

### **III. RESEARCH METHOD**

This chapter discusses about the used method of research in this study, such as: research design, population and sample of the research, research procedures, data collecting technique, research instrument, and data analysis.

#### **3.1 Research Design**

This research was a qualitative-quantitative research. This research focussed on the process and also the product of the students' speaking performance. The aims of this research were to investigate what components in negotiation of meaning were used by the students in performing speaking by using realia and what types of components of negotiation of meaning was mostly used and least used by the students. Furthermore knowing how the students' dialogue score and their difficulties while speaking by using realia were also the aims of conducting this research. The researcher observed the students' dialogue by using a video and audio recorder to see the negotiation of the meaning. Students' dialogue by using realia was also scored by the researcher and the English teacher based on Heaton's oral ability scale. After that, the researcher interviewed the students in order to know their difficulties during and after the teaching-learning process.

### **3.2 Population and Sample of the Research**

A population could be defined as the whole subjects of the research. Setiadi (2006:38) stated research population is all individuals which are being target in research. The population of this research was the second grade students at SMA N 1 Kalianda in the academic year of 2012/2013. The researcher used one class at the second year of SMAN 1 Kalianda, which is class XI Social 4 in academic year 2012/2013 as the sample. The students were given a wide chance to discuss the material given by the researcher in dialogue.

### **3.3 Research Procedures**

#### **1. Finding the subject of the research**

A class was randomly selected from several classes as the subject of the research to know how the interaction proceeded.

#### **2. Observing the teaching learning process.**

The purpose of observation was to explain the situation being investigated; activities, person or individuals who were involved in an activity and the relationships among them. What the researcher expected, then, by administering this procedure was to gather information about the t learners' activities during the speaking activities in the class. According to Arikunto (2002), there are four aspects to observe in instructional activities, they are: material, specific instructional objective, teaching learning process and evaluation. In this research, however, the researcher focused on the students speaking performance in dialogue form.

3. Recording the student's dialogue performance.

At this part, the researcher recorded the student's dialogue performance by video-audio recording as soon as their performance in pairs. Besides, the researcher at the same time took note about all events and problem occurred during the teaching learning process.

4. Interview

Interview, according to Arikunto (2002) is a kind of dialogue which is done by an interviewer to get some information from an interviewee. The interview in this research addressed to the students as the learners of the observed class to find out some information related to the important features of the classroom, especially regarding to the classroom activity.

5. Transcribing the conversation

The researcher made transcriptions based on the video-audio recording that had been taken previously.

6. Analyzing the data

The data was obtained from observing the speaking performance and interviewing the students as the learner. Data analyzing had done to answer the research questions in description form.

### **3.4 Data Collecting Technique**

The researcher uses three methods to gain the data.

#### **3.4.1 Classroom Observation**

Observation is the act of collecting data about the performance of a subject through the five sense; sight, smelling, hearing, touching and taste (Arikunto,

2002). In this research, the researcher conducted the observation in 3x45minutes. The researcher directly observed the classroom and took notes on the relevant events while the learning process was going on. In the observation, the researcher conducted speaking test to the students and analyzed their performance. The researcher could use the result of the observation as the consideration in scoring the students' performance and to see the students' difficulty while performing dialogue in front of class.

### **3.4.2 Recording**

The researcher recorded the conversation in speaking test. Video recorder and audio recorder were used to record the conversation. The research intended to have both video and audio recording to gain the data. Therefore, if there was unclear data from the video recording, it could be supported by audio recording. The researcher took the audio recording as close as possible with the students perform.

### **3.4.3 Interview**

The interview was conducted in order to find out the kind of difficulties that student encountered in their speaking. Interview was an important way for a researcher to check the accuracy of the impressions of what she had gained through observation. The purpose of interviewing the students was to find out their mind, what they thought or how they felt about something. The researcher gave some questions to collect the data about the classroom activity especially to find out the answer about the kind of difficulties in students' speaking.

### 3.5 Research Instrument

#### Speaking Test

The speaking test was an oral test in dialogue. Speaking test was conducted to know how far the students' speaking ability and what components of negotiation of meaning that they used in their dialogue. The researcher asked the students to make a dialogue in pairs in front of the class and then scored it. To make the data more valid, the researcher asked the English teacher also as the inter-rater in scoring the student's speaking performance. The researcher used table of specification for the components in negotiation of meaning by Pica's study to find out which the component was mostly used and less used in students speaking performance.

The instruction of the speaking test: the teacher asked the students to work in pair and make a conversation with his/her partner. The students pretended that they were in a created situation and had to discuss about a chosen realia to their partner.

**Table 2. Table of Specification of Components in Negotiation of Meaning**

No.	Component of Negotiation of Meaning	Frequency	Percentage
1	Trigger (T)		
2	Confirmation Check through Repetition (CCR)		
3	Confirmation Check through Modification (CCM)		
4	Confirmation Check through Completion (CCC)		
5	Clarification of Request (CR)		
6	Response Self-Repetition (RSR)		
7	Response Other-Repetition		

	(ROP)		
<b>8</b>	Response Self-Modification (RSM)		
<b>9</b>	Response Other-Modification (ROM)		
<b>10</b>	Confirm or Negate Response (RN)		
<b>11</b>	Follow-up		
<b>Total</b>			

### Scoring System

The analytical scoring was used by the researcher. Scoring system was proposed by Heaton's oral ability scale.

**Table 3. Table of the oral ability scale proposed by Heaton (1991)**

Score of Performance	Pronunciation	Fluency	Comprehensibility
80-89	Pronunciation only very slightly influenced by mother tongue	Speaks without too great an effort with fairly wide range of expression. Searcher to words occasionally but only one or two unnatural pauses.	Easy for other to understand the speakers' intention in general meaning.
70-79	Pronunciation is slightly influenced by mother tongue. Most utterances are correct.	Has to make an effort at time to search for words. Nevertheless smooth very delivery on the whole and only a few unnatural pauses.	The speaker's intention in general meaning is fairly clear. A few interruptions by other for sake of clarification are necessary.
60-69	Pronunciation is still moderately	Although she or he has	Most of the speakers' say is

	influenced by the mother tongue but no serious phonological errors.	made an effort and search for words, there are not too many unnatural pauses. Fairly smooth deliveries mostly.	easy to be followed. His intention is always clear but several interruptions are necessary to help him to convey the message or to see the clarification.
50-59	Pronunciation is influenced by the mother tongue but only a few serious phonological errors.	Has to make an effort for much of the time. Often gap to search for the desired meaning. Rather halting delivery and fragmentary.	The other can understand a lot of what is said, but they must constantly seek clarification. Cannot understand many of the speaker's more complex or longer sentences.
40-49	Pronunciation is influenced with mother tongue with errors causing a breakdown in communication.	Long pauses while the speaker searches for the desired meaning. Frequently halting delivery and fragmentary. Almost gives up for making the effort at times.	Only small bits (usually short sentences and phrases) can be understood and then with considerable effort by someone use to listen the speaker.
30-39	Serious pronunciation errors. No evidence of having mastered any of the language skills and areas practiced in course.	Full of long and unnatural pauses. Very halting and fragmentary delivery. At times give up making the effort.	Hardly anything of what is said can be understood. Even when the others make a great effort or interrupt, the speaker is unable to clarify anything that have to say

## **Validity**

### **a. Content Validity**

This kind of validity depended on a careful analysis of the language being tested and of the particular course objectives. The test should be constructed to contain a representative sample of the course, the relationship between the test items and the course objectives always being apparent (Heaton, 1991). To get the content validity of speaking comprehension, the researcher tried to arrange the materials based on the objective of teaching in syllabus for second grade of senior high school students.

### **b. Construct Validity**

In this research, construct validity concerned whether the test was true reflection of the theory of the trait – in our case - language which was being measured. If a test had construct validity, it was capable of measuring certain specific characteristics in accordance with a theory of language behaviour and learning. This type of validity assumed the existence of certain learning theories or constructs underlying the acquisition of abilities and skills (Heaton, 1991). To find construct validity of the test, the researcher formulated the test by the concept of speaking.

## **Reliability**

According to Crocker and Algina(1986), reliability is the desired consistency of test scores or the degree to which individuals deviation score, or z-scores,



remain relatively consistent over repeated administration of the same test or alternate test. To get the reliability of the data, the researcher asked the English teacher in SMAN 1 Kalianda as the inter-rater in analyzing the student's speaking performance. Both the researcher and the English teacher gave score based on the oral ability scale by Heaton.

### **3.6 Data Analysis**

The researcher provided analysis of the data by using the steps proposed by Moleong (1990) as follows:

1. Making the abstraction of the collected data was treated in one unit. The researcher interpreted all data available by selecting them into an abstraction. In this step, she selected the data in order to keep them relevant with the research question.
2. The researcher identified the data into a unity meaning that she paid attention to the term the students. It was used to distinct the activities in the process.
3. Categorizing the data based on the research questions.
4. Interpreting the data after categorizing the data then describing conclusion.