

CHAIN DRILL TECHNIQUE IN TEACHING SPEAKING

Ika Paramitha Lantu

Abstract: This research aims to find out the influence of Chain Drill Technique in teaching speaking to the tenth grade students at SMAN 1 Poso, particularly in describing an object. This research is quantitative in nature and the design was pre-experimental. The researcher applied pre-test and post-test in collecting the data. The result of data analysis shows chain drill technique in teaching speaking can increase students speaking achievement in describing an object.

Keywords: *chain drill, technique, speaking achievement*

Most students are not able to speak English well because they get difficulties in speaking. That can be because of the lack of related vocabularies, low ability in constructing sentences and utterances, and also low motivation to participate in speaking activity caused by shyness and embarrassment in making mistake. In addition to that, the situation can get worsen if the teaching technique used in classroom makes students feel bored and lose interest in the speaking class.

To avoid such situation to happen, students need to be motivated by applying teaching technique which is able to make them enthusiastic and be confident in expressing their mind in the target language. Thereby, teacher must also able to choosing the appropriate teaching technique especially teaching speaking. There are many techniques and methods that can be applied to help teacher in presenting materials in classroom.

Chain Drill Teaching Technique

Chain drill activity is one of the methods that can be used in teaching speaking. Larsen-Freeman (2000:48) stated "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". Chain drill can encourage the improvement of two abilities in one technique on teaching speaking that are students listening and speaking ability. They get listening ability from listening to their friend's 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.

Procedure of Implementing Chain Drill Technique

Procedure of activities are important to directing process of participation under practice activities, especially the direction of the chain drill should be made clear to the students. This activities such as chain of conversation with question and answer that related to the topic of discussions. The procedure to implement this technique is simple. Teacher greets students and asks questions to a particular student (student A), and then responded by Student A. After that, student A takes turn to ask another student sitting next to him. This activity will continuously work until the last turn of the last student. At the end, the last student directs greeting and asking questions back to the teacher. Chain drill gives students an opportunity to speak their idea individually. Its variations are as follows:

1. Student 1 asks student 2 a question. Student 2 asks and answers the same question of student 3.
2. Student 1 asks student 2 a question. Student 2 answers. Student 3 asks the question of student 4.
3. Student 1 asks student 2 a question: for example, "Do you have your book?" student 2 answers "Yes I do" or Yes, I have my book". Student 3 asks student 4, "Does he (she) have his (her) book?" referring to student 2.

Chain drill should be broken frequently. After six to eight student have participated in a chain of question or statement and response at one of the room (Finocchiaro, 1969:68).

Another variation of chain drill activity is each student in turn invents and utterance and produce a cue for the next student. Students should be encouraged at this stage to be as original as they can within the limitation of the pattern. The following dialogues are the examples of the technique.

Student A to Do you see my father over
student B there?

- Student B: Yes, he's across the road.
 (To student C): Do you see my friend over there?
 Student C: Yes, she's in front of the bank.
 (To student D): Do you see the apple trees over there?
 Student D: No, they're not apple trees.

Based on the statements above, the researcher concludes that in chain drill, students are asked to be creative and produce their own statement. The teacher just gives the question based on the structure that they were learnt. After that, each student is asked in parallel to make a new question but in same structure and answer in using their own ideas. Each student must have different thought, in order to know their comprehension about the structure.

Harmer (1991:95) explains that chain drill provides opportunities for students to practice a new bit of language in the most controlled way. Because chain drill gives students an opportunity to say the lines individually and they must respond by using their own ideas. Because chain drill can be applied into game, of course it maintains the students' motivation and makes them interested in learning through game. Even chain drill controls the students' utterances but for the large class it is not quite effective. Because the teacher has limited time to check one by one and make corrections for each student.

Speaking

Speaking is an oral communication process between speaker and listener and involves the productive skill of speaking and receptive skill of listening with understanding. It means that speaking is an activity where the interaction occurs between the speaker and the listener, a way to convey the message from the speaker to the listener. Communication involves sending and receiving information. Speaking itself can be evaluated through three aspects; fluency, accuracy, and comprehensibility. Fluency includes intonation and pronunciation, accuracy involves grammar steadiness and diction appropriateness, while comprehensibility includes the ability to understand someone's utterance (speaker) and ability in speaking to be understood by others (listener).

Method

This research was a pre-experimental one. The researcher used one class to be investigated and there was no control group. The researcher conducted the pre-test before

the treatment and post-test after the treatment. The research setting was located at SMAN 1 Poso City, Jl. Talasa no 6, Lawanga subdistrict. The population was the tenth graders of SMAN 1 Poso consisted of 230 students, and the sample was the XF class in academic year of 2015/2016 consisted of 29 students. The research was guided to test the researcher's hypothesis that chain drill technique could significantly influence students' speaking achievement.

Findings and Discussion

After giving the students scores by using band of speaking criteria by University of Cambridge ESOL Examination, the researcher found the result of pre-test. There were 2 students categorized into Fair, 5 students into Weak, and 22 students into Poor. One student (MZ) did not join in the class because at that time he represented his school in a drum band competition. All students' scores were interpreted based on the scoring interpretation of students' achievement recommended by Arikunto (2006:245). The mean score of pre-test was 30.27.

The researcher then gave treatment to the pre-experimental class students. The meeting was conducted three times and the time allocated for the treatment was 90 minutes for each meeting. The researcher provided lesson plan to make the treatment success. The teaching learning process was divided into three parts: pre-activity, while-activity, post-activity.

1. First Meeting

Pre Activity

To begin the activity the researcher greeted the students and checked the attendance list. In this step, the researcher explained about instructional objective that had to be achieved by the students and how to do the activity. The researcher started the lesson by giving warming up question related to the topic to the students based on lesson plan.

While Activity

In this activity, the researcher presented the topic to be discussed and practiced, and asked questions about that topic (descriptive text). After that, the researcher gave students chance to communicate and present descriptive text by their own. Later, the researcher explained about a chain drill technique and its rule and started to implement the chain drill activity.

For example: The researcher asked student one, "do you have brother or sister?", then student one answered the question from the researcher "yes I have one sister". After

that, student two asked students three, “*does she have one sister?*” by referring to student one. This chain drill activity continued until all students got the chance to speak.

Post Activity

The researcher asked students to convert their answers into descriptive text about their brother or sister in short monolog. For example:

Student one:

“I have one sister, her name is Tika. She has two pairs beautiful eyes, she is very smart and good girl. She has long and black hair, she has white skin, she has tall body, and her hobby are singing and drawing. She is still school in junior high school one poso and I very love her”

2. Second Meeting

Pre Activity

To begin the activity, the researcher greeted the students and checked the attendance list. In this step, the researcher explained the instructional objective of this meeting and how to do in the activity. After that, the researcher started the lesson by giving warming up question related to the topic to the students based on lesson plan.

While Activity

The researcher described about descriptive text, its generic structure, and its function. Later, the researcher explained about a chain drill technique and its rule. The chain drill activity was started from the researcher who proposes drilled questions to the student nearest to her with the topic *describing classroom*. First, the student responded the researcher’s questions for example: “*what do you think about this classroom?*” to student one, then student one answered “*I think this classroom is comfortable for learning*”. Later, student two asked students three “*is it comfortable?*”. Student three answered “*yes it is*”. Continuing, student four asked student five “*what makes it comfortable?*” and student five answered “*because this classroom is big and always clean*”. This chain also went on after all students got their to ask and answer the questions.

Post Activity

In post activity, the researcher asked students to arrange their answers into a good description about *describing classroom* in short monolog.

For example:

Student one:

“My classroom is very comfortable for learning, because it is big and clean. My classroom is next to school library, it has

two brown doors and eight windows. The walls are green and there are some pictures on the walls. There are twenty nine tables and chairs in my classroom, and my classroom always becomes the most favorite class for the teachers”.

3. Third Meeting

Pre Activity

To begin the activity the researcher greeted students and checked the attendance list. In this step, the researcher explained the instructional objective for the third meeting and how to do in the activity. The researcher started the lesson by giving warming up question related to the topic to the students based on lesson plan.

While Activity

In this while activity, the procedure was similar with the previous meeting, only the topic was different. In this meeting, the researcher gave topic about animal especially “cow”. for example: “*what do you think about cow?*” asked the researcher to student one. Student one answered “*I think cow is a big mammal*”. Then student two asked student three “*is it a mammal?*”. Student three answered the question, “*yes, it is*”. Continuing the pattern, student four asked student five “*does it have horn?*” and was answered by student five “*yes it has. The male one has long horn while the female has short horn*”. This activity also continued until all students got chance in the drill chain.

Post Activity

In this post activity the researcher asked students to arrange their answers in a good description about *describing cow* in short monolog.

For example:

Student one:

“Cow is one of the herbivore and big mammals. It has four feet, most of cows have brown fur, and it has one tail on its back. The male one has long horn while the female has short horn, and its milk is delicious and good for our health”.

Table 2. Students' Post-test Score

No	Initial	Components of Speaking				Total	Score	Category
		F & C	L	A	P			
1.	AR	6	6	6	6	24	66	Good
2.	AM	4	5	6	7	22	61	Fair
3.	AR	5	6	6	6	23	63	Fair
4.	AS	4	5	6	6	21	58	Fair
5.	DF	4	5	4	4	17	47	Weak
6.	EI	5	5	7	6	23	63	Fair
7.	FI	5	5	6	5	21	58	Fair
8.	FB	5	6	6	6	23	63	Fair
9.	FP	5	5	6	5	21	58	Fair
10.	FR	4	3	3	4	14	38	Poor
11.	F	5	6	6	6	23	63	Poor
12.	IK	3	4	5	6	18	50	Weak
13.	I	6	6	7	7	26	72	Good
14.	IL	5	5	6	5	21	58	Fair
15.	MR	6	6	7	7	26	72	Good
16.	MI	6	5	5	6	22	61	Fair
17.	MA	0	0	0	0	0	0	Poor
18.	MF	5	5	6	5	21	58	Fair
19.	MJ	4	5	6	6	21	58	Fair
20.	MH	6	5	6	5	22	61	Fair
21.	MZ	3	5	5	5	18	50	Weak
22.	M	5	5	7	5	22	61	Fair
23.	NA	6	6	6	6	24	66	Good
24.	PL	6	6	6	6	24	66	Good
25.	PW	5	5	6	5	21	58	Fair
26.	RA	3	4	4	4	15	41	Weak
27.	S	6	5	7	6	24	66	Good
28.	TJ	6	5	6	6	23	63	Fair
29.	LM	4	5	5	4	18	50	Weak
Total		137	144	162	155	598	1649	

Students' scores shown in Table 2 were obtained by using band of speaking criteria issued by University of Cambridge ESOL Examination. Their scores were interpreted based on the scoring interpretation of students achievement recommended by Arikunto (2006:245). The mean score for post-test was 56.86. There were 29 students observed in this research after given treatment. 6 students were categorized into Good, 15 students into Fair, 5 students into Weak, and 3 students into Poor. One student did not join the class because he was sick.

After finding the mean score of pre-test and post-test, the researcher calculated the deviation and square deviation of the student's score in the pre-test and post-test. The mean of

pre-test was 30.27 and the mean of post-test was 56.86. The mean scores showed that students' achievement increased. The function of score deviation and square deviation above was to know whether students' score increased after given treatment.

The criteria of testing hypothesis was that if t-test is greater than t-table, it means that the hypothesis was accepted, but if the t-test was lower than t-table, it indicated that hypothesis was rejected. The result showed that after counting the test result, it was found that t-test was 17,6137. Later, the researcher found that the t-value value was 2,048. The result indicated that t-test value (17,6137) was greater than t-table (2,048, df=28). Since t-test was greater than t-table, the researcher concluded that the use of chain drill technique could influence students speaking ability, means that the researcher's hypothesis was accepted.

Conclusions

The use of chain drill technique in teaching speaking can significantly influence students' achievement in speaking at tenth grade, SMAN 1 Poso, particularly in describing object (people, animal or building), as proven by the result of t-test value of students achievement score (10,3699 which was greater than t-table value). It is then recommended to use chain drill technique to teach speaking to high school graders especially when teaching them to describe an object.

REFERENCES

- Arikunto, S. (2006). *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktis*. Jakarta: PT. Binarupa Aksara.
- Finocchiaro, M. (1969). *English as a second language: From theory to practice*. New York :Harper & Row.
- Harmer, J. (1991). *The Practice of English language teaching*. New York: Longman.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.

About the Author

Ika Paramitha Lantu was born in Poso, January 20, 1984. She is a lecturer at English Education Study Program of Sintuwu Maroso University. Her interests are in Applied Linguistics in Teaching English and Literacy. She can be contacted at ika.lantu@yahoo.com.