Education Achievment: Journal of Science and Research
Volume 5 Issue 3 November 2024
Journal Homepage:
http://pusdikra-publishing.com/index.php/jsr

The Effect of Gossiping Group Activities Toward Fluency in Speaking at the 10th Grade Of MAN 3 Agam

Alfina[1], Eliza[2], Veni Roza[3], Melyann Melani[4]
[1,2,3,4] *Universitas Islam Negeri Sjech M. Djamil Djambek Bukittinggi, Indonesia*
Corresponding Author: : alfinasmk98@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO
Article history:
Received
05 August 2024
Revised
20 August 2024
Accepted
03 October 2024

ABSTRACT

This research was motivated by the findings of the researcher during observations and interviews at the 10th grade of MAN 3 Agam. Researcher found that students often used pause fillers such as "hmm" and "eee", and had low vocabulary mastery that hindered fluency in speaking. They also had difficulty expressing ideas and opinions, so the speed and tempo of speaking were affected. The study aimed to determine the effect of gossiping group activities on students' speaking fluency. The study used a type of experimental research, namely a quasi-experiment with a nonequivalent control group design. The sample in this study was selected using a random technique and the selected class was XE.2 class as the control class and XE.4 class as the experimental class. Instruments in the form of oral speaking tests that had been validated with content validity and assessed with inter-rater reliability. Data analysis included prerequisite tests for normality and homogeneity, and utilized Paired sample t-Tests and Independent sample t-Tests to test hypotheses. From the results of data analysis, it was concluded that gossiping group activities had a significant effect on improving students' speaking fluency.

Key Word *Gossiping Group Activities, Fluency, Speaking.*

How to cite https://pusdikra-publishing.com/index.php/jsr

INTRODUCTION

Speaking is the ability to express ideas, opinions, and information directly, effectively, accurately, and clearly. According to Thornbury (2005), speaking or oral communication is an activity involving people in which each listener or speaker must contribute to each other and react appropriately. Meanwhile, according to Nunan et al (2003), Speaking is a productive verbal skill to convey meaning. This includes the proper use of vocabulary, sentence structure, intonation, fluency, and precision when conveying and responding to information from the interlocutor. According to Brown (2004) aspects of good speaking are pronunciation, vocabulary, accuracy and fluency. Thus, speaking is a complex process that involves understanding, interaction, and effective expression.

There are several aspects that must be mastered in mastering speaking, one of the most important aspects is fluency. Fluency is one of the important aspects in providing understanding and interaction to the interlocutor effectively. This includes fluency in the use of vocabulary, as well as proper intonation (Stockdale, 2009). When a speaker speaks fluently, the message conveyed can be clearly understood by the listener without any hindrance or confusion. Fluency also reflects the speaker's level of confidence in conveying information. Fluent speakers are able to set the tempo and avoid pauses that are too long or too short, so that the listener's attention remains focused. It can be concluded that, speaking fluency is the part that can determine whether speaking well or not.

Based on preliminary research in the form of interviews with teacher and observations in the classroom conducted by researcher, researcher found several problems about the speaking fluency of grade 10 students in MAN 3 Agam. First, students tended to use their mother tongue when learning to speak, so students often used pause fillers such as "hmm" and "eee" when the teacher asked them to speak. Second, the students had a low vocabulary mastery, so they had difficulty producing words when speaking. Lastly, students tended to find it difficult to convey ideas and opinions when speaking, so the speed and tempo of speaking became slow.

Based on these problems, the researcher tried to find an alternative activity to overcome the problems. One of the activities that can be used is gossiping group activities. This activity can be used as useful activities in teaching and learning activities to increase students' speaking fluency. According to Regi Widanti & Nur Rachmah (2022), through gossip, a person can get used to speaking in front of others fluently and confidently. Moreover, according to Baw (2002), gossip group activities are activities that exploit human weaknesses, namely gossiping to provide language fluency training. In this activity, students can take advantage of talking about the people around them as a form of social interaction. therefore, this activity emphasizes the beneficial aspect of practicing the communicative aspect, as well as providing opportunities for students to speak and convey ideas in their minds.

Derived from the problems identified by the researcher and the problem solving plan, which involved the used of gossiping group activities to enhance students' speaking fluency, the purposes of this study were as follows : to determine the significant effect of utilizing gossiping group activities toward students' speaking fluency, to determine the difference in speaking fluency between students taught with gossip group activities and those who was not, and to determine whether students taught with gossip group activities better than students' who was not taught with gossip group activities.

RESEARCH METHODS

In this study, the researcher used experimental research, namely a quasi-experiment with a none-quivalent control group design. In this design, the researcher used two classes, namely the control and experimental classes and were given the same pre-test and post-test. However, the experimental class was taught by using gossip group activities and the control class was taught by using conventional activities. The population of this study consists of 10th graders of MAN 3 Agam which totals of 4 classes. Meanwhile, the sample in this study was class XE.2 as the control class and class XE.4 as the experimental class, these two classes were selected using the random technique, namely random selection using lottery. In this study, the researcher used an instrument, namely a speaking test or an oral test. The instrument used is tested for validity using content validity and test reliability by using inter-rater reliability. The speaking test was administered initially as a pre-test before any treatment was applied, and subsequently as a post-test after the treatment. After that, the pre-test and post-test data from both classes were processed using the Audacity and Microsoft Excel applications and analyzed using prerequisite tests, namely the normality test and the homogeneity test, after which the research hypothesis was analyzed using SPSS 26.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

Description

a. Data pre-test conducted in both the experimental and control classes

In the range 31-50, there were 11 students from control class and 19 students from experiment class. In the range 51-70, there were 9 students from control class and 5 students from experiment class. In the range 71-90, there was 1 students from control class. These findings are illustrated in the following table :

Table 1.
Pre-test scores for the Control and Experimental Classes

Score	Level	Description	Control	Experiment
1-10	0	Disfluent	0	0
11-30	1	Limited Fluency	5	1
31-50	2	Intermediate Fluency	11	19
51-70	3	Good Fluency	9	5
71-90	4	Advanced Fluency	1	0
91-100	5	Native-Like Fluency	0	0
Total			26	25

Based on the calculation from the data that researcher got from pre-test, the lowest score of pre-test gained by the control class was 25 and the highest score was 72. The mean of the class was 46, the median was 40, standard deviation was 15 and variance was 227. For the experiment class, the lowest score of pre-test gained by the control class was 30 and the highest score was 62. The mean of the class was 44, the median was 42, the standard deviation was 8, and the variance was 66. The data is displayed in the following table:

Table 2.
The Outcome of the Scores Calculations Obtained From the pre-test

	Control	Experiment
Minimum	25	30
Maximum	72	62
Mean	46	44
Median	40	42
Standard deviation	15	8
Variance	227	66

b. Data from the post-test conducted in experimental and control classes

The outcomes post-test scores attained both the control and experimental classes were as follows: In the experimental class, there were 11 students with the score of 39-50, 10 students with a score of 53-70, and 4 students with the highest score of 72-75. In the range 31-50, there were 12 students from control class and there were 11 students from experiment class. In the range 51-70, there were 13 students from control class and there were 10 students from experiment class. In the range 71-90, there were 1 students from control class and there were 4 students from experiment class. This data is displayed in the following table :

Table 3.
Post-test Scores for the Control and Experimental Classes

Score	Level	Description	Control	Experiment
1-10	0	Disfluent	0	0
11-30	1	Limited Fluency	0	0
31-50	2	Intermediate Fluency	12	11
51-70	3	Good Fluency	13	10
71-90	4	Advanced Fluency	1	4
91-100	5	Native-Like Fluency	0	0

TOTAL	26	25

Based on the calculation from the data that researcher got from post-test, the lowest score of post-test gained by the control class was 39 and the highest score was 74. The mean of class was 52, the median was 51, standard deviation was 9, and the variance was 85. For the experiment class, the lowest score was 39 and the highest score was 75. The mean of class was 56, the median was 53, standard deviation was 13, and the variance was 164. The data is displayed in the following table :

Table 4.
The Outcome of the Scores Calculations of the Post-Test

	Control	**Experiment**
Minimum	39	39
Maximum	74	75
Mean	52	56
Median	51	53
Standard deviation	9	13
Variance	85	164

After doing pre-test and post-test, the researcher compared both of the result of the pre-test and post-test from the experimental and the control class. The comparison test result of pre-test and post-test from the experimental and the control class were, the results of the post-test of the experimental class were higher than the results of the pre-test (56>44). The comparison of post-test results between the experimental class and the control class showed that the control class test was lower than that of the experimental class. This is shown by the average score of the control class post-test results (52) which means lower than the experimental class post-test results (56). There were showed in the following table :

Table 5.
Average Comparison Results

$\bar{X}$	**Pre-Test**	**Post-test**
Control	46	52
Experiment	44	56

Analysis prerequisite test

a. Normality Test for the Pre-Test Score of Experimental Class and Control Class

In the results of the normality test of the pre-test of the experimental and control classes, it was found that the Sig. (p value) of the pre-test experimental class was 0.717 >

0.05 and Sig. The (p value) of the pre-test control class is 0.053 > 0.05, meaning that the data is distributed normally. The table is presented in Table 6 :

Table 6.
Test Normality
Tests of Normality

	Class	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Speaking Fluency Test	Pre-Test Experimental Class	.108	25	.200*	.973	25	.717
	Pre-Test Controll Class	.156	26	.105	.923	26	.053

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.
a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

b. Normality Test for the Post-test Score of Experimental Class and Control Class

In the results of the normality test of the post-test of the experimental and control classes, it was found that the sig. (p value) of post-test experimental class was 0.442 > 0.05 and the sig. (p value) of post-test control class was 0.272 > 0.05, it means that the data distributed normally.. The table is displayed in Table 7.

Table 7.
Test Normality
Tests of Normality

	Class	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Speaking Fluency Test	Post-Test Experimental Class	.098	25	.200*	.961	25	.442
	Post-Test Control Class	.129	26	.200*	.953	26	.272

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.
a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Education Achievment : Journal of Science and Research
Volume 5 Issue 3 November 2024
Page 888-899

c. Homogeneity Test for the Pre-test Score from the Control and the Experimental Class

In the results of the homogeneity test of the pre-test of the experimental and control classes, it was found that the significance value (sig) Based on Mean is 0.104 > 0.05 , it can be concluded that the variance of the experimental and control class Pre-test data is the same or heterogeneous. The homogeneity of data from the pre-test of both classes is illustrated in Table 8 :

Table 8.
Test Homogenitas
Test of Homogeneity of Variance

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Speaking Fluency Test	Based on Mean	2.737	1	49	.104
	Based on Median	2.144	1	49	.150
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	2.144	1	45.177	.150
	Based on trimmed mean	2.725	1	49	.105

d. Homogeneity Test for the Post-test score from the Experimental Class and the Control Class

In the results of the homogeneity test of the post-test of the experimental and control classes, it was found that the significance value (sig) Based on Mean is 0.266 > 0.05, it can be concluded that the variance of the experimental and control class Pre-test data is the same or heterogeneous. The homogeneity of data from the post-test of both classes is depicted in Table 9 :

Table 9.
Test Homogenitas
Test of Homogeneity of Variance

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Speaking Fluency Test	Based on Mean	1.264	1	49	.266
	Based on Median	1.257	1	49	.268
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	1.257	1	48.926	.268
	Based on trimmed mean	1.268	1	49	.266

Education Achievment : Journal of Science and Research
Volume 5 Issue 3 November 2024
Page 888-899

1. **Testing Hypothesis**

a. The first hypothesis

Based on the result, it was found that the Sig (2-tailed) in the first hypothesis test was 0.000 < 0.05, which showed that there was a significant effect in the used of gossiping group activities in students' speaking fluency in the experimental class. From the data, it can be concluded that H_O is rejected and H_a is accepted. Details observed in Table 10 :

Table 10.
Testing Hypotesis I
Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Pre-Test - Post-Test	-12.52000	5.74543	1.14909	-14.89160	-10.14840	-10.896	24	.000

b. The second hypothesis

Based on the results, it was found that the Sig (2-tailed) in the second hypothesis test was 0.040 < 0.05, which showed that there was a significant difference between the class that applied the gossip group activity and the class that did not apply the gossip group activity in improving speaking fluency. From the data, it can be concluded that H_O is rejected and H_a is accepted. Details observed in Table 11 :

Education Achievment : Journal of Science and Research
Volume 5 Issue 3 November 2024
Page 888-899

Table 11.
Test Hipotesis II
Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
HASIL POST-TEST	Equal variances assumed	.230	.634	-2.111	49	.040	-8.05077	3.81443	-15.71616	-.38538
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.116	48.681	.040	-8.05077	3.80523	-15.69893	-.40261

c. The third hypothesis

Based on the average results of the students' speaking fluency test in the post-test, the score of experimental class is higher than the score of control class, which was (56>52).Thus, it concluded that students who participated gossip group activities showed better.

Discussion

Based on the data, the researcher found used of gossiping group activities had a significant effect on students' speaking fluency. This can be seen from the increase in the average pre-test and post-test in the experimental class, as well as the difference in the average post-test of the experimental class was higher than the average pre-test of the experimental class.

This finding is in line with theories from several experts related to the use of gossip group activities to improve students' speaking fluency, namely Baw (2002) and Harmer (2007). According to Baw (2002), the gossiping group activity is an activities

that capitalizes on a human weakness namely gossiping to enhance language fluency. Furthermore, Harmer (2007) stated that gossiping group activities is an activity that utilizes human weakness, namely gossiping to be able to practice fluency in language. Based on the theory, it could be concluded that the results of this research were in accordance with the theory of experts.

This finding also in line with several previous studies, namely Purnama Sari (2017) and Maretyasari (2014). Purnama Sari (2017) found that the students' had a positive perception of their speaking skills after undergoing English language instruction through a gossiping group activity. Furthermore, Maretyasari (2014) found that there was a significant difference in students speaking ability between the experimental and control classes. This was also found by the researcher in this research, namely that there was a significant difference between the fluency in speaking of students in the experimental class and students in the control class.

Gossip group activities that emphasize discussion activities in the form of dialogue to gossip can increase students' speaking fluency, this is in line with the findings of Wat Yurismawati et al (2023) and Desantri et al (2023). According to Wat Yurismawati et al (2023), students' speaking fluency increased by using a discussion approach. Meanwhile, Desantri et al (2023) states that using dialogue improved students' speaking skills. In addition, gossiping activities increase students' speaking fluency, which is included in the speaking aspect, because students are also required to be active in learning where there are question and answer activities. This was in line with the findings from Reni Safitri et al (2023), who found that there was an increase in students' speaking skill by using active learning. Meanwhile, Chairani Annisa et al (2022) indicates that Students' speaking skills improved with the use of question and answer activities in the use of picture series. Febrisa et al (2022) found that activities that encouraged students to interact actively were effective in the three-step interview technique for improving students' speaking skills. This was in line with the findings of the researcher, who found that with the use of gossip group activities, students were able to interact actively with their group members, thereby improving their speaking fluency, which was included in one of the aspects of speaking.

In conclusion, the findings of this research corroborated the existing theory that gossip group activities could improve students' speaking fluency. Gossip group activities significantly increased students' speaking fluency. This could be seen from the results of the pre-test and post-test of the experimental class, which showed that the average score of the post-test was higher than the pre-test score. Moreover, the difference in post-test scores between the control class and the experimental class, which showed that the average score of the experimental class was higher than the average score of the control class.

CONCLUSION

According to purpose of the research, which was to know the improvement of students' speaking fluency through the implementation of gossip group activities. In the implementation of this activity, the researcher taught by forming several groups to discuss various gossip topics according to the series of activities in the theory used. Summarizing the results from the research data that had been discussed and relating it to the opinions of several experts, it was concluded that gossip group activities could be one of the alternative activities that could improve students' fluency in speaking. This activity was beneficial for teachers to use in addressing the problem of students' fluency in speaking through engaging and enjoyable activities.

REFERENCES

Baw, S. S. (2002). Transforming the Whole Class into Gossiping Groups. *English Teaching Forum*, *40*.

Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*.

Chairani Annisa, Reflinda Reflinda, Melyan Melani, & Veni Roza. (2022). The Effect of Using Picture Series toward Students' Speaking Skill at the Second Grade in MTSS Nagari Binjai. *Populer: Jurnal Penelitian Mahasiswa*, *1*(4), 19–33. https://doi.org/10.58192/populer.v1i4.248

Desantri, S., Dewi, M. P., Syahrul, S., & Eliza, E. (2023). Effect of Using Dialogue Technique in Teaching Speaking at Eighth Grade of MTs N 7 Pasaman Barat. *Arzusin*, *3*(2), 107–116. https://doi.org/10.58578/arzusin.v3i2.983

Febrisa, R., Sakti, G., Syafitri, W., & Safitri, L. (2022). *The Effectivenes of Three Step Interview Technique on Students Speaking Skills*. *3*(1), 168–173.

Harmer. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (Fourth Edi). Pearson Education Limited.

Maretyasari, E. (2014). *The Use of Gossiping Group to Improve Students' Speaking Ability*. Sultan Agung Islamic University.

Nunan, D., Terrell, T. D., & Brown, H. D. (2003). Practical English Language Teaching: Young Learners. In *Language* (Vol. 57, Issue 3).

Purnama Sari, D. (2017). Students' Perception Toward Their Speaking English Ability After Being Taugh Through Gosiiping Group Technique at SMAN 3 Batusangkar. *Journal of English Linguistics and Literature*.

Regi Widanti, G., & Nur Rachmah, E. (2022). Kesehatan Mental Bagi Pelaku Gosip (Studi : Fenomenologi Ibu Karir PT. AI Surabaya). *Psikologi Humanistik*, *10*, 11. http://dx.doi.org/10.30640/humanistik '45.v0i2.358

Reni Safitri, Absharini Kardena, & Gustina Gustina. (2023). The Use of Active Learning Method in Teaching English Speaking Skill. *Education : Jurnal Sosial Humaniora Dan Pendidikan*, *3*(1), 01–09. https://doi.org/10.51903/education.v3i1.284

Stockdale, D. A. (2009). *Comparing Perception of Oral Fluency to objective Measures in the EFL Classroom*. *March*, 1.

Thornbury, S. (2005). *Scott Thornbury - How to Teach Speaking-Longman (2005).pdf* (p. 163).

Wat Yurismawati, Hilma Pami Putri, Loli Safitri, & Irwandi Irwandi. (2023). The Effect of Discussion Strategy to Improve Students' Speaking Fluency In the XI class of Ashabul Yamin Boarding School. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Sastra Inggris*, *3*(3), 14–20. https://doi.org/10.55606/jupensi.v3i3.2599