

A STUDY ON THE SECOND YEAR STUDENTS' SPEAKING ABILITY AT SMA NEGERI 1 KATEMAN

Zaidatul Rahmayanny, Effendi Gultom, Desri Maria Sumbayak
Email: emazaraya@gmail.com , effendygultom@gmail.com , desrisumbayak@gmail.com
Contact: 085272012603

Student of English Study Program
Language and Arts Department
Faculty of Teachers Training and Education
Riau University

Abstract: *This research was a study on speaking ability of the second year students of SMA Negeri 1 Kateman. The aim of this study was to know about the second year students speaking ability at SMA Negeri 1 Kateman. The sample of this research was class XI IPA 1 that consists of 13 males and 19 females. In conducting this study, there were four questions in an interview as a test which was used to know the students' speaking ability based on five aspects: pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. The questions of interview were: (1) introducing her/his self (2) telling about her/his family (3) describing the idol in her/his life (4) telling the subject her/his like in their school and its reason. To get the quantitative data in this research, the three raters were involved to give the scores of students speaking performance. From the result of the oral test in five aspects of speaking ability, the writer concluded that the average score of students' ability in speaking from rater one it was 65.62 it was categorized as good level. From the rater two it was 66.72 it was categorized as good level. From rater three it was 67.19 it was categorized as good level. From the three raters in five aspects of speaking ability above, the average of speaking ability of students at the second year of SMA Negeri 1 Kateman was 66.51 it was categorized good level. The research finding shows that most of students were still had problems to express their idea to the listeners. It was caused by the lack of their ability in grammar, vocabulary, understanding the meaning of the word, and pronouncing the word clearly. Besides, they were lack of practice their speaking with their friend and teacher in the English classroom.*

Keywords : *descriptive research, students' speaking ability*

STUDI KEMAMPUAN BERBICARA SISWA KELAS DI SMA NEGERI 1 KATEMAN

Zaidatul Rahmayanny, Effendi Gultom, Desri Maria Sumbayak
Email: emazaraya@gmail.com , effendygultom@gmail.com , desrisumbayak@gmail.com
Contact: 085272012603

Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris
Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan
Universitas Riau
2015

Abstrak: Penelitian ini merupakan studi pada kemampuan siswa tahun kedua dari SMA Negeri 1 Kateman berbicara. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui tentang siswa tahun kedua kemampuan berbicara di SMA Negeri 1 Kateman. Sampel penelitian ini adalah kelas X1 IPA 1 yang terdiri dari 13 laki-laki dan 19 perempuan. Dalam melakukan penelitian ini, ada empat pertanyaan dalam wawancara sebagai tes yang digunakan untuk mengetahui kemampuan berbicara siswa berdasarkan lima aspek: pengucapan, tata bahasa, kosa kata, kefasihan, dan pemahaman. Pertanyaan wawancara adalah: (1) memperkenalkan dirinya / dirinya (2) menceritakan tentang dirinya / keluarganya (3) mendeskripsikan idola dalam dirinya/hidupnya (4) mengatakan subjek nya / nya seperti di sekolah mereka dan alasannya . Untuk mendapatkan data kuantitatif dalam penelitian ini, tiga penilai yang terlibat untuk memberikan nilai siswa kinerja berbicara. Dari hasil tes lisan dalam lima aspek kemampuan berbicara, penulis menyimpulkan bahwa skor rata-rata kemampuan siswa dalam berbicara dari penilai satu itu 65,62 itu dikategorikan sebagai tingkat yang baik. Dari penilai dua itu 66,72 itu dikategorikan sebagai tingkat yang baik. Dari penilai tiga itu 67,19 itu dikategorikan sebagai tingkat yang baik. Dari tiga penilai dalam lima aspek kemampuan berbicara di atas, rata-rata kemampuan siswa berbicara pada tahun kedua dari SMA Negeri 1 Kateman adalah 66,51 itu dikategorikan tingkat yang baik. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa sebagian besar siswa masih memiliki masalah untuk mengekspresikan ide mereka ke pendengar. Hal ini disebabkan oleh kurangnya kemampuan mereka dalam tata bahasa, kosa kata, memahami arti kata, dan mengucapkan kata dengan jelas. Selain itu, mereka adalah kurangnya berlatih berbicara dengan teman dan guru mereka di kelas bahasa Inggris.

Kata kunci: penelitian deskriptif, kemampuan berbicara siswa

INTRODUCTION

Speaking is one of the four language skills. Students learning English in Indonesia are expected to be able to speak English as the objective of curriculum for each level. In order to communicate in English well, learners must be able to master the four language skills. As we know, one way to undertake some activities in learning English is by speaking or conversation. Speaking is one of communicative competence. Speaking is one competence that must be developed. By having conversation people can obtain ideas, messages and information. Furthermore, Hammer (1991) pointed that, a speaker says the he or she wants something happen as the result of what he or she says. The speakers may want charm the listeners and want to give some information to express pleasure. In another case they may decide to be rude or flatter, to agree or complain. In each of these cases they interested in archiving this communicative purpose. What is important is the message they wise to convey and affect they want it to have.

Basically, the objectives of speaking at senior high school are follows: first, students can make a short conversation. Second, students can describe things, places and sequence of event simply. And the last, students are able to ask and answer question about any thing

Based on the statement above the writer finds that students' difficulties in speaking might be based on two sides (students and teachers). From the students' side, the writer finds two difficulties. First, the students are afraid of making mistakes because they lack of vocabulary. Second, most of the students rarely use English in teaching and learning process. They also never use English outside of the classroom.

The other cause is that English is rarely used in classes including in the teaching and learning process. Most the of students still speak Indonesian. As a result, the students do not understand what the teachers say when the English teachers try to speak English.

Based on temporary observation, the writer found that there were many the students who still have difficulty to communicate in English well. It can be seen from several symptoms. Some students did not follow the tenses while they were speaking English. They did not know how to express their ideas in systematically words. During the process of learning, they were rarely used English and less of participation in English discussions. Everything was gating worse when the students were lack of vocabulary in speaking English. Consequently the communication between students and their groups, students and their teacher was built passively.

Based on the background above, the writer was interested to conduct a research about "A Study on the Second Year Student's Speaking Ability at SMA Negeri 1 Kateman".

METHODOLOGY

The population of the research was the second year students of SMA Negeri 1 Kateman. The population consist of two IPA classes and one Social class. The first IPA class consists of 13 males and 19 females. The second IPA class consists of 11 males and 20 femals. The rest was social class, it consist of 15 of males and 17 femalas. The sample of this research was class X1 IPA 1. The writer chose this class because based on the teacher's recommendation according to the teachers' teaching and learning

experiences, among the three classes. This class represented the whole students' speaking ability for the second grade.

The data collecting technique was used in this research was quantitative data. To get quantitative data, the writer used a test instrument. This technique was used to get students' speaking ability based on five aspects: Pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. Writer used the interview or oral test, the writer give 4 questions. The questions of interview were: (1) introducing her/his self (2) telling about her/his family (3) describing the idol in her/his life (4) telling the subject her/his like in their school and its reason. While taking the test, writer recorded what the answers of the students. The data recorded was evaluated by three raters. Two raters were the teacher of SMA 1 Kateman they were Mr. Agusman S.Pd and Mr. Desi Putra S.Pd and Mrs Ermi Julias who was teacher of Madrasah Aliyah Al-Ikhlas. They were asked to assess the data gathered by the writer in order to make the data more objective, valid and reliable.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

After the raters assessed the students speaking ability during test, the writer got the result of the students speaking ability from five aspects.

First, the students' speaking ability in pronunciation aspect from the three raters was as follows: from rater one, none of the students got the score of 81-100, three students got the score of 61-80, sixteen students reached the score of 41-60, threeteen of the student achieved the score of 21-40 and none of the students got the score of 0-20. From rater one, none of students reached the score of 81-100, none of students achieved the score of 61-80, sixteen students got the score of 41-60, sixteen of the student reached the score of 21-40 and none of the students achieved the score of 0-21. From rater three, none of the students got the score of 81-100, twenty students reached the score of 61-80, twelve students achieved the score of 21-40, none of the students got the score of 0-40 and none of students reached the score of 0-20. Most of students achieved the score range of 41-60 in pronunciation from three raters.

Second, the students' speaking ability in grammar aspect from three raters was as follows : from rater one, none of the students got the score of 81-100, none of the students achieved the score of 61-80, eighteen students reached the score of 41-60, fourteen students got the score of 21-40 and none of the students achieved the score of 0-20. From rater two, none of the students got the score of 81-100, none of the students achieved the score of 61-80, twenty students reached the score of 41-60, twelve students got the score of 21-40 and none of the students achieved the score of 0-21. From rater three, none of the students got the score of 81-100, none of the students achieved the score of 61-80, twelve students reached the score of 41-60, none of the students got the score of 21-40 and none of the students achieved the score of 0-20. Most of students achieved the score range of 41-60 in grammar from three raters.

Third, the students' speaking ability in vocabulary aspect from three the raters was as follows: from rater one, none of the students achieved the score of 81-100, none of the students reached the score of 61-80, eighteen students achieved the score of 41-60, fourteen students got the score of 21-40 and none of the students reached the score of 0-20. From rater two, none of the students got the score of 81-100, none of the students students achieved the score of 61-80, twenty three students reached the score of 41-60, nine students got the score of 21-40 and none of the students achieved the score

of 0-21. From rater three, none of the students got the score of 81-100, none of the students achieved the score of 61-80, twenty students reached the score of 41-60, nine students got the score of 21-40 and none of the students achieved the score of 0-20. Most of students got the score range of 41-60 in vocabulary from three raters.

Fourth, the students' speaking ability in fluency aspect from three the raters was as follows: from rater one, none of the students got the score of 81-100, none of the students achieved the score of 61-80, twenty one student reached the score of 41-60, ten of the students got the score of 21-40 and only one of the students achieved the score of 0-20. From rater two, none of the students got the score of 81-100, none of the students achieved the score of 61-80, twenty three students reached the score of 41-60, nine students got the score of 21-40 and none of the students achieved the score of 0-21. From rater three, none of the students got the score of 81-100, none of the students achieved the score of 61-80, twenty two students reached the score of 41-60, ten students got the score of 21-40 and none of the students achieved the score of 0-20. Most students reached the score range of 41-60 in fluency from three raters.

And last, the students' speaking ability in comprehension aspect from three raters was as follows: from rater one, none of the students got the score of 81-100, two students achieved the score of 61-80, fifteenth students reached the score of 41-60, fourteen the students got the score of 21-40 and only one of the students achieved the score of 0-20. From rater two, none of the students got the score of 81-100, only one of the students achieved the score of 61-80, twenty one of students reached the score of 41-60, ten the students got the score of 21-40 and none of the students achieved the score of 0-21. From rater three, none of the students got the score of 81-100, only one of students reached the score of 61-80, twenty one students achieved the score of 41-60, ten students got the score of 21-40 and none of the students reached the score of 0-20. Most of students achieved the score range of 41-60 in comprehension from the three raters.

DISCUSSIONS

As shown on the tables, the writer presents the average point of five aspects as in the followings:

Table. 1 The Average score and Average Point of Pronunciation from three raters

Rater	Point	Score
Rater I	2.68	67.19
Rater 2	2.5	62.5
Rater 3	2.62	65.62
Average point/score	2.6	65.10

From table, it can be seen that the point of pronunciation from rater 1 is 2.62, the point of pronunciation from rater 2 is 2.5 and the point of pronunciation from rater 3 is 2.62. So the average point of pronunciation is 2.65. Furthermore, the score of pronunciation from rater 1 is 67.19, the score of pronunciation from rater 2 is 62.5 and

the score of pronunciation from rater 3 is 65.62. So, the average score of pronunciation is 65.10 from all raters, it is categorized in *Good* level.

Table.2 The Average score and Average Point of Grammar from three raters

Rater	Point	Score
Rater I	2.57	64.06
Rater 2	2.62	65.62
Rater 3	2.62	65.62
Average point/score	2.60	65.62

From table it can be seen that the point of grammar from rater 1 is 2.57, the point of grammar from rater 2 is 2.62 and the point of pronunciation from rater 3 is 2.62. So the average point of grammar is 2.60. Furthermore, the score of grammar from rater 1 is 64.06, the score of grammar from rater 2 is 65.62 and the score of grammar from rater 3 is 65.62. So, the average score of grammar is 65.62 from all raters, it is categorized as *Good* level.

Table.3 The Average score and Average Point of Vocabulary Based on Three Raters

Rater	Point	Score
Rater I	2.56	64.06
Rater 2	2.72	67.97
Rater 3	2.72	67.97
Average point/score	2.67	66.67

From table 4.6 it can be seen that the point of vocabulary from rater 1 is 2.56, the point of vocabulary from rater 2 is 2.72 and the point of vocabulary from rater 3 is 2.72. So the average point of vocabulary is 2.67. Furthermore, the score of vocabulary from rater 1 is 64.06, the score of vocabulary from rater 2 is 67.97 and the score of vocabulary from rater 3 is 67.97. So, the average score of vocabulary is 66.67 from all raters, it is categorized as *Good* level.

Table.4 The Average score and Average Point of Fluency from three Raters

Rater	Point	Score
Rater I	2.62	64.06
Rater 2	2.72	67.97
Rater 3	2.69	67.97
Average point/score	2.67	66.67

From table 4.8 it can be seen that the point of fluency from rater 1 is 2.62, the point of fluency from rater 2 is 2.72 and the point of fluency from rater 3 is 2.69. So the

average point of fluency is 2.67. Furthermore, the score of fluency from rater 1 is 64.06, the score of fluency from rater 2 is 67.97 and the score of fluency from rater 3 is 67.97. So, the average score of fluency is 66.67 from all raters, it is categorized as *Good* level.

Table.5 The Average score and Average Point of Comprehension from three Raters

Rater	Point	Score
Rater I	2.56	64.06
Rater 2	2.72	67.97
Rater 3	2.72	67.97
Average point/score	2.67	66.67

From table 4.10 it can be seen that the point of comprehension from rater 1 is 2.56, the point of comprehension from rater 2 is 2.72 and the point of comprehension from rater 3 is 2.72. So the average point of comprehension is 2.67. Furthermore, the score of comprehension from rater 1 is 64.06, the score of comprehension from rater 2 is 67.97 and the score of comprehension from rater 3 is 67.97. So, the average score of comprehension is 66.67 from all raters, it is categorized as *Good* level

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this research was to find out the speaking ability of the second year students of SMA 1 Negeri Kateman. Based on the result from the oral test in five aspects (Pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension) of speaking ability, the writer concluded that the average score students' ability in speaking from rater one was 65.62 it was categorized as *good* level, from the rater two it was 66.72 it was categorized as *good* level, and from rater three was 67.19 it was categorized as *good* level. From the three raters in five aspects of speaking ability above, the average of speaking ability of students at the second year of SMA Negeri 1 Kateman was 66.51 it was categorized *good* level. Based on the data above, it can be said that most of students are not able to express their idea to the listener. It was caused still had problems of their ability in grammar, vocabulary, understanding the meaning of the word, and pronouncing the word clearly. Besides, they are seldom to practice their speaking with their friend and teacher in the classroom.

REFERENCES

- Burton 1982. *Mastering English Language*. Maemillan Press. Hongkong
- Douglas, Brown. 1994 *Teaching by Principle: An Interaction Approach to Language Pedagogy*. Englewood cliffs. New jersey: Ptentice Hall. Ine.
- Hornby. A.S 2000. *Oxford Advantaced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. A New Edition. Oxford University Press. England.

- Harris, David, .1974. *Testing English as Second Language*. Tata Mc.Graw-Hill Publishing Company Ltd. Newdelhi.
- Jack Richard. 1992. *Longman Dictionary Applied Linguistic*. Malaysia Longman Group UK Limited. NewYork.
- Jeremy, Hammer. 2001. *The Practice Language Learning*. Longman. London.
- Kayi, Hayriye. *Teaching Speaking Activities to Promote Speaking in a Second Language*. <http://unr.edu//.Retrieved> on October 4,2012
- Lado Robet. 1961. *Language Testing*. New York
- Nunan, David. 1991. *Language Teaching Methodology*, Prentice Hall International. UK.
- Rini. 2007. *Teaching Speaking Through Dialogue to the Eleventh Year Students: A Case Study At SMK Muhammadiyah 1 Jatinom*. Muhammadiyah University of Jakarta
- Rest, Gareth. 1997. *Factor to Consider: Developing Adult EFL Students Speaking Abilities*. English Teaching Forum.Number 35th. 2007
- Syafii. 2007. *From Paragraphs to A Research Report: A Writing of English for Academic Purposes*. LBSI. Pekanbaru
- Sopidiana. 2008. *Students' Speaking Ability in Presenring a Preaped Speech of the Second Year Students of Senior High School at Diniyah Putri Pekanbaru*. Pekanbaru.
- Tarigan. 2008. *Berbicara Sebagai Suatu Keterampilan Berbahasa*. Angkasa. Bandung.