



## SPEAKING EXPRESSION: THE SOCIODRAMA TECHNIQUE IN ENHANCING STUDENTS' SPEAKING SKILL

<sup>1</sup>Rahmiati\*, <sup>2</sup>Iskandar Abdul Samad

1 Universitas Samudra, Indonesia\*

2 Universitas Syiah Kuala, Indonesia

### ABSTRACT

This research aimed to apply Sociodrama Technique in teaching speaking. The study's objective was to investigate whether there is a significant difference in speaking scores between learners treated by Sociodrama and those who were not. The methodology of this study was an experimental research method with a significance level of  $\alpha=0.05$ . The samples of this study were 70 students in the 7th grade at one of the private junior high school in Lhokseumawe, Indonesia. These students were grouped into experimental and control groups, 35 students each. The instrument used was a test administrated in the form of pre-test and post-test. The data were analyzed using *SPSS 20*, the statistical package for social science. The data were considered normal and homogenous. From the t-test, the result showed that the critical area was higher than 2.00. The  $t_{count}$  value from the post-test between the Experimental and Control class is 2.54, which undoubtedly lies within the critical area. In conclusion, the sociodrama technique improved students' speaking ability.

**Keywords:** *EFL students; English language teaching; Sociodrama; Sociodrama technique; Speaking skills*

### ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengaplikasikan Teknik sosiodrama untuk meningkatkan skill berbicara. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk meneliti apakah ada perbedaan yang signifikan pada nilai skor siswa yang menggunakan teknik sosiodrama dengan siswa yang tidak menggunakan teknik sosiodrama. Metode penelitian ini menggunakan metode penelitian kuantitatif dengan level signifikan  $\alpha=0.05$ . Penelitian ini dilaksanakan di MTs Swasta Yapena Arun, Lhokseumawe dengan jumlah sampel sebanyak 70 siswa. Siswa tersebut dibagi kedalam dua kelompok yaitu kelas kontrol dan kelas eksperimen yang masing-masing kelompok terdiri dari 35 siswa. Instrumen yang digunakan pada penelitian ini menggunakan tes yang dibuat dalam bentuk Pre-test dan Post-test. Data diolah menggunakan *SPSS 20* setelah didapati data tersebut normal dan homogen. Berdasarkan hasil T-test, diperoleh hasil kritik lebih tinggi dari 2,00. Nilai  $t_{count}$  post-test antara kelas kontrol dan kelas eksperimen adalah 2.54 yang masih berada di critical area. Kesimpulan dari penelitian ini adalah Teknik sosiodrama meningkatkan kemampuan bicara siswa.

**Kata Kunci:** *Pengajaran bahasa Inggris; sosiodrama; skill berbicara; siswa EFL; Teknik sosiodrama*

## INTRODUCTION

Indonesian curriculum requires students to perform well in English using receptive and productive skills. Concerning this issue, teachers need to examine deeper the techniques used in teaching to evaluate the students' absence in ability.

E-ISSN: 2621-9158  
P-ISSN: 2356-0401

\*Correspondence: Corresponding  
rahmiati@unsam.ac.id

Submitted: 28 February 2022  
Approved: 23 June 2022  
Published: 27 June 2022

Citation:

Rahmiati & Samad, I. A. (2022).  
Speaking expression: The  
sociodrama technique in enhancing  
students' speaking skill. *Celtic: A  
Journal of Culture, English Language  
Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*,  
9(1), 69-81. Doi:  
10.22219/celtic.v9i1.20366

The teachers can also generate students' interest and attitude in class through the best technique. The lecturer's innovations can be used to catch students' attention and promote their interest and motivation to learn (Lumbangaol & Mazali, 2020). In addition to mastering the four language skills of speaking, reading, listening, and writing, students should also understand other aspects of English, including lexicon, syntax, spelling, and pronunciation. All these components will be necessary and valuable for the students to implement later for speaking purposes. It indicates that the goal of English teaching is for students to be able to communicate fluently in English.

Theoretically, Derakhshan, Khalili, and Beheshti (2016), in line with Byrne (1997), argued that speaking skill covers practice and production stages. The practice stage focuses on sounds, vocabulary, spelling, grammatical items, or functions, while the production stage focuses on speaking fluency. It means that the students who have passed the practice stage are encouraged to continue to the production stage. However, due to the lack of knowledge of English, the students experience difficulty practicing and producing the language themselves. They also fear making mistakes when expressing ideas or sentences. Meanwhile, in speaking, every student must be able to express ideas, practice dialogues, respond to the interviews, or tell stories.

In line with the Indonesian curriculum for junior high school, it requires students to process, present, and reason logically in concrete and abstract ways (Depdiknas, 2016), one of which is via teaching spoken expressions. Speaking expression is a spontaneous utterance and act based on the situation. It is the speaker's ability to process vocabulary into words and phrases to respond naturally in the actual situation. The expression is composed of a set of words compounded instead of interpreted by the meanings of the individual words that make it up (Akhmad & Amiri, 2018). Phrase is used to communicate thoughts, feelings, and experiences as responses to others so that the conversation can happen. It is essential because, typically, a human spends much more time interacting through oral rather than writing (Satria, 2020)

Based on the description above, the researcher conducted a preliminary study on 4<sup>th</sup> of May at one of private Islamic junior high schools (MTs) in Lhokseumawe, Aceh Province, Indonesia, and found two contradictory facts. Firstly, most students at this school appeared to have difficulty speaking English. In oral communication, they frequently struggled to explain their thoughts, feelings, and experiences because of the lack of ability to use expressions. English is only spoken in class but not in society, so they were not accustomed to speaking in English. In addition, their speaking style sounded more like reading rather than speaking, resulting in the accuracy and fluency of speaking in English is challenging for them. They lacked of vocabulary and did not know enough about intonation, pronunciation, tone of voice, and word stress.

Regarding the gap between the curriculum and the reality, the researcher conducted the study at one private MTs in Lhokseumawe to deal with the problem. The MTs is one of the Islamic Boarding Schools in Lhokseumawe, Aceh, Indonesia, where most students experienced the Pidie Jaya earthquake in 2016. During the research, the researchers suggested a technique in speaking called *Sociodrama Technique*. The Sociodrama technique was firstly introduced by Jacob Levy Moreno,

a psychiatrist from America. Moreno used this technique to heal the children's trauma during World War II through the experiential procedure for social exploration and intergroup conflict transformation. It works through showing expressions by allowing the thoughts, feelings, and hopes of all participants to rise to the surface. The effectiveness of this technique makes most global researchers apply it to the role plays in education, business, therapy, and theatre. In Education, sociodrama was adopted by the teacher in teaching history and social studies, literature, psychology, medicine and nursing, and language (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000; Fleury et al., 2015). The development of sociodrama in teaching language grew and became a teaching technique, especially in speaking. This technique trains the students to communicate in real situations and express their feelings and thoughts based on their condition. Further, sociodrama is a method that allows the students to play a specific role (Rosy, 2017). It is a technique that enhances students' ability to express their deepest affections and manage emotions (Kellermann, 2007; Alawiyah, Taufiq, & Hafina, 2019).

In this case, the researchers tried to reinforce the students' expressions of sympathy. Shortly, such as a role-play, in sociodrama, students are trained to be competent in enacting their manner or facial expression and social relation among human beings. In sociodrama, a group of students should be the actors/actresses, while other groups who are not performing should be the audience and give feedback about the problem performed in the drama (Browne, 2005; Baile & Walters, 2013). Therefore, all students are required to be active in this technique.

There are several guidelines for the sociodrama method, including simple, revealing, and detailed explanations of the instructions. Kellermann (2007) and Rosy (2017) have detailed and simplified the sociodrama method instruction into six stages as explained in the following:

a) Introduction and Warm-up

In this stage, the students are informed about the topic and the time they should spend when doing the sociodrama. Besides, the character introduction is also introduced in this phase. Before starting the action, the teacher should create a comfortable classroom condition by depicting the characters' situations in the story to the student. The teacher might also open a question or expressing-aspiration session.

b) Reenactment

In this phase, the students perform their actions. To strengthen the students' actions, teachers can also do the *Playback*, which is displaying the action through certain media to the students so that they can feel and personify powerfully with the incidents.

c) Cognitive reprocessing

This stage promotes the trauma back to the classroom by sharing experiences and perspectives about the incidents. The class may discuss what has been done and what should have been done. Weber (2012) adds that the students should be able to see things differently if they happened differently, but they still have to face what has happened and live with it.

d) Emotional catharsis

In the fourth stage, all emotions attached to trauma are drained away. The students will have opportunities to share their feelings nonjudgmentally and in a supportive way. Everyone should also show their respective manner.

e) Sharing and interpersonal support

This phase appears more similar to the previous phase. What differs is that, in this phase, students can state their support and advice to each other.

f) Closure and rituals

In the last phase, the teacher and the students pray or conduct other ceremonials showing that whatever happened has been designed by God. And most importantly, those who survive and continue their lives need to make transitions and adjust to the new living condition with the traumatic experience.

Several previous studies about sociodrama technique and the testimony can be seen in the following. First, a study by Sugiarti (2011) to the second graders at MAN Blora, Central Java, Indonesia. After the teaching treatment using Sociodrama technique for six meetings, the students' speaking ability rose not only in the ability to reveal the expressions but also in their speaking sub-skills, namely vocabulary, accuracy, fluency, and pronunciation. Second, research by Kearins (2011) that gave sociodrama treatment to 173 Aboriginal students in Australia. The result showed that after six weeks, the students could get mentally involved when speaking English instead of their native language. Lastly, a sociodrama study by Afana (2012) on the ninth-grader Palestinians in Palestine. All students there have trauma with the conflict. The findings indicated that the students' speaking skill increase after six weeks (covering 21 hours) of meetings. So, the study recommended teaching speaking using educational drama or sociodrama since it could bring better outcomes to students' speaking ability.

Based on the explanation, the population, sample, background, and experience researchers faced differ from the other researchers. So, the researchers were eager to research Using Sociodrama Technique in Teaching Speaking to prove whether this technique is effective to apply at one private MTs in Lhokseumawe, Aceh, Indonesia. Accordingly, this study aims to investigate whether the sociodrama technique could enhance students' speaking skills, particularly in comprehensibility and fluency.

## **METHOD**

This research was mainly quantitative research. It presented the data collected by the statistical procedure. Creswell (2009), Dimitrov (2008), and Pratisti and Yuwono ((2018) state that pre-experimental, true-experimental, quasi-experimental, and single-subject designs are the four categories of experimental designs. Doing true-experimental research requires the researcher to study experimental and control groups and provide intervention during the experiment. Furthermore, true-experimental research may be designed with the groups randomly assigned. In this research, there is a difference in selecting the subject of study. The researcher used one class of experiment and one class of control group, one of the true-experimental design types. The independent variable of this study is sociodrama technique, and the dependent variables are comprehensibility and fluency in speaking.

The current study's population is students at one private junior high school (MTs) in Lhokseumawe, Aceh, Indonesia, consisting of 314 students. Nevertheless, the main target was the 8th graders counted 102 students. Then, the researchers took 70 students as the sample using random sampling. The respondents were two (2) classes, 35 students, which were grouped as the experimental and control groups. The researchers used this sampling technique as Hamied (2017) stated that the most significant and practical way to categorize variables is as independent and dependent variables.

The procedure followed the one as suggested by Acharya, Prakash, Saxena, and Nigam (2013); the first-grade teachers as representatives of each class drew a lottery from a bag which two of the folds will have been written "*EG*" (*for experimental group*) and "*CG*" (*for control group*), meanwhile, other folds will be just empty. So those who took the fold with the written phrase gave their classes as the sample of this study.

The instrument used in collecting the data was a test. In the experiment class, the researcher used pictures. The students were asked to speak and video-recorded as the source of a set of data. The test asked them to respond to a condition seen in a picture. So, there were two pictures, and the student had to verbalize their expression based on these pictures using the expression of sympathy. They were given 3-4 minutes to prepare and 2-3 minutes to describe each picture. In the control class, the teaching technique referred to the conventional teaching method regularly practiced by the English teacher at the private MTs in Lhokseumawe, Aceh. This term was used to differentiate between the technique used by the researchers in teaching the experimental class and the one used by the regular teacher in the control class.

In collecting data, the researchers conducted a total of eight meetings for the experimental class. A pre-test was administered during the first meeting, then continued with the implementation of the sociodrama technique from the second meeting until the seventh. Finally, a post-test was conducted after that meeting. All stages are described in the following paragraphs.

In the first meeting, the researchers gave the pre-test for experimental and control classes with the same test. The researchers gave two pictures to the students to describe. The pictures were about Pidie Jaya earthquake and refugee camps whose houses were attacked by a particular disaster. Moreover, the students had 3-4 minutes to prepare and 2-3 minutes to describe the pictures. The students' description was recorded to be later graded by using the rubrics suggested by Heaton (1989).

After compiling the score, the second meeting was held on the next day. In the experimental class, the researchers explained sociodrama and the procedures that the students needed to follow. To start the teaching process, the researchers first asked about the topic "Pidie Jaya Earthquake". She asked questions such as "*How would you feel if you were there?*", "*What would you do?*", "*What can you do to help from here?*", and so forth. This was the introductory and warm-up stage. After some students answered and revealed their feelings of sympathy toward the condition, the researcher brought the students into the re-enactment phase. It was group 1's turn to act. Group 1 acted while others were observing their performance. After 20 minutes, the performance finished, and the class applauded. The class encountered

the third phase, i.e., cognitive processing. In this phase, the class discussed what had been done and what should have been done about the tragedy. The class also analyzed the problem causing this situation. Later, the phases of emotional catharsis and sharing support were carried out. The students revealed their feelings of sympathy toward the tragedy, and they also felt blessed that their country and region were in good condition. The last stage was closure and rituals. In this stage, the whole class, guided by the researcher, prayed for the victims in Pidie Jaya and wished that their condition would get better very soon.

For the control group, the researchers taught the class by implementing the conventional method used regularly at the school: textbook-based teaching. First, the researchers introduced the same topic: the earthquake. Then she wrote several sympathy expressions on the whiteboard and asked the students to repeat them after she read the expressions. After several repetitions, she asked the students to take notes of the expressions she wrote on the whiteboard. Later, they were asked to read a passage about war. Three students were appointed to read the passage aloud before the whole class should translate the passage. After doing the translation, the students were asked to sit in a group of 5 and write dialogue about the passage they read involving the use of showing sympathy expressions. Then, each group was assigned to come to the front of the class to demonstrate their dialogues. They were not asked to memorize, so they only read from their notebooks. Finally, the researchers ended the class.

The researchers did the same activities for the third until seventh meetings but with different topics. The topics discussed were "9/11 Terrorist Attack", "bullying", "cancer", and "poverty", which were discussed in both classes. In the last meeting, the researchers did the post-test the same way as the pre-test. For post-test, there were also two pictures. The first picture showed about "Gazan War". In the picture, there is a heavily damaged street. Furthermore, the second picture shows a group of children who are the victims of war. The students were also given 3-4 minutes to prepare and 2-3 minutes to describe their feelings toward the pictures they saw in the research instrument.

The data were separated into five steps for analysis. The first step is to determine the weight of each correct answer; the second step is to determine the normality; the third step is to determine the homogeneity; the fourth step is to determine the standard deviation; and the last step is to determine the t-test. In analyzing the data obtained from the data collection, the researcher used several formulas taken from Arikunto (2009). First, the data normality and homogeneity were investigated. Then, the mean score and standard deviation were calculated when the data were judged normal and homogeneous. Finally, the t-count was determined using the last analysis so that the researcher could establish whether the hypothesis was accepted or denied.

## **FINDINGS**

### ***Normality and Homogeneity Tests***

The Normality test and Homogeneity test from the pre-test data of the Experimental Group and Control Group are initially provided below as this is vital for further data analysis. The result of the normality test can be seen in the following table.

**Table 1.** Tests of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>		
	Statistic	df	Sig.
pretestEG	.139	35	<b>.065</b>
pretestCG	.143	35	<b>.066</b>

From the table, we can see that the data are normal. The data are considered normal if the significant value is higher than  $\alpha=0.05$ . From the table, we can learn that the significant value of the experimental group pre-test is 0.065, which is higher than  $\alpha=0.05$ . And the significant value of the control group is 0.066, which is also higher than  $\alpha=0.05$ . In conclusion, the data distribution of both groups is normal.

The next step is testing the homogeneity. The data from both groups could be claimed homogeneous if the significant value is also higher than 5% ( $\alpha=0.05$ ).

Below is the result of the homogeneity test:

**Table 2.** Test of Homogeneity

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
1.343	2	33	<b>1.54</b>

The table above shows that the significant value of the pre-test score from both the experimental and control group is 1.54. This value is higher than  $\alpha=0.05$ . In conclusion, besides normal, the data were also homogeneous. Since the data were both normal and homogeneous, these two groups have a guarantee to be compared.

### Hypothesis Testing

The following are four tests used to test the hypothesis.

#### Pre-test Experiment Group and Pre-test Control Group

**Table 3.** Hypothesis Testing 1

Group	Mean	t
Experimental	54	-2.2
Control	57	

The calculation above found that the t-table for degree of freedom (*df*) 68 and in the level of significant 0.05 was higher than 2.00. Thus, because -2.2 is not higher than 2.00, the  $H_a$  is rejected, and the  $H_o$  is accepted.

The hypothesis was rejected because there was no treatment for both groups. So, their speaking ability was scored from their natural ability. Teaching speaking techniques can make students aware of the strategies they can use during the transactions.

#### Pre-test Experiment Group and Post-test Experiment Group

**Table 4.** Hypothesis Testing 2

Group	Mean	t
Pre-test Experimental	54	2.9
Post-test Experimental	67	

From the table above, we can see that the t-table for the degree of freedom (*df*) 68 and level of significant 0.05 was higher than 2.00. Therefore, since 2.9 is higher than 2.00, the  $H_a$  is accepted, and the  $H_o$  is rejected.

The hypothesis is accepted because there has been a treatment of sociodrama for the experimental group. After the treatment, the students can use their word choice effectively in expressing sympathy and make students more expressive in delivering their feelings.

### Pre-test Control Group and Post-test Control Group

**Table 5.** Hypothesis Testing 3

Group	Mean	t
Pre-test Control	57	-1.90
Post-test Control	59	

The calculation above found that the t-table for the degree of freedom (*df*) 68 and level of significant 0.05 was higher than 2.00. It was found that the t-count was -1.90. Thus, it is clear that -1.90 is not higher than 2.00, so the  $H_a$  is rejected, and the  $H_o$  is accepted.

The hypothesis is rejected because there was no treatment of sociodrama technique for the control group. Instead, they were taught using the regular technique, which was the technique of memorizing dialogues and expressions. This kind of technique employs more activities for teachers instead of students. Whereas the technique which is good for enhancing students' speaking skills is learner-centred, not teacher-centred.

### Post-test Experiment Group and Post-test Control Group

**Table 6.** Hypothesis Testing 4

Group	Mean	t
Experimental	67	2.54
Control	59	

The calculation above found that the t-table for the degree of freedom (*df*) 68 and level of significant 0.05 was higher than 2.00. The t count found was 2.54, and it is clear that this value is higher than 2.00. So that the  $H_a$  is accepted and the  $H_o$  is rejected. This testing is the core testing used as proof of the alternative hypothesis.

The hypothesis is accepted because the technique of sociodrama has been implemented in the experimental group but not in the control group, as seen from the post-test's final score. In other words, the sociodrama technique helped students with share their emotional expressions. Before, emotional sharing could be a problem in communicating effectively. However, the technique can promote the fluency of emotional sharing realized through the speaking score increase. Below is the result of students' comprehensibility and fluency in speaking skills.

**Table 7.** Students' Comprehensibility and Fluency in Speaking Skills

No.	Variable	Pre-test average level	Post-test average level
1	Comprehensibility	1	3
2	Fluency	1	2

The table above reveals that the learners' comprehensibility in the pre-test was at level one. Level one of comprehensibility is where there is practically anything that the speaker states can be understood. Even if the listener makes an excellent attempt to interrupt, the speaker has yet to clarify what he seems to have said. This level increased after the implementation of the technique to level three. At level three, the listener comprehends most of what is said but constantly seeks clarification. As the result, the listener cannot comprehend many of the speakers' more complicated or lengthy statements.

Then, concerning the students' speaking fluency, it also increases from level one to level two. Students' speech is marked by prolonged and unnatural pauses and an extremely halting and fragmentary delivery in level one. Sometimes, the speaker surrenders to make an effort because of the limited range of expression. After the technique implementation, the fluency level was raised to level two. In level two, the speaker's speech has long pauses while they search for the desired meaning. In addition, there is frequently incomplete and halting delivery. Most of the time, the speaker almost makes an effort at times but does not.

## DISCUSSION

The current study was conducted to determine whether there is a significant achievement difference between students who are taught speaking using the sociodrama technique and those who are taught speaking using the regular approach, which is dialogue memorization method. The goal of the memorization method is to increase vocabulary and assist them in remembering pronunciation, lexis, and usages (Chen et al., 2016). However, this method still cannot make students speak spontaneously in an actual situation.

Regarding the improvement that the students achieved after implementing the sociodrama technique, the data were analyzed using *SPSS 22*. The data were normal and homogenous, and these two are the requirements to continue the process of hypothesis testing. After the normality and homogeneity test, the data obtained from the experimentation were normal and homogenous. So that the data can be processed further to prove the hypothesis. These steps were taken to ensure that the starting point for both classes was the same (Arikunto, 2009).

The symbol of  $H_0$  as the null hypothesis and  $H_a$  as the alternative hypothesis were used in hypothesizing such technique proposition. A null hypothesis declares that no correlation exists between two variables (Mourougan & Sethuraman, 2017). At the significance level of 5% or  $\alpha=0.05$ , there were four testings in hypothesis testings. The *df* is 68 since this is a one-tailed hypothesis. The advantage of doing a one-tailed test is that it increases the ability to reject the null hypothesis if it is false (Ruxton & Neuhauser, 2010; Hernandez, Andres & Tejedor, 2018). The  $t_{count}$  value has to reach above the  $t_{table}$  value. The  $t_{table}$  value for *df* 68 is 2.00, so the  $t_{count}$  value must be higher than 2.00. Testing 1 reveals that  $H_0$  is accepted and  $H_a$  is rejected. The t-value for Testing 1 is -2.2, which is not higher than 2.00.

In contrast to Testing 1, in testing 2,  $H_0$  is rejected, and  $H_a$  is accepted. The t-value of this testing was 2.9, which is higher than the critical area, so  $H_0$  is rejected. However, in Testing 3, the t-value is -1.90, making the  $H_a$  is rejected, and  $H_0$  is accepted. Lastly, in Testing 4,  $H_0$  is rejected, and  $H_a$  is accepted since the t-value of this testing is 2.54, which is higher than the critical area, namely 2.00. This result is

known as the True Positive (TP); the reason for labelling it 'positive' is tied to the unequal validity of a hypothesis test because rejecting  $H_0$  when  $H_0$  is incorrect is more informative than accepting  $H_0$  when  $H_0$  is accurate (Emmert-Streib & Dehmer, 2019).

Hypothesis testing 4 is the most crucial test because, in testing 4, the post-test between both groups is compared to see whether the technique implementation works in the experimental group. Indeed, it is proven that there is a significant difference in students' achievement between students who speak in expressing sympathy by using sociodrama technique and those taught speaking by using the conventional method at the private MTs in Lhokseumawe. This result relates to research by Trisiantari (2017), who found that there was a difference in speaking skills between the students who followed the sociodrama approach with students who followed the traditional teaching method.

This fact suggests that speaking using sociodrama technique, especially in teaching how to express sympathy, is more effective than speaking using the traditional technique used by their teacher at the school. Some factors are considered essential in this process, as it was also found in the previous studies cited in the earliest chapter. Initially, in the study by Sugiarti (2011), after the treatment with sociodrama technique, students at MAN Blora were better not only in revealing their expressions but also in their speaking sub-skills, namely vocabulary, accuracy, fluency, and pronunciation. Next, Kearins (2011) found that the students she taught improved in getting involved mentally while speaking English. This also shows that the technique builds strong emotions so the students can be good at revealing expressions. Another study by Trisiantari (2017) that gave the treatment to the primary school in Buleleng was proven to improve students' language skills in listening, reading, writing, and speaking. The last study by Afana (2012) revealed that the students' speaking skills increased after six weeks, which was covered in 21 hours. Therefore, it can be inferred that the result of the current study is in line with the result of previous studies.

Finally, based on the result of the current study, the students' score increases after the treatment because of some factors. First, sociodrama technique can enhance their motivation for their speaking skill (Sweeney, 1993; Baile & Walters, 2013). Secondly, this technique also helps students deliver their condolences as they can feel intensely other people's conditions (Scheiffele, 2003).

## **CONCLUSION**

Speaking is one of the language skills that every high school student should master. However, speaking is not only about practice but also about production stages. Students must be able to speak according to the context and respond spontaneously. Therefore, teachers must be able to develop speaking teaching techniques that can hone students' abilities in expressing thoughts in everyday life.

One of the techniques in teaching speaking is sociodrama. Sociodrama can be applied to all speaking lessons, but in this study, the researchers focused on speaking expressions, especially expressions of sympathy. This technique trains the students to speak in actual situations and express their feelings and thoughts based on their condition. Therefore, the implementation of the sociodrama technique is

considered adequate because the students have social awareness when practicing with the sociodrama technique based on their knowledge and language use.

In this research, the implication of sociodrama in teaching speaking was proven to increase the students' ability to express their sympathy. It can be seen from the significant increase in the students who were taught using the sociodrama technique compared to the control group who were not. More specifically, the students' speech increased in both comprehensibility and fluency. The comprehensibility increased from level one to level three, while the speech fluency increased from level one to level two.

The finding of the study is expected to make a real contribution to theoretical and practical benefits. Theoretically, the result of this study could be beneficial to support other theories or available concepts in doing similar studies or conducting further studies. In practice, the finding of this study would be useful information for English teachers and other researchers to give valuable feedback for improving their speaking classroom activities and as a reference for further research in the same field.

## REFERENCES

- Acharya, A. S., Prakash, A., Saxena, P., & Nigam, A. (2013). Sampling: Why and how of it? *Indian Journal of Medical Specialities*, 4(2).  
<https://doi.org/10.7713/ijms.2013.0032>
- Afana, S. M. (2012). *The Impact of Educational Drama Intervention on Palestinian Ninth Graders' English language Speaking Skills at Gaza UNRWA Schools (Unpublished Thesis)*. <https://mobt3ath.com/uplode/books/book-59892.pdf>
- Akhmad, Z., & Amiri, I. N. R. (2018). Analysis of students' understanding in using formal and informal expression. *Al-Lisan: Jurnal Bahasa (e-Journal)*, 3(2).  
<http://journal.iaingorontalo.ac.id/index.php/al>
- Alawiyah, I. T. A., Taufiq, A., & Hafina, A. (2019). The effectiveness of sociodrama to improve students' anger management skills. *Islamic Guidance and Counseling Journal*, 2(2), 56–65. <https://doi.org/10.25217/igcj.v2i2.397>
- Arikunto, S. (2009). *Dasar-dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan*. Bumi Aksara.  
[https://scholar.google.co.id/citations?view\\_op=view\\_citation&hl=en&user=ZYhYmFcAAAAJ&citation\\_for\\_view=ZYhYmFcAAAAJ:NaGl4SEjCO4C](https://scholar.google.co.id/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=en&user=ZYhYmFcAAAAJ&citation_for_view=ZYhYmFcAAAAJ:NaGl4SEjCO4C)
- Baile, W. F., & Walters, R. (2013). Applying sociodramatic methods in teaching transition to palliative care. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*, 45(3), 606–619. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2012.03.002>
- Browne, R. (2005). *Towards a framework for sociodrama*.  
<http://www.psybernet.co.nz/files/psychodrama/theses/104.pdf>
- Chen, W.-C., Yang, M.-C., & Lin, K.-M. (2016). A Study of Applying Memorization Method to Enhance Primary School Students' English Oral Ability. *Journal of Economics, Business and Management*, 4(11), 627–631.  
<https://doi.org/10.18178/joebm.2016.4.11.464>
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed methods Approaches* (Third Edition). SAGE Publications, Inc.

- [https://www.ucg.ac.me/skladiste/blog\\_609332/objava\\_105202/fajlovi/Creswell.pdf](https://www.ucg.ac.me/skladiste/blog_609332/objava_105202/fajlovi/Creswell.pdf)
- Depdiknas. (2016). *Kompetensi inti dan kompetensi dasar sekolah menengah pertama/ madrasah tsanawiyah (SMP/MTs)*. [https://simpuh.kemenag.go.id/regulasi/permendikbud\\_24\\_16.pdf](https://simpuh.kemenag.go.id/regulasi/permendikbud_24_16.pdf)
- Derakhshan, A., Khalili, A. N., & Beheshti, F. (2016). Developing EFL Learner's Speaking Ability, Accuracy and Fluency. *English Language and Literature Studies*, 6(2), 177. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ells.v6n2p177>
- Dimitrov, D. M. (2008). *Quantitative research in education : intermediate & advanced methods*. Whittier Publications, Inc.
- Emmert-Streib, F., & Dehmer, M. (2019). Understanding Statistical Hypothesis Testing: The Logic of Statistical Inference. *Machine Learning and Knowledge Extraction*, 1(3), 945–961. <https://doi.org/10.3390/make1030054>
- Fleury, H. J., Marra, M. M., & Knobel, A. M. (2015). Social Psychotherapy in Brazil. In *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy* (Vol. 65, Issue 4). <https://cehd.gmu.edu/assets/dimitrovbook/CONTENTS.pdf>
- Hamied, F. A. (2017). *Research methods: a guide for first-time researchers*. UPI Press.
- Heaton. J. B. (1989). *Writing english language tests*. Longman. <https://octovany.files.wordpress.com/2013/12/ok-writing-english-language-tests-j-b-heaton.pdf>
- Hernández, M. Á., Andrés, A. M., & Tejedor, I. H. (2018). One-tailed asymptotic inferences for the difference of proportions: Analysis of 97 methods of inference. *Journal of Biopharmaceutical Statistics*, 28(6), 1090–1104. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10543406.2018.1452028>
- Kearins, H. (2011). *What Makes Sociodrama Work as a Methodology for Owing Our Own Racism and Moving beyond It - as a Step towards Reconciliation between White Australians and Aboriginal People? (Unpublished Thesis)* [Daw Park: Australia and New Zealand Psychodrama Association Institute]. <https://aanzpa.org/wp-content/uploads/theses/125.pdf>
- Kellermen, P. F. (2007). *Sociodrama and Collective Trauma*. Jessica Kingsley Publishers. [https://www.academia.edu/38684521/\\_Peter\\_Felix\\_Kellermann\\_Sociodrama\\_and\\_Collective\\_BookFi\\_org\\_](https://www.academia.edu/38684521/_Peter_Felix_Kellermann_Sociodrama_and_Collective_BookFi_org_)
- Lumbangaol, R. R., & Mazali, M. R. (2020). Improving students' speaking ability through debate technique. *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22219/celtic.v7i2.13674>
- Mourougan, S., & Sethuraman, Dr. K. (2017). Hypothesis Development and Testing. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 19(05), 34–40. <https://doi.org/10.9790/487x-1905013440>
- Pratisti, W. D., & Yuwono, S. (2018). *Psikologi eksperimen: Konsep, teori, dan aplikasi*. Muhammadiyah University Press. [https://books.google.co.id/books?hl=en&lr=&id=BJV5DwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR3&dq=Pratisti,+W.+D.,+%26+Yuwono,+S.+\(2018\).+Psikologi+eksperimen:](https://books.google.co.id/books?hl=en&lr=&id=BJV5DwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR3&dq=Pratisti,+W.+D.,+%26+Yuwono,+S.+(2018).+Psikologi+eksperimen:)

- +Konsep,+teori,+dan+aplikasi.+Muhammadiyah+University+Press.&ots=9Njg  
YNIMOh&sig=KZr2-  
yEeC3AZ7dypAZJDvjfCGAM&redir\_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false
- Rosy, B. (2017). Sociodrama Method; Stimulate the Development of Attitudes, Knowledge and Skills of Students in Excellent Service Learning. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bisnis & Manajemen*, 3(1).  
<https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.17977/um003v3i12017p025>
- Ruxton, G. D., & Neuhäuser, M. (2010). When should we use one-tailed hypothesis testing? *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 1(2), 114–117.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2041-210x.2010.00014.x>
- Satria, V. R. (2020). English speaking teaching method for elementary school student at Kampung Inggris pontianak. *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*, 7(2), 183–190.  
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22219/celtic.v7i2.14248>
- Scheiffele, E. (2003). Alterations of Consciousness during Psychodrama and Sociodrama, Psychology - Consulting, Therapy, GRIN. *British Journal of Psychodrama and Sociodrama*, 18(2).  
<http://moreno.com.au/sites/default/files/Eberhard%20-%20Alterations%20to%20consciousness.pdf>
- Sternberg, P., & Garcia, A. (2000). *SOCIODRAMA: who's in your shoes?* (Second Edition). Praeger.
- Sugiarti. (2011). *The Experimental Study of Improving Speaking Skill Through Socio Drama at The Second Year Students of MAN Blora in the Academic Year of 2010/2011 (Unpublished Thesis)* [IAIN Salatiga]. <http://e-repository.perpus.iainsalatiga.ac.id/id/eprint/7318>
- Sweeney, T. E. (1993). *The mastery of public speaking skills through sociodrama techniques: attitudes and ability DEVELOPMENT*. New York University Press.  
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED367001.pdf>
- Trisiantari, N. ketut D. (2017). An Effect of Sociodrama Method Implementation in Students Language Skill at Fourth Grade Elementary School in Cluster XII of Buleleng District 45. *Journal of Education Technology*, 1(1), 45–50.  
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.23887/jet.v1i1.10083>
- Weber, N. B. (2012). *Vocabulary interventions for emergent bilinguals during sociodramatic play and project investigations (Unpublished Thesis)*. State University of New York. <http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12648/315>