

## THE EFFECT OF USING IMPROMPTU SPEAKING TECHNIQUE ON STUDENTS' ENGLISH-SPEAKING ABILITY

Khofifatulamni<sup>1</sup>, Eliwarti<sup>2</sup>, Muhammad Syarfi<sup>3</sup>

Universitas Riau

email: <sup>1</sup>khofifatulamni0606@student.unri.ac.id, <sup>2</sup>eliwarti@lecturer.unri.ac.id,

<sup>3</sup>m.syarfi@lecturer.unri.ac.id

**Abstract:** *This study aims to determine whether impromptu speaking affects students' English-speaking ability in the 2024–2025 school year at MAN 2 Kuantan Singingi. This quasi-experimental study employed a quantitative methodology and a pre-experiment, one group pretest, and post-test research design. Oral dialogue in a single scenario was the instrument used to gather the data, and SPSS 27 was used for analysis. The study's sample consisted of 40 11th generation students, while the population consists of all Pare Arabic and English Course students at MAN 2 Kuantan Singingi. According to the results, the experimental class's average pretest and posttest scores increased by 21 points. In contrast, the average student's score only rose 18 points above the pretest score in the controlled class, which employed traditional methods. Furthermore, the independent sample t-test result was 0.009, which is less than the alpha value of 0.05. The study's findings suggest that students' English-speaking skills improved as a result of impromptu speaking.*

**Keyword:** *Impromptu speaking, English-speaking, English teaching*

**Abstrak:** Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk memastikan apakah berbicara dadakan. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui apakah berbicara spontan memengaruhi kemampuan berbicara bahasa Inggris siswa pada tahun ajaran 2024–2025 di MAN 2 Kuantan Singingi. Penelitian kuasi-eksperimental ini menggunakan metodologi kuantitatif dan desain penelitian pra-eksperimen, satu kelompok, pra-tes, dan pasca-tes. Dialog lisan dalam satu skenario adalah instrumen yang digunakan untuk mengumpulkan data, dan SPSS 27 digunakan untuk analisis. Sampel penelitian terdiri dari 40 siswa generasi ke-11, sedangkan populasi terdiri dari semua siswa Kursus Bahasa Arab dan Bahasa Inggris Pare di MAN 2 Kuantan Singingi. Menurut hasil, skor pretest dan posttest rata-rata kelas eksperimen meningkat sebesar 21 poin. Sebaliknya, skor rata-rata siswa hanya naik 18 poin di atas skor pretest di kelas kontrol, yang menggunakan metode tradisional. Lebih jauh, hasil uji t sampel independen adalah 0,009, yang lebih kecil dari nilai alfa 0,05. Temuan penelitian menunjukkan bahwa keterampilan berbicara bahasa Inggris siswa meningkat sebagai hasil dari berbicara spontan.

**Kata kunci:** Berbicara spontan, berbicara bahasa Inggris, pengajaran bahasa Inggris

### INTRODUCTION

Speaking is an interactive activity that includes information creation, receipt, and processing, claim Burns and Joyce (1997). Grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, fluency, and comprehension are the five elements commonly recognized in the analysis of the speaking process (Brown, 2004).

Additionally, Brown (2004) distinguishes six categories of speaking ability areas—imitative, intuitive, responsive, transactional, interpersonal, and extensive—as the process of generating and conveying meaning through spoken or oral form. Speaking can take many forms. According to Na & Hipertensiva (n.d.), speaking delivery can be categorized into four types: memorized,

impromptu, extemporaneous, and manuscript. Teachers must concentrate on techniques or strategies when instructing speaking. Speaking instruction attempts to provide students with the capacity to communicate in the target language in order to handle fundamental interaction tasks (Brown & Yule, 2000). Drilling, creative tasks, role-planning, cooperative activities, reading aloud, interviews, brainstorming, and discussions are some of the tactics the teacher can employ.

In fact, not every student can talk well. According to Hosni (2014), linguistic challenges, mother tongue use, and inhibition are the main speaking issues that students at this level face. Also, the EF EPI (EF English Proficiency Index) shows that Indonesians are still not very good at speaking English, especially when it comes to schoolchildren in the 16-20 age range, who do much worse than those in the 26-30 age range. Students have difficulty speaking English for a variety of reasons, according to Ashidiqi (2016). Students' low vocabulary, speaking habits, grammar knowledge, or motivation are some of the contributing elements. One of the speaking strategies can be employed by the instructor to address the mentioned issue. One alternative method for improving students' speaking abilities is impromptu speaking, which can be advantageous for the time and effort spent helping the students solve their problems (Henderson, 1982). "Impromptu speaking is a speech, presentation, or talk done on the spur of the moment without previous specific preparation," Flanders (2007) said. Additionally, impromptu speaking allows students to freely express their thoughts and ideas on the subject matter.

### Teaching procedures of impromptu speaking

Henderson (1982) states that an impromptu speaking lesson can be planned in a few different ways. First, the teachers defines impromptu speech and explains how to introduce it, including the

rules of conversation. The following is a brief summary of the rules:

1. There are two topics from which students can choose.
2. Students can choose a topic in thirty seconds.
3. Students are then given one to three minutes to prepare.
4. Students should aim for one minute to get ready (three minutes for slow students).

However, according to Iverson & Dervan (n.d.), the following are the standard practices for impromptu speaking:

1. The teacher gives thorough explanations of the content covered today.
2. Depending on the size of the class, the teacher prepares a few subjects or questions from the content covered.
3. Students are separated into groups of four or five after the lesson.
4. The teacher selects a topic or question at random for each group after drawing lots.
5. Every student is required to present their topic in a group setting during the lesson. After that, the groups that come after take turns, and the other groups can ask questions regarding the group's performance.
6. The teacher asks the class if they are ready to ask questions after everyone has been regrouped into the larger group. They were either urged to do so or assigned tasks pertaining to subjects they thought were fascinating but did not fully understand based on the other groups' explanations. Finally, engage in meaningful dialogue with other people.

Point et al. (2014) list the common mistakes that speakers make when speaking spontaneously, including rushing their words, not making eye contact, not establishing a rapport with the audience, and showing disrespect for

other speakers. Additionally, impromptu speaking offers several benefits, such as

improved oral expression of ideas, increased confidence when addressing an audience, the capacity for instantaneous thought, and the growth of communication and leadership abilities (Barruansyah, 2018). The purpose of this study is to determine whether impromptu speaking has a significant impact on students' English-speaking proficiency and to quantify that impact

## RESERACH METHODOLOGY

The researcher used a quasi-experimental approach with a pre-test-post-test control group. Creswell (2012) defines quasi-experiments as group assignments without random participant selection. In this research design, two classes will remain together. A pretest is used to determine the initial state in the original design, and a post-test is used to determine the end state after the experimental class and the control class have applied the treatment model learning. The design is shown in the following table:

**Table Pretest and Post-test Design**

Intact group	Measurement	Application Of Independent Variable	Measurement
Experimental	Pre-test	Treatment	Post-test
Control	Pre-test	Conventional	Post-test

### Population and Sample

At MAN 2 Kuantan Singingi, the entire population consists of the Pare Arabic and English Course generation, starting from generation 1-11. The researcher selected the study's sample using the purposive sampling technique. Only 11th generation students enrolled in the Pare Arabic and English Course were included in the study. Class 11b students will be the control group, and class 11a students will be the experimental group. Furthermore,

the 11a sample and the 11b sample both contain 20 students. Thus, 40 students make up the study's total sample.

### Intrument

The research instrument used in this study was tests and treatments. To ascertain the students' baseline speaking abilities, the researcher gave them a pre-test prior to starting treatment. In order to assess the students' present level of knowledge and enhance their speaking skills, a post-test is also given after the treatment method has been put into practice.

### Data Collection Technique

Following statistical analysis of the data, the two test results from the experimental class and the control class are compared in this study. The researcher used the following methods to gather the information: The researcher first gave the pupils a pretest to find out more about their English-speaking skills. Oral dialogue, or talk, is the test format used in this pre-test. Next, the researcher conducted a treatment for the experimental class toward the students, which included impromptu speaking during class instruction and learning. The researcher used the topic of asking and giving opinions as the basis for impromptu activities during the four meetings that comprised the treatment. Last one, the researcher conducts a post-test to gauge how much students' English-speaking skills have improved as a result of impromptu speaking.

### Data Analysis Technique

The t-test, homogeneity, and normality statistical analyses were used to review and characterize the students' pre-test and post-test outcomes. For this experiment, the researcher measured the data using SPSS 27. The first step the researcher takes to ascertain whether or not the data is distributed normally is to perform the normality test. Garson (2012). To ascertain whether two or more data sets are from the same population

with the same variance, the researcher then applies homogeneity (Garson, 2012). Finally, the researcher uses a T-test to analyze and assess whether there are significant differences between the experimental and control classes' students' pre- and post-test outcomes.

**Finding and Discussion**

Although both classes had improvements, the experimental group outperformed the control group, as evidenced by the statistical analysis, which showed that the experimental class increased by 21 points, from 35.6 to 56.4 on the post-test. The controlled class went from 34.2 to 50.2 by just 18 points. It shows that the experimental group had a significantly greater number of increasing points than the control group. Therefore, if the impromptu speaking method is not used, it has less of an effect on students' speaking improvement in the controlled class.

**Normality Test**

**Table Normality Test of Pretest and Posttest in Experimental Class and Control Class**

Class	Tests of Normality					
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
	S	D	S	S	D	S
<b>R</b>						
<b>e</b>						
<b>s</b>						
<b>u</b>						
<b>l</b>						
<b>t</b>						
<b>Pretest</b>	,2	,1	,9	,2	,0	,0
<b>Experimental</b>	,6	,4	,6	,0	,6	,0
<b>Control</b>	,2	,1	,9	,2	,0	,0
<b>Post-test</b>	,2	,1	,9	,2	,0	,0
<b>Experimental</b>	,6	,9	,3	,1	,7	,1
<b>Control</b>	,2	,1	,9	,2	,0	,0

st	1	0	1	9	0	1
Contr	6		8	3		6
olled	1		9	1		2
Post-	,2	,1	,9	,2	,0	,1
test	1	0	1	9	0	1
Contr	6		3	2		3
olled	9		6	7		5

**a. Lilliefors Significance Correction**

The experimental class's Shapiro-Wilk value for the pretest results was 0.060, but the control class's was 0.162, as shown in Table 2. The pretest results for the experimental class and the control class were then distributed normally since the significance value was higher than 0.05. Furthermore, the experimental class's Shapiro-Wilk post-test results were 0.071, whereas the control class's were 0.135, as indicated in Table 2. The post-test findings for both classes were therefore regarded as normal as the significance of the two classes was higher than 0.05.

**Homogeneity Test**

The following table displays the analysis results:

**Table The homogeneity test of Pretest in Experimental and Control Class**

	Test of Homogeneity of Variance			
	Le	d	df2	Sig
<b>R</b>				
<b>e</b>				
<b>s</b>				
<b>u</b>				
<b>l</b>				
<b>t</b>				
<b>Based on Mean</b>	,16	1	38	,69
<b>Based on Median</b>	,17	1	38	,67
<b>Based on adjusted df</b>	,14	1	38	,70
<b>Based on trimmed mean</b>	,17	1	37,9	,67
<b>and with adjusted df</b>	,9		77	,4

The homogeneity test of the post-test in the experimental class and the control class based on the mean yielded a

significant value of 0.216, which is shown in Table 3. Given that the significance value was higher than 0.05, it would seem that the posttest findings in both classes were uniform.

**Table The homogeneity test of Post-test in Experimental and Control Class**

Test of Homogeneity of Variance				
	Leve	d	df2	Si
	ne	f		g.
	Statis	1		
	tic			
R Based	1,584	1	38	,216
Mean				
Based	1,308	1	38	,260
Median				
Based	1,308	1	32,5	,261
Median			14	
and				
with				
adjusted				
df				
Based	1,453	1	38	,236
Trimmed				
Mean				

The homogeneity test of the post-test in the experimental class and the control class based on the mean yielded a significant value of 0.216, which is shown in Table 4. The significance value was more than 0.05, suggesting that the post-test results in both classes were homogeneous.

### Hypotesis Test

To determine whether the hypothesis is accepted or not, a t-test is performed on the pretest and posttest results of the students in the experimental and control courses once the normality and homogeneity of the data distribution have been verified. The purpose of the t-test is to determine whether there are any discernible variations in the students' English competence between the two classes.

According to Table 5, the 2-tailed significant value was 0.009. There was a substantial influence between the two classes, as indicated by the significance level (2-tailed) being less than 0.05. This led to the acceptance of the null hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) and the rejection of the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ). It suggests that when students employ impromptu speaking strategies, their level of English language ability changes.

### FINDINGS AND SISCOSSION

Using a quasi – experimental methodology, this study examined how students' English-speaking skills were affected by the impromptu speaking technique. This study sought to ascertain whether the speaking skills of students who received instruction using standard and spontaneous approaches differed. There were two groups created from the research sample. The control group received instruction using traditional techniques, whereas the experimental group used impromptu learning as a learning strategy. Data for this study was gathered via pre- and post-test results.

The pre- and post-test results showed that the experimental class and the control class performed differently when impromptu was used as a speaking learning approach. The average difference between the pre- and post-test scores for the experimental group was 22, compared to 16 for the control group. Although this rise is not statistically significant, it might suggest that students' speaking skills have improved after they learned to employ impromptu speaking. Additionally, due to the brief treatment period, post-test outcomes for students in the experimental class did not significantly improve.

However, the independent sample t-test result (0.009), which is lower than the alpha value (0.05), demonstrated that the students' speaking abilities were impacted by using the impromptu speaking technique. This demonstrated that the students in the experimental class

had improved their speaking skills, particularly their vocabulary, fluency, comprehension, pronunciation, grammar, and ability to inquire and express opinions. Rewarding the top impromptu speakers in the experimental class also improved the mood of the students. They will also help the pupils recall both their correct and incorrect replies, and they are encouraged to provide accurate answers to every question.

Nurul Pratiwi's (2022) and Wirdayana's (2018) studies support the findings of this investigation. Furthermore, they showed that, in contrast to the natural approach method, impromptu speaking has a rather beneficial effect on students' speaking. Furthermore, the researcher claims that impromptu speaking can increase student engagement in the classroom because it compels them to think on the spot. According to the researchers, most students felt that speaking with their partners and groups gave them the confidence to freely express their ideas and opinions without feeling angry, illogical, or misinformed; these insights were also easier to implement; and students were more motivated to practice without experiencing anxiety or nervousness. Additionally, the researchers found some shortcomings in this impromptu speaking method. Some students still find it difficult to communicate verbally and are unsure of what they are saying.

## CONCLUSION

During the 2024–2025 academic year, MAN 2 Kuantan Singingi students participated in a quasi-experiment design to collect empirical data regarding the effect of impromptu speaking on students' capacity to solicit and offer opinions to others. The aim of this study is to determine whether or not students' English-speaking skills are significantly impacted by the usage of impromptu speaking strategies. According to the

computation results, students can enhance their English-speaking skills by employing impromptu speaking approaches.

To determine the pupils' baseline proficiency, the researcher first administered a pretest. Both the experiment class and the control class completed a similar test during the first session. The experimental group was the only one to get treatments or experiments from the researcher; the control group was the normal class. The experimental class fared better on the post-test and gain at the conclusion of the study than the control group.

Furthermore, an independent sample t-test with a significant value of 0.009 supports the notion that impromptu speaking strategies improve students' speaking abilities. The null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis was accepted since the test result was less than the alpha level of 0.050. It suggests that the exploration is going well. It can also be argued that impromptu speaking helped students at MAN 2 Kuantan Singingi enhance their English-speaking skills during the 2024–2025 school year.

## REFERENCES

- Andrin, G., Kilag, O. K., Abella, J., Tañiza, F., Groenewald, E., & Cordova Jr, N. (2024). Innovative Pedagogy: The Influence of Impromptu Speaking on Students' English Oral Proficiency. *Excellencia: International Multi-Disciplinary Journal of Education (2994-9521)*, 2(1), 36–46. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10552041>
- Azlina, K., Eliwarti, & Novitri. (2015). A study on the speaking ability of the second year students of SMK Telkom Pekanbaru. *Jurnal Online Mahasiswa Fakultas Keguruan Dan Ilmu Pendidikan Universitas Riau (JOM FKIP UNRI)*, 1–13.

- <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/206186-none.pdf>
- Ashidiqi, F. (2016). *The Effectiveness of One-Way Impromptu Speech Exercise in Improving Students' Oral Ability : An Experiment Study at The Eight Gade. Universitas of Mataram.* Journal.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). Principle of Language Learning and Teaching. In *Encyclopedia of the Sciences of Learning* (pp. 1743–1745).
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). Teaching Spoken Language. *Cambridge University Press*, 53(9), 1–24. [www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)
- Chaney, A. L., & Burk, T. L. (1998). Teaching Oral Communication in Grades K-8. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). Educational research: *Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (4th ed.)*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Dowling, F. (1957). *Teaching impromptu speaking*. The Speech Teacher, 6(3), 205–208.
- Gumartifa, A., & Syahri, I. (2022). How Undergraduate Students Capture English Impromptu Speech Challenge. *VELES: Voices of English Language Education Society*, 6(2), 477–487. <https://doi.org/10.29408/veles.v6i2.6601>
- Hosni, S. Al. (2004). *Speaking Difficulties Encountered by Young EFL Learners* (Vol. 2, Issue 6).
- Huwari, I. F. (2019). Problems faced by Jordanian undergraduate students in speaking english. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 8(9), 203–217.
- Irene, J., Sathasivam, K., Ng, M. M., Benjamin Jeyaraja, S. S., & Maniam, M. (2023). The Effects of Mother Tongue Interference among ESL Learners' Speaking Skills. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 13(7). <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v13-i7/17453>
- Isnawan, M. G., Nahdlatul, U., & Mataram, W. (2020). *KUASI-EKSPERIMEN* (Issue January).
- Kultsum, U. (2023). The Effectiveness Of Impromptu Speaking Method On Students' Speaking Of Introducing Oneself And Others. *JIMPS: Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Pendidikan Sejarah*, 8(3), 1830–1841. <https://jim.usk.ac.id/sejarah>
- Kwak, S. G., & Park, S. H. (2019). Normality Test in Clinical Research. *Journal of Rheumatic Diseases*, 26(1), 5–11. <https://doi.org/10.4078/jrd.2019.26.1.5>
- Lumettu, A., & Runtuwene, T. L. (2018a). Developing the Students' English Speaking Ability Through Impromptu Speaking Method. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 953(1). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/953/1/012035>
- Mbeh, A. (2017). Impromptu speaking and authentic assessment in English language teaching/learning. *International Journal of New Technology and Research*, 3(3), 263342.
- Panggabean. (2020). the Effect of Impromptu Speaking Method on Students' Speaking Ability (a Study At the Eleventh Grade Students of Sma Negeri 1 Pinangsori in 2018/2019 Academic Year). *Jurnal Liner*, 3 (1)(1), 123-137. [https://journal.ipts.ac.id/index.php/LI\\_NER/article/view/1107](https://journal.ipts.ac.id/index.php/LI_NER/article/view/1107)
- Point, T., Point, T., & Point, T. (2014). About the Tutorial Disclaimer & Copyright. *GA اصطناعي ذكاء. In Organizational Behavior*.