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ABSTRACT

The aims of the study are to know whether Analytic Teams Technique can
improve the students’ speaking skill at the eleventh grade students of XI IPA
of MAN 2 Surakarta and to know how far Analytic Teams Technique in
teaching speaking can improve the students’ speaking skill at the eleventh
grade students of XI IPA of MAN 2 Surakarta. Analytic Teams Technique is
one of best technique that is appropriate with students’ characteristic to be
more focus and easier in learning speaking. It used Classroom Action
Research in the students of class XI IPA 1 at MAN 2 Surakarta in
2015/2016 Academic Years. There were 18 students. The research was
conducted in two cycles and every cycle consisted of three meetings. The
researcher used technique of collecting data and analyzing data. The
technique of collecting data consisted of test and non test. In the technique
of analyzing data, the researcher used qualitative and quantitative data
analysis. Based on scores of speaking test, it shows that Analytic Teams
Technique could improve students’ speaking skill. The improvement in
students’ speaking skill could be shown by the results of pre-test and post-
test. The mean score of pre-test was 56.22 and it improved 62.89 in post-test
1 to 80.22 in post-test 2.
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INTRODUCTION

English becomes the most important language to be learned by students, including in Indonesia. Harmer (2007: 13) states “English is also, of course, a mother tongue for many people in the world, though, as we shall see, such ‘native speaker’ are increasingly out – numbered by people who have English as a second or third language and use it for international communication.” It shows that English has grown fastly. There, English begins to be taught at primary school to the university.

There are four basic skills in English. They are reading, listening, speaking, and writing. One of the important skills to be taught by the students is speaking. According to Richards (2008: 19), “The mastery of speaking skills in English is a priority for many second-language or foreign-language learners.” It means that speaking becomes fundamental aspect in learning English.

According to the information, there was a real fact of the situation in learning at XI IPA of MAN 2 Surakarta. The Successful Minimal Criterion (KKM) of that school is 75. It was too high for the eleventh grade students. Almost 50 % students could not pass the KKM score. The teacher argued if it was caused by English which was not their mother language, so the students did not understand enough about English.

There were some problems related to the teaching and learning of the speaking skill. Firstly the factors from the students were (1) the students were confused when they were asked to speak because they had nothing to say, (2) the
students felt unconfident when they were speaking English in front of the class. Secondly, the factor from the teacher was the teacher only used worksheet and the English book in teaching process. It did not seem attractive to the students to learn.

One of the techniques that could involve both the teacher and the students to participate in the learning activities and used to help the students in developing their speaking skill was Analytic Teams Technique. Analytic Teams Technique would make students dare to speak in front of the class because they have respective roles that had been organized. The students would also be able to interact actively because they were placed in the discussion groups that gave them full rights to explore their ideas.

THEORETICAL REVIEW

Speaking Skill

_The Definition of Speaking_

According to Harmer (1998: 87), “Speaking is a performance some kind of oral task using any and all the language.” Nunan (1998: 39) states that speaking is the single most important aspect of learning a second or foreign language and success is measured in terms of the ability to carry out a conversation in the language. Speaking is a process in delivering his mind and feeling (from brain) orally, in the word or sentences (Chaer, 2003: 148).
The Definition of Skill

According to Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary (1974: 804), “Skill can be defined as an ability to do something expertly and well.”

According to Bygate (1987: 7), “Skill is the ability to use language in order to satisfy particular demands. There are at least two demands which can affect the nature of speech. The first of these is related to the internal conditions of speech. The fact is that speech takes place under pressure of time. A second kind involves the dimension of interpersonal interaction in conversation.”

Richard and Schmidt (2002: 489) state that skill is an acquired ability to perform an activity well, usually one that is made up of a number of co-ordinated processes and actions.

The Definition of Speaking Skill

According to Bygate (1987: 1), “Speaking as skill for making or loosing friends, it is the vehicle of social solidarity, of social ranking of professional advancement and business. It is also a medium through which the language learns.” Steele (2010) states that speaking skill is the ability to communicate effectively, with little or no chance of a misunderstanding. It is kind of productive skill in the oral mode it, like the other skills, is more complicated then it seems at first and involves more than just pronunciation word. Richard (1990: 1) states that speaking skill is a priority for many second or foreign language learners.

Analytic Teams Technique

The Definition of Analytic Teams Technique

According to Barkley et al (2005: 291),
“In Analytic Teams, team members assume the roles and specific tasks to run when they read the literature assigned to them, listening to lectures, or watching a video critically. The roles such as summary, liaison (link the task with previous knowledge or with the outside world), supporters, and critics are more focused on the analytic process than in the group process (which takes roles as facilitator, the time reminder, and recording).”

Analysis is an attempt to observe in detail any matter or thing by breaking the constituent components to examine further. The analytic techniques in this primer are designed to help individual analysts, as well as teams, explore and challenge their analytical arguments and mind-sets (US Government, 2009:5).

In Analytic Team Technique, each individual in the group has a role. Barkley et al (2005: 292) divides these students with five roles, namely:

a. Supporter: a student is required to record the points of agreement and their reasons.

b. Critic: a student is asked to take notes of the points that he does not agree and the reasons.

c. Giving an example: a student is asked to give an example to the key concepts presented.

d. Summary: a student is required to prepare a summary of the most important point.

e. Questioner: a student is asked to prepare a list of questions with regard to the substantive matter.

The Procedure of Analytic Teams Technique

Based on Barkley et al (2005: 293), there are steps of using analytic team technique as follows:
a. Make student group of four or five people, give to each individual in the group a role and "work to do."

b. Convey lectures, publish video, or give the task to read the readings.

c. Give the class time to the group so that its members can be mutually shared their findings and work together to prepare for the delivery of their analysis in the form of written and oral presentation.

d. Try a closing strategy that emphasizes the roles and tasks component. Stand and Share could be an option that is suitable for fairly short, while the Panel and Poster sessions will be better suited for the tasks more complex.

**Method**

The method was used in this research is Classroom Action Research method. Mills (2000: 6) defines action research as a systematic inquiry conducted by teacher researchers, principles, school counselors, or other stakeholders in teaching or learning environment, to gather information about the ways that their particular school operate, how they teach, and how well their students learn. The model of classroom action research is this study is model by Kemmis and McTaggart in Burns (1999: 32) who state that action research occurs through dynamic and complementary process, which consist of four essential ‘moments’: planning, action, observation, and reflection.
This study used test and non test as collecting data. Test was used to examine and evaluate the students’ speaking skill. The test was given in the beginning namely pre test and in the end namely post test. Meanwhile, for the non tests were by doing the observation, interview, and documentation. In the technique in analyzing the data, it used qualitative and quantitative data analysis. Miles and Huberman (in Sugiyono, 2010: 337-345) states that the qualitative data consisted of data collection, data reduction, data display, and conclusion. The quantitative data analysis was used to analysis the data from the result of speaking test, a statistical technique was use to find the student’s mean score. It was done to compare the students’ speaking skill before and after each cycle or the result of the test.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The subject of the study was students of class XI IPA 1 of MAN 2 Surakarta in 2015/2016 academic years. It consisted of 12 girls and 6 boys. There was preliminary research before the implementation of the technique. The aim of preliminary research was to identify the problems happening during the teaching and learning process. The preliminary research was conducted by (a) observing the situation and activities of teaching and learning process learning English, (b) interviewing the English teacher, (c) interviewing the students, and (d) giving pre-test to the students before the technique implementation.

The classroom observation was conducted on Friday, 30 October 2015 in the XI IPA 1 of MAN 2 Surakarta to know situation of teaching and learning
English. The first problem was the lack of students’ speaking skill such as: the students were confused when they were asked to speak because they had nothing to say, the students felt unconfident when they were speaking English in front of the class, and most of the students were passive in learning English. The second problem was the teacher only used worksheet and the English book in teaching process. It did not seem attractive to the students to learn.

The interview was held on Thursday, 29 October 2015. The first interviewee was the English teacher of MAN 2 Surakarta (Fatkhurrohmah Atmawati) to identify the problems, students’ background and technique used in teaching English especially speaking. The second interviewees were students, as the representative students of eleventh grade of XI IPA 1, MAN 2 Surakarta. It was used to identify the difficulties faced by students focus on learning speaking.

In the last phase, the pre-test was conducted on Tuesday, 24 November 2015. The students were asked to give their arguments and recommendation individually in front of the class. After the students were tested, the researcher calculated the mean score of speaking test. It showed that the students’ speaking skill was still low. It was proven by the mean of pre-test, only 56.22. It was under the standard minimum score (Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimum) for English (75).

After doing the preliminary research, the research was conducted in two cycles. Every cycle was conducted in three meetings, the first and the second meeting was for implementation of the action, the third meeting was for post-test.
Every meeting was conducted for about 90 minutes. The topic of this research was hortatory exposition text.

In the first cycle, the result of analyzing the teaching and learning process could be explained as follows:

a) The first meeting

The first meeting was conducted on Tuesday, 5 January 2016. The students seem interested in the topic. But, most of the students of XI IPA 1 were still hard to translate the words. They had the dictionaries but they did not use it. When they were introduced with Analytic Team Technique, most of the students were still confused and did not understand with their roles. In the group discussion, some students were still noisy, while the other students were still passive and did not actively contribute. In the presentation section, some the students were also still confused how to present it and shy to speak in front of their friends. Generally in the first meeting, the class was very passive and not conducive.

b) The second meeting

The second meeting was conducted on Thursday, 7 January 2016. The students seemed more enthusiastic to learn English because the researcher played some videos of television programs in the beginning. The videos could make them interested and brainstormed. The videos and the topic of discussion were related, it made the students easier to share their opinions. The students were also understand with the Analytic Team
Technique better because there was example before they started the discussion. Some students became very active because they just knew how to implement the technique. However, some students were still shy when the researcher asked them to present their work. Generally in the second meeting, the class was very active but still noisy. But actually, the students seemed more enjoy and there was increasing of students’ attention and participation to the teaching and learning process using Analytic Team Technique.

c) The third meeting

The next meeting was conducted on Tuesday, 12 January 2016. T was used to collect the data from post-test 1. It was conducted to know the students’ improvement of students’ speaking skill after the treatment. The result of post-test 1 showed that the students’ mean score increased from 56.22 in pre-test into 62.89 in post-test. Although it was still below from the Standard Minimum Criteria or KKM (75), there was increasing of the students’ achievement from the pre-test to post-test 1.

Considering the problems that appeared in cycle 1, it was necessary to take care in point some mistakes that found in post-test 1 and proposed to conduct the second cycle. The next plan in cycle 2, it would more focus on the way to get students’ attention and concentration in order to reduce students’ noise, increasing their comprehension with explanation and instruction, improving students’ participation in the teaching and learning process which was from passive to be active; drilling the pronunciation and grammar; made the students use their
dictionary well; and gave more attention to the students to ensure that all of them did Analytic Team Technique well.

For the second cycle, the result could be explained as follows:

a) The first meeting

In the first meeting of the second cycle, it was conducted on Tuesday, 19 January 2016. The condition of the class was going better than the first cycle. The students were more enthusiastic when they were asked to watch a video and then repeat what the reporter said, but the students did not understand what the reporter said because it was so fast for them. So the researcher repeated and asked them to translate it. There were some students who still lazy to open their dictionary. The students also followed the explanation carefully. They were more familiar with the role of Analytic Teams Technique. Most of the students became active to the activity given by the researcher, so the situation of the class made the students interested to follow the teaching learning process.

b) The second meeting

The second meeting was conducted on Tuesday, 26 January 2016. The class condition was conducive enough. The games could make them active, focus, and serious. They gave correction for their partner and helped each other in discussion section. They became independent in translating the sentences. They were also more creative in giving the arguments. The implementation of Analytic Teams Technique in the teaching and learning process ran well. The students also enjoyed the
activity and most of the students change their behavior. It could be concluded that the second cycle was better than the first cycle.

c) The third meeting

The next meeting, it was conducted on Thursday, 26 January 2016. There was a significant improvement of students’ speaking skill. It was shown by students’ speaking score that was better than the first cycle. The result of post-test 2 showed that the mean score of the students increased to 80.22 in which all students could pass the KKM 75.

There was a great improvement result in cycle 2. As the result of second cycle, there were some facts gained after the action such as: 1) The improvement of students’ speaking skill, 2) The students were more confident to speak up in front of the class, 3) The students were more fluent in explaining their argument and recommendation, 4) The students had better pronunciation, 5) The students could make good sentences with correct grammar.

In cycle 2, although the class was still a little bit noisy because there were some activities added, but the class was conducive enough. Generally, the students listened to the explanation carefully. The students who were shy, in this cycle began to show up their action bravely. Compared with cycle 1, the researcher found some improvement in cycle 2. The students participated on the lesson actively. The classroom situation was also much better.

In addition, there was also improvement in post test 2. The mean score of post test 2 increased from 56.22 in the pre test, 62.89 in the post test 1 to 80.22 in
post test 2. Finally the mean score could pass the KKM (Kriteria Kentutasan Minimum) that was 75. Based on the result of cycle two, the researcher decided to stop the cycle.

CONCLUSION

Based on the result of the research which has the aim at improving speaking skill through Analytic Teams Technique, the researcher can draw some conclusion:

1. Analytic Teams Technique can improve students’ skill in speaking. Based on calculation result, the students’ mean score improves significantly after getting all of the treatment using Analytic Teams Technique. It can be seen from the mean score of pre-test and post-test from each cycle. In the pre-test, students’ mean score is 56.22. It increases to 62.89 in the post-test of cycle 1 and 80.22 in the post-test of cycle 2.

2. Analytic Teams Technique can give a good atmosphere in teaching and learning English speaking. There is a change of classroom situation during the teaching and learning process of speaking. The students are more serious, active, and independent. They can work cooperatively with their group to arrange the arguments and explain it confidently. It means that the class atmosphere really makes them follow the teaching and learning process well.
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