USING SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION AS LEARNING INTERACTIONS TO IMPROVE THE STUDENTS' SPEAKING ABILITY AT THIRD SEMESTER IN ENGLISH DEPARTEMENT OF UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH MAKASSAR

Andi Asri Jumiaty[1], Dzur Ri'fah[2]

Muhammadiyah University of Makassar

[1]*jandiasri@yahoo.co.id*
[2]*dzurrifah86@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT

This research aims to find out the improvement the students' ability in speaking. The speaking skills are complex and sometimes difficult to teach, the problem of the students have a lot of ideas in their minds but they worry to start and even they don't know how to develop ideas in teaching techniques can improve students' ability in speaking English. To solve this problem, the English teacher should have to be more creative in choosing the material and techniques which can make the speaking class more interesting, exciting and enjoyable.

This research focuses using small group discussion because it is very important to achieve speaking skill. For this reason, the researcher tries to see the students' participation and improve their speaking skills through small group discussion. The researchers assume that small group discussion will be interesting because the students will be more active and this assumption is however still in question, whether or not, the students of English department Muhammadiyah University of Makassar can take part and improve their speaking skills through small group discussion.

Key words: small group discussion, speaking skill.

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui peningkatan kemampuan berbicara mahasiswa. Keterampilan berbicara sangat kompleks dan terkadang sulit untuk diajarkan, masalah para mahasiswa memiliki banyak ide dalam pikiran mereka tetapi mereka khawatir untuk memulai dan bahkan mereka tidak tahu bagaimana mengembangkan ide dalam teknik mengajar dapat meningkatkan kemampuan mahasiswa dalam berbahasa Inggris. Untuk mengatasi masalah ini, dosen bahasa Inggris harus lebih kreatif dalam memilih materi dan teknik yang dapat membuat kelas berbicara lebih menarik dan menyenangkan; tujuan dari penelitian adalah bagaimana siswa meningkatkan kemampuan berbicara mereka.

Penelitian ini berfokus pada penggunakan diskusi kelompok kecil karena sangat penting untuk mencapai keterampilan berbicara. Untuk alasan ini, peneliti mencoba untuk melihat partisipasi mahasiswa dan meningkatkan keterampilan berbicara mereka melalui diskusi kelompok kecil. Peneliti beranggapan bahwa diskusi kelompok kecil akan membuat mahasiswa tertarik karena mahasiswa akan lebih aktif dan mahasiswa jurusan

*bahasa Inggris Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar dapat mengambil bagian dan
meningkatkan kemampuan berbicara mereka melalui kelompok diskuai kecil.*
Kata kunci: *diskusi kelompok kecil, keterampilan berbicara.*

A. INTRODUCTION

Up to now English is a tool of communication among the peoples in the world. It is an international language, and it is used all over the world, so that English becomes an important tool of international communication and association.

In modern era, with the progress and advance of science and technology many people learn English to support their understanding about the documents, literatures, written information, written science and technology, cultures, etc. English has an important tool of international communication in Indonesia.

Speaking English is one way of finding information through oral communication in the world. One, who knows English well, can easily communicate with other people all over the world since English is an international language. By this capability he or she easily applies for a job, spread news, work out his or her social relation or transacts his or her business.

The aims of language teaching and learning are often defined with reference to the four language skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Listening and reading are receptive skills, and speaking and writing are productive ones (Byrne, 1995). In this study, the writer focuses her attention to one of these skills that is speaking.

Teaching speaking is considered to be the most difficult among the four basic skills of language. Learning to speak is obviously more difficult than learning to understand the spoken language. Beside that, sometimes the teachers give the chance to speak English just to the clever students. The students who have low motivation and low achievement in speaking English are probably due to the lack of opportunity in practicing it.

Many ways in communicative activities can be used to activate the students to speak English. Small group discussion is an activity that can be used to activate the students to speak English both in classroom and outside the class even with their environment.

Small group discussion is a form of speaking in which the speakers attempt, through cooperative exchange ideas, to solve a problem or more toward its solution by a better understanding of it. By contrast, most teachers should give students a good amount of pre-digested knowledge. Students learn fact and concepts best when they use them to solve problems. Small groups must be stimulating, provocative and exciting, this guarantees learning.

While the group work was designed to have students engage in a discussion with native speakers invited to the class, the resulting interaction ended up becoming rather like a structured interview with successive exchanges of the students' questions and the native speaker's answers. How did the instructional design affect the ways in which they developed their talk? The students' planning tended to focus on the content of discussion, compiling a list of sequence-initiating actions, in particular, questions. While the plans contributed to the development of the talk, the episode reveals that a more natural and coherent discussion was afforded by the students' production of spontaneous utterances and attention to the contingent development of talk. (Junko, M. 2012)

In relation to the explanation above, small group discussion is very important to achieve speaking skill. For this reason, the researcher tries to see the students'

participation and improve their speaking skills through small group discussion. The researcher assume that small group discussion will be interesting because the students will be more active and this assumption is however still in question, whether or not, the students of English department Muhammadiyah University of Makassar can take part and improve their speaking skills through small group discussion.

In relation to the background mentioned above, the problems of the research can be summarized in the following questions:

1. Does small group discussion activate the sixth semester students of English department Muhammadiyah University of Makassar to speak English?
2. Is small group discussion improving speaking skills of the sixth semester students of English department Muhammadiyah University of Makassar?

Many researchers have been conducting studies related to this research. Their findings are briefly cited as follows:

Small group discussion or working in small groups has been shown to improve students' understanding, retention of material, and problem solving abilities. He further says that small group discussion can be applied not only for speaking class, but also be used in all language skills (Allen in Center for Teaching Excellence, 2001).

Richer et al. (in Noni, 2003) on communication between teacher-students interaction found that one form of the teacher-student interaction is through pair work. Question is of the teacher talk functions. Question consists of utterances, which are commonly used by teachers in their foreign language classroom. The way the teachers ask questions influence the students' attainment and way of thinking. Asking question that positively influences students' classroom. Therefore, the teacher needs to understand and possess the questioning technique.

Based on those findings above, researcher draws an inference that using small group discussion proposed in this research can activate as well as improve the students' speaking skills of the third semester students of Muhammadiyah University of Makassar, specially for the students English department since it is extremely important in activating the students to speak English because they can get their ideas, emotions and wishes conveyed in communication..

Speaking as a productive and interactive skill. *As a productive skill* The aims of language teaching course are very commonly defined in terms of four skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. But what is the nature of the skill? By reference to the medium, speaking and listening are said to relate to language expressed through the aural medium and reading and writing are said to relate to language expressed through the visual medium. By reference to the activity of the user, speaking and writing are said to be an active, or productive skill, whereas listening and reading are said to be passive or receptive skill. *As an interactive skill.* It is difficult to prepare the speaking skills from the listening skills clearly, in normal speech situation, the two skills are interdependent that it is impossible to hold any meaningful conversation without understanding what is being said and without making oneself understood at the same time.

There are three components of speaking. They are:

a) **Accuracy.** Accuracy in speaking means someone can produce correct sentences in pronunciation, grammar and word choice so can be understood. They are three components accuracy (1) Pronunciation, (2) Vocabulary, (3) Grammar. When a teacher teaches English, he needs to be sure that the students can be understood when they speak.

b). **Fluency.** Fluency is a highly complex notion related mainly to smoothness of continuity in discourse. It thus includes a consideration of how sentences are connected,

how sentence patterns vary in word-order and omit elements of structure, and also certain aspects of the prosody of discourse.

c). **Comprehensibility.** Comprehensibility is the process of understanding of the utterances sent by the speaker done by the listener. Comprehensibility in speaking means that the people can understand what we say and we can understand what they say.

The concepts of small group discussion

a. Group discussion

The most simple for learners to talk is by conveying some ideas or opinions then discuss it. Discussion as treated here is that form of speaking in which the speakers attempt, through cooperative exchange ideas, to solve problem or move toward its solution by a better understanding of it De Boer in Yusuf, 2003.

Using group discussion could help students to develop relationship through accumulated information. Effective communication will guide students to solve problem.

b). *Small group discussion*

Small group is a tool for students to express their ideas. Students have self initiated in convey their ideas. In small group discussion, teacher divides the whole class into group (perhaps five or fewer students for each group) that is students are to discuss a topic given by the teacher. Every student in each group must give his opinion about the topic.

c). *The advantages of small group discussion*

Classroom discussion practices that can lead to reasoned participation by all students are presented and described by the authors. Their research emphasizes the careful orchestration of talk and tasks in academic learning. Parallels are drawn to the philosophical work on deliberative discourse and the fundamental goal of equipping all students to participate in academically productive talk. These practices, termed Accountable Talks, emphasize the forms and norms of discourse that support and promote equity and access to rigorous academic learning. They have been shown to result in academic achievement for diverse populations of students. The authors outline Accountable Talk as encompassing three broad dimensions: one, accountability to the learning community, in which participants listen to and build their contributions in response to those of others; two, accountability to accepted standards of reasoning, talk that emphasizes logical connections and the drawing of reasonable conclusions; and, three, accountability to knowledge, talk that is based explicitly on facts, written texts, or other public information. With more than fifteen years research into Accountable Talk applications across a wide range of classrooms and grade levels, the authors detail the challenges and limitations of contexts in which discourse norms are not shared by all members of the classroom community. (Michaels, Sarah, O'Connor. C, and Lauren B. Resnick, 2008).

Teacher should know that one of the difficulties in expressing ideas of participating actively and effectively in speaking is that students have very low English mastery, particularly vocabulary and certain expressions. They want to say many things but they have no power to say them out. Therefore, before the students work in small group discussion, they should be taught some language expressions, e.g. how to ask and give opinion, how to say agree and disagree, like and dislike, how to address polite questions, etc.

B. Research Method

This research employed a pre-experimental method. The design of the research was one group pretest and posttest design. Treatment (X) was given between pretest (T_1) and posttest (T_2). This research has two kinds of variables, namely independent variable

and dependent variable. Independent variable is the use of small group discussion as a learning interaction device in the classroom, and dependent variables are the students' participation to speak English and their improvement in speaking skills.

   The populations of this research will conduct all of the sixth semester students of English department Muhammadiyah University of Makassar in 2014/2015 academic year. The total numbers of population will 400 students and the total number of sample consists of 40 students. In collecting the required data, the researcher will applied two kinds of instruments; they are observation checklist and speaking test.

C. FIDNINGS

1. The activation of the second year students of Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar to speak English through small group discussion

   Based on the rate percentage of the students' activation data got through observation checklist on each meeting, teaching through small group discussion can activate students to speak English. The improvement of their activity can be displayed in the following table.

   The level of the student' activation is explained by the mean score gained by the students. Based on the computation of students' activation data, the mean score of the students' activation can be presented as follows. The rate percentage of the student' activation can display in the following table:

Table 1. The level of students' activation in meeting 1, 2, 3, and 4

N O	Level	The frequency of Speaking	Meeting 1		Meeting 2		Meeting 3		Meeting 4	
			Frequency	Percentage%	Frequency	Percentage%	Frequency	Percentage%	Frequency	Percentage%
1	Very Active	The amount of speaking frequency is > 6 times in approximately 3	_	0	5	20%	19	76%	20	80%
2	Active	The amount of speaking frequency is > 6 times in approximately 3	12	48%	16	64%	6	24%	5	20%
3	Less Active	The amount of speaking is only 1 to 3 times in approximately less than 2 minutes for one student	13	52%	4	16%	_	0%	_	_
4	Non-active	The amount of speaking frequency is zero.	_	0	_	0%	_	0%	_	_
	Total		25	100%	25	100%	25	100%	25	100%

Table 7 shows that :
1. In meeeting 1, there is no 0 (0%) students were in non-active level, there are 13 students (52%) were in less active level category, there are 12 students (48%) were in active level, and there is 0 (0%) students were in very active level. It indicates that students in meeting 1 there were 0 students who were not active. It indicates that most of students were in less active category. It idicates that in first meeting students activation to speak English using small group discussion was less active. In order words In first meeting students are still less active to speak English by using small group discussion

2. In meeting 2 there is no 0 (0%) students were in non-active level, there are 4 students (16%) were in less active level category, there are 16 students (64%) were in active level, and there are 5 students (20%) were in very active level. In this meeting very active students increased from 0 to 5 students. Based on the data it means that score of the students' activation in meeting 2 were in active level. It indicates that in first meeting students activation to speak English using small group discussion was lactive. It means that students' activation was increases.

3. In meeting 3, there is no 0 studenst (0%) in non-active level, in less active level category there is no 0 studenst (0%), there are 6 (24%) students were in active level, and the last active level category there are 19 (76%) students were in. In this meeting very active students increased from 5 to 19 students and the frequency of non- active students dicreased. From the data it showed that most of students was in very active category. It means that the students' activation in meeting were classified very active. It indicates that in third meeting students' activation to speak English using small group discussion was very active.

4. In meeting 4, in non-active level there are no 0 (0%) students were in, there are no 0 (0%) students were in less active level category, there are 5 (20%) students were in active level, and than there are 20 (80%) students were in very active level. In this meeting very active students increased from 19 to 20 . It means that students' activation in meeting 4 classified very active. It indicates that in fourth meeting students' activation to speak English using small group discussion was very active.

Table 8. The level of students' activation in meeting 5, 6 and 7

N O	Level	The frequency of Speaking	Meeting 5		Meeting 6		Meeting 7	
			Frequency	Percentage %	Frequency	Percentage %	Frequency	Percentage %
1	Very Active	The amount of speaking frequency is > 6 times in approximately 3	20	80%	25	100%	25	100%
2	Active	The amount of speaking frequency is > 6 times in approximately 3	5	20%	_	0%	_	0%
3	Less Active	The amount of speaking is only 1 to 3 times in approximately less than 2 minutes for one student	_	0%	_	0%	_	0%
4	Non-active	The amount of speaking frequency is zero.	_	0%	_	0%	_	0%
	Total		25	100	25	100	25	100%

Table 8 show that
1. This table shows in meeting 5, non of students were in non-active level, 0 (0%) students were in less active level category, 0 (0%) students were in active level, and (20%) students were in very active level. In this meeting very active students increased almost same with meeting 4. It indicates that all the students in meeting 5 were active. It indicates that in fifth meeting students' activation to speak English using small group discussion was very active.

2. In meeting 6, non of students were in non-active level, 3 (16%) students were in less active level category, 11 (44%) students were in active level, and 11 (44%) students were in very active level. Based on the data all of the students in meeting 6 classified very active. It indicates that in sixth meeting students' activation to speak English using small group discussion was very active

3. The Data above showed that score of the students' activation in meeting 7 were classified active. It indicates that in seventh meeting, students' activation to speak English using small group discussion were active. Based on the pevious data, the students' activation increases from meeting to meeting. It indicates that using small group diiscussion can acivate students to speaki English.

2. The development of students' speaking performance

a. Rate Percentage of students' speaking score

Based on the computation of students' score in speaking through SPPS program, the descriptive statatistic can be displayed in the following table:

Table 2. The rate of the student's score in speaking skill

No.	Score	Classification	Pretest		Posttest	
			Frequency	%	Frequency	%
1.	81 – 100	Very good	3	12	12	48
2.	61 – 80	Good	6	24	8	32
3.	41 – 60	Fair	5	20	5	20
4.	21 – 40	Poor	11	44	0	0
5.	0 – 20	Very poor	0	0	0	0
	Total		25	100	25	100

This table shows that in pretest, 11 (8%) students were in poor category, 5 (20%) students were in fair category, 6 (24%) students were in good category, 3 (12%) students were in very good category, and none of them was in very poor category. While in posttest, none of students was in poor and very poor category, there were 5 (20%) students were in fair category, 8 (32%) student was in good category, and most of them (12 (48%) students were in very good category.

The data of the rate percentage of the students' score in speaking skills by using dialogue above indicates that the improvement of the students' achievement in post-test is high if it is compared with pre-test percentage of the students got score by using small group discussion.

The frequency and rate percentage of the students' writing achievement in each component of both tests: pretest and posttest are presented as follows:

1) Accuracy

Table 10 below pictures out the frequency and rate percentage of the students' scores of speaking achievement on accuracy component of speaking both pretest and posttest. From this table, it can be seen that the range of students score in pretest started in poor score, 10 out of 25 students or equivalent to 40 percents were scored into poor classification; by contrast in posttest, the range of students' score started in fair score.

The rest of the scores remained at every level of classification, namely: in pretest, there were 5 (20%) out of them scored into fair classification, there were 6 students scored good classification, 4 of them were scored very good, and none of them were scored in very poor classifications. On the other hand, in posttest, there were 7 (28%) out of them fell into good classification.

For better picture, the rate percentage of students' score in accuracy can be displayed in the following table:

Table 3. The rate of the student's score in Accuracy

No.	Score	Classification	Pretest		Posttest	
			Frequency	%	Frequency	%
1.	81 – 100	Very good	4	16	9	36
2.	61 – 80	Good	6	24	7	28
3.	41 – 60	Fair	5	20	9	36
4.	21 – 40	Poor	10	40	0	0
5.	0 – 20	Very poor	0	0	0	0
	Total		25	100	25	100

2) Fluency

The rate percentage of students' score in accuracy can be displayed in the following table:

Table 4. The Rate of the student's score in fluency

No.	Score	Classification	Pretest		Posttest	
			Frequency	%	Frequency	%
1.	81 – 100	Very good	3	12	10	40
2.	61 – 80	Good	5	20	8	32
3.	41 – 60	Fair	5	20	7	28
4.	21 – 40	Poor	12	48	0	0
5.	0 – 20	Very poor	0	0	0	0
	Total		25	100	25	100

Based on the table, it shows that most of the students in pretest were in poor category, on the contrary in posttest, most of the students were in very good category. The rest of the scores remained at every level of classification, namely: in pretest, there was 5 (20%) out of them scored into fair classification, 5 (20%) out of them were in good classification, 3 of them were scored in very good classifications, and none of them was in very poor classification. On the other hand, in posttest, there were 7 (28%) out of them fell into fair classification. 8 (32%) out of them fell into good classification, and none of them was in poor and very poor classification.

3) Comprehensibility

Table below pictures out the frequency and rate percentage of the students' scores of speaking achievement on accuracy component of speaking of both pretest and posttest. From this table, it can be seen that most of the students in pretest, 21 out of 25 students or equivalent to 44 percents were scored into poor classification; by contrast in posttest, most of the students, 17 out of them or equivalent to 68 percents were scored at very good classification.

The rate percentage of students' score in accuracy can be displayed in the following table:

Table 5. The rate of the student's score in fluency

No.	Score	Classification	Pretest		Posttest	
			Frequency	%	Frequency	%
1.	81 – 100	Very good	6	24	17	68
2.	61 – 80	Good	4	16	3	12
3.	41 – 60	Fair	4	16	5	20
4.	21 – 40	Poor	11	44	0	0
5.	0 – 20	Very poor	0	0	0	0

Total	25	100	25	100

The rest of the scores remained at every level of classification, namely: in pretest, there were 4 (16%) out of them scored into fair classification, 4 (16%) of them were scored in good classifications, and none of them scored very poor. On the other hand, in posttest, there were 5 (20%) out of them fell into fair classification, 3 (12%) out of them fell into good classification, and neither of them fell into poor nor very poor classification.
b. Descriptive statistics of students of students' speaking score

The descriptive statistics of the students' speaking achievement in each component of both tests: pretest and posttest are presented as follows:

1) Accuracy

Based on the computation on accuracy, the descriptive statistics of students score can be presented in the following table:

Table 6. The statistical summary of the students' pretest and posttest on accuracy

Variables	Mean	Standard deviation	Mode	Median	Min. score	Max. score	N
Pretest (X_1)	53.99	21.67	33.33	50	33.33	100	25
Posttest (X_2)	68.67	15.29	50	66.67	50	100	25

Based on the table it shows that the mean score of the students score in speaking in all components in pretest was 53.99 which was categorized as average classification and in posttest was 7.55 which was categorized as good classification. It indicates that the mean score of students' speaking achievement on the accuracy component of speaking in posttest was higher than that of the pretest. It increased 14.68 points.

2) Fluency

Based on the computation on accuracy, the descriptive statistics of students score can be presented in the following table:

Table 7. The statistical summary of the students' pretest and posttest on fluency

Variables	Mean	Standard deviation	Mode	Median	Min. score	Max. score	N
Pretest (X_1)	50.46	21.57	33.33	50	33.33	100	25
Posttest (X_2)	70	15.95	66.67	66.67	50	100	25

The table below shows that there was a significant difference between the result of the test in pretest and posttest. The mean score obtained by the students in pretest was 50.46 which was classified into fair score with standard deviation 15.95, while in posttest, the mean score was 70 which was classified into good score with standard deviation 21.57.

The mean score of the pretest and posttest above shows a positive difference which indicates that before giving treatment by small group discussion, the students' knowledge was categorized as fair classification, and after giving the treatment the students' score improved to good classification. It means that using small group

discussion could significantly improve the students' speaking skill. It increased 19.56 points.

3) Comprehensibility

The table below shows that there was a significant difference between the result of the test in pretest and posttest. The mean score obtained by the students in pretest was 54.66 which was classified into fair score with standard deviation 21.57, while in posttest, the mean score was 77.98 which was classified into good score with standard deviation 17.15.

Table 8. The statistical summary of the students' pretest and posttest on fluency

Variables	Mean	Standard deviation	Mode	Median	Min. score	Max. score	N
Pretest (X$_1$)	54.66	21.57	33.33	50	33.33	100	25
Posttest (X$_2$)	77,98	17.15	83.33	83.33	50	100	25

The mean score of the pretest and posttest above increases 23.32 points. It means that using small group discussion could significantly improve the students' comprehensibility of speaking.

c. Test of significance (t-test)

The hypotheses were tested by using inferential analysis. In this case, the researcher used t-test (test of significance) for non-independent sample, that is, a test to know significant difference between the result of students' mean scores in pretest and posttest.

Assuming that the level of significance (α) = 0.05, the only thing which is needed; the degree of freedom (df) = 24, where N - 1 (25 - 1); then the result of the t-test value and the critical value of t or known as the t-table value is presented in the following table.

Table 9. The t-test value and the t-table value of the students' speaking skill

Variables	t-test value	t-table value
Pretest – Posttest	10.740	1.711

Based on the result of data analysis as summarized in Table 14 above, the writer found that the t-test value was greater than the t-table value, where the t-test value was 10.740 > 1.711 at the level of significance 0.05 and the degree of freedom 24. , the alternative hypothesis (H$_1$) was accepted. It showed that the students' achievement on speaking after getting seven meetings of treatment using small group discussion technique could significantly improve the students' speaking skill. This means that the data of posttest as the final result gave significantly improvement. It can be concluded that the use of small group discussion technique was able to give greater contribution in teaching and learning writing, because it could improve the students' speaking skill.

Table 10. The t-test value and the t-table value of the students' speaking skill on each component of speaking

Variables	t-test value	t-table value
Pretest – Posttest on Accuracy	7.333	1.711
Pretest – Posttest on fluency	8.629	1.711
Pretest – Posttest on comprehensibility	7.688	1.711

Based on the result of data analysis as summarized in Table 30 above, the writer found that the t-test value was greater than the t-table value, where the t-test value on each component of speaking at the level of significance 0.05 and the degree of freedom 24. It

showed that the students' achievement on each component of speaking after getting seven meetings of treatment using small group discussion technique could significantly improve. This means that the data of posttest as the final result gave significantly improvement. It can be concluded that the use of small group discussion technique can improve students on speaking skill.

Discussion

1. Students' activation to speak English through small group discussion

Based on the finding it found that the small group discussion can activate students to speak English. The students' activation increases from meeting to meeting. In the last two meeting all of the students were in very active category. Therefore this finding supported theory that group discussion in the classroom is a necessary procedure in a democratic setting. It is the means by which the children can integrate themselves into the class as a unit with status, responsibility, and active voluntary participation (Drekurs and Gunawan, 1982).

Furthermore, as Gilstrap and Martin (1975) state that one interesting points relative to discussion is that teachers who generally use student ideas for some periods of discussion and those who build to have positive attitudes toward school, teachers, and subject matter under study.

2. The students' speaking performance

Based on the finding, it indicated that students' speaking performance of Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar in 2016/2017 academic year increase significantly after being thought by using small group discussion. This finding support the previous theory that small group discussion or working in small groups has been shown to improve students' understanding, retention of material, and problem solving abilities. He further says that small group discussion can be applied not only for speaking class, but also be used in all language skills (Allen in Center for Teaching Excellence, 2001).

a.   The students' speaking performance in term of accuracy

The students' speaking performance in terms of speaking accuracy involving acceptable pronunciation, correct grammar, and appropriate vocabulary were developed significantly by the use of impressionable teaching strategy of small group discussion. However, It is unavoidable that the second grade students of Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar in 2016/2017 were doing some typical mistakes during the application of this research. Commonly, the students made the mistakes covering their pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary as how they performed their selves in a good manner to speak.

The use of small group discussion as a teaching technique could improve students' speaking performance in term of both accuracy and fluency. It could be seen from the result of pre-test administered before treatment and posttest administered after treatment. However, the students of second class of Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar in 2016/2017 year still encountered some mistakes or errors in their speaking performance during the research. Some mistakes made by the students are as follow :

1) Mispronunciation

In learning English, pronunciation is one of crucial elements that the students have to know. Elements that should the students know some pronunciations well. They should know and could make the various sounds that occur in the English language. They also need to use rhythm and stress correctly if they are to be understood and they need to be able to recognize intonation. The lack of knowledge about pronunciation will possibly get some difficulties in understanding spoken English.

During the research, the researcher found that the students of second year at Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar in 2016/2017 still made some mistakes or error in their speaking. They found themselves felt difficult in pronouncing some words because mostly they were influenced by the use mother tongue. Based on the researcher's observation, the students were lazy to find the way to pronounce the words in dictionary. The result of that, most of them pronounce the words in the same written text.

Mispronunciation in the sense of faulty but intelligible pronunciation, to a greater extent, appears to be a major problem to since the students were never taught before they came to their majority now. Pronunciation, in English context, is a crucial matter to be paid attention which the students found it hard to pronounce the words as a native speaker-like. However, mostly they were influenced by their first language and the scarcity of focusing the matter of pronunciation but only in a certain subject.

Some mistakes were analyzed based on their spellings written in Oxford Dictionary not on transcriptions. The mistakes are as follow:

a). The Substitution of Phonemes

1. / ʃ / becomes / s /   Examples : She / ʃi: / becomes / si: / (5)
2. / dĵ / becomes / g /   Example : general / dĵen∂eal / becomes / general / (9)
3. / δ / becomes / d /   Examples : there / δ∂ / becomes / d∂r / (6)
4. / n / becomes / ŋ /   Examples : student / stu:d∂nt / becomes / stu:d∂ŋ / (13)
5. / ei / becomes / i /   Example : place / pleis/ becomes / plis / (2)

b) Incorrect Stress

   Examples : before /bef□' / becomes / be'fo / (19)

c) Consonant Cluster

   Examples : first / f3rst / becomes / f∂s / (6)
                 ig'zamp∂l / becomes / eksamp∂l / (16)

d) English words which are pronounced based on the written print

   Examples : has / hes / becomes / has/ (2)
                 go / g∂u / becomes / go / (2)
                 by / bay / becomes / by (2)
                 town / tawn / becomes / town / (3)
                 doing / duing / becomes / doing (3)

e) Others

   Examples : beautiful / biutiful / becomes / betiful / (12)

1. computer / k∂m'pyuwt∂r / becomes computer /
2. government / gΛvorm∂nt / becomes gopermang /
3. hazard / 'h∂ezard / becomes haesard /
4. trains / trein / becomes traing /
5. situations / 'sicu'eisy∂n /becomes cituatioongs /

It had been proved that the students need more practice to pronounce some English words in the communicative way. Small group discussion gave opportunity to practice English words. To help them found acceptable pronunciation, the researcher, as a model, pronounce repeatedly the words that have difficult sounds. The class organization gave enough opportunity for students to practice it in their discussion.

2) Grammatical error

According to Richard(2002) that knowing how to build and use certain structures make it possible to communicate common type of meaning successfully. Without this structure, it is difficult to make comprehensible sentences.

A fact that the students could not communicate and convey the meaning was in line with the statement told by Richard (2002). The students of second class 'komputer jaringan' of Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar in 2016/2017 in academic year were lacked of grammar mastery.It was brought some grammatical errors especially in the pattern of syntax, such as, word order, incomplete sentence and concord.

Some grammatical errors made by the students while they spoke English using discussion game technique as below:

1. I opinion is (my opinion is)
2. does you have opinion (do you have opinion)
3. I want to put I opinion (I want to give my opinion)
4. I Want to total I opinion (I want to conclude my opinion)
5. Can to big ur volume (can you raise your voice?)

The research proved that the most students need more practice and learning to overcome their obstacle in grammar. Therefore, during the teaching activity, the researcher explained how to use the correct form of sentences. Sometimes, the researcher asked the students to give comment toward their friends' sentences while speaking whether right or wrong.

3) Inappropriate words choice

Word or vocabulary is a core component of language proficiency and provides much of the basis for how well students speak, listen, read, and write. Without an extensive English words and strategies for acquiring new vocabularies, students often achieve less than their potential and may be discourage from making use of language learning opportunities around them such as listening to the radio, listening to native speakers, watching television and wherever they like.

This research showed that the students made some inappropriate word choices in their speaking. It was because of wrong diction, wrong class of words and the influence of mother language. There are some mistakes made by students I choosing appropriate words or vocabularies as follow :

1. Said your opinion. Should be tell your opinion:
2. Big your volume. Should be raise your voice:
3. I want to take it your opinion. Should be I want to give opinion.
4. IF you catch my wrong. Should be if you finf my mistakes
5. For your pay attention. Should be for your attention

The researcher found that all of English errors were caused by the lack of English vocabulary and the non mastery of the word usage. It could be seen that the students usually asked the teacher and their friend about the meaning of the words and during their speech they usually stopped to open dictionary.

During small group discussion, the students could found the new vocabulary from their friends, dictionary and teacher while they were speaking systematically, they know many new vocabulary.

b. The students' speaking performance in term of fluency

The fluency of speaking can guarantee the students to have an efficient communication. They might speak with the smooth flow of speech and with natural pause without too great an effort.

In this research the researcher found that students were lack of vocabulary and grammar so it cause the barrier tom speak fluently. They sometimes spoke in full of long unnatural pause, almost give up making an effort at times, made too many halting and

repeated words several times. There are some inhibitions in speaking fluency of the students made by some students as shown bellow :

1. what we …e…said in English
2. I will …e…say …thank you for….e.e my teacher.
3. My opinion …(silent)…is…e…such as …e…
   Opinion.
4. E…e …sorry…apa …e. bahasa inggris nya….I …I don't tidak setuju……..
5. Please….. big…you…..volume …ya…volume
6. That it… iis ……… I ..opinion…I… rasa…you…understand ……I.

Gradually, these problems could be solve when the students practice theory small group discussion. They looked enthusiastic, enjoy, happy, and included in discussion. The students could shared idea and free to give opinion base on their opinion. They produced more sentences and express their idea and opinion so it could improve their fluency of speaking.

c. The development of students' speaking performance in terms of   comprehensibility

The students' speaking performance in terms of speaking comprehensibility was developed significantly by the use of impressionable teaching strategy of small group discussion. Even tough, the second grade students of Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar were doing some typical mistakes during the application of this research. Commonly, the students made the mistakes covering their pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary as how they performed their selves in a good manner to speak, so it was difficult to comprehend what they said. The researcher had to listen carefully ever   e had to listen it rapidly what the students said.

Seeing the table above, it can be noted that the students were still diffic   o manage the good sentence, in order could be understood easily. Therefore, the students needed a practical situation which they can more speaking. Almost the students produced some of wrong pronunciation, grammatical errors, and wrong in vocabulary when they described about the topics given. The students just were asked to repeat their sentence if their friends did not understand it. This was an attractive learning were the students did not feel nervous or reluctant to practice their speaking.

D. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the research findings and discussion in the previous chapter, the researcher can conclude:

1. Small group discussion is effective to activate the second year students of Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar in 2016/2017 to speak English. This findings indicated by the improvement of activities done by the students meeting to meeting. The improvement from meeting 1 to meeting 7 as mush as 93.19%.
2. Small group discussion is effective to improve students' speaking performance. It was indicated by the t-value 10.740 which higher than t-table (1.711) and p value (0.000) at the level significant 5 α= 0.05. It can improve the students' speaking accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility. The highest improvement among there components was comprehensibility with the improvement 23.32 points, while the rest accuracy which increases 14.68 and fluency 19.56 points. It showed that the students' achievement on speaking after getting seven meetings of treatment using small group discussion technique could significantly improve the students' speaking skill. This means that the data of posttest as the final result gave significant improvement. It can be concluded that the use of small group discussion technique

was able to give greater contribution in teaching and learning writing, because it could improve the students' speaking skill.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Byrne, Donn. 1995. *Teaching Oral English*. Harlow; Longman Group UK Limited.

Depdiknas. 2008. *Model Penilaian Kelas: Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan SMA/MA*. Pusat Kurikulum Badan Penelitian dan Pengembangan. Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.

Frederick, E. 1993. *A Plan for Small Group Discussion*. On line (http://extension.missouri.edu/explore/commdm/dm0460.htm). Accessed on February, 21st, 2008.

Hasninati, 2012. *Improving the students' ability to write descriptive paragraph through PLEASE (Pick, List, Evaluate, Activate, Supply and End)* Unpublished. Makassar, Unismuh.

Mikundan. 2008. "Active Speaking". On line http://www.mikundan.com/ portofolio/winstaru/wvcontents/jobaids/ aecr/speak.html.on April 20th , 2008

Mariah, M. 2006. *Activating the Students to Speak English through Pair Tasks in SMU 3 Ujung Pandang*. Unpublished Thesis. Ujung Pandang: FPBS IKIP Ujung Pandang.

Mori, Junko. 2002. *"Task design, plan, and development of talk-in-interaction: An analysis of a small group activity in a Japanese language classroom."* Applied linguistics 23.3: 323-347.

Michaels, Sarah, Catherine O'Connor, and Lauren B. Resnick. 2008. *"Deliberative discourse idealized and realized: Accountable talk in the classroom and in civic life."* Studies in philosophy and education 27.4: 283-297

Noni, Nurdin. 2003. *A Hybrid of Face to Face Teaching and Computer Assisted Language Learning in ELT Based on Individual References.* Unpublished Dissertation. Makassar: PPs Hasanuddin University.

Nunan, David. 1993. Designing Tasks for Communication Classroom. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sasmedi, Darwis. 2004. *Improving the Students Ability to Speech English Using Their Own Pictures through Pair Work.* Unpublished Thesis. Makassar:PPs UNM

Ubaydillah Ibnu Sholihin 2013 http://rujukanskripsi.blogspot.co.id/2013

Van Blankenstein, Floris M., et al. 2011. "*Which cognitive processes support learning during small-group discussion? The role of providing explanations and listening to others.*" Instructional Science 39.2: 189-204.

Yusuf, Muhammad. 2006. *A Small Group Discussion as learning Interaction in Speaking*. Unpublished Thesis.Makassar FBS Universitas Negeri Makassar.