

III. RESEARCH METHODS

This chapter discusses certain points; setting, research design, population and sample, treatment, data collecting technique, and data analysis.

3.1 Setting

1. Place

This the study was at SMA YP UNILA Bandar Lampung which is suitable with the problem of the research. The researcher chose the students of SMA YP UNILA because the students are more active than other places.

2. Time

This research was carried out in September 2012, because September is the beginning of the students enter their school after they holiday. The researcher gave treatments for experimental class. The treatment was twice a week and only 90 minutes for treatment.

3.2 Research Design

In this quantitative descriptive research, the researcher used one class only. The researcher carried out the study to find out how Information Gap task can improve the students' speaking ability. The researcher used one group pretest-posttest, experimental design. The researcher conducted pretest, treatments and posttest.

T1 X T2

T1 : Pre test

T2 : Post test

X : treatment

A pretest is the activity to find out students' speaking ability before treatment. Afterword, the researcher gave two treatments to the students by using Information Gap task. Finally, a posttest is administering to find out the students' speaking ability after treatments.

3.3 Population and sample

The population of this research was the second grade of Senior High School. The researcher took one class to be treated. The researcher chose them because they have potential to be observed in Information gap task. The population selected by using random simply technique sample. The researcher chose the class that has high score in English subject.

3.4 Treatment

The researcher presented the material for treatment in the classroom through information Gap's completing drawing activity. In selecting material the researcher used the syllabus of the second grade of Senior High School.

3.4.1 Experimental Group

The researcher used syllabus for the material. The time is 90 minutes for the researcher to give material through Information Gap. The researcher asked the students to work with their partner and the researcher gave the students some drawings. Each of the drawing is different. Some students had the complete one, and the other had the incomplete one. Each of them has to communicate in order to complete the incomplete drawing. After that, the teacher asked the groups to come in front of the class one by one to perform their activity. The researcher asked them to speak clearly since the students' voice is being recording. After that the researcher saw their speaking ability through five aspects of speaking: pronunciation, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension, and grammar.

3.5 Data Collection

The researcher gathered data, that is, the students' speaking scores before the treatment (pretest) and after the treatment (posttest) in performing transactional dialogue. So, the researcher planned to identify whether there is any significant improvement of the students' speaking ability by using Information Gap task.

3.5.1 Research Instruments

The instruments in this researcher is speaking test, interview the students, and observation.

1. Speaking Test

Pretest conducted to find out whether they have relatively the same ability in speaking before treatment. Posttest is to know the effects of information gap to improve their speaking ability after treatment.

In achieving the reliability of the pretest and posttest, inter rater reliability used in this study. Both of them discussed and shared ideas of the speaking criteria in order to obtain the reliable result of the test.

The validity of the test measured by face validity, content validity, and construct validity. The researcher constructed transactional dialogue on speaking. Transactional dialogue is factual information which involves two or more speakers.

2. Interview

The researcher interview the sample to get students' opinion concerning Information Gap Task. So, the researcher got the opinion whether Information Gap task is good or not for the students to improve their speaking ability.

3. Completing Drawing

Completing drawing is a kind of activity from Information Gap task that can be used to force the students to speak in the target language. In completing drawing activity, there are some students that owned complete pictures and the rest owned incomplete ones. The students that have the complete pictures have to help the students that have the incomplete ones in order to make them complete their pictures. They have to communicate to each other.

The instructions are:

- a. the teacher give the students some pictures. The complete and the incomplete.
- b. The students that have the incomplete pictures have to ask the students that have the complete one.
- c. The students that have the incomplete pictures should not see the pictures from the complete ones.
- d. The students that have the complete pictures should not point to the incomplete pictures.
- e. The students have to communicate by their own language to complete the pictures.

3.5.2 Procedure of Data Collecting

In collecting data, the researcher used the following steps:

1. Selecting Speaking Materials

The researcher used syllabus of the second grade of Senior High School based on Curriculum or KTSP (an English Operational curriculum which is arranged and applied by each education unit).

2. Conducting Pretest

Pretest was given before the researcher applies the treatment to improve students' speaking ability through information gap. The material related to School based Curriculum or KTSP which are suitable for their level. Pretest was given to know how far the competence of the students in speaking before the treatment. The test is 60 minutes.

3. Conducting Treatment

After giving pretest to students, the researcher gave treatment using information gap. The time is 80 minutes for the researcher to give the treatment of information gap, in this case completing drawing activities.

4. Conducting Posttest

Posttest was conducted to measure students' speaking ability after give the treatment. The posttest is 60 minutes. The posttest would similar to the pretest in group and the topic changes. The researcher gave the students some drawings, after that the students

made a dialogue related to the pictures. In post test, the students that have the complete pictures changed into the incomplete ones. It was aim to see the development of students' speaking ability after they using information gap

5. Conducting Interview

The researcher interviewed the sample. The time was 5 minutes for each student. The aim of interview was to measure the use of information gap task in teaching learning process. The researcher asked the students' opinion about information gap task directly. It was aim to know that information gap task is good or not in teaching learning process.

3.6 Data Analysis

Data analysis needs careful thinking because data analysis is aimed at organizing the data. It makes the readers able to understand the result of the research. Data analysis is the process of organizing the data in order to gain the regularity of the pattern and form of the research. Data analysis is done to create understanding for the data after following certain procedure final of result of the students can be presented by the researcher to the readers (Setiyadi, 2001).

After collecting the data that was students' recording utterance in performing the activity, students' opinion about information gap, the data were analyzed by referring the speaking score based on aspects of speaking.

Scoring for pretest – posttest was tabulating the result of the test and calculating the mean of the pretest and the posttest. Repeated Measure T – test used to draw the conclusion. The data computed through SPSS version 17. The hypothesis analyzed at the significance level of 0.05 in which hypothesis will approve if $\text{sig} < \alpha$.

3.6.1 Evaluating the Students' Speaking

The researcher used inter-rater to give score of students' performance. The rater gave the students' score by listening to the record. The rater is the researcher herself and the English teacher in school. The record helped the rater to evaluate more objectively. The test of speaking is measure based on two principles: reliability and validity.

1. Inter-rate Reliability

Nitko (1983: 395) states that a reliable measure is one that provides consistent and stable indication of the characteristic being investigated.

The researcher assumes that reliability refers to extend the test is consistent in score and gives us an indication of how accurate the test score.

The statistical formula for counting the reliability is as follow:

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

R = Reliability

N = Number of students

D = Different of tank correlation

1-6 = Constant number

After find the coefficient between rates, researcher then will analyze the coefficient of reliability with the standard of reliability below:

- | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. A very low reliability | range from 0.00 to 0.19 |
| b. A low reliability | range from 0.20 to 0.39 |
| c. An average reliability | range from 0.40 to 0.59 |
| d. A high reliability | range from 0.60 to 0.79 |
| e. A very high reliability | range from 0.80 to 0.100 |

Slameto (1998:147)

2. **Validity**

Meizaliana (2009:82) states that the data is valid if the instruments used are also valid, and a test is reliable if it is constant, or it is reliable if the results of test show their constancy.

Hatch and Farhady (1982:250) defined validity as “the extent to which the result of the procedure serves the uses for which they were intended”.

Content validity, the test is a good reflection of what is thinking and the knowledge which the students to know. (Shoamy, 1985:74) states that is construct validity to measure the test will be examining to reflect what language.

Based on that quotation, validity refers to the extent which the test measures what it is intend to measure. This means that relates to the purpose of the test. The test measured based on the indicator.

3.7 Scores

In evaluating the students' speaking scores, the researcher, used the Oral English Rating sheet proposed by David P. Haris (1974: 84). Based on the Oral English Rating sheet, there are five components that are going to be tested to the students, namely: pronunciation, fluency, grammar, vocabulary and comprehension.

Here is the sample of the Oral rating sheet :

Pronunciation

- 5 has few traces of foreign accent
- 4 always intelligible though one is conscious of a definite accent
- 3 Pronunciation problems necessitate concentrated listening and occasionally lead to misunderstanding
- 2 very hard to understand because of pronunciation problems. Must frequently be asked to repeat.

- 1 pronunciation problems so severe as to make speech virtually unintelligible

Grammar

- 5 makes few (if any) noticeable errors of grammar or word order.
- 4 occasionally makes grammatical and /or word order errors which do not, however, obscure meaning.
- 3 makes frequent errors of grammar and word order which obscure meaning.
- 2 grammar and word orders make comprehension difficult. Must often rephrase sentences and / or restrict himself basic pattern.
- 1 errors in grammar and word order so severe as to make speech virtually unintelligible

Vocabulary

- 5 uses of vocabulary and idioms is virtually that of a native speaker.
- 4 sometimes uses inappropriate terms and/or must rephrase ideas because of lexical inadequacies.
- 3 frequently uses the wrong words: conversation somewhat limited because of inadequate vocabulary.
- 2 misuses of words and very limited vocabulary make comprehension quite difficult.

- 1 vocabulary limitation so extreme as to make conversation virtually impossible.

Fluency

- 5 speech as fluent and effortless as that of a native speaker.
- 4 speed of speech seems to be slightly affected by language problems
- 3 speed and fluency are rather strongly affected by language problems.
- 2 usually hesitant, often forced into silence by language problems.
- 1 speech as so halting and fragmentary as to make conversation virtually impossible

Comprehensible

- 5 appears to understand everything without difficulty
- 4 understands nearly everything at normal speed although occasional repetition may be necessary
- 3 understand most of what is said at lower than normal speed with repetitions.
- 2 has great difficulty following what is said. Can comprehend only “social conversation” spoken with frequent repetition.
- 1 cannot be said to understand even simple conversation of English.

In this case, the researcher makes an equation of making students' oral tests. The score if each is multiplied by four, so, the highest score is 100. For example, the score

of students' grammar is four. The researcher multiplies four by four, so, the score of students' grammar is 16.

Here is the identification of the scores:

If a student gets 5, so $5 \times 4 = 20$

If a student gets 4, so $4 \times 4 = 16$

If a student gets 3, so $3 \times 4 = 12$

If a student gets 2, so $2 \times 4 = 8$

If a student gets 1, so $1 \times 4 = 4$

For example: A student gets 4 in grammar, 4 in vocabulary, 3 in fluency , 2 in comprehension and 2 in pronunciation. So, the student's total score will be:

Grammar $4 \times 4 = 16$

Vocabulary $4 \times 4 = 16$

Fluency $3 \times 4 = 12$

Comprehension $2 \times 4 = 8$

Pronunciation $2 \times 4 = 8$

Total = 60

It means he/she gets 60 in speaking.

The score of speaking based on the five components can be compared in the presentage as follows:

Grammar 20%

Vocabulary 20%

Fluency 20%

Comprehension 20%

Pronunciation 20%

Total = 100

Table of Rating Sheet Score

S's Codes	Pron. (1-20)	Fluen. (1-20)	Gram. (1-20)	Voc. (1-20)	Compr. (1-20)	Total (1-100)
1.						
2.						
3.						
4.						
5.						

3.8 Hypothesis Testing

The hypothesis on this research is formulated as follows:

Ho : there are no significant difference of students' speaking ability before and after pretest and posttest through information gap task.

H1 : There are significant differences of students' speaking ability before and after pretest and posttest through information gap task.