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ABSTRACT

This classroom action research was aimed at improving students’ speaking skill on transactional / interpersonal text of class VII A SMP Negeri 1 Kedawung Kabupaten Cirebon through Talking Stick. The classroom action research used Kemmis and Taggart cycle model with 4 stages. The subject of the research were students of class VIIA with 43 students. The research as carried out from September- November 2015 with 2 cycles. The technique of data collection were performance test, performance, while for collecting teacher’ performance used observation and for collecting the data of students’ responses used questioner. To analyze data, data reduction-percentage- and simple calculation, data presentation , interpretation. The result showed that in general there was an improvement of classical learning mastery of students; speaking skill of transactional/interpersonal text about 35,36%. This was done by comparing each test on each treatment. The result of cycle 1 showed 19 students of VII A reached classical mastery of learning for about 79,54%. The average score of cycle 1 was 79 and the average score 2 was 81 with very good category. The data of students’ responses reached active criteria on cycle 1 and very good criteria on cycle 2. The teacher’s performance reached score 72 on cycle 1 with very good criteria, and 89 on cycle 2 with very good criteria. Based on the gained data, it can be said that the research had achieved its target and the improvement of students’ speaking skill on transactional /interpersonal text of class VII A of SMP Negeri 1 Kedawung kabupaten Cirebon through Talking Stick was successful.
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Sari

Penelitian Tindakan Kelas ini bertujuan untuk meningkatkan keterampilan berbicara teks transaksional/interpersonal siswa kelas VII A SMP Negeri 1 Kedawung Kabupaten Cirebon melalui Talking Stick. Penelitian Tindakan Kelas ini menggunakan model siklus Kemmis and Taggart dengan 4 tahapan. Subjek penelitian ini adalah siswa kelas VII A yang berjumlah 43 orang. Penelitian ini dilaksanakan dari bulan September- November 2015 meliputi 2 siklus. Teknik pengumpulan data adalah dengan menggunakan tes unjuk kerja, kusioner,dan observasi. Untuk mendapatkan data hasil belajar siswa digunakan tes unjuk kerja, sedangkan untuk mengumpulkan data kinerja guru digunakan observasi dan untuk memperoleh data respon siswa terhadap
Introduction

Speaking is a communicative activity in which people share their information or ideas (Beverly, 1999). Speaking is one of the language skills that should be learnt by the students at school (Misdi, 2010). In this competency, students must be able to express their thought or ideas or carry out a communication with other people (BNSP, 2006; Depdiknas, 2005). However, in reality speaking skill is still regarded to be difficult by the students to carry out. In this case, a lot of students faced difficulties in carrying out a conversation and expressing their ideas. This happened to the students of class VII A of SMPN 1 Kabupaten Cirebon. In carrying out the learning of transactional/interpersonal text of asking/giving information, saying thank you, asking for apology, and saying politeness of KD 3.3, students seem confused to compose and perform a dialogue about those materials. The students found difficulties in choosing the suitable words or expression in delivering the conversation. Therefore, it is not surprised their speaking skill achievement were not good (Furqanul & Alwasilah, 1996). Meanwhile, the passing grade or minimal mastery criteria was 80 and the classical learning mastery was 75%. Consulting these criteria, a lot of students still got the score under the targeted passing grade score, and the classical learning mastery still far from the target.
Referring the fact above, that teaching learning activity was regarded to be unsuccessful in achieving its learning target. This was because of some factors, such as the lack of students’ vocabulary mastery, teaching method that seemed unfit with the students’ condition and situation, teaching media that perhaps did not attract student’s interest and attention.

Considering the explanation above, the writer decided to have remedial teaching for this material. After having discussion with some fellow teachers, the writer decided to carrying the teaching and learning of KD 3.3 on speaking skill of transactional/interpersonal text of asking/giving information, saying thank you, asking for apology, and saying politeness through ‘Talking Stick’. This learning model was regarded to be suitable with the condition and situation of students of class VIIA as it gave more opportunity to the students express their ideas and creates joy among the students in learning that material. The writer hope that this remedial teaching by using Talking stick improve students’ speaking skill achievement, increase students’ participation in taking turn in expressing ideas and give a new atmosphere in learning English.

**METHODS**

This research took a classroom action research from Rahman (2004) and Zaenal (2006) as a method, which took cycle model with 4 stages. They are; 1) Planning, 2) Implementation, 3) Evaluation and observation, 4) Reflection. This action research was selected as one of the teacher’ reflective practices (Misdi, 2016).

The research was carried out at class VIIA of SMPN 1 Kabupaten Cirebon Kedawung – Kabupaten Cirebon, on – Jalan Cideng Raya Jaya in academic year 2015-2016 semester 1 which consisted of 44 students. The data was collected by using 1) speaking test, 2) observation, and 3) questionnaire. The technique of the data analysis was a simple calculation, by finding out the average score of the test, addition and multiplication.

To know whether the research met the target or not, the writer set up the indicators and criteria, as follows; 1) 80% of the students have passed the KKM, 2) the average of the
speaking skill was 80 and 3) the students’ participation was good, and the teacher’s performance reached good criteria.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION
The treatment of cycle 1 was carried out on 14 and 16 September 2015. While the evaluation was done on 21 and 23 September 2015, with the data as follows; 1) only 19 students - 44.18%, passed the KKM, 2) the average score was 74.30, the teacher’s performance score was 72 and the students’ questionnaire result was 301. From the gained data, it can be known that the research had not met its target. Therefore, the research continued to give the next treatment with some improvement, like revising the RPP, using ICT, providing more exercises of the learned expressions and opportunities. Meanwhile, the second cycle of the treatment was carried on 3 and 5 October 2015. The evaluation was taken place on 19 and 21 October 2015.

The result of the second cycle was; 1) 35 students—79, 54% students had passed the KKM, 2) the average score of the test was 81 which supported by the increase of the speaking skill aspect, 3) teacher’s performance score was 89 with very good criteria, 4) students’ questionnaire score reached 344 with active criteria. The reflection of cycle 2 stated that there was an improvement on students’ learning achievement, besides students were more active in doing the task of speaking skill, students’ eagerness and motivation also increased. Since the target of the research had been met, the research decided not to continue the treatment.

The results of students’ achievement on speaking skill both in cycle 1 and 2 can be explained as follows:

1. There were 25 students did not pass the KKM and 19 students had passed the KKM in cycle 1
2. In cycle 2, there were 35 students had passed the KKM - 79, 54% and the students who did not pass the KKM were about 9 students.
From the graph below, it can be known that there was an improvement on students’ achievement. This can be said that the target had been achieved. Here are some graphics which showed the gained data both in cycle 1 and 2.

![Graphic 4.1 KKM achievement on cycle 1 and 2](image)

From the data above, we know that the achievement had been increased. We know that in cycle 2 there were about 79.54% of the students had passed the KKM, while the target was only 75%. Regarding this data, it can be known that there were about 4.54% increase or improvement of the students’ achievement. This can be said that, the research had met its target.

Viewing the data from the point of average score of the student’s speaking skill achievement, it can be known that in cycle 1, the writer got 74 as the average score of the speaking skill with ‘good’ criteria, while in cycle 2 the writer got the average score 81 with ‘good’ criteria. The data can be illustrated in the graph below.

![Graph 4.2 The average score on student’s speaking skill achievement in cycle 1 and 2](image)
Considering the data above, there was also increase on the student’s average score. The target was 80, while the achievement was 81. It meant that there was an improvement, and it can be said that the research had met its target.

From the point of view of aspects of the speaking skill, the data can be explained as follows, in cycle 1, the aspect of grammar reached 568, the vocabulary reached 619, the content reached 720, the comprehension 627, and the intonation 661. While in cycle 2, the data can be exposed as the following; the grammar reached 635. The vocabulary reached 700, the content of the speaking reached 728, the comprehension reached 683, and the intonation reached 743. The gained data can be shown in the following table.

| Aspect/cycle | Grammar | Vocabulary | Content | Comprehension | Intonation |
|--------------|---------|------------|---------|---------------|------------|
| Cycle 1      | 568     | 619        | 720     | 627           | 661        |
| cycle 2      | 635     | 700        | 728     | 683           | 743        |

The data above can be illustrated in the graph as follows.

![Graphic 4.3: The achievement of the speaking skill aspect in cycle 1 dan 2](image)

From the graph above, it can be known that there was an improvement on each aspect of the speaking skill. It can be said that student’s comprehension and knowledge of the speaking skill aspect had been increased. This achievement supports the students’ achievement on the speaking test.
Meanwhile, from the questionnaire, the data can be summarized as follow; in cycle 1, it can be gained 301 of the ‘yes’ answer - 68.40% with active criteria, while the answer of ‘no’ got 344 or 78.18% with active criteria. The data can be displayed in graph 4.4.

Graph 4.4: Student’s questionnaire result in cycle 1 dan 2

Referring the data above, it can be said that the students’ questionnaire result had increased from cycle 1 to cycle 2. It can be know that the improvement was about 9.78%. Based on the questionnaire result above, it can said that the indicator of the research had met its target.

From the point of view of the score average, it can be know that it had met its target. This can be know from the average score of cycle 1 and cycle 2 which got 1 as the difference (81-80). While the result of teacher’s observation, it can be attained 17 point of the difference, in which in cycle 1 got 72 point with very good criteria and in cycle 2 got 89 point with very good criteria. This showed that the target had also met its target.

Graph 4.5: Teacher’s observation based on RPP

Considering the data above, it showed the improvement of students’ achievement in cycle 1 and 2, and the achievement of the learning mastery which was about 79% with the average score 81. The result of the questionnaire showed that the students were active in
following the activities. In addition, the teacher’s performance observation also suggests very good performance. Thus, the learning activities was concluded that both students and the teacher were able to reach the learning target successfully because the contextual way was established as said by Amas & Endah (2004). Therefore, she stopped not to do the next cycle.

CONCLUSION
Based on the data had been analyzed, it can be drawn the conclusion as follows; (1) Students’ speaking skill or learning mastery which at first was low (44.18%) improved gradually at the end of the research, which was 79.54%. It means that there was an improvement about 35.36%. This was supported by the result of the questionnaire that reached active criteria. Teacher’s performance observation also reached very good criteria. Thus, it can be said talking stick learning model can improve students’ speaking skill on transactional/interpersonal text of asking, giving information, saying politeness of class VII A SMPN 1 Kedawung kabupaten Cirebon. (2) Students’ speaking skill on transactional/interpersonal text of asking and giving information, saying politeness of VII A SMPN 1 Kedawung kabupaten Cirebon through talking stick learning model got an improvement 7 point in the average score with very good criteria in cycle 2.
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