

## **A STUDY ON THE SECOND YEAR STUDENTS' ABILITY OF SMP AS-SHOFA PEKANBARU IN CONSTRUCTING YES/NO QUESTIONS**

Najmi Afrihas, Atni Prawati, M. Nababan

Email: [afrihasn@gmail.com](mailto:afrihasn@gmail.com), [muhammadikhsansyahputra@ymail.com](mailto:muhammadikhsansyahputra@ymail.com), No. Hp: 085278371860

Student of English Language Education Department

Faculty of Teacher's Training and Education

University of Riau

***Abstract:** This research was about the ability of the students in constructing yes/no questions. The aim of this research was to find out the ability of the second year students of SMP As-Shofa Pekanbaru in constructing yes/no questions. The population was 138 students. The sample was chosen through cluster random sampling and lottery technique. The analysis was based on giving test to the students. It was found that 20 out of 138 students were 1 student (5%) in excellent level, 5 students (25%) in good level, 10 students (50%) in mediocre level, 2 students (10%) in poor level and 2 students (10%) in very poor level. The mean score of the students was 51,81. It implies that the students' ability falls into mediocre ability level. Based on the result, it is recommended that teachers should pay attention more on material yes/no questions especially in using did.*

***Key Words:** Ability, Constructing, Yes/No Questions*

## A STUDY ON THE SECOND YEAR STUDENTS' ABILITY OF SMP AS-SHOFA PEKANBARU IN CONSTRUCTING YES/NO QUESTIONS

Najmi Afrihas, Atni Prawati, M. Nababan

Email: [afrihasn@gmail.com](mailto:afrihasn@gmail.com), [muhammadikhsansyahputra@ymail.com](mailto:muhammadikhsansyahputra@ymail.com), No. Hp: 085278371860

Student of English Language Education Department

Faculty of Teacher's Training and Education

University of Riau

**Abstrak:** Penelitian ini tentang kemampuan siswa dalam penyusunan *yes/no questions*. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui kemampuan siswa kelas VIII SMP As-Shofa Pekanbaru dalam penyusunan *yes/no questions*. Populasinya terdiri dari 138 siswa. Sampelnya dipilih berdasarkan teknik *cluster random sampling* dan lotre. Analisisnya berdasarkan tes yang diberikan kepada siswa-siswa. Ditemukan bahwa 20 dari 138 siswa terdapat 1 siswa (5%) di tingkat "sangat baik", 5 siswa (25%) di tingkat "baik", 10 siswa (50%) di tingkat "sedang", 2 siswa (10%) di tingkat "rendah", dan 2 siswa (10%) di tingkat "sangat rendah". Nilai rata-rata siswa adalah 51,81. Ini berarti kemampuan siswa terdapat pada tingkat "sedang". Berdasarkan hasil ini, maka para guru harus memberikan perhatian lebih terhadap materi *yes/no questions*, khususnya penggunaan *did*.

**Kata Kunci:** Kemampuan, Penyusunan, *Yes/No Questions*

## INTRODUCTION

One of the language components that needs to be studied is grammar. It is one of the most important components to learn out of the four language skills: Speaking, Writing, Reading, and Listening. According to Hornby (2000), grammar is the rules in a language for changing the form of words and joining them into sentences. In other words, grammar is one of main aspects to be paid attentions to to construct a sentence.

In general, a sentence is divided into three types. They are the affirmative or positive sentence, negative sentence, and interrogative sentence. The third type is also known as the question. Its functions are to know something (name, adress, age, job, etc), to know how to do something, to know reason, to satisfy curiosity, etc. A question is derived from a statement and vice versa. A statement can be constructed from a question. Therefore, making questions is not less important than making statement.

In addition, constructing statement is not like constructing question. Constructing statement is easier than constructing question. We just state the subject and then followed by predicate. That is called as a statement. But, constructing question is more difficult because it needs deep comprehension. There are two possible conditions. There is an inversion or addition in the front of positive sentence.

According to Azar (1989) questions are divided into four kinds. Those are *yes/no questions*, *information questions*, *negative questions*, and *tag questions*. A *yes/no* question is a question that may be answered by yes or no. An information question is a question that asks for information by using question words: what, where, when, why, who, how or which. A negative question is a question which is used to indicate the speaker's idea or attitude . And, a tag question is a question that is added at the end of a sentence.

All kinds of questions are important material, including *yes/no* question. It is the most basic types of questions. It should be taught to the students. It is helpful for beginners who are not competent enough to produce language as well as for those who emotionally do not feel ready to talk. In other words, it is a good material for students to practice before they are ready to speak with this language.

However, *yes/no* question is not simple material to be mastered. The students will have some difficulties to constuct this question. It depends on the auxilary of the positive sentence. The students cannot directly invert or add the auxilary in the front of positive sentence.

In constructing *yes/no* questions, the general rule isto move *auxiliary* or *be verb* to the front of positive sentence. In other words, there is a changing position or inversion between *subject* and *auxiliary* or *beverb*. *Subject* is taken after the *auxiliary* or *be verb*.

But, the rule cannot be applied for all types of *yes/no* questions. If a positive sentence has no *auxiliary* or *be verb*, we cannot put the *verb* before the *subject* directly. The rule will be changed by using *do*, *does*, or *did* in the front of positive sentence.

The writer believes that this exception is more difficult than the general one to be constructed in *yes no* questions. This is because this rule depends on tenses and subject of a sentence. Then, there is a changing form of verb. This research only focuses on analyzing the usage of *do*, *does*, and *did* in *yes/no* questions.

Based on the explanation above, the writer is interested to conduct a research entitled “ A Study on the Second Year Students’ Ability of SMP As-Shofa Pekanbaru in Constucting Yes/No Questions”.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research data were collected and analyzed from 1<sup>st</sup> to 17<sup>th</sup> October 2014. It took place in SMP As-Shofa Pekanbaru. This is a descriptive research that has only one variable. The objective of this research is to know the ability of second year students of SMP As-shofa Pekanbaru in constructing yes/no questions. Gay (1987) states that the descriptive research involves collecting data to test hypothesis or to answer question concerning the current status of the subject of the study.

The population of this research was the second year students of SMP As-shofa Pekanbaru. The total population of the second year students is 138 students. It is divided into 6 classes namely class VIII.1 up to VIII.6. The sample of this research is assigned by using cluster sampling technique. For this purpose, the classes were selected randomly by using lottery technique that became the sample. It was found that VIII.2 was as try out class and VIII.4 was as final class.

The data of this research were quantitative. The instrument which was used to collect data for this research was a grammar test. The test was in written form. The writer chooses written rather than spoken form because it does not take too much time. The test was in linguistics form, but the sentences were taken from the texts which were found in the internet (<http://mmursyidpw.files.wordpress.com/2011/02/learning-description.pdf> and <http://englishjuniorhighschool.blogspot.com/p/examples-of-recount-text.html>) and students' text book (Look Ahead for Grade VIII) in order to make sentences sound authentic.

Before the researcher distributes the test to the sample, the test was tried out to some population who did not belong to the sample. The validity and reliability was found through this. Procedure of this try out was analyzed based on two levels; difficulty level and reliability level.

In analyzing the data, the writer used formula from Hatch and Farhady (1982):  
To get the students' scores in answering the test:

$$P = \frac{X}{N} \times 100$$

P= individual score

X= correct answer

N= number of items

Then, those scores were classified according to the level of ability by Harris (1974).

Table 1 Interpretation of Students' Score in Term of Level of Ability on Identifying Question Tags

No	Score	Category
1	81-100	Excellent
2	61-80	Good
3	41-60	Mediocre
4	21-40	Poor
5	0-21	Very Poor

Then, to know the percentage of the classification of the students' ability in answering question, the following formula can be used:

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

P = percentage of the students per group/level

X = the number of frequency in one level

N = the number of students

Hatch and Farhady (1982)

## **RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS**

### **Presentation of the Try Out Test**

Before administrating the real test, a try out was conducted to 19 students at SMP As-ShofaPekanbaru in VIII.2 class. Try out test consisted of 30 items. After conducting the try out, the writer compute the result of tryout test: facility value, mean score, standard deviation, and reliability score.

#### **Difficulty Level of the Test Items**

According Heaton (1988), a test is accepted in the degree of difficulty (facility value) 0,30-0,70 and it is rejected if the facility value is below 0,30 (too difficult) or above 0,70 (too easy).After analyzing the test items, it was found that there were 13 rejected items and need to be revised. Those items were 2, 5, 6, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30. The item number 2, 5, and 6 were rejected because the facility value was above 0,70 (too easy). Meanwhile, the item number 21-30 were rejected because the facility value was below 0,30 (too difficult). Then, other numbers were accepted. The rejected items were revised by changing it with the new statements.

#### **Reliability of the Test**

Before finding the reliability of the test, the writer calculated the mean score and standard deviation of the try out. The mean score of the try out test was 37,34 and the standard deviation was 21,25.

Based on those two scores, the writer calculated the reliability of the test. It was found that the reliability of the test was 1,05. This score was considered very high.

### **Presentation of the Research Finding**

The writer presents the findings concerning the students' ability in constructing yes/no questions in the following tables.

Table 2 The Percentage of Students' Ability in Using *Do* in Constructing Yes/No Questions

No	Score	Frequency	Percentage	Ability Level
1	81-100	10	50%	Excellent
2	61-80	5	25%	Good
3	41-60	0	0%	Mediocre
4	21-40	2	10%	Poor
5	0-20	3	15%	Very Poor
Total		20	100%	

Table 3 The Percentage of Students' Ability in Using *Does* in Constructing Yes/No Questions

No	Score	Frequency	Percentage	Ability Level
1	81-100	0	0%	Excellent
2	61-80	11	55%	Good
3	41-60	6	30%	Mediocre
4	21-40	2	10%	Poor
5	0-20	1	5%	Very Poor
Total		20	100%	

Table 4 The Percentage of Students' Ability in Using *Did* in Constructing Yes/No Questions

No	Score	Frequency	Percentage	Ability Level
1	81-100	1	5%	Excellent
2	61-80	0	0%	Good
3	41-60	2	10%	Mediocre
4	21-40	6	30%	Poor
5	0-20	11	55%	Very Poor
Total		20	100%	

Table 5 The Percentage of Students' Ability in Constructing Yes/No Questions

No	Score	Frequency	Percentage	Ability Level
1	81-100	1	5%	Excellent
2	61-80	5	25%	Good
3	41-60	10	50%	Mediocre
4	21-40	2	10%	Poor
5	0-20	2	10%	Very Poor
Total		20	100%	

From table 5 above, it can be seen that 1 student (5%) are in excellent level, 5 students (25%) are in good level, 10 students (50%) are in mediocre level, 2 students (10%) are in poor level and 2 students (10%) in very poor level. The mean score of the students was 51,81. It means that the students' ability falls into mediocre ability level.

### **The Interpretation of the Data**

It is obtained that the mean score of the students' score in constructing yes/no questions is 51,81 (*mediocre* level). The analysis of the data shows that: first, the mean of students' score in using *do* in constructing yes/no questions is 71. It means that the score is in *good* level. Second, the mean of students' score in using *does* is 60. It is considered in *mediocre* level. Third, the mean of students' score in using *did* is 26. It is in *poor* level.

The writer interprets that the easiest component of yes/no questions was in using *do*. It could be understood because the students would not face any difficulties to change the sentence into yes/no questions. They just took *do* in the front of question. There was no changing form of verb. Then, using *does* was a mediocre component in constructing yes/no questions. It might happen because some of students did not know the subject was singular or plural. Based on the explanation in the previous chapter, *does* was taken in the front of question whose subject is singular. After that, form of the verb was changed. The suffix *-s* or *-es* must be omitted. Furthermore, the most difficult component of constructing yes/no questions was in using *did*. There were 2 kinds of students' answers. First, the students was wrong because they did not know the sentence was in simple past form. Second, they know the sentence was in simple past form, but they did not change the form of verb. The students had to take *did* in the front of question and the verb should be changed into  $V_1$ . In conclusion, these two reasons that caused using *did* became the most difficult component in constructing yes/no questions.

## **CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS**

### **Conclusions**

This is a descriptive research that has one variable. The title is A Study on the Ability of the Second Year Students of SMP As-Shofa Pekanbaru in Constructing Yes/No Questions. Based on the result of the study presented in chapter IV, it can be concluded that the ability of the second year students of SMP As-Shofa Pekanbaru in Constructing Yes/No Questions is in *mediocre* level (51,81). It leads to an interpretation that many of students still have problems in constructing yes/no questions.

The details of the data show the students' score in using *do* in constructing yes/no questions is 71. The score shows that the students' ability is *good* level. Then, the students' score in using *does* in constructing yes/no questions is 60. It means that the students' ability is in *mediocre* level. Last, the students' score in using *did* in constructing yes/no question is 26. It indicates that the students' ability is in *poor* level.

From the data above, it can be seen that the easiest component of yes/no questions for second year students of SMP As-Shofa is in using *do*, the mediocre component is in using *does* and the most difficult component is in using *did*.

## Suggestions

After looking at the result of the research, the following suggestions might be useful in teaching and learning process at the second year students of SMP As-Shofa Pekanbaru and other people. First, the students' ability are in the mediocre level in constructing yes/no questions. They are expected to improve their ability by practicing more exercises as many as possible by enlarging their knowledge. The students should motivate themselves to learn yes/no questions.

Second, teachers should motivate and encourage students to learn yes/no questions. The writer suggests that he/she should be able to make students enjoy their English class by creating interesting media and various activities so that the students can comprehend the different use of *do*, *does*, and *did*. Third, for other researcher, if you want to do same topic about constructing yes/no question, you just need to focus on *does* and *did* component in order to make your study more useful. Finally, for English student who wants to be a teacher, the result of the research shows us that although the material is easy, we may not consider it as trivial. Yes/no question is rather simple material but it is not simple as we think if we do a test.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Azar, Betty Schramper. 1989. *Understanding and Using English Grammar: Second Edition*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Gartside, L. 1982. *English for Business Studies*. Great Britain: Hollen Street Press.
- Gay, L. R. 1987. *Educational Research: Third edition*. The United States of America: Merrie Publishing Company.
- Glatthorn, A. Allan. 1997. *Comparison Skills*. USA: University of California.
- Harris, David. P. 1974. *Testing Language as a Second Language*. Bombay: Georgetown University.
- Hatch, Evelyn and Farhady, Hossein. 1982. *Research Design and Statistics for Applied Linguistics*. Los Angeles: Newbury House Publishers Inc.
- Heaton, J. B. 1988. *Writing English Language Tests*. London: Longman Group UK Limited.
- Hornby. 2000. *Oxford Advanced Learners' Dictionary: Sixth Edition*. New York: Oxford University Express.
- Kumar, Pradeep. D. 2013. Retrieved from: <http://www.languageinindia.com/may2013/pradeepgrammarfinal.pdf>.
- Leech, GandSvartvik. 1975. *A Communicative Grammar of English*. London: Longman.
- McManis, C. Et al. 1987. *Language File*. Ohio: AfvocatcPublicing Group.



Murcia, C and Freeman, L. 1999. *The Grammar Book; An ESL/EFL Teacher's Course*. USA: Heinle and Heinle.

Nurkancana and Sunartana. 1986. *Evaluasi Pendidikan*. Surabaya: Usaha Nasional.

Poole, Garry. 2003. *The Complete Book of Questions*. Michigan: Zondervan

Quirk, R and Greenbaum, S. 1993. Retrieved from:  
<http://grammar.ccc.commnet.edu/grammar/auxiliary.htm>.

Tinambunan, W. 1988. *Evaluation of Students Achievement*. Jakarta: P2LT+K.