CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHOD

A. Research Type

This research was qualitative research. According to Gay (2000:163), qualitative research is useful for describing and answering questions about participants and context. Qualitative research is also useful for exploring complex research areas about which little is known. Qualitative research is exceptionally suited for exploration, for beginning to understand a group or phenomenon. Such explorations often result in development of new theories. Finally, qualitative research can answer questions and illuminate issues that cannot be addressed by quantitative methods.

In this case, descriptive research that used for collected and analyzed the data to find the answer of question. Based on definition above, the aim of this research are to describe student's speaking performance and to find out the dominant factor affectingstudents' speaking performance at grade VIII Islamic Junior High School 2 West Pasaman.

B. Place and Time of the Research

This research had been conductedat Class VIII of State Islamic Junior High School 2 West Pasaman, which located in Ujung Gading, West Pasaman. This research was conducted on July-August in academic year 2018/2019 at first semester.

C. Respondent of the Research

The respondent of this research is the first year students of Islamic Junior High School 2 West Pasaman enrolled in the year 2018/2019. According to Arikunto (2006: 99) respondent is person that can give answer or investigated about variable. There are seven classes of second year of Islamic Junior High School 2 West Pasaman. Total numbers of the students from the eight classes are 234 students. All of students are treated similarly in learning English; they have some books and material.

Table 3.1

Population of Grade VIII at MTsN 2 West Pasaman

NO	Class	Total
1	VIII 1	35
2	VIII 2	33
3	VIII3	33
4	VIII 4	33
5	VIII 5	34
6	VIII 6	32
7	VIII 7	34
Total		234

Source: English Teacher's Grade VIII

Arikunto (2006:120) states that the big population or more than 100subjects require the sample for at least 10 % - 15 % or 20% - 25% of thepopulation. Researcher takes12% of population or 30 students. The researcher used simple random sampling in order to get the data. According to Arikunto (2006:135), simple random sampling means that the sample of the population will be taken by lottery. Practically, separate slips of paper used to select the sample. The procedures are; firstly, all the students of the classes are identified.

Next, the researcher had taken several pieces of paper then slips up those papers into 234 parts to student's number. After that, the researcher numbered all parts of the paper count from 1-234. Last, one by one the slips of paper are picked up by the researcher while closing their eyes until the students got as the sample of the research. Sample of this research is also taken based on the normality and the homogenous of the students' mid test score.

D. **Research Instrument**

The instruments of this research werespeakingperformance test and questionnaire. In speaking performance test, the researcher asked the students to choose one out of five topics about descriptive text. Then, the researcher asked them to perform in front of the classbased on five topics wasgiven to the students.The students also gave questionnaires to find the dominant factors that effect students speaking performance. There were twenty six questionnaires. Then, they answered the questions by choosing one of options. Those were always, often, sometimes, rarely and never.

Instrument valid and reliable were the terms of absolute importance to get a valid and reliable data, Sugiyono (2013:172). Instrument valid was instrument that can be used to measure what should be measured. Then, instrument that reliable is if used some time with the objects that the same will produce the same data. the researcher used SPSS to show validity and reliability every items from the questionnaire. Then to show the items representative or not the researcher did the next step:

a. Questionnaire trials on sample with the same or familiar population. The questionnaire consist of 35 items were given to 30 students.

b. Test of validity items, validity test had an objective to know the items of questionnaire valid or not. The researcher used SPSS (*Statistical product and service solution*)to got validity items. The data would be validity tests. If every item was correlation or more than 0.3. It means that the items were valid.

Table 3.2
Test of validity items

No. Items	r-Calculate	r-Critical	Decision
1	0,769	0,3	Valid
2	0,468	0,3	Valid
3	0,787	0,3	Valid
4	0,523	0,3	Valid
5	0,644	0,3	Valid
6	0,562	0,3	Valid
7	0,285	0,3	Not Valid
8	0,463	0,3	Valid
9	0,552	0,3	Valid
10	0,565	0,3	Valid
11	0,604	0,3	Valid
12	0,420	0,3	Valid
13	0,567	0,3	Valid
14	0,186	0,3	Not Valid
15	0,557	0,3	Valid
16	0,464	0,3	Valid
17	0,756	0,3	Valid
18	0,675	0,3	Valid
19	0,713	0,3	Valid
20	0,770	0,3	Valid
21	0,772	0,3	Valid
22	0,254	0,3	Not Valid

23	0,511	0,3	Valid
24	0,552	0,3	Valid
25	0,769	0,3	Valid
26	0,468	0,3	Valid
27	0,178	0,3	Not Valid
28	0,523	0,3	Valid
29	0,644	0,3	Valid
30	0,562	0,3	Valid
31	0,282	0,3	Not Valid
32	0,081	0,3	Not Valid

Based on the table, it can be seen that from the 32 items in the trials found 6 items not valid. The number item was not valid such as number7, 14, 22, 27, 31, and 32. It means that from 32 items the researcher got 26 items are valid.

c. Test of reliability, reliability test had an objective to know the items of questionnaires reliability or not. The researcher used SPSS (*Statistical product and service solution*)to got reliability items. The data would be reliabilitytests. If the instrument was the coefficient correlation or more than 0, 6. It means that the instrument was reliable.

Table 3.3Test of Reliability

Reliability Statistics		
Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.923	.925	32

Table 3.4

Blueprint speaking performance

no	Type of Test	Aspect of Speaking Performance	Genres	indicators	item	Total
1	Speaking performance	- Introduction - Thesis statement - Connection to Audience - Subject Knowledge - Organization - Eye Contact - Gesture and Movement - Voice - Fluency	Descriptive text	The students are able to describe about pictures in: - appearance - gender - skin - hair colour - job	1-5	5
	Total					5

The quistionnaire gave to the students in order to know the dominant factor that effect student's speaking performance. It consist of 26 items and the respondents answered the quistionnaire in 20 minute.

Table 3.5

Blue Print of Questionnaire

Category	Indikator	Items	total
Factors Affecting Students' Speaking Performance	A. Topical Knowledge	1,2	2
	B. Performance Conditions		
	1. Planning	3,4	2
	2. Time Pressure	5,6	2
	3. Amount of Support	7,8,9	3
	4. Standart of Performance	10,11	2
		12,13,14,15	
	C. Affective Factors	16,17	
	1. Self Esteem	18	4
	2. Inhibition	19,20,21,22	2
	3. Risk-Taking	23,24	1
	4. Anxiety	25,26	4
	5. Empathy		2
	6. Extroversion		2

To measure the student's Speaking Performance , the researcher used the aspect analysis which adopted from Kewen@valenclacc.edu(2006) in (Aminullah), such as the table below;

Table 3.6

Aspect Analysis and Indicator for Assesing Speaking Performance

(content)

Aspect of analysis	Level Description	Score
Introduction	1. No attention getting the strategy was evident. No clear or relevant connection to topic or speech purpose. No credibility was establish.	1

	2. Use of attantion getting strategy, but did not seem to adequately capture audience attentionand/or lead to desired outcome credibiity was implied	2
	3. Effective startegy to capture listener's attention adequate introduction of the topic. Credebility was established by the speaker.	3
	4. Creative attention getting the 4strategy captures listener's attention to introduction of the topic. It is relevant to the topic and clearly gains the desired response from the audience. Credibility was established by the speaker.	4
Thesis statement	1. No thesis statement. Main points are not clearly identified. Audience unsure of direction of the message	1
	2. Thesis is implied, although not explicitly stated. Topic is clearly identified, but main points are not clearly.	2
	3. Thesis statement identifies topic and lists/previews main points. Previewed	3
	4. Speaker clearly stated a well formulated thesis statement identifies topic and lists/previews main points.	4
Connection to Audience	1. seems irrelevant to audience needs and interests. No attempt made to connect topic to audience.	1
	2. Topic seems somewhat relevant to audience. Vague reference to audience needs and/or interests. Identifies target audience.	2
	3. Connection of topic the audience needs and interests is stated with sophistication. Identifies and expresses a deep understanding of	3

		their target audience.	
	4.	Connection of topic to audience needs and interest is stated with sophistication. Identifies and expresses a deep understanding of their target audience.	4
Subject Knowledge	1.	Provides irrelevant or no support. Explanation of concept is inancurate or incomplete	1
	2.	Provides some supports for main points, but needed to elaborate further with explanation, examples, descriptions, etc. Support is relevant, but not time ly	2
	3.	Main point adequately substantiated with timely, relevant and sufficient support. Accurae explanation of key concept	3
	4.	Depth of content reflects thorough understanding of topic. Main points well supported with timely, relevant and suffcient support. Provided precise expanation of key concepst	4
Organization	1.	Lack of structure, ideas are not coherent, no transitions, difficult to identify introduction, body and conclusion.	1
	2.	General sturucture seems adequate, difference between main points and supporting detil is blurred, logical flow, but no clear signposts for transition.	2
	3.	Clear orgazational pattern, main points are distinct from supporting details. Smooth transition differentiate key points.	3

		4. Effective organization well suited to purpose. Main points are clearly distinct from supporting details. Graceful transitions create coherent progress toward conclusion.	4

Table 3.7

Aspect Analysis and Indicator for Assesing Speaking Performance

(delivery)

No	Aspect of analysis	Level Description	Score
	Eye Contact	1. Read notes/manuscript. Avoid eye contact with the other	1
		2. Only occasionally, sporadic glance at the other	2
		3. Eye contact established rapport with the other. Acanning the other to establish a zone of interaction.	3
		4. Consistently uses eye contact to maintainrapport with other. Effective use of scanning to expand zone of interaction	4
	Gesture and Movement	1. Body language is not supportive of the message, may contradic it. Gesture, facial expressions, and posture are stiff or distracting	1
		2. Body language is a minimal support of the verbal mesaage. Gestures, facial expression, and posture reflect speaker discomfort taht occassionally interferes with the message.	2

		3. Body language is an adequate support of the message. Movement and gestures clarify key points. Facial expression and posture seem comfortable	3
		4. Gesture, facial expression, and posture reinforce and enhance the verbal message. Body language is expressive dynamic, natural and comfortable.	4
	Voice	1. Fails to maintain audience interest and support the verbal message due to excessive monotone, innapropriate rate and volume. Pitch may be strained of flat	1
		2. Inconsistent use of voice to support message. Monotone passages interfere with audience interest. Rate may be too fast or slow; volume too high or low. Pitch is strained at times, too artificial or too nervous.	2
		3. Tone fits verbal message. Changing for emphasis at appropriate moments. Rate and volume allow the audience to follow message. Pitch seem natural to speaker.	3
		4. Tone is authentic and appropriate to topic. Rate,pitch and volume vary at key points to support the verbal message and keep audience interes. Voice is natural to the spker and topic, talkig with rather than at audience.	4
4	Fluency	1. Inoherent presentation to many factors that undermine fluency including poor pronunciation. Long pauses interrupt flow of speech. Excessive use of vocalized fillers distracts audience.	1
		2. Pronunciation is mostly correct yet enunciation and articulation are still tentative speaker recovers from awkward pauses and procceds. Vocalized fillers are noticcable but not excessive.	2

		3. Careful pronunciation support coherence of presentation. Enunciation anda articulation of words are mostly clear. Pauses were momentary and did not interrupt fluency of speech. Vocalized fillers are minimal and do not distract the audience.	3
		4. Coherence of presentation strongly supported be correct pronunciation, confident enunciation and articulation. Pauses are purposeful and enhance fluency of speech. Virtually no vocalized fillers are noticeable.	4

In scoring the researcher summed the score from all components of speaking; this is formula to be used:

$$Score = I+TS+CA+SK+O+EC+GM+V+F$$

Where:

I = Introduction

TS = Thesis Statement

CA =Connection to Audience

SK = Subject of Knowledge

O = Organization

EC = Eye Contact

GM = Gesture and Movement

V = Voice

F =Fluency

The table below is sample of aspect in giving score:

Table 3.8

Sample of aspects in giving speaking performance score

Num. of students	Aspects Analysis of Speaking Performance									Total score
	I (1-4)	TS (1-4)	CA (1-4)	SK (1-4)	0 (1-4)	EC (1-4)	GM (1-4)	V (1-4)	F (1-4)	
30										

Where:

I   = Introduction   EC   =Eye Contact

TS   = Thesis Statement   GM= Gesture and Movement

CA   =Connection to Audience   V   = Voice

SK=   Subject of Knowledge   F   =Fluency

O   = Organization

After getting the score of speaking performance, researcher calculated the score for each student's speaking performance;

Table 3.9

Calculating the score for each student based on the average analysis

Qualifiation	Range Score
High	2,6-3,0
Moderate	2,1-2,5
Low	1,5-2,0

Table 3.10

Score of Likert Scale

Alternative answer	Score
SA	4
A	3
D	2
SD	1

E. Technique of Data Collection

The data of this research came from the result of the student's speaking performance test. The speaking performance is testing to students took 4-5 students from each class. Then, the students performed their text in front of the class based on descriptive text. To measure student's speaking performance , the researcher adopted the eleven aspects analysis of speaking performance by Kewen@valenclacc.edu(2006) in (Aminullah), such as introduction, thesis statement, connection to audience, subject knowledge, organization (content), and eye contact, gesture and movement, voice, fluency (delivery). In addition to know the dominant factor affecting student's speaking performance, the researcher gave the questionnaires to the students.

F. Technique of Data Analysis

After collecting data, student's speaking performance result analyzed. The researcher analyzed the data that related to descriptive text. The researcher was used SPSS to analyse the dominant factor that effect student's speaking performance. In order to describe level of the student's speaking performance can be high, moderate, and low the student's speaking performance result, the researcherwas used, the formula as sugested by sudjana (1996 : 131):

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

Where:

P = Percentage of item

F = Frequency of score

N = Number of the students

This formula to find percentage of student's speaking performance by each aspect, there are; introduction, thesis statement, connection to audience, subject knowledge, organization, eye contact, gesture and movement, voice and fluency.