ANALYZING THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING CREATIVITY IN STUDENT SPEECH VIDEOS AT ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT OF IKIP PGRI BOJONEGORO

Singgih Prayogi[1], *Chyntia Heru Woro Prastiwi, M.Pd.*[2], *Oktha Ika Rahmawati, M.Pd.*[3]
[1]Fakultas Pendidikan Bahasa dan Seni, IKIP PGRI Bojonegoro
Singgihprayogi131@gmail.com
[2]Fakultas Pendidikan Bahasa dan Seni, IKIP PGRI Bojonegoro
Chyntia_heru@ikippgribojonegoro.ac.id
[3]Fakultas Pendidikan Bahasa dan Seni IKIP PGRI Bojonegoro
Oktha_ika@ikippgribojonegoro.ac.id

Abstract

This study aims to analyze speaking creativity using the principles of speaking creativity in English through speech. This study uses a qualitative descriptive analysis method. The data taken is data that has been carried out on the teaching materials of 1 lecturer for level I students of IKIP PGRI Bojonegoro in
2019/2020, 21 online data can be downloaded on the google classroom application.
Keywords: *Creativity speaking. Speech.*

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis kreativitas berbicara dengan menggunakan prinsip aspek kreativitas berbicara dalam bahasa inggris melalui cara pidato. Penelitian menggunakan kualitatif dengan metode analisis deskriptif. Data yang diambil merupakan data yang telah terlaksanakan dalam bahan ajar dosen pelajaran speaking 1 pada mahasiswa tingkat I IKIP PGRI Bojonegoro tahun 2019/2020, ada 21 data online dapat diunduh di aplikasi google classroom.
Kata kunci: *Kretivitas berbicara. Pidato.*

A. INTRODUCTION

In class, each mentor and student involve in the language of delivery of knowledge. Any teacher knowledge that is received can make a language learning which has an influence on students when their teachers deliver knowledge while in class. Students' language knowledge when the teacher conveys knowledge in learning can add knowledge to the vocabulary that the teacher has conveyed in class.

B. RESEARCH METHOD

This study using descriptive qualitative methods in the form of verbal words involving observed behaviors to produce a qualitative approach.

So that it requires researchers to get data in the field by means of distance learning with old data that has been done by speaking lecturers in the IKIP PGRI Bojonegoro. According to the lectures chart, they gave assignments to make a speech by vlogging each at home and then the students uploaded the video to google classroom.

C. RESEARCH RESULT

In terms of speech source, students who get point 1 are absent, point 2 have 5%, point 3 have 86% and point 4 have 10% of 21 students who do interaction class on google classroom. The results of this study tell us that 86% of the student population has reached the generally good criteria.

We also know that point 1 is 0%, point 2 is 14%, point 3 is 62%, point 4 is 29%. From these data the majority of students 62% of students Text of speech is very suitable with the topic of lecturers and a little elaboration although some students can master with a percentage of 29% can be point .

In the pronunciation, students can get point 3 with a percentage of 62% then with point 4 there are 19%. From these data average students can understand the topic and word level pronunciation is not significant to support the influence of clear language. In the intonation section, the data we have analyzed show that students can get point 3 with a percentage of 76% with their notes being able to position the appropriate and appropriate sentence level intonation used to convey meaning speechs

In the fluency section, we know that the majority who get point 3 are 38% and point 4 there are 29% than that point, in point 2 also get a value with a percentage of 33% where students on the fluency in English Noticeable pauses and hesitations.

In the gesture / movement section, this student can indicate which number with point 3 there are 52% while point 4 has 10%. So we know at point 3 with a percentage of 52% of students The gesture / body movement is less supportive for delivering speeches.

In the eye contact section, this gives results to students with point 3 having 57% and point 4 having 10%. This requires confidence in the creativity of speech. so from point 3 of the student More eye contact & less reading the text. From point 4 with a percentage of 10% of students Interactive & convincing, not reading text.

In the facial expression section, students get a percentage of 10% for point 4 and 48% for point 3. So, at point 3 the Facial expression students show less nervousness, rather easy to concentrate and at point 4 facial expression showing joy, relax.

In this analytical study students from improvitations who get point 4 with a percentage of 10% which in this case 100% dissimilar to the text, but the content is understandable and point 3 with a percentage of 67% so that this student has 50% similar to the text, the content is partly understandable.

In generic structure students who get more point 2 with a percentage of 48%, point 3 there are 43% and point 4 there are 10%. So that instead of point 2 students are Missing one of introduction, body, & conclusion. Only 10% get point 4 with a note Containing correct & good order of introduction, body, & conclusion) Introduction: state the topic & mention the main points of speech. Body: speak each point in detail, showing evidence or

information. Conclusion: Summarize   the main point.

Table 1.1 Scoring Rubric of Creative Speaking Aspect in Speech Performance
http://www.vikramr.com/pubs/HALEF_dialog_scoring_IS17.pdf

ASPECTS	4 (Very Good)	3 (Generally Good)	2 (Somewhat Limited)	1 (Limited)
1. Speech source	is if a student creates his own text and provides additional informatio n along with a case example to support the text of his speech.	is if the student makes his own text and does not provide additional information along with a case example to support the text of his speech.	is If a student 50% copy paste from the internet / other sources and provide additional informatio n?	is If the student is 100% copy paste from the internet / other sources and does not provide additional information?
2. Content	Speech text fits the topic of the lecturer and lots of elaborations.	Speech text is very suitable with the topic of the lecturer and a little elaboration.	Speech text is not appropriate with the topic of the lecturer and a little elaboration.	Speech text is not very suitable with the topic of the lecturer and a little elaboration.
3. Pronun ciation	Highly intelligible. Though the response may include L1 influence, word-level pronunciation do not impact intelligibility	Generally intelligible. Though the response may show noticeable L1 accent, word-level pronunciation do not significantly impact intelligibility.	Generally unintelligible. The response shows noticeable L1 accent. Errors in word-level pronunciation occasionally hinder intelligibility	Unintelligible. The response shows noticeable L1 accent. Errors in word-level pronunciation substantially impact intelligibility.
4. Intonati on/stres s	Appropriate sentence-level intonation and stress used to convey meaning. Intonation and stress do not hinder intelligibility.	Generally appropriate sentence-level intonation and stress used to convey meaning. Non-target intonation and stress may mildly impact intelligibility.	Generally inappropriate sentence-level intonation and stress used to convey meaning. Non-target intonation and stress impact intelligibility.	Inappropriate sentence level intonation and stress used to convey meaning. Inappropriate intonation and stress significantly reduce intelligibility.
5. Fluency	Very good	Good tempo and	Noticeable	Frequent long

	tempo and minimal hesitation. The response includes pauses at appropriate locations to formulate ideas.	minimal hesitation. The response includes some pauses to formulate ideas which minimally impacts the flow of speech	pauses and hesitations. The tempo is choppy, and/or filler words are frequent in the response.	pauses and/or use of filler words. It is challenging to follow the flow of ideas due to frequent long pauses and/or filler words
6. Gesture /body movem ent	The gesture & body movement supports the delivery of the contents of the speech	The gesture / body movement does not support the delivery of speech	The gesture / body movement does not support the delivery of speech	No gesture/body movement
7. Eye contact	Interactive & convincing, not reading the text	More eye contact & less reading the text	Less eye contact by reading some text	Eye contact fully showing memorizing/readi ng a text
8. Facial expressi on	Facial expression showing joy, relax	Facial expression showing less nervous, rather easy to concentrate	Facial expression dominantly showing nervous, difficult to concentrate	No facial expression
9. Improvi sation	100% dissimilar to the text, but the content is understandable	50% similar to the text, the content is partly understandable	Less than 70% similar to the text, the content is rather understandable	Reading text (100% similar to the text)
10. Generic structur	Containing correct & good	Containing introduction,	Missing one of introduction,	Missing two of introduction,

e	order of introduction, body, & conclusion) Introduction: state the topic & mention the main points of speech. Body: speak each point in detail, showing evidence or information. Conclusion: Summarize the main point	body, & conclusion, but not in good order	body, & conclusion.	body, & conclusion.

CONCLUSIONS

This has answered the research problem so far, with questions; How is the speaking creativity in speech performance among English Department students in terms of speech source, content, pronunciation, intonation, stress, pronunciation, fluency, gesture, gesture, body movement, eye context, facial expression, improvisation, generic structure? from the results of this study we know that on average students can find a good title in an effort to make a speech with speaking creativity.

The author knows that speaking creativity stimulates major changes in their abilities, performance and motivation. Speaking creativity in the form of speeches also helps and provides support to get their goals in insight and more knowledge of English. They can also overcome, be nervous and arrange how to make a speech so that this also shows their willingness to be able to understand and learn English.

The author's great goals and expectations set this title, to start a more effective and efficient way of viewing learning strategies by prioritizing speaking creativity. Another thing it aims at students can increase confidence, control nerves, and increase knowledge so that this provides a great opportunity for success to make a speech in public.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abarca, F.A. (2004). Interaction in the English classroom: an exploratory study. Actualidades Investigativas on Educacion, 4 (1), 1-24.

Bailey, K.M. (2005). Practical Language Teaching. Speaking. Singapore. Mc Graw Hill

Boonkit, K. (2010). Enhancing The Development of Speaking Ability for NonNativeSpeakers Of English, Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences.

Brown, H. D. (2001). Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy, New York: Pearson Education.

Chaney, A.L., and T.L. Burk. (1998). Teaching Oral Communication in Grades K-8. Boston: Allyn &Bacon

D. Suendermann-Oeft, V. Ramanarayanan, M. Teckenbrock, F. Neutatz, and D. Schmidt, 2015 "Halef: An open-source standardcompliant telephony-based modular spoken dialog system: A review and an outlook," in Natural Language Dialog Systems and Intelligent Assistants. Springer, pp. 53–61.

Gate, M. (2003). Language Teaching: A Scheme for Teacher Education; Speaking. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Harmer, J. (2001). The practice of English language teaching (3rd ed). London: Longman.
Harmer, J. 2001. The Practice of English Language Teaching. Cambridge: Longman.

Munjayah, A. (2004). Improving Students' Pronunciation in Speaking Class through Repetition Teachnique: An Action Research at the Fifth Year Students of SDN Premulung, Surakarta: Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta.

Harris, P. D. (1969) Testing English. Oxford: Tata McGraw-Hil

Halliday. M.A.K. 1994. An Introduction to Functional Grammar. London: Edward Arnold

Http://www.vikramr.com/pubs/HALEF_dialog_scoring_IS17.pdf

Hornby, AS. (2005). Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (Seventh Edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Kayi, Hayriye. 2006. Teaching Speaking: Activities to Promote Speaking in a Second Language The Internet TESL Journal, Vol. XII, No. 11, November 2006.

Levelt, W. J. M. (1989). Speaking: From Intention to Articulation. MA: MIT Press.

Lindsay, Cora. dkk. (2006) Learning and Teaching English A Course for Teacher. Oxford University Press. Majors' Self-instruction in Newly-Promoted University in China. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 2 no.3, 475-482.

Munjayanah, A. 2004. The Implementation of Communicative Language Teaching Speaking at LIA Surakarta: An Ethnography. Surakarta: Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta.

Mustapha, S. M., & Abd Rahman, N. S. (2011). Classroom participation patterns: A case study of malaysian undergraduate students. International Journal for Educational Studies, III(2), 145-158.

Nawawi, H. 2012. Metode Penelitian Bidang Sosial. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.

Osborn. (2008). R. Public speaking guidebook. Boston: Pearson.

Richards, Jack C. dkk. (2002). Methodology in Language Teaching An Anthology of Current Practice. Cambridge University press.

Sari, Vicka. (2012). Mulia.http://www.scribd.com/doc/52764640/8/Element-of-Speaking.

Saragih, A. 2013. Discourse Analysis A Study on Discourse Based on Systemic Functional Theory. Unimed, Medan

Schmitt, R. Applied linguistic. (2012). In A. Burns & B. Seidhofer (Eds.), Speaking and pronunciation (pp.197-199). London: Great Britain press.

Spratt, Mary. dkk. (2005). The TKT Teaching Knowledge Test Course, T.Cet; Cambridge.

Sulistyowati. (2010). The Speech Function in the Conversation between Fourth Semester English Department Students of Muria Kudus University and Foreigners. Unpublished thesis. Semarang state university

Sugiyono. 2015. Metode Penelitian Pendidikan (Pendekatan Kuantitatif)

Sugiyono. 2017. Memahami Penelitian Kualitatif. Bandung:Alfabeta

Sugiyono. (2016). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif kualitatif dan R&D. Bandung: Alfabeta

Thornbury, S. (2005). How to Teach Speaking. Oxford: Ocelot Publishing.

V. Ramanarayanan, D. Suendermann-Oeft, P. Lange, R. Mundkowsky, A. V. Ivanov, Z. Yu, Y. Qian, and K. Evanini, 2017 "Assembling the Jigsaw: How Multiple Open Standards Are Synergistically Combined in the HALEF Multimodal Dialog System," in Multimodal Interaction with W3C Standards. Springer, pp. 295–310.

Wang, Q. (2012). Classroom Teaching Strategies of Improving the English

X. Zhang, J. Trmal, D. Povey, and S. Khudanpur, 2014 "Improving deep neural network acoustic models using generalized maxout networks," in 2014 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP). IEEE, pp. 215– 219.

Ye, Ruijuan. (2006). The interpersonal metafunction analysis of Barack Obama'sVictory Speech. English Language Teaching Journal, II (3) 146-151.

Zaremba, A. J. (2006). Speaking professionally. Canada: Thompson South-Western.

Z. Yu, V. Ramanarayanan, R. Mundkowsky, P. Lange, A. Ivanov, A. W. Black, and D. Suendermann-Oeft, 2016 "Multimodal HALEF: An Open-Source Modular Web-Based Multimodal Dialog Framework," in Proc. of the IWSDS Workshop 2016, Saariselka, Finland.