

Investigating Oral Capability and Total Immersion Program at EFL Classroom

Muhammad Hanafi

afied70@gmail.com

Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidenreng Rappang

Andi Sadapotto

sadapotto.andi@yahoo.co.id

Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidenreng Rappang

Abstract

The aims of this article is to describe that total immersion program in teaching English can improve students oral capability. This article is made from research result which used pre-test and post-test design. The population of the article is the ninth grade of SMP Negeri 3 Panca Rijang there are two classes. The writer applied random technique that took one of the two classes and sample of this article was IX.2 class with 20 students. The instrument of this article was speaking test which would be administered in pre-test and post-test. The pre-test would be used to find the prior knowledge of oral capability, while post-test would be used to find oral capability achievement after treatment is given. The result of this article showed that total immersion program was effective to improve oral capability at the ninth grade of SMP Negeri 3 Panca Rijang especially IX.2 class. It could be proved from their mean score in post-test (56.95) was higher than their mean score in pre-test (48.50), and the t-test value (10.934) was greater than t-table ($\alpha = 0.05$; $df = 9$; $t_{table} = 2.262$, this means that H_1 was accepted.

Keywords: *Speaking, Total immersion program, EFL Classroom*

INTRODUCTION

In Indonesia, English is considered as foreign language is one of the school subjects taught by the English teacher. The basic concept applied is the learners of English are expected to be able to listen, read, write and speak (Sakir, 2020). Teach English to the learners need topics which held in accordance with the current discussions and problems they are familiar with. In this context, English as a teaching that encourages users (students) to build relationships among individuals to interact with each other with the needs of the school and even as a main tool to communicate in the setting of everyday life (Sakir, 2021). Success in English teaching is the dominant factor that the English teacher should pay attention to, especially in teaching the speaking skill. Thornbury (2005:1) says that "speaking is so much a part of everyday life that we take it for granted. The average person produces tens of thousands of words per day, although some people – such as the auction and politicians-may produce more than that. So natural and integral is the talk that we forget how we once struggled to achieve this ability-until, that is, we must learn how to do everything. According to Ladouse (1991: 23) "speak described as an activity as the ability to express you in a situation, or activity to report the actions or situation in

the right words or the ability to speak or express a sequence of ideas fluently". This means that talk as a way of communication affect the lives of our individual with strong. In the teaching of English language teachers may use media. Methods are used to encourage the students to communicate to teachers and students.

"Training should assist them in achieving the best goal of their skill" according to Graberg (1997:201). In applying the approach the teacher should improve a lot, for example: teachers' materials, the management of classrooms and many other things because a technique does not suit the students will make them difficult to understand the explanations of the teacher, which means that the teacher may struggle to teach them.

In building speech, it is important to understand the meaning and flu all components that generate speech that are comprehensible in communication, good pronunciation, grammar, the understanding of vocabulary, and the understanding of vocabularies. However, the language and expression are meant for contact. It should be noted. Students are not enough to learn my vocabulary, sentences, and life. In everyday conversation you have to make an expression. Language learning is about training and communicating. By training a lot in speaking, students should communicate their significance.

Many factors influence the ability to communicate, whether they are students or teachers from within or outside. The internal and external factors are named, for example external factors of the situation in the classroom, media and teacher strategies, depending on the student's behavior, etc. The teachers should perform well in front of the students because they can influence the teachers' voice, for the internal reasons of the instructor. The teacher should be able to speak in five different ways, as has already been said: the manner in which languages, words or phrases are spoken. The teacher should talk well so students will hear what the teacher says; in this situation, the teacher should be a model and the teacher should give a true example to the students. The next thing I can write about is the state of emergency. When the teacher talks smoothly, the students are able to listen to the teacher so that they can talk smoothly. The above is the interpretation; the teacher must be able to comprehend what the students are taught

METHOD

1. Research Design

In this article, the writer used the quantitative method and descriptive approach. So, this type of study can be called qualitative. Moleong (2013:11) states that descriptive research can be defined that the data collected in the form of a word, phrase, or image have another sense in addition to numbers alone. The class was be teach by used total immersion program. The design as follows:

Table 1
Research Design

O₁	X	O₂
----------------------	----------	----------------------

(L. R. Gay: 252)

Where:

- O1 : Pre-test
- X : Treatment
- O2 : Post-test

2. Population and Sample

The population of this article was in the UPT SMP Negeri 3 Panca Rijang. In addition, the total population is 287 students in the academic year 2020/2021. There were eight classes, seventh grade to ninth grade. In this article, the writer assumed that such sample class had been selected and that the IX.2 of 20 students had been chosen as a sample for this article, so that the total sample number was 20.

3. Instrument

The instrument of this article is setting the data to make more easily (Arikunto, 2002: 136). Instruments in this article, the ability to speak are the question and answers and interviews. The test applies in pre-test and post-test. Exam-the exam used to determine the speaking skills of the students before the treatment and post-test used to find the ability to speak to the students after the treatment.

4. Procedure of Collecting Data

The data of students and the procedure in collecting data is presented in the chronological order as follows:

- a. Pre-test: This aims to identify students' ability to speak. This study uses a simple form of speaking test which is the questions and answers.
- b. Treatment: The treatment conduct after pre-test given in the classroom
- c. Post-test: The test will be give after the treatment. The contents of the post-test are same with the pre-test. The purpose of this test is to determine the ability to talk to the students after giving the treatment.

5. The Technique of Data Analysis

The data will collect through the data analysis, the quantitative analysis employee statistical calculation to test the hypothesis. To analyze the data that is collected from pre-test and post-test, the following formula use in this article, they are:

- a. Scoring the result of the students test

The speaking scoring by using the scoring criteria level introduced by Heaton (1991) as follows:

- 1) The Scoring Classification for Accuracy

Table 2
Scoring Classification for Accuracy

Classification	Score	Criteria
Excellent	6	Only the mother tongue is influenced by pronunciation. The grammatical and lexical small broke two or three.
Very good	5	The pronunciation is slightly influenced by the mother tongue. A view of my life and the small errors lexical.
Good	4	Mother tongue is still highly influenced by pronunciation but no significant phonological mistakes. Some minor grammar and lexical mistake.

Average	3	Mother tongue-influenced pronunciation, just a few phonological errors. Some hey lexical judge and mistake, some of them confusing.
Poor	2	Pronunciation with a mother tongue with errors that cause communication breakdown seriously affected by mother tongue. A lot of syntax and lexical mistakes.
Very poor	1	No grammatical mistakes are as severe as simple grammar errors and a lexical mistake. One of the language skills and fields practiced in that course has not been proven.

2) Scoring Classification for Fluency

Table 3
Scoring Classification for fluency

Classification	Score	Criteria
Excellent	6	It's very extensive to talk comfortably over very long distances. Often searching for words with one or two not fair breaks.
Very good	5	I've been struggling to find the words. However, a smooth delivery across with just a few not fair breaks.
Good	4	Although he must try and find the words, there is not much of a pause that is not reasonable. Pretty smooth delivery.
Average	3	Sometimes fragmentary but succeed in conveying the general meaning. Often fragmentary and halting delivery. The distance expression is limited.
Poor	2	Long pause while he searches for the meaning desired. Often fragmentary and halting delivery. Almost given up making efforts on time limited expression.
Very poor	1	Full pause, which is not reasonable. Delivery very soft and fragmentary. At the time of surrender make

3) Scoring Classification for Comprehensibility

Table 4
Classification for Comprehensibility

Classification	Score	Criteria
Excellent	6	Easy for the listener to understand the intention of the speaker and the general meaning. Very few interruptions on the clarification.
Very good	5	The intention of the speaker and the general intent is clear enough. A few interruptions by the listener for the sake of clarification are necessary.
Good	4	Most of what speakers say is easy to follow. The goal is always clear but several interruptions are necessary to help him to convey a message or to seek clarification.
Average	3	The listener can understand a lot of what was said, but he must constantly seek clarification. Can't understand a lot of speakers a more complex or longer sentences.
Poor	2	Just a little bit (usually short sentences and phrases) can be understood and then with a great effort by someone

		who is listening to the speaker.
Very poor	1	Even when a listener makes a great effort or interrupts, the speaker can not clarify anything to say.

The score of the students

$$\text{Score} : \frac{\text{Students Score}}{\text{Total Score}} \times 100$$

b. Classifying the Students Score

Table 5
Classifying Students' Score

NO.	Clasification	Score
1	Excellent	87-100
2	Very Good	73-86
3	Good	59-72
4	Average	45-58
5	Poor	30-44
6	Very Poor	<30

Calculating the mean score, standard derivation, frequency table, and the value of *P*-value to identify the difference between pre-test and post-test by using inferential analysis in SPSS program for Windows evaluation version.

$$\frac{X}{Sd} \times N$$

Where :

X : mean

N : sample

Sd : standard derivation

Criteria of testing hypothesis, if *P*-Value >0,05 = *H*₀ will be accepted, *H*₁ will rejected. It means that there is no significance improvement. If *P*-Value <0,05, *H*₁ will be accepted, *H*₀ will rejected,. It means that there is a significance improvement.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

As described previously in the collection of data precisely in chapter 3, the writer conducted a test of the most beautiful and the post-posttest. A Pretest has been done before giving the

treatment while the posttest was conducted after giving the treatment, but with the same content and care.

1. The frequency of the students score of pre-test

Table 6
Students' Score of Pre-test

Classification	Score	Pre-test	
		F	%
Excellent	87-100	0	0
Very Good	73-86	0	0
Good	59-72	2	10
Average	45-58	8	40
Poor	30-44	10	50
Very Poor	<30	0	0
Total		20	100

The table is explained that the results of student pretest scores, including in the poor category of 10 (50%), the classification of the average category of 8 (40%) and the last classification of the good category of 2 (10%).

2. Classification the mean score students in pre-test

Table 7
Students' Mean Score

The Test	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Pre-test	48.50	6.778

3. Scoring classification of students post-test score

Table 8
Students' Score of Post-test

Classification	Score	Pre-test	
		F	%
Excellent	87-100	0	0
Very Good	73-86	0	0
Good	59-72	8	40
Average	45-58	12	60
Poor	30-44	0	0
Very Poor	<30	0	0
Total		20	100

The table is explained that the percentage and frequency of post-test students none of the students get the category of very poor, poor, very good and excellent. Where category good 8 (40%), and category average 12 (60%), and in table 8 it is explained that in the post-test almost increased.

4. Classification the mean score students in post-test

Table 9
Students' Mean Score

The Test	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Post-test	56.95	6.428

Based on table 9 above, the average results of students' oral capability in pretest was lower than posttest. The mean score in the pre-test was 48.50 while in the post-test 56.95.

5. Test of Significance (T-test)

The writer used SPSS program to analyze the test t. The goal is to determine whether there is a difference between the average value of students who are significant where $\alpha = 0.05$, degrees of freedom $(N-1) = 9$. The results of the calculation are shown as follows:

Table 10
Students' Mean Score

T-test Value	T-table
10.934	2.262

Based on the data above, it is explained that the results of students' scores on these findings, the writer using inferential statistics t-test with SPSS for Windows evaluation version to test the hypothesis. In the pre-test, the writer found that the value of t-test higher than t-table ($10.934 > 2.262$). Explaining that the H1 is accepted and H0 is rejected. Or at the level of significant of 0.05

Based on the findings of the SPSS before it is described that the oral capability of the students increased after the treatment, which is a program of immersion. As evidenced by the score of post-test is higher than the average value of the pre-test ($56.95 > 48.50$). It means from level of the poor to a good level.

In addition, based on previous data, students' oral capability after the treatment make a significant difference, where students who use the program immersion has a higher score than students who did not use the program of immersion in learning. As evidenced by the average score on the post test-(56.95) higher than pre-test (48.50).

Guoqiang Liao (2009). Entitled "Improving speaking skill through the skills Interaksinasi" stated that the choice of topic was determined by the fact that very little attention has been given to the ability of talking among the students during the previous years. As a result, students have developed barriers against the use of the target language which has a negative impact on the performance of their oral. Shaban Barimani (2013) states that English is taught as a foreign language in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Although the government is gradually trying to integrate the teaching of English in all classes: middle, Middle and elementary, learning English is still limited and needs to be further developed. This essay is a brief review of bilingualism in Saudi education. Most of the methods are especially formed and try to teach a second or foreign language in isolation. Since the 1960s the programs of the marinade version of the communicative approach has been innovated which is basically meaning oriented and unlike the old methods, trying to teach a second/foreign language in integrative.

Based on the above explanation, According to experts, the use of the program total immersion gives the change in the oral capability of the students. Even so with the study conducted by researchers, there are changes in the speaking skill of students.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Based on the findings of the SPSS before it is described that the oral capability of the students increased after the treatment, which is a program of immersion. As evidenced by the score of post-test is higher than the average value of the pre-test ($56.95 > 48, 50$). This means from level of the poor to a good level.

In addition, based on previous data, students' oral capability after the treatment make a significant difference, where students who use the program immersion has a higher score than students who did not use the program of immersion in learning. As evidenced by the average score on the post test-(56.95) higher than pre-test (48.50).

Guoqiang Liao (2009). Entitled "Improving speaking skill through the skills Interaksinasi" stated that the choice of topic was determined by the fact that very little attention has been given to the ability of talking among the students during the previous years. As a result, students have developed barriers against the use of the target language which has a negative impact on the performance of their oral.

Shaban Barimani (2013) states that English is taught as a foreign language in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Although the government is gradually trying to integrate the teaching of English in all classes: middle, Middle and elementary, learning English is still limited and needs to be further developed. This essay is a brief review of bilingualism in Saudi education.

Most of the methods are especially formed and try to teach a second or foreign language in isolation. Since the 1960s the programs of the marinade version of the communicative approach has been innovated which is basically meaning oriented and unlike the old methods, trying to teach a second/foreign language in integrative.

Based on the above explanation, According to experts, the use of the program total immersion gives the change in the oral capability of the students. Even so with the study conducted by researchers, there are changes in the speaking skill of students (Sadapotto, 2021; Ririantika, 2020; Rahman, 2020; Nurlaelah, 2020; Kasmawati 2020 & Syatriana, 2020).

Given the discovery and the discussion in chapter IV, the researcher would like to conclude that the level of nine of SMP Negeri 3 Panca Rijang, especially IX.2 classes have been improving the ability to speak them through a program of total immersion. It is evidenced by the average value of the test is high (56.95) than the value of the pre-test (48.50).

REFERENCES

- Andi Sadapotto, N. B. (2021). Ameliorate English Descriptive Writing Skill: Context Analysis. *Edumaspul: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 5, 258–265.
- Arikunto, Surhasimi. (2002). *prosedur penelitian suatu pendekatan teori dan praktek*. Jakarta Penerbit: Rineka Cipta.
- Barimani, S. (2013). On the Versatility of the Competence Acquired through Immersion Program. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, 3(8).
- Chen, Z. (2019). An Exploration of the Immersion English Teaching Model.
- Gay, T. (1981). Mechanisms in the control of speech rate. *Phonetica*, 38(1-3), 148-158.
- Graberg, S., Ylostalo, P., Wikland, M., & Karlsson, B. (1997). Endometrial sonographic and hystologic findings in women with and without hormone replacement therapy suffering from post menopausal bleeding. *Maturitas*, 27, 35-40.
- Heaton, J.B. (1991). *Writing English Language Tests*. UK: Longman.
- Kasmawati, K., & Sakkir, G. (2020). Improving Students Reading Comprehension Through “Survey, Question, Reading, Recite, Review (SQ3R)” Strategy. *Interference: Journal of*

Language, Literature, and Linguistics, 1(2), 92-99.

- Ladousse, A., & Tramier, B. (1991). Results of 12 years of research in spilled oil bioremediation: Inipol EAP 22. In *International Oil Spill Conference* (Vol. 1991, No. 1, pp. 577-581). American Petroleum Institute.
- Moleong, L.J. 2013. *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosda Karya.
- Nurlaelah, N., & Sakkir, G. (2020). Model Pembelajaran Respons Verbal dalam Kemampuan Berbicara. *Edumaspul: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 4(1), 113-122.
- Rahman, H., Sakkir, G., & Khalik, S. (2020). Audio-Lingual Method to Improve Students's Speaking Skill at Smp Negeri 1 Baranti. *La Ogi: English Language Journal*, 6(1), 15-21.
- Ririantika, R., Usman, M., Aswadi, A., & Sakkir, G. (2020). Penerapan Model Pembelajaran Tipe "Make A Match" Terhadap Hasil Belajar Bahasa Indonesia Siswa Kelas VIII SMP Negeri 1 Baranti Kabupaten Sidenreng Rappang. *Cakrawala Indonesia*, 5(1), 1-6.
- Sadapotto, A., & Bisse, N. (2021). The Upshot of Key Words Technique: Descriptive Writing of English Learners. *Edumaspul: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 5(1), 266-278.
- Sakkir, G., Dollah, S., & Ahmad, J. (2020). Favorite E-Learning Media in Pandemic Covid-19 Era. *Jurnal Studi Guru dan Pembelajaran*, 3(3), 480-485.
- Sakkir, G., Dollah, S., & Ahmad, J. (2021). E-Learning in COVID-19 Situation: Students' Perception. *EduLine: Journal of Education and Learning Innovation*, 1(1), 9-15.
- Sakkir, G., Dollah, S., Arsyad, S., & Ahmad, J. (2021). Need Analysis for Developing Writing Skill Materials Using Facebook for English Undergraduate Students. *International Journal of Language Education*, 5(1), 542-551.
- Sakkir, G., Zulfirman, Z., Mahmud, N., & Ahmad, J. (2020). Improving speaking ability using English" Shock Day" approach. *International Journal of Humanities and Innovation (IJHI)*, 3(2), 56-59.
- Syatriana, E., & Sakkir, G. (2020). Implementing Learning Model Based on Interactive Learning Community for EFL Students of Muhammadiyah University. *ELT Worldwide: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 7(1), 24-30.
- Thornbury, S. (2005). *How to teach speaking*. Pearson Longman.