

Improving Students' Speaking Skill through Communicative Approach: Discussion

Mansyur^{1*}, Muhammad Rifqi Syamsuddin², Nur Aeni³

^{1*}Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Universitas Negeri Makassar, Makassar, Indonesia
Email: mansyur.fbs@unm.ac.id

²Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Universitas Negeri Makassar, Makassar, Indonesia
Email: muh.rifqi@unm.ac.id

³Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Universitas Negeri Makassar, Makassar, Indonesia
Email: nur_aeni.fbs@unm.ac.id

ARTICLE HISTORY

Receive: 20 February 2024

Accepted: 10 June 2024

Published: 18 June 2024

KEYWORDS

Discussion Method

Speaking Skills

Communicative Approach

EFL

LICENSE

Copyright © 2024 Mansyur, Muhammad Rifqi Syamsuddin, Nur Aeni



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

ABSTRACT

The research aimed to determine whether the use of a communicative approach (discussion) improves students' speaking skills. The researcher applied a pre-experimental method with a one-group pretest-posttest design. The variables of the research were independent and dependent. The independent variable was discussion. The dependent variable was the students' speaking skills. The population of this study was the second-grade students of MAN Baraka Kab. Enrekang in the academic year of 2023/2024. A total of 31 students in one class were decided by using the cluster random sampling technique. The data were obtained by administering the speaking test to the XI MIA 4 and analyzed by using SPSS 20 to know about the result of the student's scores. The researcher found the results that discussion improves students' speaking skills. The mean score of the pre-test was 25.62 with a standard deviation was 8.56 and the mean score of the post-test was 45.34 with a standard deviation was 12.26. So, it is concluded that the students of second-grade students of MAN Baraka Kab. Enrekang showed significant improvement in their speaking skills.

*Corresponding Author:

Mansyur

Universitas Negeri Makassar

Email: mansyur.fbs@unm.ac.id

INTRODUCTION

Language is a system of communication used by the people of a particular country (Cambridge dic.). Its main function is for making interaction and communication. English is one of the international languages in the world that should be mastered to communicate with each other (Kusmaryati, 2009). It is

spoken by millions of people across the world. It is also the dominant language in many fields such as industry, agriculture, economics, education, and politics. That is why English became the first foreign language that was taught in Indonesia from elementary school up to college.

English has four basic language skills: listening, writing, reading, and speaking. Teaching English at any level always involves those four basic skills. However, for direct communication, we often use speaking skills rather than other skills. Speaking skill is one of the most important aspects of daily life communication (Kusmaryati, 2009). (O'Malley and Pierce as cited in Irawati, 2014) stated that among the four skills, speaking seems to be the most important skill that the learner should acquire since one of the major responsibilities of any teacher working with English language learners is to enable students to communicate effectively through oral language. People almost speak everywhere and every day through English and it is one way to communicate ideas and thoughts orally. It also becomes media in making communication through people from different countries.

Speaking is a kind of either productive or active skill. Though those four skills are equally important, speaking becomes the most important tool to communicate what needs to be accomplished. Irawati (2014) stated that speaking is one of the types of composing in a language, the type that is swift, complicated, frequent, and primary because the language itself is a symbol to use by communicators to construct and convey information. She showed that some teachers still find it difficult to attract their students to learn.

As language learners in high school who have learned English, they are expected to be able to interact orally with each other through English. Some criteria need to be accomplished such as pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension (Sundari, 2009). Most of the students in high school still find difficulties in performing English in their language conversation. Students faced some obstacles, that came from internal problems, such as anxiety, worried about making mistakes, and lack of self-confidence (Floriasti, 2013). Not all of the students in an EFL speaking class dare to speak (Rayhan, 2014). Some students just keep silent in the classroom.

Actually, a teacher has an important role in decreasing the problems above. Moreover, linked with the worldwide increasing demand for good communication in the English, it increased significantly the responsibility of the English language teacher (Ahmad and Rao, 2013). Teacher should know how to boost communicative competence of students because Communicative competence in the target language is more demanded now than ever before (Ahmad and Rao, 2013).

The ever growing need for good communication skills in English has created a huge demand for English teaching around the world, as millions of people today want to improve their command of English or ensure that their children achieve a

good command of English. The worldwide demand for English has created an enormous demand for quality language teaching and language teaching materials and resources (Richards, 2006 as cited in Ahmad and Rao, 2013).

Teaching English speaking is the process of giving the English lesson, from the teacher to the students based on the material from the syllabus of a certain school, so that the students can absorb it and they will be able to communicate by using English orally (Kusmaryati, 2009). But in reality, the method of teaching English that is used by an English teacher in the classroom is boring, there is no innovation in teaching English, and the teacher uses a traditional method that makes the English atmosphere in the classroom seem monotone.

There should be interesting activities in teaching English, especially in teaching speaking. The goal of teaching speaking is to focus on making students have communication skills which means that the teacher helps students to understand the language first. When the students understand they know what the situation is about and then they try to practice what they have learned in teaching speaking (Sundari, 2009). She recommended that a communicative approach might actively increase students' skills in teaching speaking learning process.

Most students have little opportunity to practice speaking English outside the classroom so need lots of practice when they are in class (Rayhan, 2014). However, most of the activities in the classroom were dominated by doing some exercises in their modules that did not enrich students' speaking skills (Floriasti, 2013)

The writer considers that it is necessary to find an alternative way to create suitable and interesting techniques for students' conditions. They need any practices to assist them in developing their speaking ability. Making students speak is neither an easy nor a fast process, teachers must be aware of some special techniques that will help to achieve the objectives (Castaldi and Lopes, 2013). They suggested the communicative approach as a special technique that might play an important role in student's oral production.

In order to be able to demonstrate comprehensible meaning, students need to get relevant and meaningful input either from listening or reading so that they acquire not only full understanding of the messages being spoken but also the model to communicate them in the appropriate speaking context (Floriasti, 2013).

In this study, the communicative approach supposed to be a good innovation to cure the poor condition of students' speaking ability. Richard in Iis Sundari (2009) stated that Communicative Approach is a broad approach to teaching that resulted from a focus on communication as an organizing principle for teaching rather than a focus on mastery of the grammatical system of the language."

The communicative approach emphasizes using the language as a whole and enables EFL/ESL learners to communicate in the target language fluently and confidently and concentrate on the communicative use of language in everyday and real-world situations (Alharbi, 2013). Harmer in Alharbi (2013) has addressed the

b. Dependent Variable

The dependent variable of this research was the students' speaking skill

2. Operational Definition

a. Discussion

Discussion is a process of sharing ideas with people and there is feedback.

b. Speaking Skill

Speaking skill is the ability to show our idea or argument orally.

Population and Sample

1. Population

The population of this research was the second-grade students of MAN Baraka Kab. Enrekang consists of 16 classes.

2. Sample

The researcher chose a cluster random sampling technique. The researcher took one class of the population randomly as a sample and it was class XI MIA 4 that consisted of 31 students.

Instrument of the Research

The researcher used a speaking test in pre-test and post-test to know the students' skill in speaking. The pre-test was aimed to identify the students' prior speaking skill while the post-test was aimed to know the improvement of the students' speaking skill after getting treatment.

Procedure of Collecting Data

Technique of data collection in this research was as follows:

1. Pre-test

The pre-test is given to the students before the treatment and it was about 90 minutes (2 × 45 minutes). It was aimed to find out the students' prior speaking skill.

2. Post-test

The post-test was conducted to find out the improvement of students' speaking skill. The test of the post-test was the same as the pre-test.

Experimentation

1. Treatment

The treatment was conducted in five meetings, and illustrate as follows:

a. The first meeting

1) The researcher divided students into 5 groups. The groups was used during the research.

2) The researcher distributed pictures in every group

- 3) The students discussed the pictures
 - 4) The student was asked to present the result of their discussion in front of the other groups
 - 5) The teacher took two groups to present their picture in front of the classroom
- b. The next meeting (Second to fifth)
- The process of second meeting until fifth meeting was same. What made it difference was the topic. Here were the process:
- 1) The researcher distributed a text to groups with the topic
 - Second meeting : **The Advantages of Social Media**
 - Third meeting : **The Disadvantages of Social Media**
 - Fourth meeting : **The Comparison of Advantages and Disadvantages of Social Media.**
 - Fifth meeting : **How to Face Social Media Wisely**
 - 2) The researcher explained the text
 - 3) The students was asked to discuss the text
 - 4) The student was asked to present the result of their discussion in front of the other groups
 - 5) The teacher chose two groups to present their group in front of the classroom

Technique of Data Analysis

The data was analyzed through the scoring rubric which is referred to Heaton 1988, in (Manurung, 2017). The rating scale measured the accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility as follows:

1) *Accuracy*

3.1 The rating scale measurement of accuracy

Classification	Score	Criteria
Excellent	6	Pronunciation is only very slightly influenced by the mother tongue. Two or three minor grammatical and lexical errors.
Very Good	5	Pronunciation is slightly influenced by the mother tongue. A few minor grammatical and lexical errors but most utterance is correct.
Good	4	Pronunciation is still low moderately influenced by the mother

Average	3	tongue but no serious phonological errors. A few minor grammatical and lexical errors but only cause confusion. Pronunciation is influenced by the mother tongue. Only a few serious phonological errors, several grammatical, and lexical errors, some of which lexical error.
Poor	2	Pronunciation is seriously influenced by the mother tongue with errors causing a breakdown in communication. Many basic grammatical and lexical errors.
Very Poor	1	Serious pronunciation errors as well as many basic grammatical and lexical errors. No evidence of having mastered any of the language skills and areas practiced in the course.

2) Fluency

3.2 The rating scale measurement of fluency

Classification	Score	Criteria
Excellent	6	Speaks without too great an effort with a fairly wide range of expression
Very Good	5	Has to make an effort at times to search for words. Nevertheless, smooth delivery on the whole and only a few unnatural pauses
Good	4	Although he has to make an effort and search for words, there are not too many unnatural pauses. Fairly smooth delivery mostly. Occasionally fragmentally but success in conveying the general meaning. Fair arrange of expression.
Average	3	Has to make an effort for much of time. Often has to search for the desired meaning. Frequently

Poor	2	fragmentary and halting delivery. Almost give up making the effort at time. Limited range of expression. Long pauses while he searches for the desired meaning. Frequently fragmentary and halting delivery. Almost give up making the effort at time. Limited range of expression.
Very Poor	1	Full of long unnatural pause, very halting and fragmentary delivery at time. Give limited range of expression.

3) *Comprehensibility*

3.3 The rating scale measurement of comprehensibility

Classification	Score	Criteria
Excellent	6	Easy for the listener to understand the speaker intention and general meaning. Very few interruptions or classification are necessary.
Very good	5	The speakers' intention and general meaning are fairly clear. A few interruptions by the listener for shake of classification are necessary.
Good	4	Most of what the speaker says is easy to follow. His intention is always clear but several interruption are necessary to help him to convey message or to seek classification
Average	3	The listener can understand a lot of what is said, but he most constantly seeks classification. Cannot understand many of speaker's more complex or longer sentences
Poor	2	Only small bits (usually short sentences and phrases) can be understood and then with considerable effort by someone who is listening to speaker.

Very poor	1	Hardly anything of what is said can be understood. Even when the listener makes a great efforts of interruption, the speaker is unable to clarify anything seems to have said.
-----------	---	--

(Heaton,1998)

- a. Converting students' score by using the following formula:

$$A \text{ Student score} = \frac{\text{the gain score}}{\text{the maximum score}} \times 100$$

The score formula Depdiknas, 2005 in

(Marlan, 2012)

- b. Classifying the students score' into the following measurement scale:

Table 3.4 Classification of Students' Speaking Achievement

No	Score	Classification
1.	81-100	Very Good
2.	61-80	Good
3.	41-60	Fair
4.	21-40	Poor
5.	0-20	Very Poor

Depdiknas, 2006 in (Marlan, 2012)

- c. Calculating the mean score by using LBM SPSS version 20 analysis
- d. Finding out the standard deviation of students' pre-test and post-test by using LBM SPSS version 20 analysis
- e. Finding out the significant difference between the mean scores of the pre and post-test by calculating the value of the test by using LBM SPSS version 20 analysis
- f. Computing the frequency and the rate percentage of the students score by using LBM SPSS version 20 analysis.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of the research present the description of the data collected while the discussions present arguments and further interpretation of the findings were given. The data were collected by administering the test. The tests were done twice namely pre-test and post-test. The pre-test was given before the treatment and the post-test was given after the treatment. The result of the test can be seen in the following:

1. The rate percentage and frequency of pre-test and post-test scores

No	Classification	Rate	Pre Test		Post Test	
			F	%	F	%
1	Very Good	81-100	0	0	0	0
2	Good	61-80	0	0	5	16.13
3	Fair	41-60	2	6.45	11	35.48
4	Poor	21-40	21	67.75	15	48.39
5	Very Poor	0-20	8	25.80	0	0
	Total		31	100	31	100

Based on the table 4.1 above, pretest shows there were 2 (6.45%) out of 31 students gained fair score, there were 21 (67.75%) of them gained poor score and there were 8 (25.80%) of them gained very poor score. In this test, none of the students got very good or even good score. The data showed that the students' speaking skill were really low.

In post-test, the data shows that there were 5 (16.13%) students got good score, there were 11 (35.48 %) students got fair score, and there were 15 (48.39%) students got poor score. In this test, none of students got very poor score. Based on the result, it can be concluded that the students' speaking skill after giving treatment is improved.

2. The Classification of the Students' Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores Based on The Three Aspects (Accuracy, Fluency and Comprehensibility)

The summary of the frequency and percentage score of the students' accuracy, fluency and comprehension in the pre-test and post-test is presented as follows:

a. Accuracy

The distribution of frequency and percentage score of students' accuracy is shown in the following table:

Table 4.2. The distribution of frequency and percentage score of students' accuracy in pre-test and post-test

No	Classification	Rate	Pre Test		Post Test	
			F	%	F	%
1	Very Good	81-100	0	0	0	0
2	Good	61-80	0	0	5	16.1
3	Fair	41-60	1	3.2	7	22.6
4	Poor	21-40	11	35.5	17	54.8
5	Very Poor	0-20	19	61.3	2	6.5
	Total		31	100	31	100

The result of data analysis based on pre-test and post-test of the students' accuracy in speaking showed that in pre-test, there were 31

students with maximum score 50.00 and minimum score was 16.67 in the pre-test. In post-test, the maximum score they got was 66.67 and minimum score was 16.67.

Based on the table above, it shows that in pre-test, there were 19 (61.3%) students gained very poor score, there were 11 (35.5%) students gained poor score and only 1 (3.2%) students gained fair score. None of the students got very or even good score. It showed that, the students' skill was really low.

In post-test, there were 2 (6.5%) students got very poor score, 17 (54.8%) students got poor score, there were 7 (22.6%) students got fair score and there were 5 (16.1%) students got good score. From the result, it can be concluded that the speaking ability in post-test of the second year students of MAN Baraka-Enrekang after giving treatment was good.

b. Fluency

The distribution of frequency and percentage score of students' fluency is shown in the following table:

No	Classification	Rate	Pre Test		Post Test	
			F	%	F	%
1	Very Good	81-100	0	0	0	0
2	Good	61-80	0	0	5	16.1
3	Fair	41-60	4	12.9	14	45.2
4	Poor	21-40	14	45.2	12	38.7
5	Very Poor	0-20	13	41.9	0	0
	Total		31	100	31	100

The result of data analysis based on the pre-test and post-test of the students' accuracy in speaking showed that in the pre-test, there were 31 students with a maximum score of 50.00 and a minimum score was 16.67 in the pre-test. In the post-test, the maximum score was 66.67 and minimum score was 16.67.

Based on the table above, it shows that in the pre-test, there were 13 (41.9%) students got very poor scores, 14 (42.5%) students got poor scores and only 4 (12,9%) students got fair scores. None of the students got very good or even good scores. It showed that the students' fluency was really low.

In the post-test, there were 12(38.7%) students got poor score, there were 14 (45.2%) students got fair score and there were 5 (16.1%) students got good scores. From the result, it can be concluded that the speaking ability in the post-test of the second-year students of MAN Baraka-Enrekang after giving treatment was good.

c. Comprehensibility

The distribution of frequency and percentage score of students' comprehensibility is shown in the following table:

No	Classification	Rate	Pre Test		Post Test	
			F	%	F	%
1	Very Good	81-100	0	0	1	3.2
2	Good	61-80	0	0	6	19.4
3	Fair	41-60	2	6.5	13	41.9
4	Poor	21-40	11	35.5	11	35.5
5	Very Poor	0-20	18	58.1	0	0
4	Total		31	100	31	100

The distribution of frequency and percentage score of students' comprehensibility in pre-test and post-test

3. The Mean score and standard deviation

The mean score and standard deviation of the students' speaking skills are presented in the following table:

Table 4.5 The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Pre-Test and Post-Test

		Pretest	Posttest
N	Valid	31	31
	Missing	0	0
	Mean	25.6271	45.3403
	Std. Error of Mean	1.53862	2.20287
	Median	22.2200	44.4400
	Mode	22.22	38.89
	Std. Deviation	8.56667	12.26505
	Variance	73.388	150.432
	Range	27.77	44.44
	Minimum	16.67	27.78
	Maximum	44.44	72.22
	Sum	794.44	1405.55

Table 4.5 shows the mean score of students' pre-test is 25.62 and the mean score of the post-test is 45.34. The standard deviation of pre-test is 8.56 while the standard deviation of post-test is 12.26. The mean score and the standard deviation of the students' post-test is higher than pre-test. It means that discussion method improves students' speaking skill.

Table 4.6 The mean score and standard deviation of the students' Pre-Test on Three Component Scales of Speaking

Statistics	
------------	--

		PRETEST_FLUENCY	PRETEST_ACCURACY	PRETEST_COMPREHENSIBILITY
N	Valid	31	31	31
	Missing	0	0	0
Mean		28.4945	23.6568	24.7319
Std. Error of Mean		2.07259	1.68827	1.87228
Median		33.3300	16.6700	16.6700
Mode		33.33	16.67	16.67
Std. Deviation		11.53970	9.39988	10.42441
Variance		133.165	88.358	108.668
Range		33.33	33.33	33.33
Minimum		16.67	16.67	16.67
Maximum		50.00	50.00	50.00
Sum		883.33	733.36	766.69

The table 4.6 shows that the mean score of the students' accuracy in speaking pre-test was 23.65 and the standard deviation was 9.39 in the pre-test. The mean score of the students' fluency in speaking pre-test was 28.49 and the standard deviation was 11.53 in the pre-test. And the mean score of the students' comprehensibility in speaking pre-test was 24.73 and the standard deviation was 10.42 in the pre-test.

Table 4.7 Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the students' Post-Test on Three Component Scales of Speaking

		POSTTEST_F LUENCY	POSTTEST_AC CURACY	POSTTEST_COM PREHENSIBILITY
N	Valid	31	31	31
	Missing	0	0	0
Mean		46.2358	41.3968	48.3865
Std. Error of Mean		2.14648	2.54864	2.48745
Median		50.0000	33.3300	50.0000
Mode		50.00	33.33	50.00
Std. Deviation		11.95111	14.19020	13.84954
Variance		142.829	201.362	191.810
Range		33.34	50.00	50.00
Minimum		33.33	16.67	33.33
Maximum		66.67	66.67	83.33
Sum		1433.31	1283.30	1499.98

The table 4.7 shows that the mean score of the students' accuracy in speaking post-test was 41.39 and the standard deviation was 14.19 in the post-test. The mean score of the students' fluency in speaking post-test was 46.23 and the standard deviation was 11.95 in the post-test. And the mean

score of the students' comprehensibility in speaking post-test was 48.38 and the standard deviation was 13.84 in the post-test. It means that the students' speaking skill got a significant improvement.

4. Test of Significance

The result of inferential statistical analysis, in order to know whether the mean differences between the two variables (pre-test and post-test) is statistically different at the level of significance (p) = 0,05 with the degree of freedom (df) = $N - 1$ (30), where $N = 31$ (number of students). The following table showed the result of the calculation.

Table 4.8 The T-Test of the Students' Improvement

Components	Probability Value	Level of Significance (α)
Accuracy	0	0.05
Fluency	0	0.05
Comprehensibility	0	0.05
Final score	0	0.05

The table 4.8 above shows the result of the computation of the T-test of the students' score of the pre-test and post-test. The probability value (0.00) was smaller than the level of significance (0.05). Therefore, it can be interpreted that there is a significant difference between the students' scores of the pre-test and post-test.

Based on the final result of three components of speaking ability showed that H_0 was rejected and H_1 was accepted, it means there was a significant difference between pre-test and post-test.

Discussion

The interpretation of the findings derived from result of data analysis deals in this part. The process of collecting data undertook into seven meetings; one meeting for pre-test, one meeting for post-test, and five meetings for the treatment. The pre-test is to measure the students' speaking ability. After pre-test, the researcher commenced the treatment in five meetings. Then, then the researcher gave post-test, after that analyzed the score of the students.

Related to the data collection through the pre-test and post-test, it showed that the implementation of discussion method improved students' speaking skill. In this case, there is a significant improvement of students' speaking skill after giving them treatment. It was supported by showing the mean score of pre-test 25.62 with

minimum score 16.67 and the maximum score was 44.44 while mean score of the post-test was 45.34 with minimum score was 27.78 and the maximum score was 72.22.

When the researcher did the pre-test, the students were really enthusiastic but had low English skill. They stated to researcher that their skill was really low in English. They had serious pronunciation errors as well many basic grammatical and lexical errors. They had not evidence of having mastered any of the language skills and areas practiced in the course. What they talk about was really difficult to understand.

During the treatments, the researcher recorded the activities. The students enjoyed the teaching and learning process very much. They were interested with the topic because it was the daily issues. They were more active and motivated to respond their friends' opinion. This facts were supported by Orlich et.al (as cited in Antoni, 2014) that discussion is used to increase teacher-students interaction and student-student verbal interaction in the classroom. Learners who had been involved will want to participate in active learning. However, the students were still made serious pronunciation errors as well as many basic grammatical errors. Therefore, the researcher corrected students' pronunciation and grammatical errors after stating their opinion in front of the class.

Another crucial things that to be discussed in this research was the major mistakes as follows: accuracy, fluency and comprehensibility.

1. Students' Speaking Accuracy through Discussion

Basically, the students' speaking accuracy classified as poor category. The writer found that there were some factors that influenced the students' speaking accuracy; they are their mother tongue, mispronunciation, grammar and word choice. The main component that influenced the students' speaking performance was their pronunciation and grammar.

a. Mispronunciation

Some mispronunciation appeared when the students pronounced the words because they were influenced by the mother tongue as their first language. For example:

- ✓ Many /mani/ should be /'men.i/
- ✓ Consist /konsis/ should be /kən'sɪst/
- ✓ Demand /deman/ should be /dɪ'mænd/
- ✓ Around /aron/ should be /ə'raʊnd/
- ✓ User /user/ should be /'juː.zə r/
- ✓ Communication /komunikasion/ should be /kə,mjuː.nɪ'keɪ.ʃ ə n/
- ✓ Interaction /interaction/ should be /,ɪn.tə'ræk.ʃ ə n/

- ✓ Used /yused/ should be /ju:st/
- ✓ Another /anoder/ should be /ə'nʌð.ə r/
- ✓ Certainly /sertainli/ should be /'sɜ:.t ə n.li/
- ✓ Introduce /introduus/ should be /

Most of the students' pronounced English words like Indonesian spelling. The students pronounced English words use mother tongue. In treatment (discussion method), the students always practice in speaking and try to pronounce well and also the researcher corrected when the students did mistakes in their practice. In the post-test, the students had better pronunciation than in pre-test.

b. Grammar

The researcher found that the students lacked of grammar mastery. He found some errors in students' grammar in speaking performan test. The students' grammatical errors were:

- ✓ Social media is instrument communication is very good
Social media is communication instrument which is very good.
- ✓ Example is of social media facebook, twitter and instagram.
Examples of social media are facebook, twitter and instagram.
- ✓ We can social media is very informat
Social media is very important.
- ✓ I can introduce with a good people China Amerika Canada and and others.
I can recognize with a nice people such as Chinese, American, Canadian and others.
- ✓ I can communication with someone with else various facebook email twitter.
I can communicate with someone with various kinds of social media such as facebook, email and twitter.

2. Students' Speaking Fluency through Discussion

Fluency is meaning speaking without too great an effort with a fairly wide range of expression, search for word occasionally by only one or two natural pauses. Most of students have enough vocabulary that can be used in speak, but they were influence by filler words, such as:

- ✓ Positif and negatif Positif and negatif impact with with eeee with,,,,,,,,, social media eeeeeeee one can communicate communicate with people
- ✓ Eeeee information in eeee is very good eeee is very die eeee example facebook twitter eeee instagram eee
- ✓ Social media social media is is is that information and can can find and can find uuuuuuuuu dumba'ka
- ✓ Social media eeeee me I can I can introduce with a good people

3. Students' Speaking Comprehensibility through Discussion

Some students did not know how to make their sentence easy to be understood. They were still not in the area of what Heaton (as cited in Rahman and Deviyanti, 2012) said about comprehension. He said that comprehensison denotes the ability of understanding the speakers' intension and general meaning. Only two students got fair score at the pre-test, the rest of them got poor and very poor score. None of them got very good or even good score.

The researcher found that the low achievement of the students in speaking class was influenced by the given topics. And most of them were speechless and did not know what they want to say during the pre-test. In addition the students' speaking skill was improved after giving treatment. The students trained with discussion material which is suitable with the post-test.

Oradee concluded that the students attitude towards teaching English speaking skill by using discussion was rated good. It is in line with the result of this research. In another research, Chi (2011) concluded that good managment of group work helps to achieve the active and equal participation of all students and will help to increase the effectiveness of speaking activities. It was proved that the use of communicative approach: discussion improved students' speaking skill.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

The findings of this research reveal the effectiveness of the discussion method in enhancing students' speaking skills. The data collection process, including pre-tests, treatments, and post-tests, demonstrated a significant improvement in students' speaking abilities. The mean score of the post-test (45.34) was markedly higher than the pre-test (25.62), showcasing progress in accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility. Students initially displayed low English proficiency, characterized by serious pronunciation errors and grammatical issues. However, through consistent practice during the treatments, they showed marked improvements, especially in pronunciation, as they adapted better to English phonetics. Common pronunciation errors influenced by their mother tongue were gradually minimized. Additionally, although grammatical errors persisted, students began to construct sentences more accurately and coherently, reflecting an improved grasp of basic grammar.

Fluency, while improved, was still impacted by filler words and pauses, indicating the need for further practice. The students' active participation during discussions fostered engagement, helping them gain confidence and motivation to express their thoughts. This aligns with Orlich et al.'s assertion that discussions enhance interaction and active learning in classrooms. Moreover, comprehensibility also improved, although it remained an area requiring additional focus. Initially,

most students struggled to communicate their ideas clearly, but their understanding of sentence structure and context improved over time. Overall, the research confirmed that the discussion method is an effective communicative approach for developing students' speaking skills. Students' enthusiasm and positive responses to relevant and relatable discussion topics significantly contributed to the learning process.

Future studies should explore extending the duration of treatments and incorporating diverse topics to sustain student interest. Teachers are encouraged to integrate discussions into their lessons, using varied communicative strategies to address persistent pronunciation and grammatical errors. Furthermore, regular feedback on accuracy and fluency is essential to support sustained improvement.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, S., & Rao, C. (2013). Applying Communicative Approach in Teaching English as a Foreign Language: A Case Study of Pakistan. *Porta Linguarum*, 20 pp. 187-203.
- Alharbi, H. A. (2015). Improving Students' English Speaking Proficiency in Saudi Public Schools. *International journal of instruction*, 8(1), 105-116.
- Castaldi, Z. & Lopes, B. (2013). How to improve the speaking skills through the communicative approach. *Diálogos Pertinentes – Revista Científica de Letras*, 9(2), 27-43. doi:http: 10.26843/dp.v9i2.776.
- Efrizal, D. (2012). Improving students' speaking through communicative language teaching method at Mts Ja-alhaq, Sentot Ali Basa Islamic boarding school of Bengkulu, Indonesia. *International Journal of Humanities and social science*, 2(20), 127-134.
- Floriasti, T. W. (2013). *Improving speaking skills through the use of integrated listening and speaking material for student teachers academic year 2012/2013*. Unpublished Thesis. Yogyakarta: Yogyakarta State University.
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. W. (2012). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications*. Pearson.
- Kusmaryati, S. E. (2009). *Improving English speaking ability through classroom discussion for students of MA NU BANAT KUDUS in the academic year 2008/2009*. Universitas Maria Kudus. Published.

- Manurung, J. E. (2017). Using think-pair-share to improve speaking achievement of the second semester English study program of Tridinanti University Palembang. *English Community Journal*, 1(2), 86-95.
- Rayhan, J. M. (2014). The Impact of Using Role Play Techniques on Improving Pupils' Speaking Skill for Primary School. *Journal of the College of Basic Education*, university of Babil, 15(2)
- Wulandari, R. (2014). *Improving students' speaking ability through communicative language games at SMPN 1 Prambanan grade VIII A in the academic year of 2013/2014 (Doctoral dissertation)*. Indonesia: Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.