How the Buzz Group Technique Affects Students' Speaking Skill

Veranika Dewi Panca Hotmarito Manalu, Hanifah, Elsa Ernawati Nainggolan
English Language Education Study Program, Universitas Maritim Raja Ali Haji,
Tanjungpinang, Indonesia.
English Language Education Study Program, Universitas Maritim Raja Ali Haji,
Tanjungpinang, Indonesia.
English Language Education Study Program, Universitas Maritim Raja Ali Haji,
Tanjungpinang, Indonesia.
Corresponding email: veranika.manalu@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this research was to see how the buzz group technique affected students' speaking skills in hortatory exposition. The study's design was quasi-experimental, there are one group experimental and one group control class include pre-test, post-test and treatment. The population of this study was eleventh grade students, with 74 individuals drawn from two classrooms. In this study, the researcher used a speaking test as the instrument of this research. Data analysis found that buzz group technique has affected to the students' speaking skill. This was discovered by data calculated using the samples T-test procedure. The statistics clearly showed that Sig. 2 tailed was 0.000. The sig. 2 tailed 0.000 > 0.05 indicates that the Buzz Group Technique had an affected students' speaking skills in hortatory exposition material at SMA Negeri 4 Tanjungpinang. The researcher proposes that teachers utilize the buzz group technique to teach speaking since it has a considerable affected on students' speaking skills based on the data.

Keywords: Buzz Group Technique, Speaking Skill, Hortatory Exposition Text

I INTRODUCTION

One of the four English language skills that a language learner should master is speaking. Learning language does not mean just learning about structure and vocabulary, it also involves about how we use that language to communicate with others, how we speak and make others understand what we say, Rao (2019) said that speaking is the most critical ability for communicating effectively in today's global environment. Speaking is an ability that is used to convey to others human ideas, feelings, opitions, and toughts. By speaking, students also can share and exchange the ideas and easy to express what they feel, what they learnt, what they want, and interact to others orally. Therefore, have a good skill in speaking is important and must be mastered.

One of the hardest talents to develop is speaking, according to Zhang (2019). Students must be adept in a number of language skills before they may learn to speak, including grammar, vocabulary, fluency, understanding, and pronunciation. As a result, having good skill is difficult. There are many difficulties that students faced when learning speaking like students feel shy and unconfident when they are asked to speak up their mind and ideas, and they sometimes feel afraid of making mistakes while they speak English.

Based on the researcher's observation, most of the students in that school especially in eleventh grade still struggled with speaking english, On the basis of the typical score for speaking was 50. It means students' speaking skill were relatively low. There are multiple factors contributing to the difficulties students face in speaking English. Firstly, students often struggle to verbally convey their thoughts and opinions owing to uncertainty and fear of making mistakes. Secondly, students often have limited vocabulary, resulting in difficulties in finding the right words while speaking. Thirdly, students may feel bored with the teaching of speaking skills due to the lack of engaging techniques used by teachers. In many cases, teachers rely heavily on dialogues as the primary method of teaching speaking, which may not be sufficiently stimulating for the students.

To address this issue, the researcher used a technique known as the buzz group technique. This technique aids in the development of highly innovative solutions to a particular problem and allows students to convey their thoughts to others. Following a discussion within their respective groups, each group then shares their findings with the entire class, and also receiving feedback from other groups. This technique promotes active participation and enhances students' speaking skills by encouraging them to articulate their thoughts and engage in meaningful discussions with their peers.

Buzz group technique is highly regarded as an effective technique for teaching speaking skills because it provides students with ample time to practice their speaking abilities. As it stated by Jailani (2016), this technique allows students to engage in quick discussions within small groups on a particular theme, topic, or issue before they are required to speak in a public setting. This approach gives students the opportunity to gather their thoughts, gain confidence, and before presenting their ideas to the larger group, they should solicit input from their peers. The buzz group technique thus facilitates a more supportive and interactive learning environment, enhancing students' speaking proficiency. Odabasi and Kolburan (2013), stated that this technique cultivate amusing and interactive atmosphere but it also helps students to remember and keep knowledge in their mind and also can improve students speaking ability.

The researcher expected that this study would aid readers' comprehension. The students were evaluated by the researchers using hortatory exposition language. Hortatory exposition text is a sort of discourse that seeks to persuade or convince the audience to take a particular action or hold a particular point of view. It is used to explain, describe, inform, or transfer information

about a specific problem to the audience. The researcher devised a criteria for evaluating the students. By utilizing this technique, students can effectively convey their ideas, opinions, and recommendations to listeners or readers. This means that students can collaborate within their groups to discuss the thesis, arguments, and recommendations in hortatory exposition texts. Additionally, the researcher introduces various issues for discussion. As a result, students are able to present their arguments in front of the class and provide solutions to problems. Through this technique, students are encouraged to express their thoughts without hesitation or shyness, fostering a more confident and active speaking environment.

Apparently, Dr. Donald Philips of Michigan State University invented the buzz groups technique. He splits his large courses into six-person groups and assigns them to research a specific subject for a set period of time. This novel strategy immediately gained traction and was dubbed the "Phillips 66" technique on campus. The utilization of buzz groups has grown in popularity for fostering collaboration, active learning, and meaningful engagement among students. By providing opportunities for small group discussions, students can exchange ideas, share perspectives, and contribute to a collective understanding of the subject matter.

The researcher has recognized the benefits of the buzz group technique based on the explanation above in facilitating meaningful discussions and promoting student engagement and active learning. By providing students with the opportunity to contribute their ideas within smaller groups, it enhances their confidence and ability to express themselves when speaking in public settings. The buzz group technique was used in the previous research; the first was devised by Khampheng Sengbounthanh (2011) in which he discovered that the Buzz Groups technique dramatically increased students' speaking abilities and the teaching of speaking talents to students. The second was by Agustina (2017) who intended to determine the academics implementing buzz group in writing descriptive text. The third study was conducted by Pangaribuan (2017) in order to evaluate the affectivity buzz group approach in writing competence. The purpose of this study is to investigate how the buzz group technique affects students' oral communication abilities. An oral test was used by the researcher to gather data. The purpose of the outcome, in accordance with the study's objectives, is to ascertain whether or whether the buzz group technique affected students' speaking proficiency in hortatory exposition material.

II METHOD

The quantitative research methodology was applied in this research (Neuman, 2014). It is an approach aided by amount or quantity measurement. To put it another way, the researcher presents statistically aggregated data to back up the conclusions. This research used a quasi-experimental approach, with patients separated into two groups: experimental (those who received the treatment) and control (those who did not). The buzz group technique was employed as the independent variable, and students' speaking skill was used as the dependent variable. According to Creswell (2012), population is a group of humans, events, or things who have a common attribute or trait that separates them from other groups. The population in research refers to the overall group that the researcher want to analyze and draw conclusions about. It depicts the broader field of interest from which the sample was drawn.

The students were separated into two groups by the researchers: XI MIPA 6 (37 students) and XI MIPA 5 (37 students). The researchers used purposive sampling because the researcher selects individuals or groups to include in the sample based on their ability, knowledge, or unique features relevant to the research goals (Gay, 2020). In this study, the oral test was used to evaluate the students' speaking ability. The use of oral tests for both pre-test and

post-test is a suitable approach to assess students' speaking skills in hortatory exposition text. The pre-test helps to establish a baseline of students' abilities before implementing the treatment (Buzz Group Technique), and the post-test measures the affected of the treatment on students' speaking skills. The researcher examined the data using SPSS.29.

III RESULT

The research tought to determine the affected of the Buzz Group Technique on students' speaking abilities in hortatory exposition text. The researcher used speaking test was utilized to collect data, and it was administered in the form of a pre-test and a post-test. The pre-test was provided prior to the treatment, and the post-test was given afterward to assess the improvement in students' speaking skills. Before beginning treatment in the XI MIPA 6 class, the researcher administered a pre-test. Where the pre-tes was to make a hortatory exposition text. The researcher was provided several topics, student can choose one of the topics and they presented it. It provided the opportunity to identify students' prior knowledge prior to studying using the Buzz Group Technique. Following the pre-test, the experimental group was assigned treatment for two meetings. Each meeting is 90 minutes long. The T-test was implemented to compare the two groups' post-test findings.

According to the data that the researcher found, the highest pre-test score in the experimental class is 80, and the lowest is 50. The highest post-test score in the experimental class is 90, while the lowest score is 55. Meanwhile, the highest pre-test score in the control class is 75, and the lowest is 40. The highest post-test score in the control group is 80, while the lowest is 40.

The researcher evaluated the data after gathering the necessary data. The researcher reported that the experimental class's overall pre-test score was 2435 after the experimental class meeting, according to the pre-test value data. The pre-test average's range was 65.81. The median value was 65, and the standard deviation was 7.863. At the time, a 2760 post-test average was used. Average overall score for the post-test was 74.59. The median is 75, and the standard deviation is 9.081. The researcher determined the control class's overall pre-test score, which was 2065 based on the pre-test value data, as the control class meeting came to an end. Average pre-test results were 55.81. The median value was 55.00, while the standard deviation was 7.684. Meanwhile, the post-test total score was 2280. The post-test total score averaged 60.00. The median is 60.00 and the standard deviation was 10.073.

The score was determined while the hypothesis was being evaluated by the researchers using the independent sample T-test. Before performing the independent sample T-test, the researchers checked to make sure that the research's distribution was normal. The researchers evaluated the data's homogeneity and normality using the SPSS program.

The normality test determines whether or not the data from the experimental and control groups are regularly distributed. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was employed by the researcher to determine the data's normality. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test is a statistical test that compares a sample's distribution to a normal distribution.

Table 1. The Normality Test

Tests of Normality						
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Pre-Test	0.108	37	0.082	0.962	37	0.235
Post-Test	0.135	37	.200*	0.971	37	0.431
*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.						
a. Lilliefors Significance Correction						

According to the significance (P-values) found in Table 4.5, where both are 0.05, 0.082 > 0.05 for the pre-test and 0.200 > 0.05 for the post-test, the data from the students' speaking skill test is normally distributed.

The homogeneity test is used to assess whether the variances of the groups being compared are equal or not. In this research was measured by comparing the sig values obtained. Suppose the score value is sig. It can be said that H0 is accepted as more significant than 5% alpha significance (α = 0.05) or the same. This means that the variance is homogeneous. Testing the homogenity of the data using SPSS 29 program.

Table 2. Homogeneity Test

Test of Homogeneity of Variance					
		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Pre-Test Group	Based on Mean	2.587	1	72	0.112
	Based on Median	2.230	1	72	0.140
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	2.230	1	68.304	0.140
	Based on trimmed mean	2.576	1	72	0.113
Post-Test Group	Based on Mean	0.614	1	72	0.436
	Based on Median	0.498	1	72	0.483
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	0.498	1	71.281	0.483
	Based on trimmed mean	0.642	1	72	0.426

Based on the significance values presented in the table, both for the pre-test 0.112 > 0.05 and the post-test is 0.436 > 0.05. The statistics on students' speaking abilities in hortatory exposition text can be described as homogeneous.

The hypothesis test, more particularly the t-test, is a statistical technique that is used to compare the means of two groups and determine whether or not there is a difference between them. The t-test was employed in this example to compare the speaking test scores of the experimental class (taught using the Buzz Group Technique) with the control class (not taught with the Buzz Group Technique). The researcher utilized the SPSS 29 program to do a hypothesis t-test. The researcher used a hypothesis t-test with SPSS 29 program.

Before doing hypothesis testing, some assumptions must be checked to verify the validity and reliability of the results. Two common assumptions that need to be checked are normality and homogeneity of variance. After confirming that the data meet the assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variance, the t-test can be applied to students in the speaking

skills of students in the experimental and control groups after using the Buzz Group Technique. The significance threshold, also known as alpha (α), is usually set at 0.05 or 5%. If the p-value is less than or equal to 0.05 (p 0.05), the result is considered statistically affected.

Table 3. Independent Sample T-test

Independent Samples Test				
			Result of Students Speaking Skill	
			Equal variances assumed	Equal variances not assumed
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	F		.614	
	Sig.		.436	
t-test for Equality of Means	T		5.818	5.818
	Df		72	71.240
	Sig. (2- tailed)		.000	.000
	Mean Difference		12.973	12.973
	Std. Error Difference		2.230	2.230
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	Lower	17.418	17.418
		Upper	8.528	8.528

The statistical analysis in table 4.7 clearly demonstrates that the Sig. 2 tailed value is 0.000. Because this value is less than the significance level of 0.05, it indicates that the Buzz Group Technique affected students' speaking skills in hortatory exposition text, because the Sig.tailed 0.000 < 0.05, acceptance of the alternative hypothesis (Ha), and rejection of the null hypothesis (Ho).

IV DISCUSSION

Based on the data analysis results, the researcher found that implementing the Buzz Group Technique had affected on students' speaking skills. The mean score for both of these classes demonstrated this. The pre-test and post-test mean scores indicate the Buzz Group Technique's effectiveness. The experimental class's pre-test mean score was 65.81, whereas the post-test mean score was 74.59. The control group, on the other hand, had a pre-test mean score of 55.81 that increased moderately following the test to 61.62. The difference in mean scores demonstrates that the Buzz Group Technique has an impact on the language development of children. This finding is consistent with Lindsay's previous research and adds credence to the study.

The effective execution of the Buzz Group Technique during the research can be ascribed to the significant improvement in students' speaking scores in the experimental class. The researcher's use of the technique facilitated a conducive learning environment where students felt more comfortable expressing their ideas and opinions. This resulted in students being more actively engaged in discussions, asking and answering questions, and collaborating with their peers. The activities in the learning process were generally done in small groups. This allowed the low achievers to collaborate and work with the high achievers. The high achievers had no motive to leave the low achievers behind because the tasks they had demanded participation from every group member. However, the outcome could be considerably better if

group members encourage and motivate one another to establish a comfortable environment in their group.

The Buzz Group Technique proved to be an effective technique in encouraging students to explore and develop their arguments, ideas, and opinions. By working in small groups, students had ample opportunities to participate actively and share their thoughts without the pressure of speaking while students present. This increased their confidence in speaking English and gave them more freedom to express themselves. Barkley (2015), which supports the use of this technique as an alternative and effective approach in the speaking class. Buzz Group technique may be implemented to any course with some modifications, such as the sort of work assigned to students, the feedback and motivation offered by the teacher and group members to other group members, and the media used.

There were some advantages and disadvantages of buzz group technique on students speaking skill in hortatory exposition text, there are several advantages of buzz group technique: First, each student gets a chance to actively participate in discussions and express their thoughts and ideas. Second, students engage in active questioning and answering. They can ask clarifying questions, seek further information, and respond to their peers' inquiries. This process enhances their speaking skills by encouraging them to actively participate in the conversation. Third, students have the opportunity to use and expand their vocabulary, practice sentence structures, and improve their overall language proficiency. Last, students feel more comfortable expressing their opinions and ideas, leading to increased participation and engagement in speaking activities.

There are several disadvantages of buzz group technique: First, distractions and off-task behavior: In a buzz group, students may get distracted or engage in off-task behavior, particularly if the teacher is not closely monitoring the groups. This can hinder the effectiveness of the speaking practice and the learning process. Second, limited time for each student: In a group setting, time for each student to speak may be constrained, especially in larger groups. Some students may not get sufficient time to express their thoughts fully or practice speaking at length. Third, unequal participation: In some buzz groups, certain students may dominate the conversation, while others may remain passive. This can lead to unequal participation, with some students not getting enough opportunities to speak and practice their speaking skills.

The researcher discovered a difference in students' speaking scores between the experimental and control groups based on statistical analysis utilizing the independent sample t-test. The p-value (sig. 2-tailed) was less than 0.005, indicating that the difference in scores was not attributable to chance and was, in fact, affected. This technique has been demonstrated to address and decrease the issues that students experience when speaking. Students become more calm, involved, and active in their learning activities when they use the Buzz Group Technique, which leads to increased speaking skills. Because Buzz Group activities necessitate special attention from the teacher, the teacher should thoroughly prepare the activities. Students working in groups may encounter various difficulties when implementing Buzz Group; hence, careful observation is required.

V CONCLUSION

Based on the research data analysis results, the researcher found that, students, speaking skill in the experimental class had affected, while in the control class students speaking skill was not affected. This conclusion is drawn on a comparison of students' post-test scores in both classes. The post-test mean score for the experimental class was 74.59, while the post-test mean

score for the control class was 61.62. The experimental class's higher post-test mean score 74.59 compared to the control class's 61.62 reveals that students' who received Buzz Group Technique therapy outperformed those who did not. After being taught using the buzz group technique, the students' activity level increased. They could participate actively in the debate with their friends, whether in a small group (buzz group) or a large group (class discussion). Students gladly joined the session and participated in the entire activities of learning and improve students speaking skill utilizing the buzz group technique.

Based on the findings of hypothesis testing and data analysis, the researcher concludes that the Buzz Group Technique can be used effectively in teaching speaking classes. The Buzz Group Technique was used with positive outcomes for the students, who became more active, involved, and passionate about learning hortatory exposition literature as a result of this technique. As a result, the Buzz Group Technique has affected on students' speaking skill in hortatory exposition text at eleventh grade of SMA Negeri 4 Tanjungpinang.

REFERENCES

Anderson, T., & Dron, J. (2011). "Three generations of distance education pedagogy". *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 12(3), 80–97. https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v12i3.890*

Broughton, G., Brumfit, C., Flavell, R., Hill, P., & Pincas, A. (2014). "Teaching English as a Foreign Language*", New York: Rouletdge 180:2.*

Brown, H. D., & Lee, H. (2010). "Principles of Language Learning and Teaching Fourth Edition*". New York: Wesley Longman 426:26.*

Carter, R., & Nunan, D. (2002). "The Cambridge guide to teaching english to speakers of other languages". *ELT Journal, 56(1), 87–89. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/56.1.87*

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). "Case studies". *In Research Methods in Education (6ᵗʰ ed). New York: Routledge 143:45 https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315456539-19*

Creswell, J. W. (2012). "Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluting Quantitative and Qualitive Research 4th Edition". *Boston: Pearson. 167:89*

Daulay, S. H. Lubis, Y., Damanik, E. S. D., Wandini, R. R., & Putri, F. A. (2021). "Does Pictionary Game Effective for Students' Speaking Skill" *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics, 6(1), 13–25.*

Dirgeyasa, Wy. I. (2015). "What and How to Assess a Genre-Based Writing". *Proceeding of 4th International Conference on Language Education: English Language Teaching, 9(9), 45. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n9p45 State University of Makasar South Sulewesi Indonesia.*

Dörnyei, Z. (1994). "Motivation Foreign Language Motivating in Classroom the Foreign Language Classroom". *The Modern Language Journal, 78(3), 273–284*

Elizabeth F. Barkley. Claire Howell Major, and K. Patricia Cross. (2014). "Collaborative Learning Techniques: A Handbook for College Faculty, 2nd ed". *San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons 276:93*

Gay, L.R, Miles, G. E. and Airasian, P. (2011). "Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Applications. 10th Edition". *Pearson Education International, Boston 49(2): 243-72*

Jailani, A. (2016). Thesis: "The Effect of Using Buzz Group Method on Students' Motivation and Their Speaking Ability at Senior High School Level". *In Journal of Asian Islamic Higher Institutions (JAIHI): journal (Vol. 2, Issue 2). http://www.aiua.asia/*

Larsen-Freeman. (2015). "Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching". *New York: Oxford University Press. 2nd Edition 43(4), 343-375.*

Leong, L., & Ahmadi, S. M. (2017). "An Analysis of Factors Influencing Learners' English Speaking Skill". *International Journal of Research in English Education, 2(1), 34–41.*

Luhman. (2016). "The Effectiveness of Animation Video in Teaching Speaking to Junior High School". *Journal of English Language and Education 2(1):33.*

Maulana, D., Wahyuni, W. S., & Siregar, D. (2019). "The Correlation Between 85Motivation Behaviour and Speaking Ability". *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education), 1(2), 115.https://doi.org/10.22460/project.v1i2.p115-124*

Rivera Munoz, C. A., Baik, C., & Lodge, J. M. (2020). "Teacher and student interactions in the first year of university". *Journal of Further and HigherEducation, 44(8), 1130–1142. https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2019.1664731*

Smith, H., & Higgins, S. (2016). "Opening classroom interaction: The importance of feedback". *Cambridge: journal of education, 36(4), 485-502.* https://doi.org/10.1080/03057640601048357.

Ulan, D. A. (2017). "An Analysis of Classroom Interaction in the Teaching-Learning Process of Speaking at Tenth Grade Students of Smk Al-Husain Keling in the Academic Year of 2017/2018". *Jurnal Edulingua, Vol 4(2), 94-100.*