



## THE EFFECTIVENESS OF *SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION* TO IMPROVE STUDENTS' SPEAKING ABILITY IN ENGLISH AT MTsN 3 MATARAM

Ririn Saputri<sup>1\*</sup>, Lalu Nurtaat<sup>2</sup>, Santi Farmasari<sup>3</sup>, Sahuddin<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1 2 3 4</sup> English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education,  
University of Mataram, Indonesia

\*Corresponding Author: [ririnsaputri789@gmail.com](mailto:ririnsaputri789@gmail.com)

---

**Abstract:** The objective of this research is to determine whether or not the small group discussion technique was effective in improving the speaking skills of eighth-graders in MTSN 3 Mataram during the academic year 2022–2023. This study was carried out at MTsN 3 Mataram, located at Jl. Lingkar Selatan No. 191, Mataram. The kind of this research is quasi-experimental. The population in this research was eighth graders from MTSN 3 Mataram. In the sample, VIII A served as the experimental class, and VIII B served as the control class. The researcher used a pre-test and a post-test as two tests for collecting data. Pre-test score means for the experimental group is 50.89 and for the control group is 51.06, according to the study's findings. Following treatment, the experimental group's post-test mean score is 82.97, while the control group's mean score is 71.69. The results showed a substantial difference between the two classes in the post-test. The t-test for the outcome analysis was sig (2-tailed)  $0.000 < 0.05$ . So, it can be claimed that the technique of small group discussions is effective in increasing students' speaking ability in English.

**Keywords :** *Speaking, small group discussion.*

---

## INTRODUCTION

It is undeniable that in real life, humans cannot be separated from communicating. As social beings, humans certainly need other humans in terms of realizing some of their desires, and of course those desires can be realized through communication. With good

communication, people can understand what the people want, in education, work, society, and so on.

Speaking skills are defined as the ability to express opinions, ideas, facts, and feelings for others (Gani, Fajrina & Hanifa, 2015). This is an indication of whether some people are able to speak well or not. One of the main goals of language learning is to be able to speak properly and correctly because it is one's ability to clearly transfer ideas to others. So, we can say that someone can communicate ideas well to others. Imam Fauzi (2017) stated that active speaking skills can be developed gradually by having proper and effective listening skills. So, it can be said that discussion requires the participation of at least two or more people, both of whom must speak and listen.

At MTsN 3 Mataram, in learning English, especially speaking, many students of the eight grade students experienced low speaking skills; this was evident from their responses, as they were unable to answer when asked by their teacher about a learning topic. In addition, it appears that the class is not interactive when the teacher is teaching, which is due to their low knowledge and ability to speak. Another thing that also causes students to be less interactive in learning is that they lack the confidence to express themselves, whether to express opinions or answer teacher questions. When the teacher said their name to talk, they were scared and nervous, and their voices stuttered softly.

Despite the fact that speaking is critical for students in practicing their ability to produce words, sentences, and ideas in English, there are many obstacles that can make students uncomfortable and lack confidence in speaking the language.

The first is about the lack of students' vocabulary. A person's speaking ability is measured by how much vocabulary he has; when he has a lot of vocabulary, it is not impossible that his speaking ability is good, and vice versa. Second, the students have difficulty understanding grammar. The accuracy of grammar in writing and speaking greatly determines the credibility of students; by mastering grammar, they are able to understand and present ideas to the audience properly and correctly. Third, it is about the students' motivation. Learning motivation is very necessary to help students have a high level of enthusiasm for learning; this can be obtained from the surrounding environment, both from parents and the playing environment, as well as from the school environment. The last is the students' mindset: "English is difficult." This also slightly affects the students' brain filters in accepting English learning. As (Nurhalizah, Sujana & Wardana, 2021) said Students find it challenging to communicate since there aren't enough opportunities for practice, there isn't enough language input (vocabulary, grammar,

pronunciation), and the instructional strategies chosen don't allow students the chance to practice communicating.

In teaching, a teacher is required to be good at understanding the students' conditions and needs. The teacher must apply techniques or teaching strategies that do not make students feel bored and must be good enough to make students interested in the lesson. Based on the experience of researchers during the practical field experience, the teacher often teaches English without making students' learning interesting, such as by explaining the material mostly using the lecture method while taking notes on the material on the blackboard, then asking students to take notes on the material given; after that, the teacher does practice, namely by asking students to repeat what he said with the aim that students are able to pronounce words or sentences in English properly and correctly; then the teacher gives some questions related to the material being taught and continues with exercises with related material; and finally, the teacher closes the learning activity by giving assignments as student learning materials while at home.

This method continues to be carried out, but game interludes involving teaching and learning activities are very rarely carried out. When the teacher is unable to teach, students are only assigned to work on questions in a student worksheet. The problem is the gap between the current situation and the expected reality. These obstacles must be able to be wisely resolved so that there is no difference between theory and practice.

In MTsN 3 Mataram, when teachers teach and learn English subjects, teachers sometimes apply several methods or techniques to teach English, such as the jigsaw method, discussion, direct role-play method, audio-lingual method, etc. The teacher also uses the discussion method in learning English and divides the students into several small discussion groups. They often use small group discussion in their work, such as when making dialogue, writing, translating texts, and reading. However, in teaching speaking, small group discussion is rarely used, and when teachers do use it, they rarely follow the rules of the technique, which is why it is not optimally used. Small group discussions will be more optimal when used in speaking classes. The students in a speaking class are more likely to engage in conversation, whether it is between two persons or in a group setting (Aropi & Lestari, 2022).

In small group discussions, students are placed as the main actors in the learning process. Students can be more flexible and active in asking questions, conveying ideas, giving opinions, and observing. Teachers also have an important role to play in making students more accustomed to asking questions, giving ideas, and giving opinions.

Students should also be self-focused and investigate an open question or problem. They identified a problem, found a solution based on it, and used creative problem-solving strategies to reach a conclusion, so that when students are given space to express themselves, they are more confident.

According to Antoni (2014), Small-group discussions can help students become more fluent speakers. We can use small group discussions to improve our public speaking skills for three different reasons. The teacher and students speak more aloud to the class during the first conversation. The second conversation is intended to promote deep interpersonal communication and learning. Procedures, attitudes, or talents may be learned. Thirdly, it is used to teach students how to become more independent and responsible students.

According to the explanation above, I am interested in conducting research under the title "The Effectiveness Of Small Group Discussion To Improve Students' Speaking Ability in English At MTsN 3 Mataram." Many other researchers may have contributed to this study, but the average research project uses a mixed method, whereas in this research, the researcher used a quasi-experimental design.

## **RESEARCH METHODS**

The research method used in this study was quasi-experimental. According to Sugiyono (2018), Experimental research is a form of study methodology that is used to determine the impact of treatment. Additionally, quasi-experimental research is a sort of design that involves two groups, one of which serves as the experimental group and the other as the control group, according to Rukminingsih et al. (2020). There are two types of quasi experimental design: nonequivalent control group design and time-series design.

This research took place at MTsN 3 Mataram. The population in this research is the eighth grade of MTsN 3 Mataram. The total number of students in the eighth grade is 212, divided into 6 classes, namely VIIIA, VIIIB, VIIIC, VIID, VIIIE and VIIF. The sample for this study was selected by using the cluster random sampling method. Because of the size of the population, cluster random sampling is utilized. Hence, the sample was drawn at random from members of the same class rather than at random from all classes. The instrument used to collect data in this research is a speaking test. The data was collected through pretest, treatment and posttest.

## FINDING AND DISCUSSION

### 4.1.1 Pre-test and Post-test Score

#### a. The score of the experimental group

The effectiveness of small group discussions in teaching speaking to students in the experimental group was compared using pre- and post-test data. The two data sets are described as follows: Pre- and post-tests are given to students in the experimental group who are required to retell a narrative text that they have read before. The effectiveness of the small group discussion used with the experimental group's students was evaluated using the results from the pre- and post-tests. Below are the outcomes of the pre-test and post-test results. The data used in this study came from the students' initial abilities. The information used is the treatment data gained prior to treatment. Data collected throughout the research on students' starting skills are shown in Table 4.1 below:

**Table 4.1**  
**Experimental group score**

No	Student's name	Pretest	Score category (pretest)	Posttest	Score category (posttest)
1	AISHA ALZENA ABDULLAH	47	Very poor	78	Good
2	AKHMAD FATHI ATALLAH	51	Poor	83	Very good
3	ALIFA MAHIRAH AYU SYAKIRA	75	Good	85	Very Good
4	ALIFA NABILA SHOLEHA	68	Fair	82	Very good
5	ALLIFAH LAILATUL FITRIYAH	54	Poor	84	Very good
6	ATIKA ZAHRA	66	Fair	80	Good
7	BAIQ VIYANDA KHEYRA SAUFIYADI	67	Fair	82	Very good
8	BINTANG AHMAD ZAIDAN	75	Good	91	Excellent
9	ELSA AISYA DIJAYA	56	Poor	82	Very Good
10	FATIMAH AZ ZAHRA	57	Poor	84	Very Good
11	GADIS MAR'ATUS SOLIHAN	56	Poor	81	Very good
12	HAZIM MAHFUDH	62	Fair	80	Good
13	INDAH RAHAYU SULISTIA	47	Very poor	82	Very good
14	KHAIRUL MAJDI ASYFAHAN	49	Very poor	81	Very Good
15	LAILI RAHMAYANI	55	Poor	84	Very good
16	LALU MUHAMMAD KAISARI P.	50	Very poor	75	Good
17	LAZIZA PUTRI	57	Poor	78	Good
18	M. ADIT ZAKARIA	55	Poor	82	Very good
19	MAHARANI ALLEDYA PRATIWI	68	Fair	81	Very good
20	MAULIZA PUTRI	65	Fair	78	Good

21	MUHAMMAD YAZID FATWARI	62	Fair	73	Good
22	MUHAMMAD YURAZZAQU RAMADHAN NAVAN	35	Very poor	66	Fair
23	MUTIARA MADINA	50	Very poor	79	Good
24	PUTRI WINDARI	49	Very poor	89	Very good
25	RIZKA APRILIA	60	Poor	85	Very Good
26	RIZKI BINTANG PAMUNGKAS	36	Very poor	92	Excellent
27	SAKIRA AZHARA	28	Very poor	92	Excellent
28	SALSABILA BILQIS	36	Very poor	96	Excellent
29	SITI NINDHIRA ZAIYANUSSYIFA DESTRIANI Q.	24	Very poor	100	Excellent
30	SOBIYYA FAIKA INSYIRA	36	Very poor	100	Excellent
31	SYAQILA NANDINI	40	Very poor	88	Very Good
32	TATA CITRA LESTARI	44	Very poor	84	Very Good
33	VYDHAN QIANSZY VARINNO	60	Poor	86	Very Good
34	ZAEDA RAHMATIKA AMNI	16	Very poor	68	Fair
35	MUHAMMAD KINAN SYAUKANI	36	Very poor	76	Good
36	DWI SHIFA KAMILANI JAMILAH	40	Very poor	80	Good
	<b>Average</b>	<b>50.89</b>		<b>82.97</b>	

In the pretest result, there are 2 students received good category, which translates to 5,5%, 7 students received fair category, which translates to 19,4%, 10 students received poor category, which translates to 27,7%, and 17 students received very poor category, which translates to 47,2%, while in the post-test results there are 6 students got the category excellent, which translates to a 16,6%, 18 students got the category very good, which translates to 50%, 9 students got the category good, which translates to 25%, and 3 students got the category fair which translates to a 8,3%.

#### b. The Score of The Control Group

**Table 4.2**  
**Control group score**

No	Student's Name	Pretest	Score Category (Pretest)	Posttest	Score Category in (Posttest)
1	ADDINYA AULA FELHALA	71	Good	75	Good
2	ALIFIYA NURSALMA	53	Poor	67	Fair
3	ALTARIQ RAFIANSYAH	60	Poor	78	Good
4	ASHA SARAH BAHIRA	60	Poor	65	Fair
5	ATHAYA AZKA MOUNIA	63	Fair	79	Good

6	AZIZIA ANNISA	62	Fair	72	Good
7	BAIQ SHOPIA ZASKIA	65	Fair	71	Good
8	DINDA ANASTASYA PUTRI	62	Fair	72	Good
9	FAJAR RIZKI PRATAMA	56	Poor	61	Fair
10	FARA ALMAGFIRA	56	Poor	73	Good
11	FATIMATUN NISA	60	Poor	70	Fair
12	GESTIANA GINARSIH	45	Very poor	71	Good
13	GLADI SAMUDRA CAHAYA	40	Very poor	73	Good
14	HIDAYATUN THOYYIBAH	65	Fair	79	Good
15	KEYLANO RICHI PUTRA HULAEFI	60	Poor	67	Fair
16	L. M. SUNANUL HUDA	62	Fair	65	Fair
17	LALU BANI AHMAD FIKAR	45	Very poor	71	Good
18	LATIFA AWALIYA TOYIB	60	Poor	70	Fair
19	LIZA AULIA	56	Poor	73	Good
20	MAIFA PUTRI ANNABILLAH	70	Fair	82	Very good
21	MAYATI	65	Fair	71	Good
22	MELISA HOTAMI	62	Fair	72	Good
23	NADINE INDRIA ASMARANI	60	Poor	78	Good
24	NAJWA MUTIARA TANJUNG	53	Poor	67	Fair
25	NEISHA KARINA PRIWIYASMARA	71	Good	75	Good
26	RAMADHAN AHMAD ARYANTO	20	Very poor	64	Fair
27	RIA ALMA LESTARI	36	Very poor	76	Good
28	RONI HASBY	28	Very poor	76	Good
29	SAFITRI RAMDANI	32	Very poor	74	Good
30	SEPTIAWAN SYAH	48	Very poor	64	Fair
31	SUCI WAHIDATUNNISA	16	Very poor	76	Good
32	ULFIANA HUMAIRO	32	Very poor	64	Fair
33	WAPIK VINA ANDRIYANI	40	Very poor	80	Good
34	WAYAN DHIYA ULHAQ ASY'ARI	28	Very poor	70	Fair
35	WAYAN MIKRATIN KAILA SAFITRI	60	Poor	72	Good
36	YULIANA HARTINI	16	Very poor	68	Fair
	<b>Average</b>	<b>51.06</b>		<b>71.69</b>	

According to the pretest results, there are 2 students received good category which translates to 5%, 8 students received fair category which translates to 22,2%, 13 students received poor category, which translates to 36,1%, and 13 received very poor category, which presents 36,1% got. Meanwhile, in the post-test results, there is 1 student got the very good score, which presents 2,7%, 22 students got the

category good, which translate to 61,1%, and 13 students got a category fair, which presents to 36,1%.

#### 4.1.2 Descriptive Statistic

**Table 4.3**

**The Students' Pre-test and Post-test Score of the Experimental Group and Control Group**

**Descriptive Statistics**

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pre Test Experiment	36	59	16	75	50.72	14.302
Post Test Experiment	36	34	66	100	82.97	7.401
Pre Test Control	36	55	16	71	51.06	15.826
Post Test Control	36	19	61	80	71.64	5.027
Valid N (listwise)	36					

The experimental group's score differed from the control group's score, as shown in table 4.3. The control group's mean pretest score was 51.06, with the greatest score in that group being 71 and the lowest being 16, while the experimental group's mean score was 50.72, with the highest score being 75 and the lowest being 16. The experimental group had a higher mean score than the control group in the pretest, it can be inferred.

The post-test scores for the two groups also differed; for the experimental group, the mean post-test score was 82.97; the highest score was 100; and the lowest score was 66; for the control group, the mean post-test score was 71.64; the highest score was 80; and the lowest score was 61. It can be concluded that there is a difference between the means of the post-test results for the experimental class's students, who had been taught utilizing small group discussion, and the control class's students, who had only received conventional method.

## CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Based on the findings of the previous chapter's hypothesis, the significance level of the t-test value at the degree of freedom 70 is 0.05 (95%), which is higher than the t-table distribution. This demonstrates how well-received small group discussions were in the



eighth-grade MTsN 3 Mataram speaking class. Hence, chapter 4's SPSS 25 findings show that the t-test value is 7.601, whereas the t-table value in df 70 is 1.994 at the significant level of 0.05 (95%), so it can be stated that  $H_0$  is rejected and  $H_a$  is accepted. In light of this, the answer to the issue of whether SGD is beneficial in improving students' speaking skills is yes, using small group discussion to teach speaking is more effective than not using it.

When compared to the control group, which received only conventional treatment, the experimental group's difference in post-test average value was greater (82.97) than that of the control group, which received only conventional treatment (71.69). As a result, it can be concluded that using small group discussions to teach speaking had a significant impact and was more effective.

At the end, The findings of this study have a number of theoretical and practical implications. For example, Learning speaking using small group discussions can train students to learn independently. Material descriptions make students think critically and creatively, so that students are expected to construct their knowledge. In its presentation, this teaching material also provides space for Students work together and share information. It is supported. With group discussion activities, simple and independent activities imitating knowledge and skills. After studying learning activities in teaching materials, students are given the opportunity to reflect on activities or knowledge they have just received, so they can feel new ideas in his mind. Furthermore, students can measure own level of success in learning based on learning outcomes.

In order to help teachers, students, and other researchers, the researcher would like to make suggestions based on the experience conducting research.

#### 1. For the Teachers

To increase enjoyment and increase interest in learning English, the English teacher should provide interesting material, media, models, and methods of learning to the class. The teacher must take steps—or prepare for them—to help students overcome some of the challenges they may face while learning English, as well as in accordance with their needs or the learning objectives, in order for the students to be able to comprehend the information being conveyed with ease, participate actively in class discussions without becoming nervous, and enjoy their education rather than find it boring or monotonously slow.

#### 2. For Students

Students should actively participate in asking questions about material they don't understand and not be afraid to ask questions when they come across challenging

vocabulary they don't understand. When the teacher asks you to speak, please do so. Don't be afraid of being wrong; those who are afraid of being wrong will definitely fail, but when you try, there is a possibility of success.

3. For other researchers

It can be utilized as reference material or as information by future researchers who are interested in performing research when conducting studies comparable to this one. The results of this study should hopefully be expanded upon by future research in order to overcome any deficiencies that may be objectively noted.

## REFERENCES

- Aropi, P., & Lestari, Y. B. (2022, June). An Analysis of Adjacency Pairs In Speaking Class AtCecKampoeng Pare Mataram. 2022. In *Journal of English Education Forum (JEEF)* (Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 12-21).
- Crisianita, S., & Mandasari, B. (2022). The Use of Small-Group Discussion To Improve Students' Speaking Skill. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 3(1), 61-66.
- Gani, S. A., Fajrina, D., & Hanifa, R. (2015). Students' Learning Strategies for Developing Speaking Ability. *Studies in English language and education*, 2(1), 16-28.
- Nurhalizah, P., Sujana, I. M., & Wardana, L. A. (2021, December). Mind Mapping Technique To Improve Students' Speaking Ability In Retelling Narrative Story. In *Journal of English Education Forum (JEEF)* (Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 48-54).
- Rosadi, F. S., Nuraeni, C., & Priadi, A. (2020). The Use of Small Group Discussion Strategy in Teaching English Speaking. *Pujangga: Jurnal Bahasaan Sastra*, 6(2), 134-146.