

CHAPTER III

METHOD OF THE RESEARCH

A. Design of the Research

The design of this research used a descriptive research, which studies how to describe and interpret an object in accordance with the fact that there is, without exaggeration. Descriptive research is often referred to as non experiment, in this research the writer did not manipulate variables and also always give priority to the fact, so this research is purely to explain and describe.

In order to collect the data of this research, the writer used instrument, it is test orally

B. Time and Location of The Research

This research was conducted at Islamic Junior High School Al-Ihsan Siak Hulu Regency of Kampar. It was conducted from January to March 2014.

C. Subject and Object of The Research

The subject of this research was the second grade students of Islamic Junior High School Al-Ihsan Siak Hulu Regency of Kampar. The object of this research was speaking ability at second grade students of Islamic Juior High School Al-Ihsan Siak Hulu Regency of Kampar.

D. Population and Sample of the Research

The population of this research was the second grade students of Islamic Junior High School Al-Ihsan Siak Hulu Regency of Kampar. The school had 6 classes which male and female students were separated in different classes. Three classes were for male and the others for female. The number of the second grade students of Islamic Junior High School Al-Ihsan Siak Hulu Regency of Kampar in 2013/2014 was 154 students.

Based on the research design, the writer used random assignment by using lottery system for taking the sample which took four students for every classes

Table III. 1

The Total Population of The Second Grade Students at Islamic Junior High School Al-Ihsan Siak Hulu Regency of Kampar In 2013-2014

Number	Class	Total	Sample
1	VIII Al-Fath	24	4
2	VIII Tabuk	29	4
3	VIII Thaif	29	4
4	VIII Hunain	23	4
5	VIII Qodisiah	25	4
6	VIII Anjaluth	24	4
Total		154	24

E. Technique of Collecting Data

1. Test

The researcher scored the students' speaking ability according to categories developed by Hughes. According to Hughes, there are some components that should be considered in giving students' speaking ability score: They are accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension¹. So, Hughes described the rating as follows:

a. Accent

Table III. 2

Accent

Category	Requirement
6	Native pronunciation, with no trace "foreign accent"
5	No conspicuous mispronunciations, but would not taken from a native speaker.
4	Marked "foreign accent" and occasional mispronunciations which do not interfere with understanding
3	"Foreign accent" requires concentrated listening, and mispronunciations lead to occasional misunderstanding and apparent errors in grammar or vocabulary.
2	Frequent gross errors and a very heavy accent make

¹ Arthur Hughes. *Testing for Language Teachers*. (United Kingdom: Cambridge University, 1989). p. 111

	understanding difficult, require frequent repetition.
1	Pronunciation frequently unintelligible.

b. Grammar

Table III. 3

Grammar

Category	Requirement
6	No more than two errors during the interview
5	Few errors, with no patterns of failure
4	Occasional errors showing imperfect control of some patterns but no weakness that causes misunderstanding
3	Frequent errors showing some major patterns uncontrolled and causing occasional irritation and misunderstanding
2	Contrast errors showing control of very few major patterns and frequently preventing communication.
1	Grammar almost entirely inaccurate expert in stock phrases.

c. Vocabulary

Table III. 4

Vocabulary

Category	Requirement
6	Vocabulary apparently as accurate and extensive as that of an educative native speaker
5	Professional vocabulary broad and precise; general vocabulary adequate to cope with complex practical problems and varied social situations.
4	Professional vocabulary adequate to discuss special interest: general vocabulary permits discussions of any-technical subject with some circumlocutions.
3	Choice of words sometime inaccurate, limitation of vocabulary prevents discussion of some common professional and social topics.
2	Vocabulary limited to basic personal and survival areas (time, food, transportation, family, etc)
1	Vocabulary inadequate for even the simplest conversations.

d. Fluency**Table III. 5****Fluency**

Category	Requirement
6	Speech on all professional and general topics as effortless and smooth as native speaker's
5	Speech is effortless and smooth, but perceptively non-active in speed and evenness
4	Speech is occasionally hesitant, with some unevenness caused by rephrasing and groping for words.
3	Speech is frequently hesitant and jerky; sentences may be left uncompleted
2	Speech is very slow and uneven except for short routine sentence.
1	Speech is also halting and fragmentary as to make conversation virtually impossible

e. Comprehension

Table III. 6
Comprehension

Category	Requirement
6	Understand everything in both formal and colloquial speech to be expected of an educated native speaker.
5	Understand everything in normal educated conversations except for very colloquial or low-frequently items, or exceptionally rapid or slurred speech
4	Understand quite well normal educated speech when engaged in a dialogue, but may require the occasional repetitions and rephrasing.
3	Understand careful, somewhat simplified speech when engaged in dialogue, but may require considerable repetitions and rephrasing.
2	Understands only slow, very simple speech on common social and touristic topics; require constants repetition and rephrasing
1	Understand to little for the simple types of conversations.

In Islamic Junior High School Al-Ihsan Siak Hulu Kampar, the writer used the following form to assess the speaking ability of students.

Table III. 7
Assessment Aspects of Speaking Monologue Descriptive Text

No	Aspects Assessed	Score					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Accent					For native speaker	
2	Grammar						
3	Vocabulary						
4	Fluency						
5	Comprehension						
Total							
Maximum Score		20					

Explanation of score:

1 = incompetent

2 = competent enough

3 = competent

4 = very competent

Final score = total score: maximum score x 100

F. Technique of Data Analysis

The writer analyzed the students' speaking ability at the second grade of Al-Ihsan Islamic Junior High School Siak Hulu Regency of Kampar by using the following formula:

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

N

P= Percentage

F= Frequency

N= Number of respondents

G. The Validity and the Reliability of the Test

1. Validity of the Test

The test used for testing the students' speaking ability has to have reliability and validity. According to Brown, a test is a method of measuring a person's ability, knowledge, or performance in a given domain.² Furthermore, Hughes states that a test is said to be valid if it measures accurately what it is intended to measure.³ Based on the experts above, the researcher concludes that a test can be said valid if it is really measured person's ability appropriately. Furthermore, Gay states that there are three kinds of validity. They are content validity, criterion-related validity, and construct validity.⁴

² H. Douglas Brown, *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices* (San Francisco: San Francisco State University, 2003), p. 3.

³ Arthur Hughes, *Op. Cit.*, p. 26.

⁴ L.R. Gay and Peter Airasian, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 163-167.

In this research, the researcher used content validity. According to Bambang, if a measurement is as the representative of the ideas or the appropriate material that will be measured called content validity⁵. The materials of the test have been taught at the second year of Islamic Junior High School Al-Ihsan Siak Hulu Regency of Kampar. It means the test had fulfilled the validity of the content

They were familiar materials and near to the students' daily life. They were appropriate with the students' knowledge, insight and experience. Moreover, the materials were taken from the book guide for the students and other related resources. In this research, the researcher prepared some topics based on the topics discussed at the time. The topics were chosen randomly by students and they presented it in front of class. The voice of the students was recorded. The pretest and posttest of this research were valid, because the students' speaking was measured by two raters by using the standard score of assessing speaking from Hughes. The test was based on the materials studied by the students. In making the test, the researcher had consulted first with the researcher's supervisor.

⁵ Ag. Bambang Setiyadi, *Metode Penelitian Pengajaran Bahasa Asing; Pendekatan Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif*. Edisi Pertama. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.2006. p.23

2. The Reliability of the Instrument

Brown said that reliability has to do with accuracy of measurement. This kind of accuracy was reflected in obtaining of similar results when measurement was repeated on different occasion or with different instruments or by different person. The characteristic of reliability was sometimes termed consistency.⁶ To know the reliability of the test, the writer used SPSS 16 application to find the reliability of the test based on Alpha Cronbach's technique.

Table III. 8

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.764	24

The table above shows that the reliability value was 0.764. According to Siregar, an instrument can be said as a reliable instrument when the score of reliability coefficient (r_{11}) is higher than 0.6. Based on the table, it was clear that r_{11} is higher than 0.6. The comparison can be seen as follows:

$$0.764 > 0.6$$

It shows that the score of r_{11} was higher than 0.6, it means that the test was reliable.

⁶ H. Douglas Brown, *Op. Cit.*, p. 19