



The SEALL JOURNAL  
The STKIP Al Maksum English Education, Linguistics  
and Literature Journal  
Vol, 1, No. 1, April 2020, pp  
E-ISSN:2721-7124 / P-ISSN: 2721-7116



Available online at:

<https://jurnal.stkipalmaksum.ac.id/index.php/jellas>

## **Developing Students' Activity Through Role Play Method By Using Interview Technique on 11th Grade at SMA Melati Binjai North Sumatera Province**

**Maitri Ramadhani<sup>1)\*</sup>, Sara Frimaulia<sup>2)</sup>, Alwi Musthofa<sup>3)</sup>  
<sup>1,2,3</sup>STKIP Al Maksum Langkat**

\*Email : [maitriramadhani@stkipalmaksum.ac.id](mailto:maitriramadhani@stkipalmaksum.ac.id)

### **Abstract**

This research paper elucidates the effective utilization of role-play as a pedagogical tool to cultivate an immersive experiential learning milieu tailored for postgraduate scholars enrolled in courses focused on comparative evaluation theory and/or evaluation procedures. The integration of meticulously crafted role-play exercises within each of these courses serves to augment the level of student participation, consequently fostering a heightened degree of engagement with the course material. By immersing students in these role-play scenarios, the approach transcends the boundaries of conventional learning, facilitating a profound comprehension of the subject matter through active participation. The intricate role-play exercises outlined within the paper are characterized by their intricate design, ensuring students' active involvement in the learning process. These exercises are strategically developed to propel students beyond the confines of textual analysis, encouraging them to delve into experiential learning. By propelling students to think beyond the mere words they encounter in reading materials, the exercises stimulate critical thinking and creative problem-solving. Furthermore, the experiential nature of the exercises provides a secure environment for students to embrace a "learning by doing" ethos. This not only nurtures their understanding but also cultivates a sense of safety that emboldens them to explore and experiment without the fear of failure.

**Keywords:** roleplay; interview technique

## I. Introduction

When teaching evaluation theory, how can students be engaged so that they really understand. This paper describes our attempts to create an experiential learning environment for graduate students in these two courses. Experiential learning environments are designed to increase student engagement in the learning process and, in turn, academic achievement. For us this means moving away from a more traditional top-down pedagogical model to the creation of student–student and student–faculty partnerships in the classroom. We like to think of our students as “participants” and ourselves as “facilitators” of learning. Our belief is that the best way to understand evaluation theory and procedures is through participation. One useful technique that inspires participation is role-play. While it is plausible to picture how students can participate in the practice of evaluation, it may be more difficult to imagine what it means to participate in evaluation theory. In this paper, we describe the processes of participation in both courses. The need for the development of training courses in evaluation has been largely unmet. Many graduate programs lack courses in evaluation, relying heavily upon research methods courses or informal training for teaching evaluation. The few courses that are taught, however, often employ traditional instructional methods, such as lectures and reading lists. We argue that these modes of teaching are not appropriate for building the skills necessary to conduct evaluation, nor do they foster deep understandings of theoretical perspectives. Moreover, many students prefer to develop knowledge through doing rather than sitting and listening. In the case of the courses, we discuss in this paper, doing typically refers to role-play. This represents an intentional restructuring of the students’ learning experiences to foster more explicit intellectual connections among students and between students and faculty. This is compatible with the adult learning literature in which it is noted “action begets learning” (Cavaliere & Sgroi, 1992, p. 7). John Dewey’s notion of learning by doing established a methodology of instruction promoted by adult learning scholars suggesting that social and intellectual skills come to the learner through situations characterized by interactivity, not isolation (Carr, 1992).

One, of course, can “learn by doing” through participation in actual evaluations. However, when teaching an evaluation procedures or theory course that takes place over a limited period of time (an academic quarter or semester), the approach of participating in evaluations presents limitations. For instance, there are time constraints and logistical concerns. Arranging appointments with stakeholders, and multiple follow-up meetings to focus the evaluation can be enormously time consuming. This also presumes that stakeholders are willing and have the time to participate in activities that may reach beyond their commitments to the actual evaluation at its particular stage. Additionally, most evaluations are conducted over a lengthy period of time (a year or more). Thus, students would be involved in only those select stages of the evaluation process that are occurring during the time they are enrolled in the course. Most importantly, however, students in the field lack the security of the classroom learning environment where it is safer to take risks and experiment with new concepts and ideas. Thus, we find role-play to be a viable and productive method for “learning by doing.”

Before describing our instructional processes, let us first define what we mean by role-play. Ladousse (1987) suggests that we look at the words themselves. Participants assume a “role”, that is, they play a part (either their own or someone else’s) in a specific situation/scenario. “Play” means that the role is taken on in a safe environment where participants can express their views in creative ways.<sup>1</sup>

To further understand our definition of role-play, we distinguish between role-play and simulation, although we recognize that some argue that such a fine distinction is unnecessary. The use of role-play as an educational or training technique is considered to be part of a wider set of techniques that have collectively become known as simulation. Simulations are complex, lengthy and relatively inflexible events, yet they always include an element of role-play. Role-play, on the other hand, can be a simple, brief technique, easily organized. Role-play is highly flexible, leaving much more room for the demonstration of individual variation, initiative, and imagination (Ladousse, 1987). Both, however, take an approach to learning that is fundamentally different from other teaching methods found in most graduate schools. The key difference is the emphasis on experiencing the course as opposed to simply being lectured to. Role-play promotes interaction in the classroom and peer learning, which increases motivation (Livingstone, 1983). Classrooms that utilize role-play tend to create environments that are less anxious and fearful. This, in turn, helps to create a classroom characterized by “community sharing” (Adams, 1973). That is to say, students more readily share their ideas and thinking. Because of the lack of anxiety and increased motivation, students tend to experiment more broadly. As instructors, we also act as participants in role-play, rather than simply observing it. Thus, when role-play is a core element of a course, learning is more easily promoted.

Role-playing is most commonly used in situations dealing with attitudes and feelings, for example, to replicate the feelings of someone in a particular social situation. Role-play can also be a tool for cognitive development, although it is not used frequently in this manner. It is also used to develop skills such as coaching, listening and conflict resolution. A quotation attributed to Confucius implies as much: “I hear and I forget; I see and I remember; I do and I understand.” A more recent insight related to role-play as a kind of “doing” is provided by Thatcher (1990): “Learning is the process of preparing to deal with new situations. It may occur consciously or unconsciously, usually from experiencing real life situations, although simulations and imagined situations can induce learning.”

In the context of our teaching, the purpose of role-play in the procedures course differs slightly from that of the theory course. A common aim of both is to train participants to think on their feet. For the procedures course, it is also to learn how to handle situations as they unravel—a useful dress rehearsal for real life. For the theory course, the aim is to move beyond the simple regurgitation of readings by developing advanced understandings of difficult theoretical notions through communication. Next, we describe how these goals are achieved.

## **II. Literature Review**

As stated previously, the aim of the theory course is to provide students with an in-depth understanding of prevalent evaluation theories, with systems for categorizing those theories, with an understanding of major issues in evaluation, and with an understanding of the processes of theory development in evaluation. For the purposes of describing the use of role-play, we focus primarily on the first of these purposes: understanding (really understanding) the prevalent evaluation theories.

The activities to achieve this goal primarily occur during the first 5 weeks of the 10-week quarter course. Activities in subsequent weeks, which are directed towards categorizing theories and looking at major issues in evaluation, enhance these understandings. The first 2 weeks of the course present a general overview of evaluation,

including historically significant papers, books, and events that shaped the evaluation field. For educational evaluation, this includes such historical landmarks as: Ralph Tyler and The Eight Year Study, Sputnik, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1964, the Cronbach article “Course Improvement ... ,” and a number of other seminal articles published during the 1960s. For the social science “evaluative research” historical thread, one needs to start with Edward Suchman’s early work, some work at the Urban Institute, and, of course, the early textbook writing of Peter Rossi.

The next 3 weeks (weeks 3–5) are substantially more intensive and are designed to foster an understanding of evaluation theorists’ thinking processes. During these weeks, role-play is relied upon considerably. Students prepare for the role-play experience each week by doing extensive research and reading on a particular theorist and by writing a short, three-page “theorist summary paper.” Theorist summary papers have a specific set of guideline questions to be addressed that help students to understand the essentials of a theorist’s point of view. The questions guide the student’s writing effort and their contemplation process.

Questions such as the following are designed to extend the students’ analyses of the theorist’s work:

What does the theorist take to be the ultimate purpose of evaluation? The subsidiary purpose?

What is the theorist’s general approach to carrying out these purposes?

According to this theorist, what is (should be) the role of the evaluator in “valuing” data?

According to this theorist, what is (should be) the role of the evaluator in making causal (rather than descriptive) claims?

What does this theorist view as the role of those affected by or interested in the evaluation? In what ways do they participate?

According to this theorist, how can we train a person to be an evaluator?

For week 3 (theorist summary paper number one), all students focus on one of three theorists (typically Cronbach, Scriven, and Stake) and they are provided with a partial reading list of three or four references. For weeks 4 and 5, a broad array of theorists are selected with typically not more than one or two students selecting an individual theorist. During this part of the course, students must conduct a much more extensive literature search on their own.

In the first role-play exercise (week 3), the format of the TV game show To Tell the Truth is used. Students watch a taped episode of the show prior to engaging in the exercise, so the task is unambiguous. In this classic TV program, a brief biography is read of a semi-famous or unique person whose appearance is not familiar. Three individuals purporting to be this person (one of them authentic) are then questioned by contestants who must guess who is

### **III. Research Method**

This research was True-Experimental (Quantitative). The research was conducted from July to August 2020. The subject of the research was 36 students of the eleventh grade of Senior High School 3 of Binjai. The sample took by cluster random sampling. The topic is How to speak well in speaking skill. The technique of collecting data used a monologue test. The monologue test was done to know whether there is a significant difference by using role-play with ask and question (interview) in teaching speaking skill.

In validity, the indicator measured are pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, and fluency. In this study, the writer used inter-rater reliability. According to Gay, et al (2012:168), "Inter-rater reliability is the consistency or two or more independent scores, raters and observes." Therefore, the first rater in this study was the English teacher of Senior High School 3 of Binjai and the second rater was the writer herself. In this research, to analyze the data, the writer used independent t-test. In analyzing the data, the writer used independent sample t-test. The writer compared the result of the students' the post-test scores in the experimental group with the result of the students' the post-test scores in the control group. The calculation used Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) version 24.

## **IV. Discussion**

### **Testing Hypothesis**

After doing the experience in teaching speaking through Role Play with Ask and question (Interview), it was clear that the Eleventh Grade Students of Senior High School 3 of Binjai were successful in learning speaking through Role Play with Ask and question (Interview). The students' average score in the pre-test was 49.72 and average students' score in the post-test was 78.88. If the t-obtained is higher than t-table, the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) would be rejected, while the alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) would be accepted (Arikunto, 2010:257). The findings of this study showed that t-obtained 11.352 was higher than t-table 1.68. It means that there was significance differences between the students' score in the pre-test and post-test.,The students' mean score in the posttest of the experimental group was significantly higher than the one in the posttest of the control group, with the students' average score of the experimental group in the posttest was 53.29 while the students' average score in the control group was 46.04. Meanwhile the critical value was 0.05 significance level for two-tailed test with 35 (df) was 1.68 since the t-obtained was 11.352, it was higher than the t-table. The result showed that the t-obtained was higher than t-table, it means the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) was rejected while the alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) was accepted. It could be concluded that there was a significant difference of speaking scores of the eleventh grade students taught through Role-play with Video blog (Interview) from those of ones taught a conventional technique at Senior High School 3 of Binjai. Consequently, based on the findings the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) was rejected while the alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) was accepted. It indicates that there was any significant difference of speaking scores of the eleventh grade students taught through Role-play with Video blog (Interview) from those of ones taught a conventional technique at Senior High School 3 of Binjai. The writer observed that the students are motivated to learn in speaking skill through RolePlay with Ask and question (Interview).

## **V. Conclusions**

The students' mean score in the posttest of the experimental group was significantly higher than the one in the posttest of the control group, with the students' average score of the experimental group in the posttest was 53.29 while the students' average score in the control group was 46.04. Meanwhile the critical value was 0.05 significance level for two-tailed test with 35 (df) was 1.68 since the t-obtained was 11.352, it was higher than the t-table. The result showed that the t-obtained was higher than t-table, it means the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) was rejected while the alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) was accepted.

## References

- Adams, D. M. (1973). *Simulation games: An approach to learning*. Worthington, OH: Charles A. Jones Publishing.
- Carr, D. (1992). Cultural institutions as structures for cognitive change. *New Direction for Adult and Continuing Education*, 53, 21–35.
- Cavaliere, L., & Sgroi, A. (1992). Active learning: Perspectives on learning that leads to personal development and social change. *New Direction for Adult and Continuing Education*, 53, 5–10.
- Ladousse, G. P. (1987). *Role-play*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Livingstone, C. (1983). *Role-play in learning language*. London: Longman.
- Patton, M. Q. (1997). *Utilization-focused evaluation: A new century text*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Thatcher, D. C. (1990). Promoting learning through games and simulations. *Simulation and Gaming*, 21(3), 262–273.
- Van Ments, M. (1989). *The effective use of role-play: A handbook for teachers and trainers*. London: Kogan Page.