
Learners Pronunciation Ability and Communicative Drilling Technique at Eighth Grade of SMKN 2 SIDRAP

Ismail Ma'sa¹, Syam Hermansyah², Andi Sadapott³, Kamridah⁴

^{1, 2, 3, 4, 5} English Education Departement, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidenreng Rappang, Indonesia masaismail79@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The objective of the research were to find out : (1) whether or not the ability the use of Communicative Drilling increased pronunciation ability of the second year students at SMK 2 Sidrap and (2) whether or not the second year students of SMK 2 Sidrap are interested in pronunciation through Communicative Drilling. This research applied Pre-experimental method that applied one group pretest and posttest. The subject of the research was the second year students of SMK 2 Sidrap academic year 2018 – 2019. total number of population was 92 students spread in three classes and one class of them VIII.3 were taken as sample by using cluster sampling technique. The data of the research were collected by using two kinds of instruments, namely pronunciation test and questionnaire. Pronunciation test was used to obtain data of the students' pronunciation ability and questionnaire was used to know the students interest in pronunciation by using communicative drilling.

The result of data analysis showed that the mean score of post test (70) was higher than the mean score of pre test (28). This showed that was significant difference between the students before and after taught by using communicative drilling. Then, the analysis of interest by using Linkert Scale indicated that the students were interested to pronounce English through communicative drilling. It was proved by mean score of students' interest was (79.9) in categories in interest.

The result of the t-test value (7.29) was greater than t-table ($\alpha = 0,05$; $16 = 2.120$). This mean that H1 was accepted. Based on data analysis, the researcher concluded that teaching pronunciation by using Communicative Drilling increased the students' ability to pronounce English. Moreover, the use of Communicative drilling makes the students' interested in pronouncing English.

Keyword: communicative drilling and pronunciation ability

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia is the country where English is positioned as a foreign language. Considering the importance of English, Indonesian government has decided to put English as one of the subjects which is taught in the school from kindergarten until university level. English is considered as important subject to learn since many fields in human life especially education uses English as the language to communicate and to share knowledge and information

It is very common that many foreign language learners have problems in teaching and learning process. In this case, many of English foreign learners have difficulties in pronunciation teaching process because of some factor. There are six factors that influence

ISSN 2460-4739(print)

*Correspondence:

Ismail Ma'sa

Learners Pronunciation Ability and Communicative Drilling Technique at Eighth Grade of SMKN 2 SISRAP

p. 203 - 210

learners' pronunciation, mother tongue, age, amount of exposure phonetic ability, personality, and motivation (Kenworthy:1987).

Abbas Pourhossein Gilakjani (2016) state that English pronunciation instruction is difficult for some reasons. Teachers are left without clear guidelines and are faced with contradictory practices for pronunciation instruction. There is no well-established systematic method of deciding what to teach, when, and how to do it. As a result of these problems, pronunciation instruction is less important and teachers are not very comfortable in teaching pronunciation in their classes.

Spoken communication is grounded on the communicability not only determined by correct grammar and profuse vocabulary but also on the correct interplay between the segmental and suprasegmental features making up pronunciation. As Burns (2003) concedes, despite minor inaccuracies in vocabulary and grammar, learners are more likely to communicate effectively when they have good pronunciation and intonation. Nowadays, as Pourhosein (2012, p.120) states, despite the "emphasis on the importance of meaningful communication and intelligible pronunciation, it is not enough to leave pronunciation teaching and training to pronunciation classes only"; it is determining that the relatively few hours devoted to this purpose in the curriculum are planned and devised to make the most of them, giving students the tools to continue improving on their own and the voice to express in which ways they learn the best. In spite of this, "researchers in applied linguistics have paid little attention to learners' perceptions of pronunciation instruction in L2 contexts" (Kang, 2010) so that this article has tried to deepen on students' perceptions and feelings about English pronunciation issues in general and about the English pronunciation subject "Pronunciation and comprehension of oral English" in particular in order to make a diagnostic analysis of the situation which will ideally lead to an improvement in their pronunciation skills.

To solve the problem above, the teacher of English had a role, in helping to hand the learning especially. How the teacher organize the materials are presented to learners and how student and teacher interaction of developing pronunciation ability. From the phenomenon, the researcher can also concluded to apply an effective and efficient strategy to improve the pronunciation ability.

Based on the statements, the researcher intends to make a research about the pronunciation ability is improve under title: Improving Students' Pronunciation through Communicative Drilling Technique Eight Grade students' at Junior High School (SMPN) 4 Pancarijang

METHODS

2.1 Research Design

This research will apply pre-experimental method design. Pre-experimental method research design combine quantitative and qualitative by sentially mixing both qualitative and quantitative in a research (Gay et al .2006:490). According to Creswell (2014:268) in his book there are three types of mixed designs (Convergent parallel design, explanatory sequential design and exploratory sequential design,). Based on the types, the researcher tried to use Convergent Parallel design.

2.2 Research Variables

In this research there are two kinds of variable namely:

a. Independent variable

The independent variable is the variable that the experimenter expects to influence the other (Nunan, 1992:25). Is the implementation of the teaching pronunciation through communicative drilling.

b. Dependent variable

The dependent variable is acting. In this study, the students' achievement manifested in the test score would be dependent variable. Is the pronunciation ability of students'.

Population and Sample

2.3 Population

According to Creswell (2005:142), population is the group of individuals who have the same characteristics. The population of this research is taken from the Eighth Grade students of SMK 2 Sidrap in 2018/2019 academic year. The classes are classified based on the students' registration number when they register to enter the school. VIII.1 consist of 22 students, VIII.2 consist of 21 Students and VIII.3 consist of 22 Students. The number of population was 65 students.

TABLE 1/ The Eight-Grade SMK 2 Sidrap

Classes	Sex		Total
	Male	Female	
VIII.1	10	12	22
VIII.2	10	13	23
VIII.3	13	11	24
VIII.4	12	11	23
Total	45	47	92

2.4 Sample

Sample is a subgroup of the target population that the researcher plans to study for generalizing about the target population Creswell (2012:142). In this research, the researcher will apply cluster random sampling technique that one class would be the sample. The researcher choose VIII.2 students as the sample the number of total sample are 23 students.

TABLE 2/ Sample Eight-Grade SMK 2 Sidrap

Class	Male	Female	Number of students
VIII.2	13	11	23
Total sample			23

2.5 Instrument of the Research

1. Pronunciation test

The Pronunciation test would use communicative drilling as instrument. It is aim at finding out the students' ability to pronounce English words by communicative drilling. The test consist of pre-test and post-test. The pre-test would intend to see the students' ability in learning pronunciation material before the treatment and post-test would intend to see the result of the treatment on students' pronunciation.

2. Questionnaire

The questionnaire would be used to obtain information about the students' attitude toward be

used of communicative drilling. And this way also could support the data from other instruments. The questionnaire consists of 20 items, 10 items positive statements and 10 negative statements which use Likert Scale with five options.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Result

This section deals with the presentation of the students' ability in pronunciation test and students' attitude toward the use of communicative drilling method.

The result of the test are as follow :

Students' pronunciation ability

Scoring classification of students' test

The classification of the students' score before they given treatment will be presented in the table below :

TABLE 4.1/ the result of pre-test

No	Classification	Score	Frekuensi	Percentage
1	Very good	86 – 100	0	0 %
2	Good	71 – 85	0	0 %
3	Average	56 – 70	3	17.7 %
4	Poor	41 – 55	2	11.8 %
5	Very poor	0 – 40	12	70.8 %
Total			17	100 %

Table above show that before treatment was given, there were 12 (70.8 %) out of 17 students' in "very poor" classification. 2 (11.8 %) out of 17 students' in "poor" classification. 3 (17.7 %) of them out in "average" classification. And there is no one student (0%) of the students in "good" and "very good" classification. It can be concluded that before was given the students' ability in pronunciation in English words was "very poor" classification.

The classification of the students' score after they are given treatment will be presented in the table below :

TABLE 4.2/ the result of pre-test

No	Classification	Score	Frekuensi	Percentage
1	Very good	86 – 100	5	29.4 %
2	Good	71 – 85	2	11.8 %
3	Average	56 – 70	10	58.9 %
4	Poor	41 – 55	0	0 %
5	Very poor	0 – 40	0	0 %
Total			17	100 %

Table above show that after treatment was given, there were no one students (0%) out of 17 students' in "very poor" and "poor" classification. 10 (58.9 %) of them in "average" classification, 2 (11.8 %) of them in "good" classification. And 5 (29.4 %) of them in "very good" classification.

From both of the table above indicate that before treatment was given students' ability in English pronunciation was categorized into "very poor" classification and after treatment was given the students' ability in English pronunciation was categorized into "average" classification it means that the students' ability to pronouncing english words has an improvement after getting treatment in this case communicative drilling. The writer indicate that by communicative drilling the students' english pronunciation can be improved too. So the writer concluded that communicative drilling is one of effective ways in learning and teaching process, especially in teaching English pronunciation.

The mean score and standard deviation of the students' tesy result

In this part, the discussion deals with the argument of the difference of the students' pronunciation ability after giving test. The mean score of pre-test and the mean post-test was significantly different. The findings of test are presented in the following table.

TABLE 4. 3/ The mean score and standard deviation of the students' test

No	Type of Test	Mean score	Standard Deviation
1	Pre-test	40.94	11.87
2	Post-test	75.88	13.49

Based on the table above showed that the mean score of test of both pre-test and post-test is different. This is caused the effect of teaching by using communicative drilling method. The mean score of post-test, (75.88) is categorized as average categorized and pre-test, (40.94) is categorized as very poor category. The mean score of post-test was higher than pre-test ($75.88 > 40.94$), the standard deviation of pre-test was 11.87 and standard deviation of post-test was 13.49.

In order to know whether or not the mean difference of both tests is statically signifant at the level of significant at the level of significant 5% (0.05), degree of freedom ($N - 1$) = 16, the result of calculation is shown as follow:

TABLE 4. 4/ the t-test of the students' ability

Variable	t-test value	t-test table
Pronunciation Test	7.29	2.120

Based on the statistic test in asymptotic significant (2-tailed) column, in relation to the finding of test, the t-test value was higher than the t-table ($7.29 > 2.120$). This means that H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted, on significant level of $\alpha = 0.5$. it means that communicative drilling increase students' pronunciation ability.

2. Students' Interest

To know the students' interest toward the use of communicative drilling method in improving students' pronunciation ability. The researcher distributed questionnaire to the students'. The data was analyzed by using Likert Scale and SPSS 21.1.

TABLE 4. 5/ The percentage of students' Interest

Category	Range	Frequency	%
Strongly interested	85 – 100	7	41.1
Interest	69 – 84	7	41.1
Moderate	51 – 68	3	17.7
Uninterested	36 – 50	0	0
Strongly interested	20 - 35	0	0
Total		17	99.9%

The Mean Score of Students' Interest

TABLE 4. 6/ The Mean Score of Students' Interest

Total Respondent	Total of Students' Score	Mean
	1	7
	3	9
	5	.
	6	7

The table above shows that the mean score of students' interest is 79.7. it means the students' were interested to use communicative drilling in improving students' pronunciation ability.

Discussion

This section deals with argument and further interpretation of the research findings in pronunciation ability in pretest and posttest results.

Based on the students' work in the pre-test, the researcher analyzed that most students had low ability in pronunciation.

The result of data analysis showed that there was significant difference between the students' score in pretest and posttest. It was proven by the mean score of posttest which was

higher than pretest ($7.29 > 2.120$). the analysis indicated that the students were strongly interested to improve the pronunciation ability through communicative drilling. It was proved by interest mean (79.7) where 41.1 % students were strongly interested, 41.1% students were interested and 17.7% students were moderate. Based on the data analysis, the researcher concluded that : (1) the use of communicative drilling improves students' pronunciation ability; (2) the use of communicative drilling makes the students interested in improving pronunciation.

This is also in line with Tam (1997) stated communicative drilling make people to be stressed on pronunciation and quality of voice, it is conform to Acton (1984) stated that communicative drilling leads students concern on accuracy, makes them listen and understand their speech on a daily basis and helps students' to enhance their control of English rhythm. Therefore according to him, communicative drilling is one of interesting techniques for developing students' pronunciation.

CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion in the previous chapter, researcher makes a conclusion that teaching pronunciation using communicative drilling is effective because it can improve the pronunciation ability and intrinsic motivation of the students' as well. The students' improvement on pronunciation ability is shown from the difference of the students' mean score between before and after the actions. The students' intrinsic motivation also improved.

The improvement was shown from the students' attitude the actions. During the researcher as implementing the actions, the students' were more active and relax. It was totally different from their attitude in the first meeting. In the first meeting, they were too afraid to show their 'existence' by keeping quiet during the lesson. In the second and the next meeting, they were easily did some activities asked by the teacher. They interested and enjoyed joining the class.

REFERENCES

- Akmaijan, A., Demers, RA., Farmer, A K & R.M. 1998. *Linguistics : an introduction to Language and Communication*, 4h edn, MIT Press, Cambridge, London.
- Bachman, L. 1990 *Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing*. New York: Oxford University Pres.
- Brown, D.H 2001. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. 2nd. Ed. New York: Pearson Education.
- Burns, A 2003. *Clearly speaking: pronunciation in action for teachers*. National Center for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquaire Universty, Sydney NSW 2019.
- Celce-Murcia, M. 2006. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. 3rd ed. Singapore: Heinle & Heinle.
- Dobrovolsky. 1989. *Phonetic : The sounds of Language*.
- Dr. K. Venkata Subbaiah, Fiaz Khan, Challa Suresh (2017) *Optimization of Process Parameters in CNC Drilling of EN 36*. Pdf format available at <http://www.internationaljournalsrg.org/IJME/2017/Special-Issues /NCRAME/IJME-NCRAME-P133.pdf>
- Giergerich, Heinz J. 1992. *English Phonology: an Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Gilakjani, Abbas Pourhossein. 2002. *The significance of Pronunciation in English Teaching*. www.researchgate.net
- Gilakjani, Abbas Pourhossein. 2012. *A Study of Factors Affecting EFL Learners' English Pronunciation Learning And the Strategies for Instruction*. *Internatioanal Journal of*

- Humanities and Social Science 2.3, 119-128
- Handoko, Kenny Ckristian, Mindari, Ruruh (2016) Using Drilling to Teach Pronunciation to the Seventh Graders. Pdf format available at <http://repository.wima.ac.id/6215/>
- Howlader, Mohammad Rasel 2001. Approaches to Developing pronunciation in a Second Language: A study in Banglades. ASA University.
- Ilham. 2013. Increasing students' pronunciation ability of the second years students' through reading aloud at STKIP Muhammadiyah Sidrap
- Heaton, J.B. Classroom Testing. London: Longman, 1990.127 p.
- Heaton, J.B. Writing English Language tests. 1st edition. London: Longman, 1988. 160 p.
- Kang, O. 2010. ESL learners' attitudes toward pronunciation instruction and varieties of English. In J. Levis & K. LeVelle (eds). Proceedings of the 1st Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Theaching Conference. Ames, IA: Iowa State University, 105-118.
- Kelly, Gerald. 2000. How to Teach Pronunciation. Essex: Pearson Education.
- Kenworthy, Joanne. 1987. Teaching English Pronunciation. Essex: Addison Wesley Longman Ltd.
- Maharida. 2017. Using Substitution Drill Technique To Improve Students' Pronunciation Ability. Pdf format available at www.researchgate.net
- Nunan, D. 1991. Languange Teaching Methodology : a textbook for teacher. Prencite Hall International English Language Teaching.
- Nurani, Siti. Rosyada, Amrina. 2015. Improving English Pronunciation of Adult ESL Learners through Reading Aloud Assessments at <https://journal.binus.ac.id>
- Riyanto, Yatim. 2001. Metodologi Penelitian Pendidikan. Penerbit SIC.
- Seidlhofer, B. 1995. "Pronunciation Awareness:Some thoughts on pronunciation in teacher education". Speak Out! Newsletter of the IATEFL Pronunciation Special Interest Group, 6, p. 12-16.
- Soon, Goh Ying, Saiful Nizam. Al Marimuthu, Rasaya. Abdul Wahab Naemah, Othman, Jam. And Peng, Chenk Slak. (2017). Improving Pronunciation Accruacy of Oral Production Using Online Chinese Pinyin Text To Speech System. Pdf format available at www.iarjournal.com
- Surfian, Andi R. 2016. The Use of English Learning Material Design Through Ulead VideoStudio on Improving Reading Comprehension at Tenth Grade SMAN 2 Panca Rijang.
- Sugiyono. 2009. Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D. Bandung:
- Trujillo, Fernando. 2002. English Phonetics and Phonology. Avalaible at www.ugr.es/~ftsaez/fonetica/production_speech.pdf