The Effectiveness of Chain Drill Technique in Teaching Speaking Skill
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Abstract: This study aims at finding out the effectiveness of Chain Drill technique in teaching speaking skill. This study used a quasi-experimental research method with pretest-posttest control group design. The instrument used to gain data of samples was a speaking test in the form of instruction. The technique used to collect data was pretest and posttest of speaking test. Data gained were subsequently analyzed by using descriptive and inferential statistical analysis from which a conclusion was drawn. Based on the result of analysis, it was found that the mean score of post-test was higher than the mean score of pre-test (64≥37), while in the control class, the mean score of post-test was also higher than the mean score of pre-test (50≥30). From the data obtained, it was found a difference in scores both in post-test from pre-test between the two classes; experimental class and control class 14≥7 which showed experimental score was higher than the control class. The result of further analysis on t-test, it was found that t-test score (2.52) was higher than t-table (1.671) at the level of significance 0.05 (95%) with the degree of freedom 42. In other words, this result of analysis showed that $H_a$ was accepted and $H_0$ was rejected. Thus, it can be concluded that the use of Chain Drill technique is effective in teaching speaking skill.
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Introduction

Speaking is one of the skills that should be learned by students in the process of learning English language. Speaking is communicating any messages involving a two-way interaction i.e. a speaker; the one processing messages and a listener functioning to filter the messages being transferred. Cameron (2001: 40), speaking is the active use of language to express meanings so that other people can make sense of them. Speaking facilitates the students to learn on how to organize ideas, express the language in spoken form with an acceptable way of pronunciation and stress use. Speaking is needed by the teacher and students to talk to one another for their lesson purposes. Among languages used to speak through worldwide, English has dominated most of the language users. It makes sense since English is widely used by the speakers among countries as English gives speakers of countries fluent and active interaction for communicating messages. Heretofore, English plays an important role as an international communication tool where people have to acquire it including foreign language learners in Indonesia.
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line with this, Richards and Renandya (2002: 210) establishes that speaking is one of the central elements of communication. Richard (2008: 19) states that the mastery of speaking skill in English is a priority for many second- language or foreign- language learners. Consequently, learners often evaluate their success in language learning as well as the effectiveness of their English course on the basis of how much they feel they have improved their spoken language proficiency.

In the process of learning speaking English, there are many difficulties commonly encountered by Indonesian learners. Of these difficulties, pronouncing the accepted words referring to the phonemic symbols and patterns drives the learners difficult to produce good sound of utterance. The difficulty to mention the words based on the original words with good spelling becomes a common problem for the learners. These difficulties are undeniably caused by interference of Indonesian and their mother tongue. The difficulty to have in depth understanding to the meaning of the utterances spoken also has made the learners to process the messages which makes the messages can't be well grasped by the interlocutors. These difficulties can be seen in every level of study beginning with elementary school level up to high level of schools. These phenomena happen to almost secondary schools level including SMPN 4 Praya. This is due to the policy of educational ministry which obliges the students to learn foreign language including English since their secondary school levels.

Based on the observation, the researcher found some difficulties still faced by students in their process of learning speaking in the class. These difficulties were reflected in the students' difficulty in pronouncing the words, constructing utterances in which words composed into utterances to express ideas to speak was ungrammatically correct, having low understanding towards the other students' utterances when processing the messages being transferred by any other students in the class. Besides, the teaching technique used by the teacher in teaching students to learn to speak was still found not relevant to the students' ability and level of knowledge which influenced students difficult to well help students to learn speaking English. In this case, the teacher has to raise sensitivity to use what so called old perspective of teaching technique which made students much depended upon the teachers' activeness rather than on the students. In this condition of learning, the teacher ought to dominate the learning continuity before the students subsequently take the role. This is as the learners need a drive from the teacher which forces the students to act before they come up to act and speak impulsively. Bailey, (2005: 270) writes that one learning style issue that influences learner’s speaking in class is the contrast between reflectivity and impulsivity. Reflective learners prefer to think their answers or comments before speaking in class, while impulsive learners tend to be more impetuous and may take a gamble. The learning facility which was not supporting the learning process was also becoming another problem influencing the students' low ability in learning good speaking. To solve these problems, the researcher felt interested to teach the students to learn speaking English by using Chain Drill technique. A term refers much to the teaching concept of Audio Lingual Method by Freeman-Larson which focuses on oral performance and language repetition.

Larson-Freeman, (2000: 48) writes that a chain drill gets its name from the
A chain of conversation that forms around the room as students, one-by-one, ask and answer questions of each other. The teacher begins the chain by greeting a particular student, or asking him questions. That student responds, and then turns to the students sitting next to him. The first student greets or asks a question of the second student and the chain continues. A chain drill allows some controlled communication, even though it is limited. A chain drill also gives the teacher an opportunity to check each student’s speech. The use of drill by the teacher in learning oral language triggers the learners the opportunity to practice phonological and grammatical elements of language. This in line with what Brown (2001: 272) claims that 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. Handayani (2011: 52) writes that there are at least advantages of chain drill technique in the teaching of speaking, those are Chain Drill technique makes the teacher easier in checking and correcting the students speaking aspect and Chain drill technique make students practice speaking English effectively.

The use of Chain Drill in the teaching of speaking has significantly contributed to the acquisition of the learners’ speaking proficiency. A recent study has established this contribution on the role of Chain Drill towards the learners’ speaking ability. Cahyani, (2017: 63-73) in her study found that there was a significant influence of using Chain Drill Technique to improve students’ speaking ability at the first semester of the eighth grade of SMPN 4 Natar. Further, based on the result of pre-test before Chain Drill technique was implemented, the speaking ability of the students was lower than after Chain Drill technique was implemented. After getting the treatment and post–test, it was found than there were significant differences between the experimental class and control class. The post–test score of the experimental class was higher than the post–test score in the control class. It can be seen from the pre–test and post test, the mean of post–test was in control class 15.84 and post–test in the experimental class was 19.38. Another result of the study by Hermanto (2016: 70) finding that the average scores of experimental class was 75.2 and control class was 69.47. It meant that the experimental class was better than the control class. And the result of t-test showed that t-score 2.0830 was higher than t-table 1.6666. Consequently, based on the testing, learning using Chain Drill technique was effective when applied in the process of learning English especially in speaking. These results of the study drive the researcher to commit more study on seeking the effectiveness of Chain Drill in the teaching of speaking to the secondary level of school at the eighth-grade students. The result of the study is expected to legitimize the role of Chain Drill in the efforts of fostering the learners’ speaking proficiency within the English language learning.

**Research Method**

This research used quantitative approach in the form of experimental research. Experimental research seeks to find the causal relationship between two factors which are raised by the researchers in the purpose of reducing or eliminating any distracting factors. Experimental is much characterized by much greater control over the research environment and this case some variables are manipulated to observe the effect on other variables (Khotari, 2004: 3).
The design of the research used was pretest-postest control group design. The population of the research was the eighth-grade students of SMPN 4 Praya in academic year 2018/2019 consisting of four classes; VIII-A, VIII-B, VIII-C, and VIII-D with the total number of the students were 87 students. There were two groups used to be researched as samples namely experimental and control group taken through cluster random sampling. To determine the group belonging to the experimental and control group, a lottery was used. VIII-C consisting of 22 students used as the experimental class while VII-A consisting of 22 students used as the control class. The experimental group received a new treatment by using Chain Drill technique. Meanwhile, the control class was treated by using Presentation, Practice, Production. The instrument of the research used was speaking test in the form of instruction. The result of readability test of the instrument showed that the instrument was readable with the percentage of the readability reached 79 with fairly easy category showing that the instrument was worthy to be used. Data were gained from the result of pre-test and post-test of students’ speaking scores. Data gained were subsequently analyzed through descriptive and inferential statistical analysis from which a conclusion of the study was drawn.

Research Findings and Discussion

Research Finding
This session leads to display the finding of the investigation and discussion of the data finding.

The result of the normality test from the pretest of experimental group was that pa (138 ≥ 0.05) and (033 ≥ 0.05). It means that the data of pretest was in normal distribution. The score of p could be seen from sig in the table of Kolmogorov-Smirnov^a columns because the sample of the research was more than fifty. The result of the normality test from the pretest of control group was pa (003 ≤ 0.05) and (200 ≤ 0.05). However, data of posttest were not in normal distribution and it was beyond the researcher’s ability. The score of p could be seen from sig in the table of Kolmogorov-Smirnov^a columns because the sample of the research was less than fifty. Meanwhile, based on the result of the homogeneity test it was found that the probability value (p) of the data from the experimental and control group of pretest scores was 0.65. It means that p value of the data was higher than d. (0.65 ≥ 0.05). Thus, it can be concluded that the sample data from the population has homogenous variance. The result of the homogeneity test showed that the probability value (p) of the data from the experimental and control group of posttest scores was 188. It means p value of the data was higher than d. (188 ≥ 0.05). Thus, it can be concluded that the sample data from the population has homogenous variance.

1. Data Description of Experimental Group
The result of data analysis showed that the highest score was 76 and the lowest score was 36. The mean score was 64, the median was 84.5, the mode was 45.3, the range was 40, and the standard deviation was 90. Then the frequency distribution, histogram, and polygon of the data were shown in the table 1 below:
2. Data Description of Control Group

The result of data analysis showed that the highest score was 68 and the lowest score was 35. The mean score was 50, the median was 42.8, the mode was 41.7, the range was 33, and the standard deviation was 1.00. Then the frequency distribution, histogram, and polygon of the data were shown in the table below:

The subsequent test was testing hypothesis. The hypothesis was tested by using t-test by comparing t-obtain and t-table value at the level of significance 0.05 (95%) with the total of samples were 44 students. Based on the result of hypothesis testing, it was found that \( t_c \) (t-obtain) \( \geq T_t \) (t-table) or 2.52 \( \geq 1.671 \) which meant that t-obtain score was higher than t-table. This result of test showed that the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis was accepted. This result of t-test implied that the use of Chain Drill Technique in teaching Speaking skill was effective.

**Discussion**

As the result of the data in the research finding on the effectiveness of Chain Drill towards the students’ speaking ability displayed, it was found that after getting treatment, students' ability in speaking both the experimental and control class showed significant difference in scores. The gaining score in the experimental class was higher than the control class in which the mean score of the experimental class was 64 while in the control class was 50. The highest score between the two groups was also different where the experimental class got 76 while the control class scored 68. The result of this study showed that teaching speaking by using Chain Drill technique had
given different and better effect on students’ speaking performance compared to Presentation, Practice, Production technique. The mean score of students in the experimental group had passed the standard score of English subject at the school. This result of study implied that Chain drill technique was one of the strategic teaching techniques which ought to be applied in the classroom for the teaching-learning process since it was able to create a vivid atmosphere and encourage the students to share and foster their ideas in oral performance. Meanwhile, the use of Presentation, Practice, Production in teaching speaking to the students in the control group had given improvement in the score of the students’ speaking. However, the improvement was not significantly showed. This could be seen from the result of their current mean score in the post-test of the students’ speaking skill which had not yet passed the standard score of the school. Whereas, as it had been presented in the previous data that before the students of both classes were given treatments, the students of both experimental and control group had the same pretest, in which the students’ speaking performance score of both classes was categorized low. The difference of average scores between experimental and control class was also homogeneous. It meant that before the had treatments the students had the same condition, they were still low in speaking ability.

As the treatment and the further test were conducted the two teaching techniques between the two groups had contributed to the different scores gained by the students. The teaching technique used in the experimental class was more successful in giving influence on the students’ oral performance compared to that of in the control class. On the other words, teaching speaking to students of the experimental class treated by using Chain Drill technique produced a much greater change in students’ speaking performance compared to the group of students taught by Presentation, Practice and Production. Not only the way the students expressed their idea when speaking was different from each technique of teaching, but also there were many approaches in teaching speaking to the students that made some of students could and not enjoy fully the learning and some others did not between the two classes. For instance, Chain Drill technique did only not focus on one part of the speaking indicator to be well practiced but also it covered all indicators of speaking in the final result of the learning. Although this teaching technique much depended on the teacher’s activeness and creativity of teaching, the students were driven to work together or by their classmates in the classroom. This result of the study was established by some research results. Handayani (2011) in her research finding found that the result of the study after giving the treatment to the students by using the Chain Drill, the students' speaking English improved. This improvement was proved by the improvement in the mean scores between the pre-test score and the second cycle test. It improved from 1.3 to 3.5. This showed that this technique effectively helped the students improve their speaking ability.

The different change of score for both groups because the experimental group was treated by using Chain Drill technique, while the control group was treated by using the conventional technique. Then, the degree of freedom (df) that was used in this research were interpreted to compare the two critical values; t-test. In the experimental group, the mean score of post-
test was higher than the mean score of pre-test (64>37), and the difference was statistically significant because of the t-test of post-test, where probability value was lower than alpha (0.00< 0.05). While in control group, the mean score of post-test was also higher than the mean score of pre-test (50>30), but the difference was statistically significant because probability value was higher than alpha (2.52>0.05).

From the comparison above, it was clear that the t-test, it indicated the gap of difference of the mean score was significantly found in both groups at the significant level 0.05. This successful result by Chain Drill towards students’ speaking performance score could be established by the result of the previous study by Widyaningsih (2014) studying about Improving Speaking Skill by Using Chain Drill Technique at the Eighth Grade Students of SMPN 1 Amlapura. The result of the study showed that Chain Drill technique could improve students’ speaking skill. This was proved by the improvement in the mean scores in cycle I (70.28) and cycle II (80.68). From this score, it was seen that there was difference in range of score between the two cycles, in which the first cycle In addition, the subjects also responded positively to the implementation of chain Drill technique in speaking activity.

Based on the result of the study above, it was obvious that Chain Drill played a significant role to the students’ oral language performance. As it had been presented in the data previously found, there was found a difference in scores obtained in the post-test from pre-test between the two classes; experimental class treated by Chain Drill 14≥7 and control class treated by Presentation, Practice, Production in which it showed that the experimental class score was achieved higher than the control class score. It was also approved by the result of score analysis by using t-test formula in which the result of t-test was (2.52) and t-table (1.671) showing that t-test was higher than t-table at the significant level 0.05. On the other words, this result proved that Chain Drill was effective to be used as the optional teaching technique in the effort of developing the students’ speaking skill, particularly at the students of the secondary levels.

**Conclusion and Suggestion**

Based on the result of the score gained in the students’ speaking skill, the t-test computation, and the results of the supporting studies which have established this finding of study, it can be concluded that the Chain Drill technique is effective to teach speaking skill. As the final statement considering the finding of the study, the researcher would like to give some suggestions that English teacher ought to seek appropriate teaching technique in teaching English, particularly in teaching speaking skill. Chain Drill technique can be an effective option in the process of the teaching speaking skill in the classroom. English teacher should be creative in preparing materials for the speaking instruction and applying a different technique of teaching should be based on the level and knowledge of students produces oral learning quality. The teacher should give the students more motivation in learning English, including practice and in the effort to improve their speaking proficiency in the class. It is also expected that the result of the study can be useful to be used as an additional reference and insight for those who are interested in conducting research more about the use of Chain Drill in any other skills of English
language teaching particularly in the teaching of speaking skill.
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