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Abstract
This study was intended to improve the students’ ability in speaking through ICARE model at the third semester students of English Department of Muhammadiyah University of Makassar. This research employed Classroom Action Research consisting of two cycles where each cycle consisted of four meetings. The instrument used in this research was speaking test. The data obtained from the test in the end of each cycle was analyzed quantitatively. The findings showed that there was significant improvement on the students’ speaking ability in terms of accuracy and fluency in which the mean score of diagnostic test was 5.17, the mean score of cycle I was 6.06 and the mean score of cycle II was 7.21.
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INTRODUCTION
Speaking is like the first assessment for each learner who is studying English and each learner has to speak. Yet, we still find some students are speaking little or even passive in classroom, and it can be caused by many things including the students, the class situation, environment, teaching method, technique, approach or even from the teachers who do not deliver their material successfully. In this last century, many linguists and educators give more attention in action research to teach English as foreign language.

Based on the diagnostic test given to the third semester students of English Department of Muhammadiyah University of Makassar, it is found that almost every one of them wished to speak, but they found themselves difficult and even bereft to express it. It is because they do not have enough knowledge about grammar and vocabulary that actually can lead them from accuracy to fluency. This, of course, results in lacking confidence to speaking which they are afraid of making mistakes in
speaking. In this case, the researcher focuses her attention on the speaking ability as one of the skill of language. The students are usually very eager to produce the language but they sometimes find it difficult. Chastain (1976: 334) states that learning to speak is obviously more difficult than learning to understand the speaking language.

Byrne (1976:8) states the oral communication is two-way process between the speaker and the listener and in values the productive skill as speaking and receptive skill and listening, so both speaker and listener are active during the oral communication takes place. This means that a speaker may express his/her mind to the listeners later giving response related to the topic they are talking about.

Harmer (1983:130) states that, when two people are engaged in talking to one another, we can be sure that they are in general way to suggest that the speaker makes a decision to address someone. Speaking may be forced on him in some ways but can still say that he wants or intends to speak, otherwise he would keep silent. He has some communicative purposes namely speaker says things because they what something to happen because of what they say. He selects from his language store. The teacher has an alternative capacity to create new sentences if he is a native speaker.

Gardner (1992:2) states that speaking is information by giving ideas, asking question and giving responses which have correlation with opinions, or arguments that can stimulate students to support their opinion. It is expected that through the speaking activities, the students can apply their speaking.

Speaking however particularly in English is not easy to do. Gronbeck (2006:334) states that learning to speak is obviously more difficult than learning to understand the spoken language, because it concerns with sequential arrangement of activities that requires on the part of the teacher and the learners. So it is enough for the students to hear or to listen the speech only. Therefore, as students, they have to practice their English anywhere. A teacher should give more attention and give various activities in teaching speaking skill to increase the student ability to use the language because this case is one of the ways to improve students’ English speaking.

**Concept of Learning ICARE Model**

According to Aulia (2011), ICARE Model as a model learning system sure needing steps from the planning, implementation, until evaluation. There is stage of planning who preparing the material based on curriculum, and analysis in the class.

According to Hoffman & Ritchie (1998), ICARE is an acronym for Introduction, Connection, Application, Reflection, Extension. The implementation of learning ICARE Model that is:

**Introduction**: In this stage of the learning experience the teacher or facilitator establishes the content of the lesson to the learners. This must include an explanation of the objectives of the lesson listening and what will be accomplished outcomes during that lesson. The introduction should be quick and simple.

**Connection**: most learning is sequential with one competency building on the preceding one. Therefore, all good learning experiences must start from what learners
already know and can do and build on that. In the connection stage of the session, you try to link the new content of the session with something that is familiar to the learners from their previous learning or prior experience. The teacher can achieve this by conducting a simple brainstorming exercise to understand what learners already know, by asking learners to tell what they remember from the previous lesson or by developing an activity learner can do independently. Following this, you connect the participants to the new content. This can be done through a simple presentation or explanation lasting about ten minutes at the most.

**Application:** This is the most important stage of the lesson. After learners have acquired the new knowledge or skills through the connection section, students or learners need an opportunity to practice applying these knowledge and skills. The application part should be the longest part of the session when learners are working independently from the instructor, in pairs or in groups to complete a real life activity or solve a real life problem using the new information and skills they have acquired.

**Reflection:** This is the summary section of the lesson where learners have the opportunity to reflect on what they have learned and the instructor to assess the extent of learning. Reflection or summary activities can involve a group discussion where the instructor asks learners to give a presentation or explain what they have learned. They can be an individual writing activity where learners write a summary of their learning or it can be a quick quiz where the instructor asks questions based on content of the lesson/session. A key point to remember with reflection is that the instructor must provide the learners with the opportunity to say what they have learned.

**Extension:** The Extension part of the session is where you provide learners with activities they can do following the session to reinforce and extend the learning. In school’s extension activities are usually called homework. Extension activities can include providing additional reading material, research tasks or exercises

**Method**

This research followed the principal working of Classroom Action Research (CAR) that contained of four stages: planning, implementation of action, observation, and reflection. Generally, classroom action research was divided into two cycles and each cycle consisted of the four stages. The indicators of research were the students’ accuracy in terms of grammar and vocabulary; and fluency. The subject of the research was the third semester students of English Department of Muhammadiyah University of Makassar.

The instruments used in this research were observation sheet and oral test. The researcher also used recorder to save the students oral data. The oral test was given at the first observation as diagnostic test, and at the end of each cycle as test cycle I and test cycle II. The data obtained from the oral test was analyzed quantitatively.

**DISCUSSION**

1. **The Improvement of the Students’ Accuracy**

The improvement of the students’ speaking accuracy can be seen in the following table:
Table 1: The Improvement of the students’ Accuracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Speaking Accuracy</th>
<th>Improvement (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-Test</td>
<td>Cycle I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocab</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>5.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>6.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above indicates that there was improvement of the students speaking accuracy from D-Test to cycle I and cycle II. The students’ mean score in Diagnostic Test in terms of accuracy was 5.20 then improved to be 6.08 in cycle I and 7.20 in cycle II. Therefore, the improvement of students’ accuracy from D-Test to cycle I was 16.92%, and from cycle I to cycle II was 18.42%.

2. The Improvement of the Students’ Fluency

The improvement of the students’ speaking fluency through ICARE model can be seen in the following table:

Table 2: The Improvement of the Students’ Speaking Fluency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Speaking Fluency</th>
<th>Improvement (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-Test</td>
<td>Cycle I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows that there was improvement of the students’ fluency from D-test to cycle I and cycle II. The students’ mean score in Diagnostic Test in terms of fluency was 5.15 then improved to be 6.05 in cycle I and 7.23 in cycle II. Therefore, the improvement of students’ fluency from D-Test to cycle I was 17.47% and from cycle I to cycle II was 19.50%.

3. The Improvement of the Students’ Speaking Ability

The application of ICARE model in improving the students’ speaking ability covers speaking accuracy and fluency can be seen clearly in the following table:

Table 3: The Improvement of the Students’ Speaking Ability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaking ability</th>
<th>D-Test</th>
<th>Cycle I</th>
<th>Cycle II</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>6.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows that there was improvement of the students’ speaking ability from D-test to cycle I and cycle II. The students’ mean score in Diagnostic Test was 5.17 then improved to be 6.05 in cycle I and 7.21 in cycle II. Therefore, the
improvement of students’ fluency from D-Test to cycle I was 17.21% and from cycle I to cycle II was 18.97%.

**DISCUSSION**

During the teaching and learning process in cycle I, the researcher finds that the students are difficult to speak in a correct vocabulary it causes by their language still influence by mother tongue and most of them do not have vocabulary stock for delivering their ideas. To solve this problem, the researcher has done cycle II and revise the previous lesson plan, give them deep explanation and repeated the word still they can get it. In cycle II, the students’ speaking vocabulary was 8 students (38.09%) got very good, 13 students (57.14%) got good, 2 students (4.76%) got poor with mean score was 7.30.

During the teaching and learning process in cycle I, the researcher found that the students were difficult to speak in a correct grammar event some of them have been good speaking. It caused by their language still influenced by mother tongue and most of them did not have knowledge about grammar for delivering their ideas. To solve this problem, the researcher has done cycle II and revise the previous lesson plan, give them deep explanation and repeated the word still they can get it. In cycle II, the students’ speaking grammar was 19 students (76.19%) got very good, 5 students (23.08%) got good with mean score was 7.08.

During the teaching and learning process in cycle I, the researcher found that the students did not have enough self-confidence when they speak in English. It caused their still influenced by society, mother tongue and most of them though that English is no important lesson to be learned. To solve this problem, the researcher has done cycle II and revise the previous lesson plan, give them deep explanation and repeated the word still they can get it. In cycle II, the students’ speaking grammar was 7 students (33.34%) got very good, 14 students (66.67%) got good with mean score was 7.23.

**CONCLUSION**

The application of I CARE model could significantly improve the students’ speaking ability in terms of accuracy dealing with vocabulary, grammar and fluency at the third semester students of English Department of Muhammadiyah University of Makassar.
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