

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter is going to elaborate several items which related to the method of the study. They are included research design, population and sample of the research, research site, instruments of the research, data collection procedure, and data analysis.

3.1 Research Design

The design of this research was quasi experimental study (time series design). Quasi-experimental design that consisted only experimental class without control class. Ary, et.al. (1979) defines quasi-experimental design as the design which would have two choices either uses control group or not. Sugiyono (2006) says that time series design is one of the quasi experimental design that only used experimental class without a control group. Creswell (2012) states that time series design is a design which only uses one group with multiple pre-test and post-test. The design of this study can be seen in the following scheme:

Table 3.1 Research Design

Time Series Design							
Select	Pre Test	Pre Test	Pre Test	Treatments	Post Test	Post Test	Post Test
Participants							

Ary et al. (2010) also states that in the one-group pretest–posttest design usually involves three steps: (1) administering a pretest measuring the dependent variable; (2) applying the experimental treatment X to the subjects; and (3) administering a posttest, again measuring the dependent variable. Differences attributed to application of the experimental treatment are then evaluated by comparing the pretest and posttest scores.

3.2 Population and Sample

Ary, et.al. defined population as all members of any well defined class of people, events or objects. The population of this research was all of the second grade students in one of the vocational high schools in Cimahi who were registered in academic year 2015/2016. It was considered homogeneous because all the populations were not based on ranking.

3.3 Sample

The sampling technique of this research was the purposive sampling. It means that in determining the sample class was based on the purpose of the study. In this study, the researcher used class XI KP B as the experimental because all the classes have the same level in terms of ability. There was not favorite class.

3.3 Research Site

This study took place at one vocational high school in Cimahi, West Java. The research site was chosen because it is accessible since the researcher is one of the English teachers in this site. In this regard, the researcher knows that Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) has not been applied, especially in teaching speaking.

3.4 Instruments of the Research

The research instruments being applied in this study for quantitative data collection comprised lesson plans, English speaking test, criteria of speaking ability for evaluating speaking ability, speaking observation form, and students' opinion form.

3.4.1 Lesson plans

The lesson plans were designed along the following procedures:

1. The researcher studied the 2006 English Curriculum/syllabus, Standard of Competency, Basic Competency (KD), Course Materials, Learning

Process /Activities, Assessment/Evaluation, Time Allotment, and Sources of Learning.

2. The researcher selected the Basic Competency (KD) which are relevant to the objective of the study including:

1. Giving suggestion and offering
2. Giving opinion
3. Wish and hope
4. Procedural Text

3. The researcher designed the lesson plan based on the Task-Based Lesson Plan framework proposed by Willis (1998) which consists of Pre-Task, Task Cycle, and Language Focus.

3.4.2 English speaking tests

The speaking test comprised pre-test and post-test to measure students' speaking ability. They were intended to find out whether Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) was effective in improving the students' speaking ability. The speaking tests consisted of pre-test and post-test. In this case, the pre test was carried out to identify the learners' initial ability in speaking skill. Therefore, it was given in the first meeting to find out the students' ability before they got involved in the treatment. There were five tasks with different language functions and situations, including Giving suggestion and offering, Giving opinion, Wish and hope, and Procedural Text.

Post-test was basically conducted in the same way to the pre-test. It was conducted after the students get the treatment. It was used to measure how effective the treatment of teaching speaking by using Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT). The post-test items were the same in both pre and post tests.

It was in the form of open ended speaking test in which the students were

required to have the conversation related to the procedure text and convey the expression of giving suggestion and asking someone to do something. This text was used since in SKL speaking activities required students to express interpersonal and transactional texts. Speaking (oral) test was used to measure the students' ability in speaking for four reasons.

First, oral testing was an important part of an overall assessment program, especially when communicative language proficiency was the goal of instruction. Test of oral performance was important to resemble authentic language use as much as possible (Hadley 2001). Second, oral test was important to be conducted as an attempt to know the students' ability to comprehend the meaning in a variety of tasks; therefore, the students received a single score reflecting their performance (Douglas in Hughes, 2002).

Third, oral tests in pairs were used in this study since the effective way of assessing a students' ability to speak was to give works in pairs or groups. Working in pairs, students can describe their own ability in create the dialogue (Heaton, 1995). Pair tasks have many advantages. However, they are also challenges. The examinees' talk is almost inevitably influenced by the other participant's personality, communication style, and language level. Therefore, there is a possibility that all test takers may not get an equal opportunity to show their speaking skills at their best (Weir, 1993; Iwashita, 1999) in Luoma (2004).

The speaking test that was used in this research should be valid and reliable. As stated by Sugiyono (2012), a good instrument (whether test or non test) must be valid and reliable. By using valid and reliable instruments in collecting the data, it is highly expected that the results of the study will be valid and reliable too.

In term of validity, Hatch & Farhady (1982, p. 251) explain that validity is divided into three types. The first type is content validity. It concerns with how well the test represents the content or behavior to be tested. The second type is criterion-related validity. It concerns with how well test performance predicts some future performance or estimates performance on some other valued test. The

third type is construct validity. It concerns with whether or not the test performance can describe the psychological factors related to the test performance (e.g., self-concept, anxiety).

Moreover, reliability can be defined as the extent to which a test produces consistent results when administered under similar conditions (Hach & Farhady 1982, p. 244).

3.4.3 Classroom Observation sheet

The second instrument was classroom observation sheet which was used to know and observe what the teacher and students were doing in the classroom. And it was also used to find out the phenomena happened during the implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching approach in the speaking class of procedural text.

3.4.4 Note Taking

Note taking was an instrument that was used to take notes about what is going on in the classroom from beginning of the lesson until the end of the lesson. In this case, it has included note the application of Task-Based Language Teaching in speaking activities.

3.4.5 Handy Camera

Handy camera was an instrument which was used to record what was happening in the classroom. It could be as a proof that the research was conducted in the classroom. Besides, it was also used to know how the implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching in speaking English.

3.5 Data and Technique of Data Collection

3.5.1 Data collection

Data collection of this research comprised of qualitative data and quantitative data. Qualitative data could be seen from the result of observation sheet and note taking. It was because those instruments were used to collect

more information about the implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching in speaking English. Then, it could be seen from teaching and learning process and how the problems that faced by the students could be solved. While, quantitative data could be seen from speaking test. In this case, the result of evaluation test was as the consideration in cultivating the quantitative data. The quantitative data elaborated about the result of accuracy and fluency in speaking.

3.5.2 Technique of Data Collection

Techniques of data collection of this research can be illustrated as follows:

1. Observation

Observation sheet was made as a guidance in observing the students. The researcher knew activities during the implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching. Then, it was not only the application of this approach which was observed, but also the speaking accuracy and fluency of students in speaking English.

2. Giving a test

There were two kinds of tests that will be given to students. Those were pre-test and post-test. Pre-test was given in the beginning before doing the research. It was used to know the background knowledge of the students. Next, the post-test was a test which was given at the end of the research. It was used to find out the progress of students in speaking English and whether students developed their speaking achievement or not after Task-Based Language Teaching implemented.

3.6 Marking Schema

The marking schema for accuracy and fluency could be mentioned as follows:

Table 3.2 Band score of oral testing criteria for accuracy

Proficiency Description	Score
Accent	
Pronunciation frequently unintelligible	1
Frequent gross errors and a very heavy accent make understanding difficult, require frequent repetition	2
“Foreign accent” requires concentrated listening, and mispronunciations lead to occasional misunderstanding and apparent errors in grammar or vocabulary.	3
Marked “foreign accent and occasional mispronunciations which do not interfere with understanding	4
No conspicuous mispronunciations, but would not be taken for a native speaker.	5
Native pronunciation, with no trace of “foreign accent.”	6

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

Proficiency Description	Score
Vocabulary	
Vocabulary inadequate for even the simplest conversation.	1
Vocabulary limited to basic personal and survival areas (time, food, transportation, family, etc.)	2
Choice of words sometimes inaccurate, limitations of vocabulary prevent discussion of some common professional and social topics.	3
Professional vocabulary adequate to discuss special interests: general vocabulary permits discussion of any non-technical subject with some circumlocutions.	4

Professional vocabulary broad and precise; general vocabulary adequate to cope with complex practical problems and varied social situations.	5
Vocabulary apparently as accurate and extensive as that of an educated native speaker.	6

(Hughes, 2003:111)

Table 3.3 Band score of oral testing criteria for fluency

Proficiency Description	Score
Speech Flow	
Hesitations, slowness, or even silences in language processing may prevent communication	1
Speech is very slow and exceeding halting, strained and stumbling except for short or memorized expressions	2
Speech is slow and often hesitant and jerky. Sentences may be left uncompleted, but speaker is able to continue.	3
Speech is medium and there may be occasional loss of fluency, this does not prevent effective communication	4
Speech is fast but with some hesitation and unevenness caused primarily by rephrasing and grouping words	5
Speech is effortless and smooth with speed approaches that of a native speaker	6

Proficiency Description	Score
Average Speed	
No word along conversation	1
Utterances are produced in few words, even in short and single word	2
Average speed indicates up to 50 words per minute	3
Average speed indicates between 50 and 100 words per minute	4
Average speed indicates ability to speak at length with relative ease on familiar topics, between 100 and 200 words per minute	5
Average speed indicates ability to speak at natural length more than	6

200 words per minute	
----------------------	--

Proficiency Description	Score
Pausing	
Producing any pauses, whether silent pauses, fillers uh/um only, or fillers uh/um plus continuously and distractingly	1
Producing stretches of language with long pauses to get understood with interlocutors, pauses are distracting	2
Producing sentences with pauses that are sometimes distracting. Pauses occur when looking for lexical choices	3
Producing sentences with pauses that are sometimes not distracting	4
Producing sentences with pauses that are not distracting	5
Producing pauses that are supported by good arrangement, it approaches native speaker expression	6

(Cauldwell, 2005:9).

The way of calculating final accuracy and fluency:

The way of calculating final accuracy:
 Accuracy : $\frac{\text{total score of accuracy (accent, grammar, vocabulary)}}{\text{total maximum score (18)}} \times 100\%$

The way of calculating final fluency
 Fluency : $\frac{\text{total score of fluency (flow, speed, pause)}}{\text{total maximum score (18)}} \times 100\%$

Table 3.4 Students' classification in Speaking Achievement

Classification	Value	Speaking Achievement (%)
Very High	8-10	80-100
High	7-7.9	70-79
Enough	6-6.9	60-69
Low	0-5.9	0-59

(Sayekti, 1983:75)

3.7 Hypothesis

There are two hypotheses that proposed in this thesis:

Ho (null hypothesis): There is no different effect in the use of Task-Based Language Teaching in the experimental group on the students' speaking ability

H1 (alternative hypothesis): There is a different effect in the use of Task-Based Language Teaching the experimental group on the students' speaking ability

3.8 Concluding Remarks

This chapter has discussed the methodology of the research. It included research design, research site and participant, data collection techniques, data analysis techniques, and hypothesis. Chapter IV will elaborate the findings and discussion of this study.

