ABSTRACT

The objective of this research was to know whether the Describing objects Technique can improve students’ speaking ability effectively.

The method of this research was quantitative approach. The instruments of the research were test items, observation sheet. The test item consist of pre test and post test. The pretest was given to find out the ability of the students before they were given treatment, the posttest was given to find out the ability of the students after they were given treatment. Both of the pretest and post-test in the form of an oral test. The subject of the study was 15 students of Dena English Courses at Batu. The data of this research were collected by giving pre-test, observation, post-test. The collected data were noted and analyzed by using several statistics formulas. The results of data analysis showed that: Standard deviation of the result of average score was 14.4. The mean score of pretest was 36.2. The mean score of posttest was 49.7. The mean score from the pre –test and post-test was 13.5. And the result of t observation (to) of the test was 3.6. At the degree of significance 5% = 2.14. The result is 2.14 < 3.6.

Based on the data analysis above, the writer concluded that the increasing is significant at each language factor. Its meant that the describing objects technique has significance effect to improve the students’ speaking ability. And if the teacher frequent to use this technique, the students’ ability of speaking must be better.
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INTRODUCTION

Language as a tool of communication has an important role for human life and it is used as a medium to interact with one another, to fulfill their daily need. One of the language in the world is English. English as an important part as a means of international communication. We know that there are four aspects influencing the ability in mastering English as well. They are: reading, listening, writing, and speaking. Therefore, in this study, the writer focuses discuss in improving an aspects of english that is; speaking. There some reason why this study prefers speaking skill than another skills because in fact, to master those skill is not easy, many students usually find difficulty in speaking English. Some factors are their fear of making mistakes, being laughed by their friends and lack of confidence of their own abilities. Therefore, a teacher should help the students in solving this problem by motivating them to speak.

It is also happened in students of Dena English Courses. For the first observation for students, many problem we found that relating the students’ speaking ability, such as: the students’ speaking ability is not good enough, students are shy and afraid to speak. Then we observed the real situation for a week in the classroom, we know that the cause is practice of speaking in the teaching learning process is rarely to be done and in teaching learning the tutor still use the old
ways to teach their students as like the old methods/technique and not using the good media. All this time, in learning just concern on the theory not on the practiced.

For this reason above, we decided to use a technique that can make students to take part actively in the class and automatically this technique can improve the students’ ability in speaking English. It is doing describing object. Some reason why the describing object can help the students in improve their speaking ability. The reason such as; (1) learning with describing object technique will give motivation to students because describing objects as a interesting thing and inviting the students to be curious. (2) describing object technique will evoke any knowledge the students and also especially to improve the skills of students in speaking. (3) describing objects is one of potential activity that gives students feeling of freedom to express themselves and it is potentially to encourage students to be active in practice speaking english.

Based on the background above, the researcher formulates the following research questions: How can describing object technique improve the student’s speaking ability effectively at English Courses?

Related to the problem statement above, the objective of this study is then specified: to know describing objects technique can improve the students’ speaking ability effectively at English Courses.

The result of this study is expected to be useful information to: (1) can help the teacher to develop their teaching speaking technique so they can make their students active in their speaking class where all students give their participation well for their friends that perform in front of the class. (2) can make the students more active in their speaking without being shy and afraid. They can explore their words from the object that they brought.

This study was done by the subject of the students in Dena English Courses at jl. Moch. Sahar, Batu. Using describing object is give more opportunities to learners to make changes in speaking during the time allocated in English Course.

The study focuses specifically on using describing object in teaching speaking. Teaching speaking is a very important part of second language learning. The ability to communicate in a second language clearly and efficiently contributes to the success of the learner in school and success later in every phase of life. Therefore, it is essential that language teachers pay great attention to teaching speaking [1]. The using of describing object can helps students to be good observers of things in their surroundings. Teaching with objects is an excellent means to enhance students’ sensory literacy, allowing them to develop the ability to compile evidence through sight, touch, hearing, smell, and even taste [2].

**METHODOLOGY**

Research design is the plan and structure of the investigation used to obtain evidence to answer research questions. The design describes the procedures of conducting the study [3]. The research design in this study is quantitative approach. According to Creswell (2009) quantitative-based survey research is one of the most common approaches in social science. It promotes understanding of social trends, attitudes and perceptions of a sample population [4]. Then Muijs,D.(2004) said Quantitative research is ‘Explaining phenomena by collecting numerical data that are analysed using mathematically based methods (in particular statistics) [5].

In this research used experiment because the researcher wants to apply and prove the technique whether it will be
successful. The result of the research is to find the difference of the student’s speaking ability between before and after using describing object. Data of the research is collected by the way of the operational technique. It means that the data is obtained from the field. The data collection is a process whereby the researcher meets the respondent and thus obtains data from the respondents [6].

In this study, the data will be used is primary data because all information that is directly gathered from the research subject. All the data that is obtained from the pre-test, observation, post-test and questionaire. The data that the writer collects are taken from the followings:

1. Pre-test, the writer gives the pre-test to obtain the data, this is especially to know the students’ speaking ability before the applying of the describing object technique in teaching speaking.

2. Observation sheet, the data was taken from observation are to know the students condition before that application of this technique and to know the improvement of students’ speaking ability through the applying of this technique.

3. Post-test, the writer gives the post-test to obtain the data, this is to know the students’ speaking improvement after the applying of this technique in teaching speaking.

To anaylize the students speaking ability, the writer used the formula:

\[ M = \sum_{1}^{n} X \]

Where \( \Sigma X \) is total of Language Components, \( M \) is means of Language Component and \( N \) is total of Subject. To uses the formula above, the writer used Higgs and Clifford (1982) in [7] as follows:

Table 1 Checklist of conversation performance Factors and descriptors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accent</td>
<td>1. Pronunciation frequently unintelligible&lt;br&gt;2. Frequent gross errors and a very heavy accent make understanding difficult require frequent repetition&lt;br&gt;3. “Foreign accent” requires concentrated listening and mispronunciations lead to occasional misunderstanding and apparent errors in grammar or vocabulary.&lt;br&gt;4. Marked “foreign Accent” and occasional mispronunciations that do not interfere with understanding.&lt;br&gt;5. No conspicuous mispronunciations, but would not be taken for a native speaker&lt;br&gt;6. Native pronunciation, with no trace of “foreign accent”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>1. Grammar almost entirely inappropriate or inaccurate, except in stock phrases.&lt;br&gt;2. Constant errors showing control of very few conversational microskills or major pattern, and frequently preventing communication.&lt;br&gt;3. Frequent error showing inappropriate use of some conversational microskills or some major pattern uncontrolled, causing occasional irritation and misunderstanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Vocabulary limited to minimum courtesy requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Vocabulary limited to basic personal areas and very familiar topics (autobiographic information, personal experiences, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Choice of words sometimes inaccurate, limitation of vocabulary prevent discussion of some common familiar topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Vocabulary adequate to discuss special interest and any nontechnical subject with some circumlocutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Vocabulary broad, precise and adequate to cope with complex practical problem and varied topics of general interest (current events, as well as work, family, time, food, transportation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Vocabulary apparently as accurate and extensive as that of an educated native speaker.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Speech is so halting and fragmentary that conversation is virtually impossible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Speech is very slow and uneven, except for short or routine sentences; frequently punctuated by silence or long pauses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Speech is frequently hesitant and jerky; sentences may be left uncompleted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Speech is occasionally hesitant, with some unevenness caused by rephrasing and groping for words.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Speech is effortless and smooth. But perceptibly nonnative in speed and evenness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Speech on all general topics as effortless and smooth as a native speaker’s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Understand too little to respond to conversation initiations or topics nominations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Understand only slow, very simple speech on topics of general interest requires constant repletion and rephrasing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Understand careful, somewhat simplified speech directed to him or her with considerable repetition and rephrasing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Understand quite well normal educated speech directed to him or her, but requires occasional repetition or rephrasing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Understand everything in normal educated conversation, except for very for very colloquial or low-frequency items or exceptionally rapid or slurred speech.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Understand everything in informal and colloquial speech to be expected of an educated native speaker.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 Conversational english proficiency weighting table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Proficiency Description</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Accent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

1. Result

To know the base score of the students’ speaking ability by using Describing Objects technique, the researcher together with the collaborator conducted the test. The students’ performance then observed and evaluated based on the scoring rubric with speaking on it: accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.

The result of the pre test after combined with the speaking indicators; accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension, the writer conclude that the result of speaking ability can be seen in the following table 3.

Table 3 The comparison table of language factors total score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>STUDENTS’ NAME</th>
<th>Score PRE-TEST</th>
<th>Score POST-TEST</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>D2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ADEK AFRILIA P.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ALFIAN ANGGA S.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ANANDA NA’AFI A.R.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ANISA ZAHRA A.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ARTA AGUNG DIA P.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>APRILIA PUTRI M.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>DEVITA PUTRI A.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>EGIS CAHYA D.S.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>INDONESIA SAKTI FIKRI NURZAKI</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the data in the table 3, the writer calculated the result $\Sigma D = 203$ and $\Sigma D^2 = 3073$. To calculate the standard deviation of the result of average score, the writer used the formula as follows [8]:

$$s = \sqrt{\frac{\sum x^2 - \left(\frac{\sum x}{n}\right)^2}{n - 1}}$$

$S =$ the standard deviation of the difference in scoring of the pre-test and post-test

$X =$ the difference in scoring of the pre-test and post-test

$X =$ the mean of the difference in scoring of the pre-test and post-test.

$n =$ the total number of the students.

$$s = \sqrt{\frac{3073 - 183.2}{14}}$$

To calculate the mean score from the pre-test and post-test, the writer used the formula as follow:

$$M1 = \frac{\Sigma x_1}{n_1} \quad \text{and} \quad M2 = \frac{\Sigma x_2}{n_2}$$

$M1$ : Mean of the Language Factors of pre-test score

$M2$ : Mean of the Language Factors of post-test score

$\Sigma X$ : Total of the Language Factors score

$N$ : Total of the Subject/Students

The computation of the mean scores of the pre-test is as follows:

$$M = \frac{\Sigma x}{n}$$

$$M = \frac{543}{15}$$

$M = 36.2$

- The mean score of pre-test = 36.2
The computation of the mean scores of the post-test is as follows:

\[ M = \frac{\sum x}{n} \]

\[ M = \frac{746}{15} \]

\[ M = 49.7 \]

- The average score of post-test = 49.7

To calculate the mean score from the pre-test and post-test, the writer used the formula as follow (Crowl, 1996: 140):

\[ \bar{x} = \frac{\sum x}{n} \]

Where:

\( X \) = the mean of the difference in scoring of the pre-test and post-test

\( X \) = the difference in scoring of the pre-test and post-test.

\( n \) = the total number of students.

\[ \bar{x} = \frac{\sum x}{n} \]

\[ \bar{x} = \frac{203}{15} \]

\[ \bar{x} = 13.5 \]

The last calculation is determining the result of \( t \) observation (to) of the test with formula:

\[ t = \frac{D}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum D^2 - (\frac{\sum D}{n})^2}{n(n-1)}}} \]

\[ t = \frac{13.5}{\sqrt{\frac{3073 - 183.2}{15(15 - 1)}}} \]

\[ t = \frac{13.5}{\sqrt{\frac{3073 - 183.2}{210}}} \]

\[ t = \frac{13.5}{13.8} \]

\[ t = \frac{13.5}{3.7} \]

\[ t = 3.6 \]

The result 3.6 indicated that there was a difference of degree. To complete the result of the research, the writer found out the degree of freedom (df) with the formula:

\[ df = N - 1 \]

\[ df = 15 - 1 \]

\[ df = 14 \]

(see table of ‘t’ value at the degree of significance of 5% ) :

At the degree of significance 5% = 2.14.

The result is 2.14 < 3.6.

The result of analyzing the data by using the formula above shows that the coefficient is 3.6.

It means that there is a significance increase after the describing technique used in teaching speaking.
Table 4: The comparison table of the total score of each language factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Factors</th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accents</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

Based on the conversational English proficiency conversion table and on the result of the pre-test highest score is 57 and the lowest score is 27. From the post-test in the highest score is 71 and the lowest score is 37. In pre-test the students’ means score is 36.2 and the students’ mean of post-test is 49.7. The difference between the two means is 13.5.

The next analysis, the researcher compares total score in each languages factor. Which in this table shown, that in each of languages factors the score have increasing From pre-test to post-test. We can see for accent the score increase from 19 to 26, grammar from 132 to 180, Vocabulary from 140 to 224, fluency from 90 to 112 and for the comprehension from 162 to 204.

Based on the data analysis above, the writer concluded that the increasing is significant at each language factor. Its meant that the describing objects technique has significance effect to improve the students’ speaking ability. And if the teacher frequent to use this technique, the students’ ability of speaking must be better.

CONCLUSION

Based on the result and discussion above, it can be concluded in the following ways:

1. Describing objects technique has significance effect to improve the students’ speaking ability. There is different of students speaking ability before an after being taught Describing Objects technique. It can be seen from the calculation of students speaking ability in this study. The results of data analysis showed that: Standard deviation of the result of average score was 14.4. The mean score of pretest was 36.2. The mean score of posttest was 49.7. The mean score from the pre–test and post-test was 13.5. And the result of t observation (tO) of the test was 3.6. At the degree of significance 5% = 2.14. The result is 2.14 < 3.6.

2. Describing Objects Technique has improved students speaking ability as follows: (1) for accent the score increase from 19 to 26, (2) for grammar from 132 to 180, (3) for vocabulary from 140 to 224, (4) for fluency from 90 to 112 and (5) for the comprehension from 162 to 204.

3. The result on using the Describing objects Technique on the students’ speaking ability was very good. Based on the result of t observation (tO), the writer concluded that the hypothesis was accepted because the tobs was higher than the t-table (3.6 > 2.14). It means that there is a significance increase after the describing technique used in teaching speaking. Therefore, this technique can be used in teaching speaking to increase the students speaking ability. It meant that describing objects technique was effective to be used in teaching speaking.

REFERENCES


Amini dan Marzuki: Improving The Students’ Speaking Ability Of Describing Object Technique