

ARTICLE APPROVAL SHEET

**STUDENTS' IMPROMPTU SPEECH AT ENGLISH VAGANZA COMPETITION
ORGANIZED BY UNIVERSITY OF PASIR PENGARAIAN**


**Intended to fulfil one of the requirements for the awards of Sarjana Degree in English
Study Program**

Approved in Pasir Pengaraian on Thursday, February 02nd 2017

By :



Pipit Rahayu, M.Pd
Advisor I



Andri Donal, M.Pd
Advisor II

The Head of English Study Program
FKIP UPP



STUDENTS' IMPROMPTU SPEECH AT ENGLISH VAGANZA COMPETITION ORGANIZED BY UNIVERSITY OF PASIR PENGARAIAN

Feni Almaida Choiria^{*)}, Pipit Rahayu¹⁾, Andri Donal¹⁾

^{1&2)} English Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of Pasir Pengaraian
Hp: 082285368182 Email : fenny.almaida@gmail.com

ABSTRAK

Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk menemukan bagaimana kemampuan siswa dalam menyampaikan pidato secara langsung dalam perlombaan English Vaganza yang diselenggarakan oleh Universitas Pasir Pengaraian. Jenis penelitian ini adalah deskriptif kuantitatif. Sample penelitian ini adalah dari siswa yang mengikuti lomba tersebut berjumlah 19 orang. Cara pengambilan data tersebut melalui video rekaman. Ada beberapa indikator penyampaian pidato secara langsung; yaitu isi dan penyampaian. Berdasarkan hasil penelitian disimpulkan bahwa tingkat penyampaian pidato secara langsung siswa dalam perlombaan English Vaganza adalah lumayan baik dengan persentase 2,3 %

Kata kunci : pidato secara langsung, perlombaan English Vaganza, penelitian kuantitatif

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the research was to find out how is the students' impromptu speech at English Vaganza Competition organized By University of pasir Pengaraian. This research was descriptive kuantitatif. Sample of this research was students who join the competition that 19 students. The data was taken from video. In analyzing the data, there were some indicators of impromptu speech; they are content and delivery. Based on the result of the analysis, it can be concluded that the students' impromptu speech at English Vaganza Competition are fair with the percentages was 2.3 %

Keywords : impromptu speech, English Vaganza Competition, Quantitative research

INTRODUCTION

English is an international language that used as a tool of communication not only for the students, but also for a businessman and people who have a job in other countries. English is also as a foreign language in Indonesia and English has been introduced to students started from Basic Education or Elementary school, Junior High School (SMP/MTS), Senior High School (SMA/MA/SMK) the last in University Students.

Indeed, the achievement of good speaking activity is when the people who interact can understand each other. Speaking is important for them to practice their capability and their understanding, how to send idea, and how to spell word well. In this case the students' experiences and interest are very needed to make the process of their understanding more easily. Some students in Senior High School are not able to practice English well. Some students still use their language as their family's habit or mother tongue language.

Sometimes, the students are not confident to practice their English in outside the class.

Moreover, impromptu speech in usual situation such as in front of the class is different in a competition. In competition, the students more enthusiastic in delivering competition. The students want to become the best participant or become the winner of the competition. Meanwhile, a competition can not become a place to practice in speaking, but the students can show up their ability in impromptu speech by ESSA (English Students Section Association) of University of Pasir Pengaraian. It can make students to be interested in studying English. Moreover, English Vaganza Competition have made a variation of competition about English. Such as: speech, debate, storytelling, drama, singing competition and so on. Especially for impromptu speech competition, students of Senior High School can explore his/ her ability in impromptu speech.

Based on that phenomenon, the researcher interested to conduct the research on the impromptu speech of senior high school students of Rokan Hulu who participate on impromptu speech competition in University of Pasir Pengaraian

METHODOLOGY

This research using descriptive quantitative, (woody:2008). Research was an intensive and purposeful search for knowledge and understanding of social and physical phenomena. Research was scientific activity undertaken to establish something, a fact, a theory, a principle or an application.

For the sample, the researcher choose all the participants who join on impromptu speech competition or using total sampling technique. It consists of 19 participants from 11 of Senior High School in Rokan Hulu. All of the participants became the object of this research, because the population is less tahn 100 people. According to Riduwan in (2015:20) states sample is a set of population to take the data and that can to represent of population. If population less than 100 people, take the all students.

In order to analyze the data, the reseacher used the following criteria :

Edie Wagner, (1968) in Professional Studies, is the coordinator and also collect rubrics and answer questions. Below are descriptions of some of the range. A score of 4 or 2 are in the middle. For #1, for example, a “4” would be “somewhat” clear; a “2” would be somewhat evident but not entirely.

Table 1 : Tracking purposes content

	High		Average		Low
States the purpose.	5	4	3	2	1
Organizes the content.	5	4	3	2	1
Supports ideas.	5	4	3	2	1
Incorporates stories and examples.	5	4	3	2	1
Summarizes the main idea(s).	5	4	3	2	1

Therefore, The indicator of the impromptu speech have 2 components, including delivery. Such as demonstrates awareness of listener’s needs, speaks clearly with appropriate vocabulary and information, uses tone, speed, and volume as tools, demonstrates complexity of vocabulary and thought, appears comfortable with audience.

Table 2 : Tracking purposes delivery

	High		Average		Low
Demonstrates awareness of listener’s needs.	5	4	3	2	1
Speaks clearly with appropriate vocabulary and information.	5	4	3	2	1
Uses tone, speed, and volume as tools	5	4	3	2	1
Demonstrates complexity of vocabulary and thought.	5	4	3	2	1
Appears comfortable with audience.	5	4	3	2	1

(Wagner, 1968)

Based on two indicators above, In tracking purpose, Edie Wagner explained that high score or point five is giving when the students can fulfill each of the indicator perfectly, middle high score or point four is giving when the students can fulfill each of the indicator well, but sometimes the students do a mistake. In average score or point three, will be got by the students when they can fulfill each of the indicator in middle or standart of assessment. Therefore, middle low score or point two is giving when the students can fulfill each of indicators in average but sometimes the students do a mistake, and low score or point one is giving when the students can not fulfill each of the indicator well.

Table 3: range of the score

No	Level	Range	Letter
1	Very good	3.5 – 4.0	A
2	Good	2.5 – 3.49	B
3	Fair	1.5 – 2.49	C
4	Poor	<1.5	D

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Students’ Impromptu Speech at English Vaganza Competition Organized By University of Pasir Pengaraian

There are two aspects in scoring system of students’ impromptu speech at English Vaganza Competition in University of Pasir Pengaraian. They are content and delivery. In content, there are 5 criteria such as students should states the purpose, organizes the content, supports ideas, incorporates stories and examples and summarizes the main idea(s). Therefore, in delivery have 5 criteria such as demonstrates awareness of listener’s needs, speaks clearly with appropriate vocabulary and information, uses tone, speed, and

volume as tools. Demonstrates complexity of vocabulary and thought, the last appears comfortable with audience.

Table 4 : Percentage of the students in stating the purpose

No	Level	Range	Frequency	Percentage %
1	Very good	3.5 – 4.0	5	26.3 %
2	Good	2.5 – 3.49	7	36.9 %
3	Fair	1.5 – 2.49	5	26.3 %
4	Poor	<1.5	2	10.5 %
Total Score			19	100 %

Based on the table 4, five (5) students have percentage 26.3 % the level is very good in range between 3.5 – 4.0. Than, seven (7) students have percentage 36.9 % the level good in range between 2.5 – 3.49. five (5) students have percentage 26.3 % the level is fair in range between 1.5 – 2.49 and two (2) students have percentage 10.5 % the level is poor in range <1.5.

Table 5 : Percentage of the students in organizing the content

No	Level	Range	Frequency	Percentage %
1	Very good	3.5 – 4.0	4	21.1 %
2	Good	2.5 – 3.49	6	31.6 %
3	Fair	1.5 – 2.49	7	36.8 %
4	Poor	<1.5	2	10.5 %
Total Score			19	100 %

Based on the table 5, four (4) students have percentage 21.1 % the level is very good in range between 3.5 – 4.0. Than, six (6) students have percentage 31.6 % the level good in range between 2.5 – 3.49. seven (7) students have percentage 36.8 % the level is fair in range between 1.5 – 2.49 and two (2) students have percentage 10.5 % the level is poor in range <1.5.

Table 6 : Percentage of the students in supporting idea(s)

No	Level	Range	Frequency	Percentage %
1	Very good	3.5 – 4.0	3	15.8 %
2	Good	2.5 – 3.49	5	26.3 %
3	Fair	1.5 – 2.49	9	47.4 %
4	Poor	<1.5	2	10.5 %
Total score			19	100 %

Based on the table 6, three (3) students have percentage 15.8 % the level is very good in range between 3.5 – 4.0. Than, five (5) students have percentage 26.3 % the level good in range between 2.5 – 3.49. nine (9) students have percentage 47.4 % the level is fair in range between 1.5 – 2.49 and two (2) students have percentage 10.5 % the level is poor in range <1.5.

Table 7 : Percentage of the students in incorporating stories and examples

No	Level	Range	Frequency	Percentage %
1	Very good	3.5 – 4.0	2	10.5 %
2	Good	2.5 – 3.49	6	31.6 %
3	Fair	1.5 – 2.49	9	47.4 %
4	Poor	<1.5	2	10.5 %
Total score			19	100 %

Based on the table 7, two (2) students have percentage 10.5 % the level is very good in range between 3.5 – 4.0. Than, six (6) students have percentage 31.6 % the level good in range between 2.5 – 3.49. nine (9) students have percentage 47.4 % the level is fair in range between 1.5 – 2.49 and two (2) students have percentage 10.5 % the level is poor in range <1.5.

Table 8 : Percentage of the students in summarizing the main idea (s)

No	Level	Range	Frequency	Percentage %
1	Very good	3.5 – 4.0	5	26.3 %
2	Good	2.5 – 3.49	2	10.5 %
3	Fair	1.5 – 2.49	8	42.1 %
4	Poor	<1.5	4	21.1 %
Total score			19	100 %

Based on the table 8, five (5) students have percentage 26.3 % the level is very good in range between 3.5 – 4.0. Than, two (2) students have percentage 10.5 % the level good in range between 2.5 – 3.49. Eight (8) students have percentage 42.1 % the level is fair in range between 1.5 – 2.49 and four (4) students have percentage 21.1 % the level is poor in range <1.5.

Table 9 : Percentage of the students in demonstrating awareness of listener's Needs

No	Level	Range	Frequency	Percentage %
1	Very good	3.5 – 4.0	4	21.1 %
2	Good	2.5 – 3.49	4	21.1 %
3	Fair	1.5 – 2.49	8	42.1 %
4	Poor	<1.5	3	15.8 %
Total score			19	100 %

Based on the table 9, four (4) students have percentage 21.1 % the level is very good in range between 3.5 – 4.0. Than, four (4) students have percentage 21.1 % the level good in range between 2.5 – 3.49. eight (8) students have percentage 42.1 % the level is fair in range between 1.5 – 2.49 and three (3) students have percentage 15.8 % the level is poor in range <1.5.

Table 10 : Percentage of the students in speaking clearly with appropriate vocabulary and information

No	Level	Range	Frequency	Percentage %
1	Very good	3.5 – 4.0	4	21.1 %
2	Good	2.5 – 3.49	5	26.3 %
3	Fair	1.5 – 2.49	7	36.8 %
4	Poor	<1.5	3	15.8 %
Total score			19	100 %

Based on the table 10, four (4) students have percentage 21.1 % the level is very good in range between 3.5 – 4.0. Than, five (5) students have percentage 26.3 % the level good in range between 2.5 – 3.49. seven (7) students have percentage 36.8 % the level is fair in range between 1.5 – 2.49 and three (3) students have percentage 15.8 % the level is poor in range <1.5.

Table 11 : Percentage of the students in using tone, speed and volume as tools

No	Level	Range	Frequency	Percentage %
1	Very good	3.5 – 4.0	1	5.3 %
2	Good	2.5 – 3.49	7	36.8 %
3	Fair	1.5 – 2.49	9	47.4 %
4	Poor	<1.5	2	10.5 %
Total score			19	100 %

Based on the table 11, one (1) student have percentage 5.3 % the level is very good in range

between 3.5 – 4.0. Than, seven (7) students have percentage 36.8 % the level good in range between 2.5 – 3.49. nine (9) students have percentage 47.4 % the level is fair in range between 1.5 – 2.49 and two (2) students have percentage 10.5 % the level is poor in range <1.5.

Table 12 : Percentage of the students in demonstrating complexity of thought and vocabulary

No	Level	Range	Frequency	Percentage %
1	Very good	3.5 – 4.0	3	15.8 %
2	Good	2.5 – 3.49	4	21.1 %
3	Fair	1.5 – 2.49	8	42.1 %
4	Poor	<1.5	4	21.1 %
Total score			19	100 %

Based on the table 12, three (3) students have percentage 15.8 % the level is very good in range between 3.5 – 4.0. Than, four (4) students have percentage 21.1 % the level good in range between 2.5 – 3.49. Eight (8) students have percentage 42.1 % the level is fair in range between 1.5 – 2.49 and four (4) students have percentage 21.1 % the level is poor in range <1.5.

Table 13 : Percentage of the students in appearing comfortable with audience

No	Level	Range	Frequency	Percentage %
1	Very good	3.5 – 4.0	3	15.8 %
2	Good	2.5 – 3.49	4	21.1 %
3	Fair	1.5 – 2.49	10	52.6 %
4	Poor	<1.5	2	10.5 %
Total score			19	100 %


Based on the table 13, three (3) students have percentage 15.8 % the level is very good in range between 3.5 – 4.0. Than, four (4) students have percentage 21.1 % the level good in range between 2.5 – 3.49. ten (10) students have percentage 52.6 % the level is fair in range between 1.5 – 2.49 and two (2) students have percentage 10.5 % the level is poor in range <1.5.

Table 14. Percentage of total score students' impromptu speech at English Vaganza Competition in University of Pasir Pengaraian

NO	Level	Range	Frequency	Percentage %
1	Very good	3.5 – 4.0	4	21.1 %
2	Good	2.5 – 3.49	4	21.1 %
3	Fair	1.5 – 2.49	8	42.0 %
4	Poor	<1.5	3	15.8 %
Total score			19	100 %

Based on the table 14, the result of students' impromptu speech at English Vaganza Competition in University of Pasir Pengaraian, 4 students have percentage 21.1 the range between 3.5 – 4.0, 4 students have percentage 21.1 % the range between 2.5 – 3.49. Than, 8 students have percentage 42.0 % the range between 1.5 – 2.49 and 3 students have percentage <1.5. From the data in the table of the result the students' impromptu speech at English Vaganza Competition, the researcher give more explanation clearly in diagram.

Diagram 1 : total score students' impromptu speech at English Vaganza Competition in University of Pasir Pengaraian



In this diagram, it can be seen that, after the researcher conclude all the indicator of impromptu speech in students' impromptu speech at English Vaganza Competition almost the same between very good and good. It consist 4 students both of the levels. But there are 8 students have level fair and 3 students have poor level. So, from the result above the researcher conclude that students' impromptu speech at English Vaganza Competition in University of Pasir Pengaraian is fair. It means that almost the students who join in impromptu speech competition still low in impromptu speech.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Based on the data percentage in finding and discussion the researcher concluded that the students' impromptu speech at English Vaganza Competition in University of Pasir Pengaraian was fair level in 2016. Almost all of the students had difficulties in content have states the purpose, organizes the content, supports ideas, incorporates stories and examples, summarizes the main idea(s). Meanwhile, in delivering have demonstrates awareness of listener's needs, speaks clearly with appropriate vocabulary and information, uses tone, speed, and volume as tools, demonstrates complexity of vocabulary and thought, appears comfortable with audience when delivering impromptu speech.

It means that the students who join in impromptu speech competition at English Vaganza Competition in University of Pasir Pengaraian had fair level in delivering impromptu speech. 4 students (21.1 %) had the very good level. 4 students (21.1 %) had the good level. 8 students (42.0 %) had the fair level and 3 students (15.8 %) had the poor level.

Finally, the researcher would like to give some useful suggestions to the following person who have show more attention to deliver an impromptu speech in a competition or in front of public and the students. They are in following :

1. The students of senior high school who join in impromptu speech at English Vaganza Competition.
The students should have an English learning experience in improving impromptu speech. By using good method and comprehension in some indicators, the students can show up their ability confidently.
2. The English teachers of Rokan Hulu
The teacher more intent to give some information about indicators of assessment in impromptu speech when the students want to deliver their topics. The teacher also can help to increase student's confidence by giving comprehension in impromptu speech and give them an opportunity to perform well in a competition. The teacher should give motivation and good learning process in relaxing condition in order to reduce problems, therefore they can enjoy the joyful learning.
3. The students of English Departmen in University of Pasir Pengaraian
The English students should have one of considerable sources or reading materials either to enrich their reference in speaking thesis especially an impromptu speech or to improve the knowledge of the aspects of impromptu

speech and they can use this thesis as a source as possible.

4. The researcher

This research is hopeful give the contribution to other researchers to do the next research. It can be a guiden for the next reseracher in their thesis especially in speaking skill. It can give more attention to the researcher when doing the research in speaking because many aspect can include in the research to be analyze.

BIBLIOGRAPY

Ardito, giuliana.2008. *The systematic use of impromptu speeches in training interpreting students*. University of Trieste retrieved 9-26-2016

Brown, Douglas. 2000. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. 4th Edition. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.

Brown, H. D. & Abeywickrama, P. 2010. Language assessment: principles and classroom prac-tice (2nd ed.). New York: Pearson Education Inc.

Clark, C.1977. The progress of a study identifying the speaking and communication skills of college graduates. In S.Morreale & M. Brooks (Eds.), *1994 NCA summer conference proceedings and prepared remarks: Assessing college student competency in speech communication* (pp.51 54).Washington, D.C.: National Communication Association

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. 2005. *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (Third ed.), California: Sage Publication.

Enkvist N.L.1982 (ed): *Impromptu speech: A Symposium*, Åbo, Åbo Akademi.

Goffman, E.1981: *Forms of talk*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.

Harmer, Jeremy.2001. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. London: Longman

Harmer, Jeremy, *the Practice of English Language Teaching*, Pearson Education limited England, 2002, 3rd Ed.

Harris, David P.1969.*Testing English as a Second Language*, Georgetown University.

Heaton. 1978.*Writing English Language Test* . London: Longman.

Henderson. D. 1982. *Impromptu Speaking As A Tool To Improve Non-Native Speakers' Fluency In English*. ELS Language Centers Wagner College, NYC. Jalt journal, VOLUME 4. Retrived September 24th 2016

Hornby, A S, Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary of Current English, NY: Oxford University Press, 2000, 6th Ed.

Irwandi.2015. *An Analysis on the third semester students' speaking skill in delivering impromptu speech at English study program in University of Pasir Pengaraian*. Universitas Pasir Pengarain

Kavaliauskiene, Galina. 2013. *Ongoing Research Into Speaking Skills*. English for Specific Purposes World, ISSN 1682-3257. Mykolas Romeris University.

Kayi, Hayriye. 2006. *Teaching Speaking: Activities to Promote Speaking in a Second Language*. The Internet TESL Journal 7 (11).<http://iteslj.org/Techniques/KayiTeachingSpeaking.html> (retrieved on Agustus 22nd, 2016).

Knight, B.1992. *Assessing speaking skills: a workshop for teacher development*. ELT Journal, 46(3), 294–302.

Kopczynski A.1982."Effects of some characteristics of impromptu speech on conference interpreting, in *Impromptu speech: A symposium*. Ed. by N.L. Enkvist, Åbo, Åbo Akademi, pp. 255-266.

Lehtonen J.1982."Non verbal aspects of impromptu speech" in *Impromptu speech: A symposium*. Ed. by N.L. Enkvist, Åbo, Åbo Akademi, pp. 33-45.

Luoma, Sari.2004. *Assessing speaking*. Cambridge: Cambri-dge University Press.

Nunan, David, *Research Method In Language Learning*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Randy, C.Martin.2009. *Impromptu speech*. Nfl retrived 10-22-2016

Rubin, R. B. 1982a.Assessing speaking and listening competence at the college level:The communication competency assessment instrument. *Communication Education*, 31, 19-32.

