

Chain Drill Technique in Teaching Speaking

Dewi Anggraini

MA Nurul Huda Sukaraja

deapotter2123@gmail.com

Abstract

The objective of the research was to find out whether or not there is a significant difference between the students who are taught by using chain drill technique and the students who are taught by using a conventional technique in teaching students' speaking ability at the seventh-grade students of MTs Nurul Huda Sukaraja. In this research, the writer used an experimental method. The population of this research was 111 students, and there were 48 students was taken by using cluster random sampling for the sample, those were 24 students of experimental group who were taught using chain drill technique and 24 students of the control group who were taught using the conventional technique. For analyzing the data, the writer used the independent t-test, and the result of the calculation showed that t-obtained was higher than t-table ($5.73 > 2.0129$). It meant that there was a significant difference between experimental and control group. So, the alternative hypothesis (H_a) was accepted and the null hypothesis (H_o) was rejected. As a conclusion, using chain drill technique to teach speaking is effective.

Key Words: Chain Drill Technique, Teaching, and Speaking Ability.

INTRODUCTION

There are four skills in learning English those are listening, speaking, reading and writing. But, the mastery of speaking skill in English is a priority for many second-language or foreign-language learners (Richards, 2008:19). Why does it become the priority? Because English is an international language which is used by all people around the world to communicate with others. From a pragmatic view of language performance, listening and speaking are almost always closely interrelated (Brown, 2003:140). By listening to a correct model, students will be able to speak correctly. By creating English atmosphere in the classroom placed teacher as a model, students will be accustomed to using English orally to express their mind, feeling, communicate with their friends and teacher and etc, so they will be able to use English fluently in daily life.

Students have some problems in speaking English, according to Hinkel (2005:121), there are some students' speaking problems to talk in the classroom, these are inhibition (students are often inhibited, they are worried about making mistakes, fearful of criticism or losing face and they are shy of the attention that their speech attracts), nothing to say (learners often complain that they cannot think of anything to say and they have no motivation to express themselves), low or uneven participation and mother-tongue use (the learners often use mother-tongue to speak with others, because it is easier for the learners).

In addition, Hetrakul (1995:76) states that some students' problems in speaking English are there is no support for the students to speak English, they have problem with grammar and vocabulary, most students are very easy to get confused with English grammar and sometimes when they are speaking English, they have a sentence in mind, but they are missing two or three important vocabulary words – and then it becomes difficult to say what they are thinking.

It relates to the writer's observation at MTs Nurul Huda Sukaraja, she found that the students were lazy to speak. When they were asked to speak, they used their first language (native language) rather than using English. It is because they do not accustom to using English in English class. The students' difficulties in speaking are caused by low vocabularies, low ability in producing and constructing sentences and utterances, and also low motivation to participate in speaking activity caused by shyness and embarrassment in making mistake.

The primary of the speaking problem is low motivation for students to speak English. Harmer (2002:51) states that motivation is accepted for most fields of learning that motivation is essential to success, without such motivation we will almost certainly fail to make the necessary effort.

Students need to be motivated by applying teaching technique which is able to make them enthusiastic and confident in expressing their mind in the target language. Experts have totally given their mind in the study of developing techniques and methods to teach English as the second language in order to improve the motivation of the students in learning English. As the result, a variety of English teaching techniques and methods have been found and applied in every level of education. One of them is chain drill, a teaching technique that is created from the Audio-Lingual Method firstly applied by Charles Fries (1945) of the University of Michigan (Larsen-Freeman, 2000:35).

Chain drill technique is one of technique that suitable for teaching speaking (Larsen-Freeman, 2000:46). Chain drill technique is started by the teacher, the teacher prepares questions to be asked to the student nearest with the teacher. Then, teacher addresses some questions to the student nearest with the teacher. After that, the first student responds to the teacher's question. The first student understands through teacher's gestures then the first student turns to the student sitting beside the first student and asks questions like teacher asked before. The second student, in turn, says the lines in replay to the first student. When the second student has finished, the second student asks questions to the student on the other side of the second student. This chain continues until all of the students get a chance to ask and answer the questions. The last student directs greeting and asking questions to the teacher.

Larsen-Freeman (2000:46), suggests the teachers use chain drill if the teachers want the students to be able to speak English communicatively. Furthermore, Larsen-Freeman explained that chain drill has been used in teaching speaking. Chain drill gives students an opportunity to speak their idea individually, chain drill lets students use the expressions in communication with someone, even though the communication is very limited.

Concept of Speaking

Speaking is one of two productive skills in a language teaching. It is defined as a process of building and sharing meaning through the use of verbal or oral form (Thornbury, 2002). Moreover, Kushartanti (2005:32) defines speaking asset of voices uttered by one and understood by someone else.

Walter (2004) defines speaking as the development of the relationship between speaker and listener. In addition, speaking determining which logical linguistic, psychological a physical rules should be applied in a given communication situation. It means that the main objective of speaking is for communication.

From the definitions about speaking above, it could be concluded that Speaking is a form to say or talk something to give information with expressing of ideas, opinions, views, and description to other for getting response or way of conveying a message in order to make understanding of wishes to other and to contribute to the other.

Elements of Speaking

According to Harmer (2001:269) in his book *The Practice of English Language Teaching* that the speakers have to be competent in speaking skill, those are language features in which contains four points. They are:

1. Connected speech. It is the sound's modifying in producing utterance when people speak. In which includes modifying (assimilation), omitting (elision), adding (linking), or weakening (through contraction and stress patterning).
2. Expressive devices. It is the stress and pitch variation in producing utterance in order to convey the truth meaning of the messages meant by the speaker. It includes the variation of

the volume and speed of the speech. By using these devices, people will be able to show what and how they feel to whom they are talking to.

3. Grammar and lexis. People live in different ways, places and environments which is causing a different mindset too. Therefore, teachers need to supply their students with various phrases for different function in their speaking classroom activity. For instance, students will know what expressions they have to use appropriately in different stages of interaction.
4. Negotiation language. This is the speech clarification. It is the use of language on how to clarify and to show what they means. Sometimes people do not hear or understand what other people's saying. Therefore, it is necessary to have an appropriate language of how to clarify in order to avoid misunderstanding between the speaker and the listener (Harmer,2001: 267-270).

In addition, Harmer (2001:270) concerned with other elements of speaking that is necessary to be mastered by a successful speaker, those are mental/ social processing and the rapid processing which involves language processing, interaction, and information processing.

1. Language processing. Effective speakers need to be able to process language in their own head and put it into a coherent order so that it comes out in forms that are not only comprehensible but also convey the meaning that is intended.
2. Interaction. Most speaking involves interaction with one or more participants. It means that effective speaking also involves a good deal of listening, an understanding of how others felt and a knowledge of how the linguistically to take turns or allow others to do so.
3. Information processing. Quite apart from our response to other's feelings, we also need to be able to process the information they take us the moment we get it.

Those elements mentioned above showed that the speakers must be communicatively competence in the language they use. As it is stated by Walter in her book, about communicative competence that it defines as the ability to use language appropriately in a variety of context (Walter, 2008:18) which involves:

1. Grammatical Competence. It is a competency that focuses on the accuracy and correctness of using language code such as vocabulary, spelling, grammar, pronunciation and so on in the language skill especially speaking and writing.
2. Sociolinguistics Competence. It is a competency that focuses on the use of appropriate language in the various social setting. Here, the target language speaker is demanded to know how, where and when the language will be uttered by them the inappropriate situation, such as how to invite, how to asking information, how to describe something and etc.
3. Discourse Competence. It is a competency that focuses on the appropriateness of combining and connecting phrases and sentences in engaging conversation.
4. Strategic Competence. It is a competency that focuses on manipulation of language in achieving the communication goals. This competency involves the use of both verbal and nonverbal, such as changing the voice tone, using the body language and emphasizing the specific word (Walter, 2008:19).

Concept of Chain Drill Technique

Brown (2003: 272) stated about drills as follows: Drills offer students an opportunity to listen and to orally repeat certain strings of language that may pose some linguistics difficulty- either phonological or grammatical. Drills are commonly used in Audio-Lingual Method. The goal of this method is to use the target language communicatively. Larsen-Freeman (2000: 45) states that the goal of teachers who use the Audio-Lingual method is they want their students to be able to use the target language communicatively.

According to Larsen-Freeman (2000:46), we have to use drills if we want the students to be able to speak English communicatively. Furthermore, she explained that drills, as part of the audio-lingual method, have been used in teaching speaking. Since the primary goal of the audio-lingual method is to use the target language communicatively, drills are suitable for teaching speaking. Chain drill itself is a teaching technique that is created from the Audio-Lingual Method firstly applied by Charles Fries (1945) of the University of Michigan. And for this reason, it has sometimes been referred to as the "Michigan Method" (Larsen-Freeman, 2000:35). A chain drill gets its name from the chain of conversation that forms around the room as students, one-by-one, ask and answer questions of each other (Larsen-Freeman, 2000:48).

According to Larsen Freeman (2000:48), the steps of chain drill activity can be described as follow:

- 1). The activity is begun as the teacher greets and asks questions to a particular student.
- 2). The student will respond the question.
- 3). Then, he takes a turn to ask another student sitting next to him.
- 4). This activity will continue work until the last turn of the last student.
- 5). In the end, the last student directs greeting and asking questions back to the teacher.

A chain drill allows some controlled communication among the students while the teacher can check students' speech as well. Either teacher or students themselves can correct their friend's oral sentences whether they are well constructed or not. As the result, any mistakes that probably occur can be corrected directly as soon as possible. Besides, the use of peer student's correction will prevent student's worrying in making the mistake that can improve their confidence to try.

The use of chain drill can encourage the improvement of students' listening and speaking skills. They get listening skill from listening to their friends' questions. Therefore, they have to focus on what their friends asking about. Once they can answer the question correctly, it means that they absolutely can understand the question. Moreover, the way they ask questions or answer the questions drives students to practice speaking. This activity makes students accustomed to express their ideas through oral speech. It also creates a new habit to use English in communicating with others that will improve their speaking ability as the result.

METHODOLOGY

In this study, the writer used quantitative research. In this study, there were two kinds of variables: independent variable and dependent variable. An independent variable is a variable presumed to be affected or influence another variable. A dependent variable is a variable presumed to be affected by one or more independent variable (Wallen and Fraenkel, 1990:43). The independent variable in this study was Chain Drill Technique and the dependent variable was the students' speaking ability. The population of this study was the seventh-grade students of MTs Nurul Huda Sukaraja in The totals of the number of population in this study were 111 students. In this study the writer used cluster random sampling. It is the random selection of a naturally occurring group or areas and the selection of an element from the choosing group or areas.

In this study, the writer used a test to collect the data. A test is a series of questions or exercises and other tools used to measure the skills, knowledge of intelligence, ability or talent possessed by individual or groups (Arikunto, 2010:193). In this study, the writer divided the test into two, pre-test and post-test. In this study, the scoring of the test was given by English teacher of MTs Nurul Huda Sukaraja as rater 1, and writer as rater 2. To find out the data either pretest and post-test, the writer used the speaking oral test.

In giving scores, the writer followed rating scale developed by H.Douglas Brown (2003:172-173). It showed items that were important to be scored: Grammar, Vocabulary, Fluency, Pronunciation. It could be seen in the following table.

Tabel 1
Aspect for Giving the Score in Speaking

No.	Component	Score	Classification
1	Grammar	5	Control of grammar is good
		4	Control of grammar is quite good
		3	Control of grammar is tolerable
		2	can usually handle elementary construction quite accurately but doesn't have confident control of grammar
		1	Errors in grammar are frequent
2	Vocabulary	5	Have a lot of vocabulary repertory
		4	Have pretty many vocabulary repertory
		3	Tolerable of vocabulary repertory
		2	Lack of vocabulary repertory
		1	Poor of vocabulary's repertory
3	Fluency	5	Able to use language fluently
		4	Able to use language quite fluently
		3	Tolerable of fluency
		2	Less of fluency
		1	Poor of fluency
4	Pronunciation	5	error in pronunciation are disappear
		4	Error in pronunciation are quite rare
		3	Error never interfere with understanding
		2	Accent is intelligible though often quite faulty
		1	Errors in pronunciation are frequent

(H.Douglas Brown, 2003:172-173)

$$\text{Students' score} = \frac{\text{Score obtained} \times 100}{\text{Score maximal}}$$

Criteria of the Score

The criteria of score used to interpret whether the students were considered excellent, very good, good, moderate, enough, low, and poor.

Table 2
The Score Category

Percentage Range	Level of Competency
91-100	Excellent
81-90	Very Good
71-80	Good
61-70	Moderate
51-60	Enough
41-50	Low
0-40	Poor

Statistical Analysis by Using Independent t-test

The collected data was analyzed using independent t-test. It was used to find out the difference between experiment class and control class

The formula is as follows:

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{s_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{s_2^2}{n_2}}}$$

(Sugiyono, 2006:222)

Where :

\bar{X}_1 : Mean of the post-test scores in the experimental group

\bar{X}_2 : Mean of the post-test scores in the control group

S_1^2 : The variance of experimental group

S_2^2 : The variance of control group

n_1 : Number of students at experimental group

n_2 : Number of students at control group

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In this study, the writer gave the pre-test and post-test in experimental group. The pre-test was given to know how far the students' speaking ability before the writer taught the students through chain drill technique, and after the treatment by giving the post-test. In addition, the sample of the students were 24 students. The score distribution of pre-test and post-test in the experimental group can be seen in the following table.

Tabel 3

The Score Distribution of Pre-test and post-test in the Experimental Group

Score Interval	Category	Pre-test		Post-test	
		Frequency	Percentage(%)	Frequency	Percentage(%)
91-100	Excellent	0	0 %	0	0 %
81-90	Very Good	0	0 %	2	8.33 %
71-80	Good	0	0%	13	54.17 %
61-70	Moderate	10	41.67 %	7	29.17 %
51-60	Enough	5	20.83%	2	8.33 %
41-50	Low	9	37.5%	0	0 %
0-40	Poor	0	0 %	0	0 %
Total		24	100 %	24	100 %
Mean		56.77		73.13	
Median		58.75		72.5	
Modus		65		72.5	
Minimum score		42.5		60	
Maximum score		70		87.5	
Range		27.5		27.5	
Variant		79.61		49.60	

From the Table above, the pre-test score was described that there were 10 students (41.67%) who are in moderate category, there were 5 students (20.83%) who are in an enough category, and there were 9 students (37.5%) who got Low category. For category of excellent, very good, good, and poor there was nobody. Moreover, the post-test score can be seen that there were 2 students (8.33%) who got very good score, there were 13 students (54.17%) who got good score, there were 7 students (29.17%) who got moderate score and the last there were 2 students (8.33%) who got enough score. And there was nobody in excellent, low and poor category.

Furthermore, the score distribution of pre-test and post-test score in control group could be seen in the following table.

Tabel 4
The Score Distribution of Pre-test and post-test in the Control Group

Score Interval	Category	Pre-test		Post-test	
		Frequency	Percentage(%)	Frequency	Percentage(%)
91-100	Excellent	0	0 %	0	0 %
81-90	Very Good	0	0 %	0	0 %
71-80	Good	1	4.17 %	2	8.33 %
61-70	Moderate	9	37.5%	12	50 %
51-60	Enough	4	16.67 %	7	29.17 %
41-50	Low	10	41.66 %	3	12.5 %
0-40	Poor	0	0 %	0	0 %
Total		24	100%	24	100 %
Mean		56.67		61.67	
Median		60		62.5	
Modus		65		65	
Minimum score		45		47.5	
Maximum score		72.5		72.5	
Range		27.5		25	
Variant		73.19		46.56	

From the Table above, the pre-test score was gotten that there was no student (4.17%) who got good score, there were 9 students (37.5%) who got moderate score, there were 4 students (16.67%) who got enough score and the last there were 10 students (41.66%) who got low score. And there was nobody for the criteria of excellent, very good and poor score. In addition, from the post-test score, it was gotten that there were 2 students (8.33%) who got good score, there were 12 students (50%) who got moderate score, there were 7 students (29.17%) who got enough score and the last there were 3 students (12.5%) who got low score. For the criteria of excellent, very good, and poor score, there was no student got it.

Statistical Analysis of Post-Test in Experimental Group and Control Group by Using Independent t-test

Based on the students' score obtained in the post-test of experimental group and control group, the writer calculated by using independent t-test to find out whether there is significant difference between students who were taught by using chain drill technique and students who were taught by using conventional technique in teaching speaking.

$$\begin{aligned}
 t &= \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{S_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{S_2^2}{n_2}}} \\
 t &= \frac{73.13 - 61.67}{\sqrt{\frac{49.60}{24} + \frac{46.56}{24}}} \\
 t &= \frac{11.46}{\sqrt{2.07 + 1.94}} \\
 t &= \frac{11.46}{\sqrt{4.01}} \\
 t &= \frac{11.46}{2.00} \\
 t &= 5.73
 \end{aligned}$$

From the calculation above, the value of t_{obtain} was 5.73, with 5% significant and degree of freedom (df) $n-2 = 48-2 = 46$ and the level significant was 0.05 for two tail test and the value of t_{table} was 2.0129, the critical value in the t_{table} was 2.0129. Since the t_{obtain} was higher than critical value in the t_{table} it meant that there was a significant difference achievement between students who were taught by using chain drill technique and students who were taught by using conventional technique.

Therefore, it could be interpreted that teaching speaking by using chain drill technique enable them to get better score. Whereas, the result of independent t-test was 5.73 and the critical value in the t-table was 2.0129, it indicated that teaching speaking by using chain drill technique was significant effective. In other word, Alternative Hypothesis (Ha) was accepted and the Null Hypothesis (Ho) was rejected. It meant that there was any significant difference achievement between students who were taught by using chain drill technique and students who were taught by using conventional technique

CONCLUSION

Based on the data analysis, the writer concluded that there was any significant different between the students who are taught by using chain drill technique in teaching speaking ability to the Seventh grade students of MTs Nurul Huda Sukaraja in academic years 2015/2016. It enable them to get better score. The result from the analysis showed that t-obtained was 5.73 whereas the value of t-table was 2.0129. Therefore, t-obtained was higher than t-table, this indicated that Ha was accepted and Ho was rejected.

REFERENCIES

- Arikunto, S. (2010). *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Ary, et al. (2010). *Introduction to Research in Education*. Canada: Nelson Education, Ltd.
- Bailey, K.M., & Savage, L. (1994). *New ways in teaching speaking*. Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.
- Brown, H. Douglas. (2003). *Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices*. New York: Longman.
- Brown, H.D. (1994). *Teaching by principles: an interactive approach to language pedagogy*.
- Frankel, R.J & Wallen, E.N.(2000). *How to Design and Evaluate Research In Education*.san Fransisco State University: McGraw Hil.
- Harmer, Jeremy. (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. London: Pearson Education Limited.
- Hetrakul, Kavin. (1995). *The Second Language*. <http://eserver.org/courses/spring95/76-100g/KavinHetrakul.html> (accesed on January 18th 2016)
- Hewitt, Ralph., and Mary Little. (2005). *Leading Action Research in Schools*. Florida: University of Central Florida.
- Hinkel, E. (2005). *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Kushartanti, et al. (2005). *Pesona Bahasa; Langkah Awal Memahami Linguistics*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Larsen-Freeman, Diane. (2000). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- .Sugiyono. (2010). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan, Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R& D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Thornbury, S. (2002). *How to Teach Speaking*. Edinburg Gate Harlow Essex England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Walter, Teresa. (2004). *The How-To Handbook Teaching English Language Learners*. New York: Pearson Education