

III. RESERCH METHOD

A. Research Design

This research was an experimental research where one group pretest – posttest was applied to get the data. This research used one class as experimental class by using pair work treatment. This research was intended to find out whether pair work technique can significantly increase the students' fluency. In this research the students had been given pre- test before treatment, and after three times treatments the students were given post-test. The pre-test is used to find out the students' preliminary ability and the post-test is used to look how far the increase is after the treatments. The design can be represented as follow:

T1 X T2

T1 : Pretest

T2 : Posttest

X : Treatment

(Setiyadi, 2004 : 4)

B. Subject

The subject of the research was VIII G students of SMP N 8 Bandar Lampung.

This class is the superior class (kelas unggulan). The subject is chosen because the

students' speaking ability in that class is better than those in the other classes. The class consists of 40 students. By simple probability sampling the students was selected randomly by using lottery into pairs. Those who receive odd numbers will be paired with those who receive even number in order. For example student number 1 will be paired with student number 2.

C. Data

The data of this research is in form of students' speaking ability in performing transactional dialogue in terms of fluency in producing invitation.

D. Data Collecting Technique

In collecting the data, the researcher follows the following steps:

1. Selecting speaking materials

In selecting the speaking material, the researcher saw the syllabus of grade VIII of SMP based on the KTSP (School-Based Curriculum). One of the objectives of KTSP (School-Based Curriculum) for grade VIII of SLTP is students are intended to convey transactional dialogue in pair. The topic chosen were inviting someone asking, accepting and refusing an invitation.

2. Determining instrument of the research

The speaking test had been instrument of this research. The form of the test is subjective test. The researcher conducted pre-test and posttest of students' speaking ability in form transactional dialogue in order to gain the data before and after the treatment conducted. There were two raters, the researcher

herself and an English teacher, to reduce the subjectivity in judging the students' fluency and to have reliable test result. In performing the task, the students are asked to speak and the students' voice will be recorded.

3. Determining subject

The subject of this research was VIII G students of SMP N 8 Bandar Lampung that consists of 40 students. In determining the subject, the researcher used simple random probability sampling. The researcher had taken one class as the sample of the research.

4. Conducting pre-test

The researcher conducted the pretest before the treatment of pair work technique. The pre- test is aimed to know how far the students' competence in speaking before the treatments of pair work technique, which was at least 90 minutes in experiment class. The material that will be tested is related to School Based Curriculum or KTSP and suitable with their level. In selecting speaking material, the writer used the syllabus of grade VIII of SMP students. The topic chosen were inviting someone asking, accepting and refusing an invitation.

In performing the task, the students were asked to speak clearly since the students' voice would be recorded in cassettes and two raters, the researcher herself and an English teacher, would score it. The scoring system was based on the rating scale by Shohamy.

5. Conducting treatments

The researcher presents the material for treatment in experimental group through pair work technique. There would be three times treatment in which

90 minutes was distributed for each treatment. In selecting the speaking material the writer used the syllabus of grade VIII of SMP student based on School Based Curriculum or KTSP which was the newest curriculum used by the school.

The topics choose was inviting someone, accepting and refusing an invitation in the forms of transactional dialogue.

The procedure of teaching speaking through pair work technique as follows:

A. Pre- activities.

- Teacher greets the students.
- Teacher checks the students' attendance list.
- Teacher gives leading question related to the topic will be discussed as brainstorming of what they are going to learn.

For example: Do you know how to invite someone and accept and refuse an invitation?

What are the expressions that are commonly used to it?

- Teacher gives a chance for some students to give their opinion.
- Teacher introduces pair work technique to the students and gives them explanation.

B. While activities

- Teacher tells the students a short dialogue related to the topic.
- Teacher gives key words or terms that are commonly used to express the topic and how to pronounce some difficult words.
- In pair phase, the teacher divides the students into pairs.
- Teacher explains the rule of the technique to the students.

- Teacher gives explanation about kinds of invitation that related to the topic will be discussed. Teacher poses a topic (open – ended question) to the students.

“Class.....have you ever been invited by someone?”

Inviting someone makes relationship between you and others people.

There are many kinds of invitation, for example inviting someone to do homework together, inviting someone to play badminton, inviting someone to a birthday party, inviting someone to attend a meeting, inviting someone to join a holiday travel, and so on. Do you know how to invite someone, and then how to accept and refuse the invitation to do homework together?”

- In think phase, the teacher asks the students to spend several minutes to think about the topic.
- Teacher asks the students randomly whether they have opinion or not. It can be done by asking them “Have you got your own opinion?” It is intended to force them in order to elaborate their opinion.
- Teacher gives the example of the dialogue of invite someone to do homework together clearly.

A : Hello, Pras!

B : Hello!

A : Pras, do you want to do homework together?

B : Why not!

A : Ok. I will wait you.

B : See you.

- In pair phase, the students then are asked to move to their pair.

- Having paired off with, the students are asked to make a dialogue with their pair related to the topic. Here, they give their opinion to their pair, and then they, in turn, practice applying the expression usually used in inviting someone. They are allowed to make a dialogue with their pair for about 4-5 minutes. Here the teacher monitors the students' interactions.
- The students perform their idea as what they have done in front of class by conducting transactional dialogue.

C. Post- activities

- Teacher asks the students whether they have any difficulties related to the topic.
- Teacher does evaluation by asking the students "what they have learnt?"
- Teacher closes the meeting.

6. Conducting posttest

The posttest aims to know the progress of students' fluency after being given pair work as a treatment. Some materials tested for the posttest were similar to the materials for pre test. In conducting the posttest the researcher provided some topics, let the students choose one of the topics provided and make a group of two. The students were called to perform their dialogue in front of the class, again the students are asked to speak, since the students' voice would be recorded, the researcher and an English teacher judged the students' performance.

7. Analyzing the data

After collecting the data that is student's recorded utterance in performing the dialogue, the data would be analyzed by referring to the rating scale namely fluency and then interpretation of the data will be done.

First, scoring the pretest – posttest and then tabulating the result of test and calculating the mean of the pretest and the posttest. Repeated Measure T – Test used to draw the conclusion. The comparison of the two means counted using Repeated Measure T – Test would tell us the significant increase of students speaking ability. The data were computed through SPSS version 12. The hypothesis was analyzed at the significant level of 0,05 in which the hypothesis is approved if $\text{sig} < \alpha$.

E. Criteria for Evaluating Students' Speaking

The researcher conducted speaking test. In conducting the test the researcher provided some topics and let them make a short dialogue in group of two. The speaking test was carried out orally and directly, the teacher called the students in pair to perform transactional dialogue. They had 10 minutes for preparing their performance, and each pair had 4 minutes for performing the dialogue. In performing the dialogue, the researcher asked the students to speak clearly since the students' voice would be recorded. The material given will be based on the appropriate curriculum (KTSP).

The form of the test was Subjective test since there is no exact answer. In this test the researcher used inters – rater to assess' students' performance. The raters would

be the researcher herself and an English teacher. The raters will give the score by listening the record. The researcher recorded the students' utterances because it can help the raters to evaluate more objectively. The test of speaking is measured based on two principles, reliability and validity.

a. Reliability

Reliability refers to whether the test is consistent in its score and gives us an indication of how accurate the test score are (Shohamy, 1985:70). To get the reliability of the test, the researcher will be used inter-rater reliability. It means, the extent to which different raters (judge) agree about the level of language that is being produced. The statistical formula for counting the reliability is as follow:

$$R = 1 - \frac{6 \cdot \sum d^2}{N(N^2 - 1)}$$

Notes:

R : Reliability

N : Number of students

d : The different of rank correlation

1-6 : Constant number

The standard of reliability:

A. a very low reliability	ranges from 0.00 to 0.19
B. a low reliability	ranges from 0.20 to 0.39
C. an average reliability	ranges from 0.40 to 0.59
D. a high reliability	ranges from 0.60 to 0.79
E. a very high reliability	ranges from 0.80 to 0.100

Slameto (1988:147)

b. Validity

Validity refers to the extent to which the test measures what is intended to be measured. This measure is related directly to the purpose of the test (Shohamy, 1985: 74). They are four types of validity: face validity, content validity, construct validity, and empirical validity, but in this research content validity and construct validity will be used.

Content validity is intended to know how whether the test is a good reflection of what has been taught. So in this research, the researcher suited each item arranged according to the topics of each material based on syllabus and curriculum for Junior High School. Meanwhile, construct validity examines whether the test actually is in line with the theory of what it means to know the language (Shohamy, 1985:74). It means that the test will measure certain aspect based on the indicator. The researcher would like to examine it by correlating the aspects that will be measured with the theories of this aspect (fluency).

The theories or definition that will be correlated to the test is as follows:

Aspect to be measured	Theories
Fluency	Fluency is the ease and speed of flow of the speech (Harris, 1974:81). Fluency is the smoothness of flow with which sounds, syllables, words and phrases are joined together when speaking. Nation states fluency involves the degree of control of language item, and the way language and content interact.

It is important to make sure that the raters use same scoring criteria. In evaluating the students' speaking score, the researcher and another rater will base their judgment by considering one aspect of speaking to be tested; it is fluency.

The following table is the oral ability scale proposed by Nation that will be used as the scoring standard for the students' fluency in producing invitation. The scoring system modified from Shohamy (1985).

Score	Fluency		
	Speed and flow of language production	Degree of control of language item	Way language and content interact.
0-20	No language produced	Silence or near silence (occasional "yes/no") in English, pronunciation problem so severe as to make speech unintelligible, vocabulary limitation, cannot be said to understand even simple conversation, no more than two errors during conversation.	No interaction
21-40	Speech is slow, exceedingly halting. Difficult to perceive continuity in utterances.	Less than single sentences, fragmentary speech, very hard to understand because of pronunciation problem most frequently be asked to repeat, misuse of words and very limited vocabulary make comprehension quite difficult, has great difficulty following is said can comprehend only "social conversation" spoken slowly and with frequent repetition, few errors with no patterns of failure.	Very hard to attain any interaction

41-60	Frequently hesitant	Single-sentence utterance; intrusion of Mother Tongue; many repetitions, pronunciation problems necessitate concentrated listening and occasionally lead to understanding, frequently use wrong word, conversation somewhat limited because of inadequate vocabulary, understand most of what is said at slower than normal speed with repetition, frequent errors showing some major patterns uncontrolled and causing occasional irritation and misunderstanding.	Interaction possible only at the simplest level
61-80	Normal rate of speech for most formal and informal conversation.	Discourse unit more than one sentence; able to express himself/herself (with some effort) on the subject being discussed, but little or no use of conversation markers (such as question-tags) or cohesion markers (sentence connectors),	Interaction adequate although occasionally hesitant
81-100	No hesitations, Speech is effortless and smooth, but non-native in speed.	Appropriate use of the more common language expressions, always intelligible though one is conscious of a definite accent, sometimes use inappropriate terms and must rephrase ideas, because of inadequate vocabulary, understand nearly everything at normal speed although occasionally repetition may be necessary, constant errors control of very few major patterns and frequently preventing communication.	Interaction effective

This is some example of language expression that use in invitation, but the students can use their own language or expression to invite someone.

Kinds of Invitation	Inviting	Accepting	Refusing
Birthday Party	Would you like to come to my birthday party?	Yes, I would love to. I'd be happy to accept. That's a good idea. I'd be delighted.	I'd love to, but I'd like to very much, but I'm sorry, but I have to I'd like to, but I'm not sure I have time.
	We would like to invite you for my youngest sister birthday.		
	Andy tomorrow evening is my birthday. Do you feel like coming to my house? We will have a party.		
	Why don't you join me for a birthday party?		
	I would like to invite you to come to my birthday party.		
	I'd glad if you could come to my birthday party		
Internal Student's	On Monday our school is going to held a meeting to discuss about class meeting. The head master hope all of the member of Internal Student's Organization (OSIS) come. Can you attend to the meeting?		
	Would you mind to coming the		

Organization (OSIS) Meeting	meeting?	I'd be glad to accept. What a good idea. Thanks, I'd love to.	I'm sorry/I'm afraid I can't, I have to Thanks anyway, but I'd like to very much, but
	Why don't you join us on the meeting?		
	Will you come to the meeting?		
Holiday	We are going to Tawamangu. Would you like come along?		
	Would you like to join us on our holiday to Bali?		
	Do you feel like going to Semarang?		
	Why don't we go to the beach?		

F. Data Analysis

In order to see whether there is any significant difference of developing students' fluency, the researcher examines the students' score using the following step:

1. Scoring the pre-test and posttest

Each rater scored the students' speaking performance of pre test and post test.

Then, the scores between two raters were taken the average to be the final score that would be analyzed statistically using Repeated Measures T- Test.

2. Tabulating the scores of the students' speaking test results using analyzed rating scale. The rating scale (band) used for measuring the improvement of the students' speaking fluency is taken from Nation, modified by Shohamy

(1985), that will be used as the scoring standard for the students' fluency in producing invitation.

3. Drawing conclusion

The data in form of minimum score, maximum score, and standard deviations were counted. To draw the conclusion the means of students' score in pretest and posttest were compared to see the value of significance by using Descriptive statistics of SPSS 12.0.

G. Hypothesis Testing

The hypothesis is stated as follows:

There is an increase of students' fluency in producing invitation in speaking after they are taught through pair work technique.