

The Effect of Speakmate Toward Students' Speaking Performance at English Department of Dayanu Ikhsanuddin University

Yunus^{1*}, Abidin Pammu¹, Nasmilah¹

Hasanuddin University, Indonesia

Correspondence: yunushambaallah@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The problem in this research are: Does speakmate influence students speaking performance at English Department, and how is students' self-confidence of having speakmate on students' speaking performance. This research aims to know the effect of speakmate on students' speaking performance and know students' self-confidence to speak mate. This research was a quantitative approach by applying experimental method of quasi-experimental design. The population was all of eight-semester college students, class C and class D who enrolled in academic year 2017/2018. The sample was taken by the. The researcher used purposive sampling, 10 students in experimental group and 10 students in the control group. The instrument used in this research was pretest and posttest in experimental group and control group in the form of speaking test. The finding indicated that the mean score of paired students with their speakmate of the experimental group in pretest is 60.66 in moderate category and the mean score in posttest is 77.33 in the good category. while in the control group, the mean score in pretest is 60.66 in moderate category and the mean score in posttest is 64.66 in the moderate category. The result of hypothesis analysis indicated that tcount is 2.905 is more significant than t-table is 2.101. it means that Ho is rejected and H1 is accepted. Based on the calculation of the t-test above, it can be concluded that speakmate influence students speaking performance. Majority of students show their agreements that speakmate influence students' speaking performance.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Published June 23rd 2021



KEYWORDS

Speak Mate, Speaking Performance, Students

ARTICLE LICENCE

© 2021 Universitas Hasanuddin
Under the license CC BY-SA
4.0



1. Introduction

Speaking performance is a means of oral communication in giving idea, information to the other one, which involves producing the sound and the gesture, the movement of the muscles of the face, and indeed the whole body. Manser (1991) stated that performance is the person's process or manner of a play. Therefore, we may conclude that speaking performance is the way of one's manner in speaking, which is assessed through how fluency and accuracy. Accuracy is how people use appropriate words and the pattern of sentences, while fluency is someone's way of speaking dealing with how to produce word in specific periods without missing any main words on their speech.

The researcher researched the English department of Dayanu Ikhsanuddin University Baubau and found that students had better self-confidence while talking with their best friend or speakmate. it was showed that students talked without afraid of making a mistake. A psychologist, Irene (2012) says that having a good friends on whom we can rely for helps, in reaching goal and as friend to talk with will improve our sense of self-confidence.

2. Literature Review

Many definition of speaking have been proposed experts. Speaking is productive skill (Spratt et al., 2005: 34). It involves using speech to express meaning to other people (Suherman, 2018; Ritonga, et al., 2020). The essential components mentioned in speaking are the speakers, the hearers, the message and the response. In speaking, the students have to pronounce words, use intonation and use stress properly because they are all connected which the listener can get the message of the conversation.

In the same respect, Nunan (2003: 48) agrees with Spratt et al., that speaking is a productive oral skill, and it consists of producing systematic verbal utterances to convey meaning. In addition, speaking as the ability to speak fluently presupposes not only knowledge of language features but also the ability to process information and language “on the spot” (Riski, et al., 2018). It needs the ability to assist in managing speaking turns and non-verbal language (Junaidi, et al., 2020). Therefore, spoken fluency is required to reach the goal of the conversation.

Speakmate is a friend or friends to talk. unlike friend in general, but friend we know closely, friends that we comfort to talk, study or discuss anything bravely and we have high self-confidence to it. Based on Macmillan Dictionary (2017) accessed on 28 Feb 2021), “close friend” can be defined as somebody who you can talk about everything with, who makes you feel comfortable without fear of judgment. A “close friend” can also be someone who is always there for you, caring about your well-being. Based on (www. Psikoma.com/Apa-itu-persahabatan-pandangan-psikologi/amp/ accessed on 11 June 2017) some psychologist define about friendship such as Baron & Bryne, (2006) say that friendship is a relationship where two people spend time together, having interaction in any situation, and always support each other.

Meanwhile, Tillmann (2015) says that best friend as a close friend. That is a person to talk, person that we depend on it and get helps, support, and carrying until you have fun doing something. Students in Indonesia always make such group with friends they know most. Students who put themselves in environment that accept their behaviour. It is closely with students’ self-esteem. Friendships, peer relationships, and social approval are important for self-esteem (Leary, et al., 1995).

3. Methodology

A quasi-experimental is a study that includes a manipulated independent variable but lacks important controls (e.g., random assignment), or study that lacks a manipulated independent variable but includes important controls. This research uses a quasi experimental design that has both pre-experimental and post-test experimental and control group. The participant were divided into two classes, one represent the experimental group and this group was paired students with their speakmate and in control group was paired randomly.

4. Findings And Discussion

This analysis describes the questionnaire's analysis, the rate percentage of pretest and posttest, mean score and standard deviation of students’ sample from English students of Dayanu Ikhsanuddin University.

a. Pretest and Posttest Students’ speaking performance

Table 1. Mean Score and standard Deviation of the pretest score of Experimental and Control group

No.	Group	Mean score		Standar deviation	
		Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest
1	experiment	60.666	77.33	8.577	10.037
2	control	60.666	64.66	10.634	9.454

Table 1 describes for experimental group the mean score of pretest is 60.66 with standard deviation is 8.58 while the mean score in posttest improves to 77.33 with standard deviation is 10.037. It indicates that the students’ speaking performance getting improved significantly after the given treatment by pairing students with speakmate. on the contrary, the mean score of control group in pretest is 60.66 with standard deviation 10.63. Control class also makes some progress but it is not as significant as Experimental class. The mean score of control group in posttest is 64.66 with standard deviation 9.45.

From the data above, the researcher concludes that the student’s rate percentage in posttest is greater than the rate percentage in pretest. The experimental group score is also greater than the control group score in terms of mean score and greater improvement. It means there is a significant influence of students’ speaking performance after special treatment has been given toward the experimental group.

The frequency and percentage of students’ speaking performance in pretest of experimental group and control group can be seen in the following table:

Table 2. The frequency and percentage of students’ Accuracy in pretest

Classification	Score	Experimental group	Control group
		Pretest	Pretest

		F	%	F	%
Very Good	86 – 100	0	0%	0	0%
Good	71 – 85	5	50%	3	30%
Moderate	56 – 70	5	50%	5	50%
Low	41 – 55	0	0%	2	20%
Very Low	26 – 40	0	0%	0	0%
Total		10	100%	10	100%

The table 2 above shows that most of the students in Experimental group are in moderate category and Control Group were in moderate and remain in low category. The frequency of experimental group which is categorized in very good is none of student (0%) and so in control group. The frequency of experimental group which is categorized in good are 5 students (50%), while in control group are 3 students (30%). The frequency of experimental group which is categorized in moderate are 5 students (50%), while in control class are 2 students (20%). The frequency of experimental group which is categorized in low id none of the students (0%) and so in control class.

Table 3. The frequency and percentage of students' Fluency in pretest

Classification	Score	Experimental group		Control group	
		Pretest		Pretest	
		F	%	F	%
Very Good	86 – 100	0	0%	0	0%
Good	71 – 85	1	10%	2	20%
Moderate	56 – 70	8	80%	6	60%
Low	41 – 55	1	1%	2	20%
Very Low	26 – 40	0	0%	0	0%
Total		10	100%	10	100%

The table 3 above shows that most of the students in Experimental group are in moderate category and Control Group were in moderate and a half in good and low category. The frequency of experimental group which is categorized in very good is none of student (0%) and so in control group. The frequency of experimental group which is categorized in good are 1 student (10%), while in control class are 2 students (20%). The frequency of experimental group which is categorized in moderate are 8 students (80%), while in control class are 6 students (60%). The frequency of experimental class which is categorized in low only 1 student (10%) and 2 students (20%) in control group. While the frequency of experimental group which is categorized in Very low is none of the students (0%) and so in control group.

Table 4. The frequency and percentage of students' Idea content in pretest

Classification	Score	Experimental group		Control group	
		Pretest		Pretest	
		F	%	F	%
Very Good	86 – 100	0	0%	0	0%
Good	71 – 85	1	10%	2	20%
Moderate	56 – 70	4	40%	6	60%
Low	41 – 55	5	50%	2	20%
Very Low	26 – 40	0	0%	0	0%
Total		10	100%	10	100%

The table 4 above shows that most of the students in Experimental group are in low category and Control Group were in moderate and a half in good and low category. The frequency of experimental group which is categorized in very

good is none of student (0%) and so in control group. The frequency of experimental group which is categorized in good are 1 student (10%), while in control group are 2 students (20%). The frequency of experimental class which is categorized in moderate are 4 students (40%), while in control class are 6 students (60%). The frequency of experimental group which is categorized in low are 5 students (50%), while in control class are 2 students (20%). While the frequency of experimental group which is categorized in very low is none of the students (0%) and so in control group. The posttest score of Experimental and Control group The frequency and percentage of students' speaking performance in posttest of Experimental and Control class can be seen in the following table:

Table 5. The frequency and percentage of students' Accuracy in posttest

Classification	Score	Experimental group		Control group	
		Posttest		Posttest	
		F	%	F	%
Very Good	86 – 100	1	10%	0	0%
Good	71 – 85	3	30%	2	20%
Moderate	56 – 70	6	60%	7	70%
Low	41 – 55	0	0%	1	10%
Very Low	26 – 40	0	0%	0	0%
Total		10	100%	10	100%

The table 5 above shows that most of the students in Experimental group is in good category and control class is in moderate category. The frequency of experimental group which is categorized in very good is none of student (0%) and so in control class. The frequency of experimental group which is categorized in good are 8 students (80%), while in control group are 20 students (20%). The frequency of experimental group which is categorized in moderate are 2 students (20%), while in control class are 7 students (70%). The frequency of experimental group which is categorized in low and vey low are none of students (0%), and so in control class (0%).

Table 6. The frequency and percentage of students' Fluency in posttest

Classification	Score	Experimental group		Control group	
		Posttest		Posttest	
		F	%	F	%
Very Good	86 – 100	2	20%	0	0%
Good	71 – 85	7	70%	5	50%
Moderate	56 – 70	1	10%	4	40%
Low	41 – 55	0	0%	1	10%
Very Low	26 – 40	0	0%	0	0%
Total		10	100%	10	100%

The table 6 above shows that most of the students in Experimental class and Control group are in good category. The frequency of experimental groups categorized in very good are 2 of students (20%), while in the control group there is none of students (0%). The frequency of the experimental group categorized in good is 7 students (70%), while in the control group are 5 students (50%). The frequency of the experimental group categorized in moderate is 1 (10%), while in the control group are 4 students (40%). The frequency of experimental groups categorized in low only are none of students (0%), and 1 student (0%) in the control group. While the frequency of experimental group which is categorized in very low category is none of the students (0%) and so in control group.

Table 7. The frequency and percentage of students' content in posttest

Classification	Score	Experimental group	Control group
----------------	-------	--------------------	---------------

		Posttest		Posttest	
		F	%	F	%
Very Good	86 – 100	2	20%	0	0%
Good	71 – 85	6	60%	3	30%
Moderate	56 – 70	2	20%	6	60%
Low	41 – 55	0	0%	1	10%
Very Low	26 – 40	0	0%	0	0%
Total		10	100%	10	100%

The table 7 above shows that most of the students in Experimental class are in good category and Control class is in moderate and a half in good category. The frequency of experimental class categorized in very good are 2 of the students (20%), and none of the students in the control group. The frequency of experimental class which is categorized in good are 6 students (60%), while in control class are 3 students (30%). The frequency of experimental group which is categorized in moderate are 2 students (20%), while in control class are 6 students (60%). The frequency of experimental group which is categorized in low is no one of student (0%), while in control group is 1 students (10%). Meanwhile, the frequency of experimental group which is categorized in very low category is none of the student (0%), and so in control group. Data analysis of students' score, after giving pretest, treatment, and posttest, the researcher gets the result of pretest and posttest as presented as follow:

Table 8. The rate percentage of pretest and posttest.

Classification	Score	Experimental group				Control group			
		Pretest		Posttest		Pretest		Posttest	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Very Good	86 – 100	0	0	3	30	0	0	0	0
Good	71 – 85	1	10	5	50	1	10	3	30
Moderate	56 – 70	5	50	2	20	5	50	4	40
Low	41 – 55	4	40	0	0	4	40	3	30
Very Low	26 – 40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total		10	100	10	100	10	100	10	100

Table 8 shows the students' classification of score for both experimental and control group in pretest and posttest. In experimental group, students' speaking performance at pretest classified as moderate with the mean score of 60.66. Increasingly, in the posttest, the mean score change to 77.33 and it is classified as good. This means generally student' score are improves. This is supported the data above, where there 3 students (30%) get very good score posttest than in the pretest no one can get such score. It is also shown that number of students who are classified as good is increasing from 1 (10%) to 6 (60%). After the posttest, none of students (0%) are classified into low. There is significant increase from both of them. Where in the pretest, there are 5 students (50%) in moderate and 4 students (40%) in low classification.

From control class, there are also improvements. The mean score gets better in the posttest with mean score 64.66 from 60.66 in the pretest, but it is classified as moderate. It can be seen from the data that there are only 3 students get good score in posttest. Beside 4 students get classified moderate in the posttest. Half of students in this class is classified as low in pretest, but there is none of student in the posttest. In summary, by the mean score, this group gets slightly improved and by the score classification, most students get better even if they are still classified into moderate.

From the analysis above can be concluded that both group gets improvement, even if the researcher used different strategies. Experimental group which is applied by pairing students with speakmate as treatment gets improvement within 16.67 points in the mean score, while control group, which is paired with students get increased about 4.0001 points in mean score. Then, it can be stated that there is significant effect of pairing students with speakmate than pair students with random students.

This analysis deals with the detail explanation of the statistics on the correlation and the significant difference between pretest and posttest.

Determine alpha (α) = 0.05

Find the number of degree of freedom using the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned} df &= (0.05/2 ; N1+N2) -2 \\ &= (0.05/2 ; 10+10) - 2 \\ &= 0.025 ; 20 - 2 \\ &= 0.025 ; 18 \end{aligned}$$

The researcher compared the result to t-table distribution which significance and degree of freedom (df) are 0.05 and 18. It is found that t-table was 2.101 while the value of t-test was 2.905

Table 9. t-test and t-table value

	t-test	t-table	S/NS
Pretest	0.000	2.101	Non Significant
Posttest	2.905	2.101	Significant

The researcher calculates whether of not both groups are in statistically significant difference at lever of significance 0.05 with degree of freedom (18). The result of the calculation in pretest shows that t-test value is 0.000 and t-table value is 2.101 In this case, t-test value is smaller that t-table value ($0.000 < 2.101$). it indicates that there is no significant difference between those mean scores that are acquired by both groups in pretest phase. That pretest finding is different form the result found in posttest. The t-test value is 2.905 and t-table value is 2.101. in this condition, t-test value is higher that t-table ($2.905 > 2.101$). It indicates that the difference between those mean scores from posttest is statistically significant. Therefore, null hypothesis (HO) was rejected and alternative hypothesis (H1) was accepted.

Table 10. Students' self-confidence of having speakmate toward students'speaking performance

Respond	Category	Frequency	Percentage
0% - 19.99%	Strongly disagree	0	0
20% - 39.99%	Disagree	0	0
40% - 59.99%	Undecided	0	0
60% - 79.99%	Agree	4	26.67
80% - 100%	Strongly agree	11	73.33
Total		15	100

From table above From the table above it showed that there were 26,67 percent item which had in Agree category, while there were 73.33 percent categorized as a strongly agree and no one had a negative feeling or had very low interest. It means that predominantly student had a very and high sel-confidence when the students paired with their speakmate.

Based on the result of the research that the researcher have done about pairing students with their speakmate in English departement of Dayanu Ikhsanuddin University, the researcher summarize that paired students with their speakmate was proved have influence for students' self-confidence in doing speaking performance. Based on Macmillan Dictionary (2017) accessed on 2 June 2017, "close friend" can be defined as somebody who you can talk about everything with, who makes you feel comfortable without fear of judgement.

The researcher's hypothesis in this research the effect of speakmate toward students' speaking performance. So, the research conducted to test how significant the improvement of students' speaking performance after they (experimental group) had been gotten treatment by pairing students with theri speakmate. the strategy in approximately four meetings. Then, in this part, the researcher tries to discover in detail the research result and factors influencing those findings.

Based on the finding above, the researcher found that most of the items in the questionnaire, the respondents were agree. And it just some of them that the respondents disagree and undecided for it. Especially in questionnaire number 1 until 10 and 15.

5. Conclusion

The mean score of posttest (77.33) was higher than the mean score of pretest (60.66) and t_{test} (2.905) was higher than t_{table} (2.101) at significant level 0,05 and the degree of freedom (df) was 18. It showed that there was a significant

difference of students' speaking performance before the treatment and after the treatment by pairing students with the speakmate. It was also proved with the mean score of control group after pairing students randomly with their friends, which students mean score in posttest was only 64.66. So, it could be conclude that paired students with their speakmate, it gave influence to their self-confidence especially when they speak in English at English departement. Besides that, the significance sig (2-tail) is 0.009 smaller than 0.05. so it shows that the research is success. Based on the result of the questionnaire gave to the students, there are 4 questionnaire or 26.67% responded by the students with good category and there are 11 questionnaire or 73.33% responded by the students with very good category. It indicates that students show their positive agreements for the item of the questionnaire.

References

- Baron, R.A., Byrne, D & Barncombe, N.R. (2006). *Social Psychology*, Eleventh Edition. New York : Pearson.
- Irene, S. L. (2012). Five ways friends help build self confidence. [www. Psychologytoday.com/blog/the-friendship-doctor/201110/five-ways-friends-help-build-our-self-confidence](http://www.Psychologytoday.com/blog/the-friendship-doctor/201110/five-ways-friends-help-build-our-self-confidence). Accessed on 13 June 2017.
- Junaidi, J., Hamuddin, B., Julita, K., Rahman, F., Rianita, D., & Derin, T. (2020). Artificial Intelligence in EFL Context: Rising Students' Speaking Performance with Lyra Virtual Assistance. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 29(5), 6735 –6741.
- Leary, M. R., Tambor, E. S., Terdal, S. K., & Downs, D. L. (1995). Self-esteem as an interpersonal monitor: The sociometer hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68(3), 518–530. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.68.3.518>
- Macmillan Dictionary, (2017). *friend (noun) definition and synonyms | Macmillan Dictionary*. [online] [Macmillandictionary.com](http://www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/british/friend_1). Available at: http://www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/british/friend_1 (Accessed 28 Feb. 2021).
- Manser, M. H. (1991). *Oxford Learner's Pocket Dictionary*, 3rd eds. Oxford: Oxford.
- Nunan, D. (2003). The Impact of English as a Global Language on Educatinal Policiesand Practices in the Asia-Pasific Region *TESOL Quarterly* 37(4),589-613
- Riski, H., et al. (2018). Improving The Students' speaking Ability Through Silent Way Method At Smu Negeri 12 Makassar. *JURNAL ILMU BUDAYA* 6 (2), 303-312.
- Ritonga, S. N. A., Nasmilah, N., & Rahman, F. (2020). The Effect Of Motivation And Anxiety On Students' Speaking Performance: A Study At Dayanu Ikhsanuddin University. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 3(2), 198-213.
- Spratt, M., Pulverness, A., & Williams, M. (2005). *The TKT Course*. Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.
- Suherman, L. A. (2018). The Analysis of Metaphorical Domain on English "Stab Verb" in Corpora. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 1(1), 52-58.
- Tillmann, Lisa M. (2015). *Friendship as Method." In In Solidarity: Friendship, Family, and Activism Beyond Gay and Straight*, by Lisa M. Tillmann, 287-319. New York: Routledge.