5%, i.e. $2.106 > 2.000$. The significance level is 0.037. It is lower than 0.05.

Therefore, it can be stated that the post-test scores of the experimental group is significantly different from that of the control group. It means that in the end, the students' speaking ability of the post-

test between students who are taught with classroom discussion in the English teaching and learning process and those who are not taught with classroom discussion in the English teaching and learning process is significantly different.

The table below indicates that t_o is higher than the t value at the significance level of 5%, i.e. $2.975 > 2.000$. The significance level is 0.004.

Table 10. T-test Result of the Gain

Variable	t_o	t_t 5%	df	P	Conclusion
A1- A2	2.975	2.000	69	0.004	$t_o > t_t$

It is lower than 0.05. Thus, the null hypothesis of no treatment effect is rejected and the proposed hypothesis which states “There is a significant difference of speaking mastery between the students who are taught using classroom discussions in the English teaching and learning process and those who are not taught without using classroom discussions” is accepted.

There are some results revealed in the findings. Based on the analysis, it shows that there is a significant difference in the speaking skill mastery between the students who are taught using classroom discussions in the English teaching and learning process and those students who are not taught using classroom discussions. In general, the students’ scores of experimental group are higher than the students’ scores of control group after the implementation of the classroom discussions.

The result of post-test indicates that t_o is higher than the t value at the

significance level of 5%, i.e. $2.106 < 2.000$. The significance level is 0.037. It is lower than 0.05. Then, the gain that shows the mean score of the experimental group is 15.11 while the mean score of the control group is 11.03. The mean score of the experimental group is higher than the mean score of the control group, i.e. $6.027 > 0.949$.

The standard deviation of the experimental group decreases from 7.30 to 6.92 or the scores of the experimental group from pre-test to post-test are more homogenous. While, the standard deviation of the control group increases from 7.53 to 8.36 or the scores of the control group from pre-test to post-test are more heterogeneous. Besides, the mean of experimental group increases 207% from the standard deviation of the pre-test. While the mean of the control group also increases 147% from the standard deviation of the pre-test.

It can be concluded that the mean percentage from the standard deviation of pre-test and the t-test in

experimental group are higher than the control group. Besides, the scores of the experimental group become homogenous while the scores of the control group become heterogeneous. Briefly, the use of classroom discussions can improve the students' speaking mastery. Therefore, it is clear that the classroom discussion is an effective technique in improving students' speaking skill mastery of English as shown in the experimental group. Thus, the null hypothesis of no treatment effect is rejected and the proposed hypothesis which states that "There is a significant difference in the speaking mastery between the students of SMP N 3 Depok who are taught using classroom discussions in the English teaching and learning process and those who are not taught without using classroom discussions" is accepted.

CONCLUSION

The conclusion of this study is made on the basis of the data analysis. The mean of pre-test and post-test in experimental group increases from 59.80 to 74.92. So, the students' speaking mastery improves

from the poor to the good category. The standard deviation of the experimental group decreases from 7.30 to 6.92 or the scores of the experimental group from pre-test to post-test are more homogenous. The mean of experimental group increases 207% from the standard deviation of the pre-test. The English learning achievement of student's speaking mastery from the students who are taught without using classroom discussion are:

The mean of pre-test and post-test of control class increases from 60.06 to 71.09. So, the students' speaking mastery stays in the good category. The standard deviation of the control group increases from 7.53 to 8.36 or the scores of the control group from pre-test to post-test are more heterogeneous. The mean of the control group also increases 147% from the standard deviation of the pre-test. From the comparison of experimental and control group, it can be found that the result of post-test oft o is higher than the t value at the significance level of 5%, i.e. $2.106 < 2.000$. The level significance is 0.037. It is lower than 0.05. So, the proposed hypothesis which states

“There is a significant difference of speaking mastery between the students who are taught using classroom discussions in the English teaching and learning process and those who are not taught without using classroom discussions” is accepted.

The standard deviation of the experimental group decreases from 7.30 to 6.92 or the scores of the experimental group from pre-test to post-test are more homogenous. While, the standard deviation of the control group increases from 7.53 to 8.36 or the scores of the control group from pre-test to post-test are more heterogeneous. So, the scores of experimental group become homogenous and control group become heterogeneous.

Besides, the mean of experimental group increases 207% from the standard deviation of the pre-test. While the mean of the control group also increases 147% from the standard deviation of the pre-test. So, the increasing mean from the standard deviation of the pre-test in experimental group is higher than that in the control group.

Therefore, the hypothesis reading “the speaking mastery of the

students who are taught by using classroom discussions is higher than that of those who are taught without using classroom discussions” is accepted. In other words, the proposed hypothesis that states “There is a significant difference in the speaking skill mastery between the second grade of junior high school students who are taught by using classroom discussion and those who are taught without using classroom discussion of the second year students of SMP N 3 Depok” is accepted. Therefore, using classroom discussions in the English teaching learning process is suggested to apply in the learning activities. In line with the effectiveness, it is clear that using classroom discussion in the English teaching learning process is more effective than that without classroom discussions. By using classroom discussions, the students will find it easier to comprehend the material given. They will have chance to speak and will be happy to learn English. They will not be afraid in sharing their opinion, in revising their friends opinion and debating their opinion orally. In order words, they will achieve better in speaking. From the result of the research, classroom

discussions can create creativity in presenting and conducting the teaching learning process. So the teachers through classroom discussion can improve the use of various interactive activities in order to make the students interested in learning the materials and ease the teaching and learning program. It can also decrease boredom when the English-learning process is going on. It can also create fun and interesting activities that provide students to compete and discuss the material among them. It implies that discussion is a necessary teaching method in the English teaching-learning process so that the teacher can use classroom discussion in the teaching-learning process.

REFERENCES

- Arends, Richard I. 1997. *Classroom Instruction and Management*. New York: The McGraw-Hill companies, Inc.
- Brown, H.D. 2001. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. 2nded. New York: Longman.
- Celce-Murcia, Marianne (Ed.). 2000. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. 3rded. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Chayanuvat, Anchalee. 1996. *Constructing Your Course Materials for Effective English Teaching*. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University Press.
- Hadi, Sutrisno. 2004. *Metodologi Research* Jilid 3. Yogyakarta: Andi Offset
- Harmer, J. 1991. *The Practice of Language of English Language Teaching*. London: Longman
- Hatch, Evelyn & Hossein Farhady. 1982. *Research Design and Statistics for Applied Linguistics*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.
- Howard, Jay. R. 2004. *What does reseach tell us about classroom discussion?* Washington DC: American Sociological Association
- Jones, Vernon F. with Jones, Louise S. 1998. *Comprehensive Classroom management: Creating communities of support and solving problems*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Murphy, P. Karen., Anna O. Soter., Ian A. G. Wilkinson., Maeghan N. Hennessey. 2009. *Examining the Effects of Classroom Discussion on Students' Comprehension of Text: A Meta-Analysis*. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 2009, Vol. 101, No. 3, 740–764

Nurgiyantoro, Burhan. 2009.
*Penilaian dalam Pengajaran
Bahasa dan Sastra. BPFE :*
Yogyakarta

Suharto, G. 2002. *Statistika Deskriptif*.
Yogyakarta: Universitas

Negeri Yogyakarta.
Weinbergh, George .H and
Schumaker, John. A. 1969.
*Statistics: An Intuitive
Approach.* 2nded. Belmont,
California: Wadsworth
publishing company.