ABSTRACT

IMPROVING STUDENTS' ABILITY IN SPEAKING
THROUGH IMAGINATION ACTIVITY
AT THE FIRST GRADE OF SMPN 11 BANDAR LAMPUNG

By

Kartina

It is widely understood that speaking skill is difficult language skill to study since it has any components to involve, such a pronunciation, fluency, and comprehensibility. Studies on this skill revealed that SMP students found difficulties in a practicing speakng skill.

This research was conducted based on the problem faced by the seventh grade students of SMPN 11 Bandar Lampung. The problem is the low speaking ability of the students in that school. Their low speaking ability is caused by the unsuitable teaching method used by the teacher to teach speaking. The teaching method used by the teacher also made the students' learning activities low. That is why, the writer did a research which covered not only the students' speaking ability but also the students' learning activities and the teacher's teaching performance. The objectives of the research are to find out whether the imagination activity is applicable to improve the students' speaking ability, to know in what aspects the imagination activity improves the students' learning activities, and to know how the teacher responds to the teaching and learning process in her teaching performance when the imagination activity is being implemented. The research was conducted at SMPN 11 Bandar Lampung. The subject of the research was students of seventh grade class E in the academic year 2011-2012.

This was a Classroom Action Research conducted in two cycles. Each cycle comprised planning, action, observation and interpretation, analysis and reflection. The researcher used indicators dealing with the learning product and learning process. To collect the data of the learning product and process, the writer used speaking test and observation sheet as the instruments.

The result of the learning product showed that the imagination activity is applicable to improve the students' speaking ability. In cycle 1, there were only 15

students (46.87%) whose speaking scores achieved the target of the indicator. While, there were 17 students whose scores were under the target. For pronunciation, there were 15 students (46,87%) reached 65-73, and there were 17 students (53.13%) who got 56-64. In fluency, there were 18 students (56.25%) who reached 65-73, and there were 14 students (43.75%) who got 50-59. For comprehensibility, there were 21 students (65.62%) who got 67-73, meanwhile, 11 students (34.38%) got 56-64. In cycle 2, there were 3 students (9.4%) who can reach 74-82, there were 28 students (87.5%) who got 65-73, meanwhile only one student (3.1%) got 56-64. For more detail, in cycle 2, for pronunciation, there were 4 students (12.5%) who reached 74-82, 27 students (84.4%) got 65-73, and 1 student (3.1%) got 64. For fluency, there were also 4 students (12.5%) got 74-82. There were 27 students (84.4%) reached 65-73, and 1 student (3.1%) got 64. For comprehensibility, there were 5 students (15.6%) whose comprehensibility was good so they got 74-82, there were still 26 students (81.3%) who reached 65-73, and there was still one student (3.1%) who got 56-64.

For the learning process, that is, the students' learning activities, there were 15 students (6.87%) of 32 students who did 80% of the activities observed by the researcher. For the teacher's performance, the teacher got 70 for her teaching performance. This means that the research indicator for the teacher's teaching performance can be fulfilled in Cycle 1. In Cycle 2, for students' activities, there were about 26 students (81.25%) who did 80% of the activities in the teaching and learning process. Meanwhile, for the teacher's performance, she reached 80 for her teaching performance.