

Enhancing the Student Involvement in Learning Speaking through Impressive Personal Experience Material (IPEM)

Hasna

Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia

Email: hasna.19031@mhs.unesa.ac.id

Available Online:

<http://www.jurnal.unublitar.ac.id/index.php/briliant>

History of the Article:

Received on 18 December 2020
Accepted on 22 February 2021
Published on 28 February 2021
Pages 132-145

Keywords:

IPEM; student involvement;
student interest

DOI:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.28926/briliant.v3i4.611>

Abstract: Based on the observation in some speaking classes in Indonesia, most of the students reluctant to involve themselves in speaking learning process. Therefore, the study is aimed to find out: (1) the extent to which the influence of IPEM in making the students involve themselves in learning Speaking; and (2) the students' interest in attending the Speaking class through IPEM. Students' activities were observed, recorded, and noted during the teaching and learning process; and given questionnaires and interview in the last meeting in the class. The results show that: (1) IPEM enhances the student involvement in learning Speaking especially for most of those who get low involvement (33.3%) can achieve moderate involvement (56.7%); and (2) most of the students are interested in attending the Speaking class in which 89.6% of them are categorized high interested and the mean score of students' questionnaire answer is 82 which is categorized high interested.

INTRODUCTION

In Indonesia, undergraduate EFL education students are the students who take undergraduate program in a university particularly for English education study program. They are prepared to be teachers for junior and senior high school students. As teachers, they have to master English teaching materials particularly for junior and senior high school students. In addition, they must be able to transfer the materials successfully by using some techniques in order that their students can receive the materials successfully and easily. Students will understand the materials successfully and easily if the students are interested or have high motivation in attending the teaching and learning process because of the techniques and the materials used. So that, the techniques and the materials used are very important things in teaching and learning process. This study is important because it focuses on the materials used in teaching and learning process.

Speaking is a crucial part of second language learning and teaching, (Pollar, 2009). While, speaking skill is one of the most important skills that teachers have to master. Among the four skills such as Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing, hence speaking is intuitively the most important, (Masuram and Sripada, 2020). It is the most serious ability for the lecturers to teach. In spite of the fact that most of students have modest chance to carry out speaking English outside the classroom and so require bags of practice when they are in the class. Through speaking skills, teachers can transfer the teaching material to their

students. Furthermore, students can get the target language exposure from them when they are teaching. They are the main resource for students' language exposure. Students' speaking skills that are developed through material of teaching speaking are very urgent to be studied because without these skills students as teacher candidates will get difficulties in preparing themselves to be good teachers after they have finished their study.

During the observation, the problems found were as follows: (1) Most of the students did not speak during the teaching and learning process because of some reasons: there was no explanation or guidance at all from the lecturer during the preparation time. In other words, language input from the lecturer was very limited. The explanation was only about what the students had to do before they spoke up in the production phase. The lecturer did not encourage all of the students to speak by using the time effectively, (2) Most of the students were not interested in attending the teaching and learning process - it was proven by the fact that many of them had no idea during the discussion time, even they did something else rather than pay attention to the subject, (3) The lecturer did not appreciate their participation by giving them any mark for every contribution, and (4) There was no correction from the lecturer both during the subject and the end of it.

To solve the problem in teaching speaking, some articles have shown the solution such as Spherical Video-based Virtual Reality (SVVR), (Chien et al., 2020); identifying factors causing anxiety among students tertiary level through open-ended questionnaire, (Rajitha and Alamelu, 2020); giving the students task e.g., to write diary about what they do at home (Task-Based Teaching), (Masuram and Sripada, 2020); exploring non native teachers in giving correction feedback, in which teacher should know how to give CF in other to make their students understand the material presented by teacher, (Rahimi and Zhang, 2015); exploring teachers attitude toward the use of e-portofolio in speaking class, (Yastibas and Cepik, 2015); action research by developing teaching material for implementing the three organizational and pedagogical technologies such as "cognitive dissonance", information gap", and logical impasse", (Millrood, 2015); using domestic violence in literature classroom, (Ramakrishnan, 2014); using multimodal discourse analysis theory to the teaching of college English listening and speaking, (Hong, 2012); exploring whether newspaper articles can be used as speaking materials in foreign language courses as they include most authentic language patterns, a quasi-experimental study with hypothesis: "Language should be taught by original materials and spoken language is best acquired when it is obtained from authentic sources", (Akdemir et al., 2012); and giving the students questionnaire to know the level of their EQ and their view toward Brain-based activities in speaking classes, (Bora, 2012). However, none of them use the students' personal experience as material source in teaching speaking. Thus, the use of personal experience in teaching speaking can be the research gap.

Personal experience is closely related to storytelling, therefore this study also considers some articles which discuss storytelling such as (Esteban, 2015; Flórez-Aristizábal et al., 2019; Gimeno-Sanz, 2015; Lenhart et al., 2020; Mokhtar et al., 2011; Razmi et al., 2014; Ta and Filipi, 2020; Thang et al., 2014; Tsou et al., 2006). Storytelling has been used for children since long time ago (Tsou, 2006), but nowadays storytelling is still used for children (Flórez-Aristizábal et

al., 2019; Lenhart et al., 2020). Storytelling is not only used for children in language but also for adult even in learning English as an Academic Purposes (EAP) course, (Thang et al., 2014). Moreover, storytelling has been used in learning communicative skills (listening and speaking) through drama, (Mokhtar et al., 2011). Then, digital storytelling is used in EFL classroom to improve oral production, (Razmi et al., 2014). One study which is considered closely related to material for teaching was conducted by (Esteban, 2015) who uses storytelling to integrate curricular contents and language. Last, storytelling is used as a resource for pursuing understanding and agreement in pragmatics, (Ta and Filipi, 2020).

By examining PhD supervision interactions, it is proven that storytelling is a source for promoting understanding and agreement, (Ta and Filipi, 2020). The data from the interactions were analyzed by using conversation analysis. Supervisor recommendation and storytelling; supervisor disagreement and storytelling; and student disagreement and supervisor storytelling were analyzed to see the use of storytelling in promoting understanding and agreement. It has been found that through storytelling, the supervisors provide examples to clarify their feedback and assert their knowledge authority, thus pursuing their students' understanding and acceptance/agreement. The analysis of the students' responses to storytelling also shows that the students orient to supervisor storytelling as a pursuit of understanding, and agreement with and acceptance of feedback given. This study suggests that future studies should examine whether and how doctoral students' storytelling function in distributing power relations.

Storytelling can also be used in teaching English Specific Purposes. A study in a technical university setting has shown that using Digital Storytelling is a useful and engaging teaching approach for foreign language learning (Gimeno-Sanz, 2015). Learners of English in aerospace engineering have proven that their reading and writing skills were improved through the practice of the WebQuest, scripting, voice-over recording and synchronization, writing the log, preparing the "making-of" presentation, using the forum, and filling in the assessment forms in Digital Storytelling (DS) project. While, their listening and speaking skills were developed in activities such as working collaboratively in groups using English as the means of communication, recording their digital story, watching the video recordings, watching their classmates' digital stories, watching other examples of digital stories and delivering their "making-of" presentations.

Two other scholars who have investigated Digital Storytelling are Tang et al. and Razmi. Undergraduate students and teachers as the participants were interviewed and given questionnaire to know their responses to the use of Digital Storytelling as an innovation for learning English in an English for Academic Purpose (EAP) at the Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities (FSSH), the National University of Malaysia (Thang et al., 2014). Both teachers and students responded positively toward the implementation of the DST (Digital Storytelling) Project in the ESS (English for Social Science) course. Sixty learners from an Iranian Undergraduate EFL classroom were explored to see whether the use of Digital Storytelling technique affects the improvement of their oral skills (Razmi et al., 2014). It is found that by involving Digital Storytelling, not only learning becomes personal, enjoyable, attractive but it helps students improve their writing, reading, listening and speaking skills by learning to express opinions and constructing digital narratives for an audience.

Even though personal experience is almost the same or part of storytelling, it is more specific than storytelling. In storytelling, someone can tell anything he/she wants. However, personal experience only focuses on himself/herself. (Muller Mirza et al., 2014) have shown personal experience in teaching language for cultural diversity by asking teachers to make material, interviewing them before the lesson, asking the students to write a short text about one of the picture in the material, audio and video recordings of the lessons, asking the students to write their comments about what they did and learned during the lesson, interviewing the teacher after the class, asking the teacher about her or his perception of the lessons, and FGD with the students in the class. While, (Burdelski, 2004) examines narratives of personal experience as they emerged within supervisor-teaching assistant (TA) during weekly meetings.

The conversation among doctoral students and their supervisors through storytelling were analyzed to promote understanding and agreement among them (Ta and Filipi, 2020), while the present study focuses on analyzing undergraduate students' involvement by assigning them to tell their own impressive personal experiences as teaching material in speaking class. More complicated textbooks namely Technology Enhanced Activities for Aerospace Engineering were used in tasking technical students to produce Digital Storytelling to improve 4 language skills, but the material have to be supported by the university (Gimeno-Sanz, 2015).

Considering the different focuses of some previous studies in using storytelling and personal experience in teaching language, this study is aimed to use students own impressive personal experiences as teaching material in teaching speaking. Some studies have concentrated on teaching students through *Personal Experiences (PE)*, but it had never been found a study about *Impressive Personal Experiences (IPE)*. As a result the study is categorized as new one because of the *impressive* word. The advantage of *IPEM* is the teaching and learning process is easy for the students to understand as the teaching materials are not too far from their previous knowledge. The study is also feasible because it is very possible to be done in classroom as other teaching materials that are presented by lecturers.

METHOD

This study used observation and FGD design. Quantitative and Qualitative data were equally weighted. Firstly, the data were quantitatively analyzed. Then, the result of quantitative analysis was interpreted qualitatively, (Edmonds and Kennedy, 2017). On the basis of *Speaking II* syllabus, there were six topics provided during the teaching and learning process. They were childhood, daily activity, family, friendship, food and drinks, and technology and education. Because many things happened during the meetings in the class that were not predicted, only four treatments meeting were analyzed. Therefore, only 4 activities were done to promote speaking, they were *Asking and Answering Questions, Explaining, Describing, and Narrating*. So that, in the second meeting, the activities were *Asking and Answering Questions* about *childhood*, the third meeting was only used to explain what the writer expected to be done and not to be done by the students based on the second meeting. The activity for the fourth meeting was *Explaining activity* and *daily activity* as the topic. The fifth meeting was used to inform the students about the writer's analysis of the fourth meeting.

The activity for the sixth meeting was *Describing activity* and the topic was *family*. The seventh meeting was used to explain the students' work correction and asked the students to do *Narrating activity* with *friendship* topic at home and submit this homework in CD form. At the end of the seventh meeting, the students were dictated six questions related to their interest.

In the presentation section, the students were given example of how to tell *IPE* which was related to the lecture own *IPE*. Nevertheless, this activity had only been doing for two meetings because it seemed that the students could not analyzed what they had heard. They could not understand material by only giving them example of the implementation of material. On the other words, they were not able to see beyond or behind example of material application.

There were eight meetings for the whole. The first meeting was for the introduction to the *IPEM*. The second until the seventh meetings were the treatment meetings. The 7th, 8th meetings, and other day that was not included in treatment meetings were for the questionnaire and interview. Therefore, the students in *Speaking* class were treated for six meetings and each meeting spent 90 minutes. In this case, the *Speaking II* syllabus was connected to the students' *IPE*.

The instruments used in this study were video recording, field note, questionnaire, and interview. The teaching and learning process were recorded from the first until the eight meeting. While the teaching and learning process was running in the class, it was written several things happened in the class that could be written at the time and that were predicted to forget if they were not written at the time, such as which students were included in group one, two and so on. As soon as after the treatment had finished on each meeting, the note was completed related to everything happened during the treatment.

Questionnaire was given to the students to find out the students' interests through the use of *IPEM*. The questionnaire used Likert Scale. There were 20 statements to cover whether the students are interested in learning *Speaking* subject, or not. There were 10 positive items of statement given to cover the students' interest in the implementation of *IPEM*. But there were also 10 negative items of statement about the students' uninteresting in learning *Speaking* subject by using *IPEM*.

Interview was conducted on the seventh, the eight meetings and other day. This instrument was aimed to get the data about students' interest that could not be obtained from the questionnaire. It was intended to find out more in-depth data about students' interest. It used semi-structured interview that combined both structured and unstructured approaches. The interview was formal and planned. In order to fill the time efficiently, the students were interviewed at the same time for all of them in the class.

To see the implementation of *IPEM* in learning speaking for the students, student involvement is considered the most important to analyze in this study. Student involvement is one of the most widely studied areas in higher education and every researcher has different concept in terms of "engagement" and "integration", (Sharkness and DeAngelo, 2011). Student involvement can also mean students' interaction and participation in learning activities, (Abdullah et al., 2012).

Students' involvement meant in the study was students' long learning. Students' long learning were represented by the duration and quality of their speaking performance in and outside the class. Therefore, to know the students' involvement, speaking duration was calculated firstly then the quality of students speaking performance. Thus, the students' involvement was gotten from speaking duration added by the quality of students' speaking performance.

To know the duration of students' speaking performance, the video recording of teaching and learning process from every meeting including students' speaking video task done by themselves at home if they could not perform in the class at the time of *Speaking II* subject, was displayed. Because the *Speaking II* subject in the university where the study was conducted had only 2 credits semester and one credit semester for university students was 50 minutes, every meeting had only 100 minutes. Every meeting consisted of beginning the class in 5 minutes, running the class in 25 minutes, practice in 30 minutes, production in 30 minutes, and closing and ending in 15 minutes. Because the class consisted of 30 students, every student was given 1 minute to speak in production section. For those who spoke in 1 minutes got 100 for speaking duration scores. To score the students speaking duration the formula used was shown below:

$$\text{Score} = \frac{\text{Students' speaking duration in second}}{\text{Number of second in one minute}} \times 100$$

If the students had more than 1 minute, they automatically got 100 for their speaking duration scores.

Students' speaking skills meant in the study were the students' speaking skills in every meeting that consisted of micro and macro-skills. The data about students' speaking skills were also taken from the video recording of teaching and learning process from every meeting including the students' speaking video task done by themselves at home if they could not perform in the class at the time of *Speaking II* subject.

Considering the micro and macro-skills in speaking, the pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary were measured for micro-skills; then, fluency, discourse, function, cohesion and strategic options for macro-skills. To get the scores of students' involvement for answering study question number 1, the scores of their speaking duration and the score of their speaking macro and micro skills were totally added. Then, she determined the level of students' involvement by using the score rate interval below.

Table 1. The Range and Category of Students' Level of Involvement

Range	Category
85 – 100	Very High
69 – 84	High
53 – 68	Moderate
37 – 52	Low
20 – 36	Very Low

Source: (Sugiyono, 2008: 182)

The students' answers to the questionnaire were given scores based on the Likert Scale adapted from Arikunto's 2006. After that, the scores were categorized based the score interval adapted from Sugiyono 2008. Finally, to know the percentage from the frequency of the students for each category shown in Sugiyono's score interval, their scores were computed by using Arikunto's formula. The score of the students' answer for each item was classified by using Likert Scale as shown below:

Table 2. Score and Category of Students' Interest from Questionnaire

Positive Statement Score	Category	Negative Statement Score
5	strongly agree	1
4	Agree	2
3	Undecided	3
2	Disagree	4
1	strongly disagree	5

Source: (Arikunto, 2006: 299)

The score rate ranges from 20 to 100 (interval 80). Since the questionnaire employed five categories, the interval which was used to determine the category of the students was divided by five ($80 : 5 = 16$). The score interval was determined based on (Sugiyono, 2008: 182). After the interest category for each student was determined, the number of students who got the same category was counted. Then, the percentage of each category was calculated by using the following formula (Arikunto, 2006: 239):

$$P = \frac{F_q}{N} \times 100\%$$

Where:

P = percentage of one category of students' interest

F_q = number of frequency

N = total sample

Data from interview were coded into five categories, i.e., strongly expected, expected, moderate expected, unexpected, and strongly unexpected answer. Score was given to the answer codes based on table 3 below, (Arikunto, 2006: 299). Then, the frequency and percentage of students' interest from interview was counted based on table 1 above.

Table 3. Score and Category of Students' Interest from Interview

Score	Code
5	Strongly Expected
4	Expected
3	Moderate Expected
2	Unexpected
1	Strongly Unexpected

RESULTS

Student Involvement

Before the treatment was given, the students were given personality test. Personality test was aimed to know the students' personality before studying *Speaking II* subject. Knowing students' personality before entering the class was expected to help the writer make pairs and groups of students when doing various teaching and learning activities in the class.

There was no student who got both very high and very low involvement. On one hand moderate involvement and low involvement showed good effect of *IPEM* in which the higher the meeting the more frequency and percentage of students who had moderate involvement. On the other hand, the higher the meeting the lesser the frequency and percentage of students who had low involvement.

Student Interest

Students' Interest Data from Questionnaire

From the table above, it is known that 9 (31.0%) students were very highly interested, 17 (58.6%) highly, 2 (6.9%) moderately, 1 (3.4%) lowly, and there was no student who was very low interested. It is shown that the mean score of the students' interest from the questionnaire was 82. Based on Sugiyono's category, the students' interest was categorized high interest.

Students Interest Data from Interview

Actually there are 10 interview questions given to the students to know their in depth interest learning speaking through *IPEM*, but only eight questions are shown in this paper. Tabel 6 above shows that below 35% students who gave unexpected and strongly unexpected answer. While the students who gave expected answer including moderate and strongly expected answer were 60% until 96.2%.

DISCUSSION

Student Involvement

The influence of *IPEM* to some (4 or 3) of them was just to make them persistent their involvement level. It was not increasing their involvement level from high to very high. It means that most of their scores for the nine items that were measured before determining their involvement level were persistently in high level. In addition *IPEM* made involvement level of one student decrease. On the 4th meeting, there was a student whose speaking duration increased from 52.0 to 100.0, but his grammar, vocabulary, and discourse scores decreased. It means that he had more ideas to say than on the 2nd meeting, but his knowledge about grammar and vocabulary choice to express the ideas were not enough. Furthermore. the relationship between the main ideas and supporting ideas was not good in terms of his discourse skill. It was possibly caused by the large number of ideas he would express at the time.

Most of the students who got moderate involvement on 2nd meeting still got the moderate involvement on 4th meeting. except no. 29. It was because student no. 29 was absent on the day. So that, it could not be predicted what level

he got on the 4th meeting as well as the reason of his involvement level. For the seventh students who got moderate involvement on the 2nd meeting got different orders on the 4th meeting. For no. 3, 25, 2, and 5 got lower order than before because their grammar, vocabulary, cohesion, and discourse scores were lower than before. While 18, 22, and 26 got higher order than before. Student no 21 was absent on the 2nd meeting. So that, it could not be predicted whether he got higher or lower level than before.

On the 4th meeting students no. 4, 15, 24, 10, 13, 27, and 6 got moderate involvement which were higher than on the 2nd meeting because they got low involvement on the 2nd meeting. Additionally, students no. 10, 3, 13, on the 4th meeting got lower involvement on the 6th meeting. While, students no 16 and 30 were absent on 2nd, 4th, and 6th meetings. They were only present on the 7th meeting; consequently, they got low involvement on the 7th meeting. For student no 29 got low involvement on the seventh meeting, it was highly possibly because of his absence on the 4th and 6th meetings, and actually he got moderate involvement on the second meeting. Student no 23 got low involvement on 2nd and 4th meeting as well as she was absent on the 6th meeting.

Differently from what is found by Mirza. 2014, in which focuses on the unicity and generacity shows that bringing student personal experience into the class activities can make the collection of the experiences become impersonal. There is no problem with the grammar, vocabulary and discourse (micro and macro speaking skills), even the skills performed by the participants shows the expectation of the study. The basic problem in the study is not speaking skills but secundaritation in education with cultural diversity. However. the study implys that student personal experience can be good as source for teaching material because the material not only makes the students are familiar with the content to express but also builds the teacher and other students empathy for who express the experience.

Thus. this study has similarity with what is found by Mirza 14 which shows that student personal experience is good as source for teaching material. The most important thing should be considered in this study is the teaching procedure because the data analysis shows that the problem face by the students in relation to the grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, discourse, and cohesion comes from the teaching procedure. Learning activities should begin from asking the students to write their *IPE* based on some topics taken from the syllabus by using their source language. Then. teacher produces teaching material based on the students' *IPE*. Beside teaching procedure, the second important thing is the word *impressive*. The students should know what is meant by the word *impressive* before choosing the *IPE*. The *IPE* meant is the student personal experience which they remember best.

Student Interest

Based on the findings, the analysis result shows that the use of *IPEM* in teaching *Speaking English* subject significantly influenced the students' interest in attending the *Speaking II* subject. This means that *IPEM* is a good applicable material in teaching *Speaking* subject. Furthermore, from the frequency and percentage of student interest to *IPEM* based on data from questionnaire, the analysis result shows that 9 students (31%) were strongly interested and 17

students (58.6%) were interested. It shows that the use of *IPEM* influenced significantly students' interest in learning *Speaking English* subject.

In the study, the interest of students was considered as output because they were expected to have improvement in the use of *IPEM*. The students gave responses that learning speaking by using *IPEM* improve their interest in the process of study. They felt that their confidence, pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, cohesion, discourse, and strategic options increased because of the implementation of *IPEM*. In the other hand, they involved themselves more and more in the classroom.

Although all the interview questions were aimed to know the students' interest in the application of *IPEM*, some questions had specific purpose. Question number 1 was about what the students' feeling when the writer firstly entered their class and explained about what she would do in their class in terms of the study. The question was aimed to know the first impression that the students got from the lecturer and their feeling in imagining what would happen later in their class in terms of the study. Nine students (34.6%) gave unexpected answer for the question. However, the total number of students who gave strongly expected, expected, and moderate expected answers was 17 (65.4%). It means that most of them welcomed the writer at the first meeting and they would also welcome her during the teaching and learning process.

Question number 2 was about what steps the students did when they did the tasks. Actually, the lecturer had explained the answer of this question on the first meeting. She asked this question on the interview day to know whether the students kept in mind what she had explained to them to see their interest whatever she had given them in the class. There were 16 (61.5%) students who gave expected answer and only 10 expressed unexpected one. The data show that most of the students paid attention to what the lecturer had explained in the class.

Question number 3 was about whether the students' used other subjects to help them in doing the tasks in order to know whether they could correlate one subject with others. Twenty-one (80.8%) students stated moderate expected answer and only 5 (19.2%) students had strongly unexpected answer. From the data, it was clear that they could correlate the subject that the lecturer taught with other subjects. However, all of students had moderate expected answer only got 3 score because they only mentioned 1 or 2 subjects and a few material in which most of the subjects were correlated each other. Actually, there were 3 students answer that so many material they got from other subjects to do the task given by the writer by their reason because all of the subjects they had ever got in their study were correlated each other; nevertheless, they could/did not mention the subjects and the materials they meant.

Question number 4 was about whether they choose free narrating or narrating *IPE*. There were 22 (84.6%) of the students who chose narrating *IPE*. They stated that it was easy for them to recall and to retell something they had ever experienced than something never. Only 4 (15.4%) of them who chose free narrating because it was easy for them to express what they want without limitation of something they had ever experienced. From the data, it is strongly believeable that most of them were interested in the application of *IPEM*.

Question number 5 was asking about whether the students frequently reported or liked reporting their experiences to other people or not. Only 3

students possessed unexpected answer; contrarily, 23 (88.5%) of them possessed expected answer. The data also supported their interest in *IPEM*. Nonetheless, only 14 (53.8%) got 5 score (strongly expected) because 3 (11.5%) gave expected and 6 (23.1%) moderate expected answer whose score 4 and 3. For those who got 5 score were who answered that they liked and frequently telling their *IPE* without mentioning the requirement the kind of *IPE* and to whom they told it. While, 4 score was given for those who liked telling their *IPE*, but only to believable friends and un-secret *IPE*. For 3 score, they said that they sometimes liked which meant that they liked only 50%.

Question number 6 was asking about whether they liked listening to other people's experiences. Actually all (100%) of the students who attended the interview day answered that they liked listening to other persons' *IPE*, but 8 (30.8%) of them expressed strongly expected answer because they liked without mentioning any requirement. Whereas, 17 (65.4%) students liked with various requirements, such as only that gave them inspiration, funny experience, failure and success, appropriately being heard, and from the ones they believed. Only one (3.8%) conveyed moderate expected answer because he sometimes liked and only for interesting experiences according to him.

For question number 7, there were 25 (96.2%) of 26 students who chose to tell the experiences of themselves. While, question number 8 was asking whether the materials of the writer herself experiences, students' work correction and oral explanation given by her in the class were useful for them. One hundred percent of them (26 students) answered that the materials were useful for them, but they had numerous reasons, such as they could pronounce much words well, they could know how to put words on the right order, they could know their mistake in constructing sentences, they could increase their vocabulary, they were able to be open persons, etc. The two numbers of interview questions presented data that they were highly or strongly interested in *IPEM*.

CONCLUSION

The use of *IPEM* made the students involve themselves more and more in learning *Speaking II* only for those students who had low involvement to have moderate involvement. There was no at all student who got very high involvement because of some reasons. i.e., they had lacked of grammar and vocabulary knowledge since the earliest meeting; the material presented in the presentation section during two meetings – the lecturer own experiences as input for them could not cover all of grammar and vocabulary that they needed in telling their own experiences; and different topics for different meetings made them cannot use much of vocabulary they got from the early meetings – they needed new grammar and vocabulary on every meeting based on the topics that were in the *Speaking II* syllabus; they had low ability to analyze material that had been given to them before getting new material from other sources – they just focused and depended on what the lecturer had given to them. There was also no at all student who had very low involvement because they were third semester of university students in English department – they were not Junior, Senior, High School students or other low levels.

If function and discourse were not included in measuring students' involvement, surely *IPEM* would have increased students' involvement in

learning *Speaking* subject from low to high. Moreover, the strength of the study was that the students did not worry about the content that they would tell in speaking activity because it was their own experience which was best memorized by them. Being compared with one other way of teaching *Speaking* subject – asking students to read an article, then asking them to retell the content of the article by using their own sentences, the study is surely easier than the other way because the content of the article has never been experienced by them. Therefore, it will be difficult for them to memorize it.

This study is recommended to develop syllabus and material for *Speaking* subject. Even though syllabus and material are generally made long time before teaching and learning processes begin; in relation to this study, the syllabus and material should be completed after asking the student to write their *IPE* in Indonesia. Thus, before the lecturer ask the students to their own experiences in English based on the topic given to them for each meeting, one week before they should be asked to write their own experiences in Indonesian in the class. After that, they should submit the task to the lecturer before the class ends. Then, the lecturer composes a story in English that cover most of the vocabulary and grammar the students' need at his/her home during one week before the next meeting.

When the next meeting is coming, the lecturer should present the material containing the story had been composed by him/her at his/her home before the meeting. Every student should have the hard copy of the material or at least the soft copy. The material should be presented in group discussion with the lecturer and among groups in the class. In addition, grammar and vocabulary used should be explained during the discussion section. Next, at the end of every meeting the students are asked to write their own experience in Indonesian based on the topic for next meeting. Last, the students were assigned to record themselves while telling their own *IPE* based on the topic had been discussed on the day.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, M.Y., Bakar, N.R.A., Mahbob, M.H., 2012. The Dynamics of Student Participation in Classroom: Observation on Level and forms of Participation. *Procedia - Soc. Behav. Sci.* 59, 61–70. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.09.246>
- Akdemir, A.S., Barin, M., Demiroz, H., 2012. Broadsheet English: Teaching Speaking Through Newspaper Articles. *Procedia - Soc. Behav. Sci.* 46, 3967–3971. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.180>
- Bora, F.D., 2012. The Impact of Emotional Intelligence on Developing Speaking Skills: From Brain-based Perspective. *Procedia - Soc. Behav. Sci.* 46, 2094–2098. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.434>
- Burdelski, M., 2004. Closed- and open-ended narratives of personal experience: Weekly meetings among a supervisor and teaching assistants of a “Japanese language education practicum.” *Linguist. Educ.* 15, 3–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2004.10.002>
- Chien, S.Y., Hwang, G.J., Jong, M.S.Y., 2020. Effects of peer assessment within the context of spherical video-based virtual reality on EFL students' English-Speaking performance and learning perceptions. *Comput. Educ.* 146,

103751. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103751>
- Edmonds, W.A., Kennedy, T.D., 2017. An applied reference guide to research designs.
- Esteban, S.G., 2015. Integrating Curricular Contents and Language through Storytelling: Criteria for Effective CLIL Lesson Planning. *Procedia - Soc. Behav. Sci.* 212, 47–51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.11.297>
- Flórez-Aristizábal, L., Cano, S., Collazos, C.A., Benavides, F., Moreira, F., Fardoun, H.M., 2019. Digital transformation to support literacy teaching to deaf Children: From storytelling to digital interactive storytelling. *Telemat. Informatics* 38, 87–99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2018.09.002>
- Gimeno-Sanz, A., 2015. Digital Storytelling as an Innovative Element in English for Specific Purposes. *Procedia - Soc. Behav. Sci.* 178, 110–116. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.03.163>
- Hong, L., 2012. Application of the Multimodal Discourse Analysis Theory to the Teaching of College English Listening and Speaking. *IERI Procedia* 2, 319–324. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ieri.2012.06.095>
- Lenhart, J., Lenhard, W., Vaahtoranta, E., Suggate, S., 2020. More than words: Narrator engagement during storytelling increases children’s word learning, story comprehension, and on-task behavior. *Early Child. Res. Q.* 51, 338–351. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2019.12.009>
- Masuram, J., Sripada, P.N., 2020. Developing spoken fluency through task-based teaching. *Procedia Comput. Sci.* 172, 623–630. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2020.05.080>
- Millrood, R.P., 2015. Techniques and Technologies of Teaching Speaking: Dealing with Backwash Effect in Russia. *Procedia - Soc. Behav. Sci.* 200, 46–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.08.009>
- Mokhtar, N.H., Halim, M.F.A., Kamarulzaman, S.Z.S., 2011. The effectiveness of storytelling in enhancing communicative skills. *Procedia - Soc. Behav. Sci.* 18, 163–169. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.05.024>
- Muller Mirza, N., Grossen, M., de Diesbach-Dolder, S., Nicollin, L., 2014. Transforming personal experience and emotions through secondarisation in education for cultural diversity: An interplay between unicity and genericity. *Learn. Cult. Soc. Interact.* 3, 263–273. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2014.02.004>
- Pollar, 2009. Teaching english at Damascus University medical school. *East. Mediterr. Heal. J.* 15, 653–664. <https://doi.org/10.26719/2009.15.3.653>
- Rahimi, M., Zhang, L.J., 2015. Exploring non-native English-speaking teachers’ cognitions about corrective feedback in teaching English oral communication. *System* 55, 111–122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.09.006>
- Rajitha, K., Alamelu, C., 2020. A study of factors affecting and causing speaking anxiety. *Procedia Comput. Sci.* 172, 1053–1058. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2020.05.154>
- Ramakrishnan, M.S., 2014. Speak Out: Teaching Domestic Violence in Your Literature Classroom. *Procedia - Soc. Behav. Sci.* 118, 296–301. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.02.040>
- Razmi, M., Pourali, S., Nozad, S., 2014. Digital Storytelling in EFL Classroom (Oral Presentation of the Story): A Pathway to Improve Oral Production.

- Procedia - Soc. Behav. Sci. 98, 1541–1544.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.576>
- Sharkness, J., DeAngelo, L., 2011. Measuring Student Involvement: A Comparison of Classical Test Theory and Item Response Theory in the Construction of Scales from Student Surveys. *Res. High. Educ.* 52, 480–507.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-010-9202-3>
- Ta, B.T., Filipi, A., 2020. Storytelling as a resource for pursuing understanding and agreement in doctoral research supervision meetings. *J. Pragmat.* 165, 4–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.03.008>
- Thang, S.M., Sim, L.Y., Mahmud, N., Lin, L.K., Zabidi, N.A., Ismail, K., 2014. Enhancing 21st Century Learning Skills Via Digital Storytelling: Voices of Malaysian Teachers and Undergraduates. *Procedia - Soc. Behav. Sci.* 118, 489–494. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.02.067>
- Tsou, W., Wang, W., Tzeng, Y., 2006. Applying a multimedia storytelling website in foreign language learning. *Comput. Educ.* 47, 17–28.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2004.08.013>
- Yastibas, A.E., Cepik, S., 2015. Teachers' Attitudes toward the Use of e-portfolios in Speaking Classes in English Language Teaching and Learning. *Procedia - Soc. Behav. Sci.* 176, 514–525.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.505>