

A STUDY ON THE SPEAKING ABILITY OF THE SECOND YEAR STUDENTS OF SMK TELKOM PEKANBARU

Azlina Kurniati, Eliwarti, Novitri

Email: azlinakurniati@gmail.com, eliwartieli@gmail.com, novitri_11@yahoo.com
No. Hp: 085265622055

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

***Abstract:** This descriptive research was conducted to find out the students' speaking ability in the language function, particularly the expressions of opinion, agreement and disagreement. The samples of this research were 27 students from XI TKJ class of SMK TELKOM Pekanbaru. The researcher used cluster random sampling technique to decide the sample. The instrument used in this research was a Dialogue Completion Task which contained 12 questions. The data were analysed by calculating the students' score individually and finding out the mean score. The data were presented by using graphic. The data showed that the student's speaking ability was in **good** level with the average score 61.38. The result of students' ability in each aspect was **average** level for expression of opinion (59.59), while expression of agreement (61.84) and disagreement (60.22) were in **good** level. Based on the finding, it was suggested that the students need to do more practice in speaking in order to help them to increase their understanding of the materials. The teacher needs to give more opportunities for the students to practice using expression of opinion, agreement and disagreement, especially practice to initiate/ask using of those expressions. Further research can focus on each subtopic in detail, particularly about expression of opinion since it was the students' lowest score.*

Key words: Ability, Speaking, Expression of opinion, agreement and disagreement

STUDI TENTANG KEMAMPUAN SPEAKING SISWA KELAS DUA SMK TELKOM PEKANBARU

Azlina Kurniati, Eliwarti, Novitri

Email: azlinakurniati@gmail.com, eliwarti@gmail.com, novitri_11@yahoo.com
No. Hp: 085265622055

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

Abstrak: Riset deskriptif ini dilaksanakan bertujuan untuk mencari tahu kemampuan *speaking* siswa dalam penggunaan ekspresi *opinion, agreement and disagreement*. Sampel dari penelitian ini adalah 27 siswa dari kelas XI TKJ SMK TELKOM Pekanbaru. Diambil dengan menggunakan teknik *cluster random sampling*. Instrumen yang digunakan adalah test yang terdiri dari 12 pertanyaan. Data dianalisis dengan menghitung nilai siswa secara individu dan mencari nilai rata-ratanya. Data disajikan dalam bentuk grafik. Berdasarkan hasil yang didapatkan dari penelitian, kemampuan *speaking* siswa kelas dua SMK TELKOM Pekanbaru pada ekspresi *opinion, agreement and disagreement* adalah bagus (*good*) dengan nilai rata-rata 61.38. Hasil dari kemampuan *speaking* siswa disetiap aspek adalah sedang (*average*) untuk *expression of opinion* dengan nilai 59.59, dimana *expression of agreement* (61.84) dan *expression of disagreement* (60.22) adalah bagus (*good*). Berdasarkan hasil tersebut, disarankan agar siswa-siswa untuk melakukan latihan *speaking* guna untuk meningkatkan kemampuan mereka dalam memahami materi tersebut. Guru disarankan untuk memberikan kesempatan kepada siswa untuk berlatih dalam menggunakan *expression of opinion, agreement and disagreement*, terkhusus latihan dalam bertanya menggunakan *expression of opinion, agreement and disagreement*. Penelitian lebih lanjut bisa fokus terhadap setiap aspek secara detail, khususnya tentang *expression of opinion*.

Kata kunci: Kemampuan, Berbicara, Expression of Opinion, Agreement and Disagreement

INTRODUCTION

Pollard (2008: 34) states that speaking is one of the most difficult aspects for students to master. The reason why speaking is difficult aspect for students to master because they do not having enough exposure to English (environmental factor), infrequent English speaking practice in daily life (they could use the mother tongue to communicate, instead of using English), feeling shy and laziness to learn English. Many of students

cannot speak clearly when they talk with foreigner because they don't know how to express what they want to say and how to say that. For it, they get a miss communication. To minimize the mistakes and get a good communication with native speakers or no, the learners must know and comprehend the use of expressions and the elements in speaking.

Because of the importance of speaking, the English teachers teach speaking or include speaking activities in every topic of the lesson is to make the students have better speaking ability. It can be seen in lesson plan that teacher provide some exercises about speaking activities. However when the writer conducted practice teaching in TELKOM vocational high school from October 2014 to January 2015, the students were reluctant to speak and asked question. They tended to keep silent and many of them avoid to respond questions doing in front of the class. When the writer asked the teacher about the students' activity, the teacher also explained that the most of the students tend to use Indonesian language or their mother language.

The objective of learning English in SMK (Vocational Schools) is to make the students able to communicate in English to support the students' major skills. People may think that the main ability to communicate in English is speaking ability. The ability to communicate in English is the ability to understand and produce spoken or written language that is integrated in four skills of English; they are listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

The nature of speaking

Brown (2004) states that speaking is a productive skill that can be directly and empirically observed, those observations are invariably colored by the accuracy and effectiveness of a test taker's listening skill, which necessarily compromises the reliability and the validity of an oral production test. Speaking in a classroom involves the interaction between teachers and students or among the students which depends on how classroom activities are organized. Compared with writing and reading skill (commonly assumed as written language, receptive skills), speaking has some distinctive characteristics. In speaking, speakers do not typically speak complete sentences; use less specific vocabulary than in written language.

Brown (2004) further states that there are some basic types of speaking as in the following taxonomy:

1. *Imitative*. At one end of a continuum of types of speaking performance is the ability to simply parrot back (imitate) a word or phrase or possibly a sentence. While this purely phonetic level of oral production, a number of prosodic, lexical, and grammatical properties of language may be included in the criterion performance.
2. *Intensive*. The production of short stretches of oral language designed to demonstrate competence in a narrow band of grammatical, phrasal, lexical, or phonological relationships.
3. *Responsive*. Responsive include interaction and test comprehension but at the somewhat limited level of very short conversations, standard greetings and small

talk, simple requests and comments. This is a kind of short replies to teacher or student-initiated questions or comments, giving instructions and directions. Those replies are usually sufficient and meaningful.

4. *Interactive*. The difference between responsive and interactive speaking is in the length and complexity of the interaction, which sometimes includes multiple exchanges and/or multiple participants. Interaction can take the two forms of transactional language, which has the purpose of exchanging specific information or interpersonal exchanges which have the purpose of maintaining social relationship.
5. *Extensive (monologue)*. Extensive oral production tasks include speeches, oral representations, and storytelling, during which the opportunity for oral interaction from listeners is either highly limited (perhaps to nonverbal responses) or ruled out together.

The speaking type in this research is intensive speaking as the designing assessment. At the intensive level, test-takers are prompted to produce short stretches of discourse (no more than a sentence) through which they demonstrate linguistic ability at a specified level of language. Intensive tasks may also be described as limited response tasks (Madsen in Brown, 2003), or mechanical tasks (Underhill, 1987), or what classroom pedagogy would label as controlled response. There are several kind of intensive speaking as the designing assessment, such as:

1. **Directed Response Tasks**
The test administrator elicits a particular grammatical form or a transformation of a sentence. Such task are clearly mechanical and not communicative, but they do require minimal processing of meaning in order to produce the correct grammatical output.
2. **Read-Aloud Task**
Intensive reading-aloud task include reading beyond the sentence level up to a paragraph or two. This technique is administered by selecting a passage that incorporates test specs and by recording the test-takers output; the scoring is relatively easy because all of the test-taker's oral production is controlled.
3. **Sentence/Dialogue Completion Tasks and Oral Questionnaires**
Test-takers are first given time to read through the dialogue to get its gist and to think about appropriate lines to fill in. then as the tape, teacher, or test administrator produce one part orally, and test-takers responds.
4. **Picture-Cued Tasks**

Picture cued stimulus requires a descriptions from the test-takers. Picture may be very simple, design to elicit a word or a phrase; somewhat more elaborate and “busy”; or composed of a series that tells a story or incidents.

5. Translation

As an assessment procedure, the advantages of translation lie in its control of the output of the test-taker, which of course means that scoring is more easily specified.

Therefore, the writer used sentence/dialogue completion tasks to assess intensive speaking. How to assess intensive speaking using sentence/dialogue completion task is, first, test-takers are given time to read through the dialogue to get its gist (main point), then the tape/teacher produces one part orally and the test-taker responds.

The components of speaking skill

According to Vanderkevent (1990) there are three components in speaking

a. The Speakers

Speakers are a people who produce the sound. They are useful as the tool to express opinion or feelings to the hearer. So if there are no speakers, the opinion or the feelings or the feeling won't be stated.

b. The Listeners

Listeners are people who receive or get the speaker's opinion or feeling. If there are no listeners, speakers will express their opinion by writing.

c. The Utterances

The utterances are words or sentences, which are produced by the speakers to state the opinion. If there is no utterance, both of the speakers and the listeners will use sign.

According to Harris (1974) there are five components of speaking skill concerned with comprehension, grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, fluency.

a) Comprehension

For oral communication, it certainly requires a subject to respond, to speech as well as to initiate it.

b) Grammar

It is needed for students to arrange a correct sentence in conversation. It is in line with explanation suggested by Heaton (1978: 5) that students' ability to manipulate structure and to distinguish appropriate grammatical form in appropriateness. The utility of grammar is also to learn the correct way to gain expertise in a language in oral and written form.

c) Vocabulary

Vocabulary means the appropriate diction which is used in communication. Without having a sufficient vocabulary, one cannot communicative effectively or express their ideas both oral and written form. Having limited vocabulary is also a barrier that precludes learners from learning a language. Without grammar very little can be conveyed, without vocabulary nothing can be conveyed. So, based on this explanation, the researcher

concluded that without mastering vocabulary sufficiently is English learners will not be able to speak English or write English properly.

d) Pronunciation

Pronunciation is the way for students" to produce clearer language when they speak. It deals with the phonological process that refers to the component of a grammar made up of the elements and principles that determine how sounds vary and pattern in a language. There are two features of pronunciation; phonemes and supra segmental features. From the statement above, the researcher concluded that pronunciation is the knowledge of studying about how the words in a particular language are produced clearly when people speak. In speaking, pronunciation plays a vital role in order to make the process of communication easy to understand.

e) Fluency

Fluency is the ability to read, speak, or write easily, smoothly and expressively. In other words, the speaker can read, understand and respond in a language clearly and concisely while relating meaning and context. Fluency can be defined as the ability to speak fluently and accurately. Fluency in speaking is the aim of many language learners. Signs of fluency include a reasonably fast speed of speaking and only a small number of pauses and "ums" or "ers". These signs indicate that the speaker does not have spent a lot of time searching for the language items needed to express the message. From the ideas above, the researcher concluded that another important component is fluency. Fluency means the capability of someone speaks fluently and accurately with little using pauses like „ums“ and „ers“, and so on.

Speaking Assesment

There are six components of speaking to be scored; pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension and task as Brown (2004) has stated.

Pronunciation

- 5 = equivalent to and fully accepted by educated native speaker
- 4 = errors in pronunciation are quite rare
- 3 = errors never interfere with understanding and rarely disturb the native speaker. Accent may be obviously foreign.
- 2 = accent is intelligible though often quite faulty.
- 1 = errors in pronunciation are frequent but can be understood by a native speaker used to dealing with foreigners attempting to speak his language.

Grammar

- 5 = equivalent to that of an educated native speaker.
- 4 = able to use the language accurately on all levels normally pertinent to professional needs. errors in grammar are quite rare.
- 3 = control of grammar is good. able to speak the language with sufficient structural accuracy to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversation on practical, social and professional topics.

- 2 = can usually handle elementary constructions quite accurately but does not have thorough or confident control of the grammar.
- 1 = errors in grammar are frequent, but speaker can be understood by a native speaker used to dealing with foreigners attempting to speak his language.

Vocabulary

- 5 = speech on a levels is fully accepted by educated native speakers in all its features including breadth of vocabulary and idioms, colloquialisms, and pertinent cultural references.
- 4 = can understand and participate in any conversation within the range of his experience with a high degree of precision of vocabulary.
- 3 = able to speak the language with sufficient vocabulary to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, and professional topics. Vocabulary is broad enough that he rarely has to grope for a word.
- 2 = has speaking vocabulary sufficient to express himself simply with some circumlocutions.
- 1 = speaking vocabulary inadequate to express anything but the most elementary needs.

Fluency

- 5 = has complete fluency in the language such that his speech is fully accepted by educated native speakers.
- 4 = able to use the language fluently on all levels normally pertinent to professional needs. Can participate in any conversation within the range of this experience with a high degree of fluency.
- 3 = can discuss particular interest of competence with reasonable ease. Rarely has to grope for words.
- 2 = can handle with confidence but not with facility most social situations, including introductions and casual conversations about current events, as well as work, family and autobiographical information.
- 1 = (no specific fluency description. Refer to other four language areas for implied level of fluency.)

Comprehension

- 5 = Equivalent to that of an educated native speaker.
- 4 = can understand any conversation within the range of his experience.
- 3 = comprehension is quite complete at a normal rate of speech.
- 2 = can get the gist of most conversation of non-technical subjects (i.e., topics that require no specialized knowledge)
- 1 = within the scope of his very limited language experience, can understand simple questions and statements if delivered with slowed speech, repetition, or paraphrase.

Task

- 5 = speaking proficiency equivalent to that of an educated native speaker.
- 4 = would rarely be taken for a native speaker but can respond appropriately even in unfamiliar situations. Can handle informal interpreting from and into language.
- 3 = can participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, and professional topics.
- 2 = able to satisfy routine social demands and work requirement; needs help in handling any complication or difficulties.
- 1 = can ask and answer questions on topics very familiar to him. Able to satisfy routine travel needs and minimum courtesy requirements.

For intensive speaking, Brown (2004) states that there are three components of speaking to be scored:

- 2 Comprehensible; acceptable target form
- 1 Comprehensible; partially correct target form
- 0 Silence, or seriously incorrect target form

Therefore, the writer used the component of intensive speaking to be scored because it is more appropriate scoring scale for scoring intensive speaking as comprehension aspects for dialogue completion task combined with the component of speaking based on Brown that the writer used in this research.

Language Function

A language function is the purpose of speaking that sentence or phrase. Language functions refer to the purposes in which use language to communicate. We use language for a variety of formal and informal purposes, and specific grammatical structures and vocabulary are often used with each language function. For example, “I’m sorry” represents the function of apologizing and, “Good morning” represent the function of greeting. In this research, the writer used language function particularly expression of opinion, agreement and disagreement.

A. Expression Opinion

An opinion is a subjunctive belief, and is the result of emotion or interpretation of facts. An opinion may be supported by an argument, although people may draw opposing opinions from the same sets of facts. Opinions are never right or wrong, they are merely a figment of what someone believes. However it can be reasoned that one opinion is better supported by the facts than another by analyzing the supporting arguments.

B. Expression of Agreement and Disagreement

Expression agreement and disagreement is closely related to discussion text as it explores an issue from different points of view. This type of text is labeled s pros and cons. There are examples of expressing agreement and disagreement.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This is a descriptive research. It serves to describe, fond of describing (Hornby, 1974). According to Gay (1987: 89) descriptive research involves collecting data in order to answer the questions concerning the current status of the subject of the study. The reason why the writer chose this research is to know the students' speaking ability in using language function in the expression of opinion, agreement and disagreement. From the data of this study, we can get the answer about the students' speaking ability in using language function in the expression of opinion, agreement and disagreement.

The Population of this study is the second year student of SMK TELKOM Pekanbaru. The total population of the second year students of SMK TELKOM Pekanbaru is 128 students. They consisted of 6 classes: class TKR 1, class TKR 2, class TELKOM 1, class TELKOM 2, class TKJ and class TSM. Therefore, whether class TKR 1, class TKR, class TELKOM 1, class TELKOM 2, class TKJ and class TSM will be the sample of this research.

According to Gay (2000) if the population is homogenous enough and the population is less than 100 persons, the sample taken is 50%, but if the population is more than 100 persons, the sample taken is only 15% of them. Since the number of population in this research is quite large, the writer took 15% as the sample. Therefore, the writer took 27 students as the sample proportionally.

In order to decide the sample, the writer used cluster sampling technique. Cluster sampling used when it is more feasible or convenient to select groups of individuals that it is to select individuals from a defined population in Borg and Gall (1979). Therefore class TKJ was chosen by using the lottery that the writer gave to each of the chairman.

The writer gave the test to the students by giving dialogue completion task to the students. Students are given time to read through the dialogue to get its gist (main point), then the tape produced one part orally and the students responds. The writer asked the students about some expressions that were taught in second grade high school. There are expression of Opinion, Agreement and Disagreement. Then, the writer recorded the conversation to analyze their speaking ability.

After collecting all the data, the writer analyzed the data. The students' individual scores from the test were computed by using the formula which was adapted from brown (2004).

$$SA = \frac{C+F+G+P+V+T}{6}$$

- SA = Speaking ability score
- C = Comprehension score
- F = Fluency score
- G = Grammar score
- P = Pronunciation score
- V = Vocabulary score
- T = Task score

The score of students' ability in the test were being classified to determine their level of the ability. Therefore, the classification was as follows:

The Level of Ability

NO.	Test Score	Level of Ability
1.	80-100	Excellent
2.	60-79	Good
3.	50-59	Average
4.	0-49	Poor

Adapted from Harris (1974)

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The following table was the result of speaking ability of expression of opinion, agreement and disagreement of the second year students of SMK TELKOM Pekanbaru:

The Level Students' Speaking Ability

Test Score	Level of Ability	Frequency	Percentage
80 – 100	Excellent	0	0%
60 – 79	Good	18	66.6%
50 – 59	Average	9	33.4%
0 – 49	Poor	0	%

Based on the information above, it was found that the students' average score was 61.38. Furthermore, there was no student who could achieve excellent level. It also supported by the data that there were 18 students or 66.6% who could achieve good level. Then, there were 9 students or 33.4% who could achieve average level. Then, there was no student who could achieve poor level. In addition, the average of students' speaking ability level was in a good level.

Moreover, the writer analyzed the students' ability in answering dialogue completion task of expression opinion, agreement and disagreement. The graph below showed the students' ability in answering the dialogue completion tasks.

Students' Raw Score in answering the Dialogue Completion Tasks

The graph above showed that the students' score in answering the dialogue completion task which was ranked from questions number one until twelve.

Furthermore, the writer analyzed the students' speaking ability of expression of opinion, agreement and disagreement in each aspect as in the following table:

Student's Speaking Ability in Expression of Opinion, Agreement and Disagreement						
	Expression Of Opinion		Expression of Agreement		Expression of Disagreement	
Average Score	Asking opinion	Giving opinion	Asking for agreement	Giving agreement	Asking for Disagreement	Giving disagreement
	57.31	61.87	54	69.69	52	67.67

The average score of the students in asking opinion is 57.31. It means that the students' speaking ability in asking opinion was in average level. The average score of the students in giving opinion was 61.87. It means that the students' speaking ability in giving opinion was in good level.

The average score of the students in asking for agreement was 54. It means that the students' speaking ability in asking for agreement was in average level. The average score of the students in response for agreement was 69.69. It means that the students' speaking ability in response for agreement was in good level.

Furthermore, the average score of the students in asking for disagreement was 52.77. It means that the students' speaking ability in asking for disagreement was average level. The average score of the students in response for disagreement was 67.67. It means that the students' speaking ability was in good level.

From the data above, among the six subtopics investigated, it was known that expression of asking for disagreement was the lowest score for the students. Then it was followed by expression of asking for agreement, asking for opinion, giving opinion, response for agreement and response for disagreement. Expression of response for disagreement was the students' highest score, it was in average to good level. As whole, the students' scoring in responding was higher than their scoring for asking for the three language functions.

CONCLUSION

There were 27 students participated in this research. Out of 27 students, no student was in excellent level of ability, 18 (66.6%) students were in good level of ability, 9 (33.4%) students were in average level of ability and there was no student in poor level of ability.

The average score of the students in asking opinion was 57.31, giving opinion was 61.87, asking for agreement was 54, response for agreement was 69.69, asking for disagreement was 52.77 and response for disagreement was 67.67. Respectively, asking for disagreement with 52.77 and asking for agreement with 54 were in average level of ability, asking for opinion with 57.31 was in average level of ability, giving opinion with 61.87

was in good level of ability while response for agreement with 69.69 and response for disagreement with 67.67 in good level of ability.

Based on the score of each subtopic, it was known that the students' speaking ability in asking for disagreement was the lowest score. This might be asking for disagreement was more difficult for students compare to the other subtopic. In addition, the students' highest score was response for disagreement. This might be response for disagreement was higher to understand by the students.

The average score of expression of agreement was 61.84. The average score of expression of disagreement was 60.22. The average score of expression of opinion was 59.59. From the three language functions above, the students' score for expression of opinion was the lowest score. From the two types of questions in the language functions, asking and responding, the students' score for responding was higher than the score for asking, because responding was easier for the students to answer than initiate/asking the questions.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the results of the study and the conclusion, the writer would like to propose some recommendations related to the students' speaking ability in expression of opinion, agreement and disagreement. The recommendations are:

- i. The students need to realize the expression of opinion, agreement and disagreement, three of the content subject in language function, need deep understanding; therefore they need to study more seriously, especially in speaking skill.
- ii. The students need to do more practice in speaking in order to help them increase their understanding of the materials.
- iii. The teacher need to give more opportunities for the students to practice using expression of opinion, agreement and disagreement, especially practice to initiate/asking using expression of opinion, agreement and disagreement in speaking activity.
- iv. Further the research can focus on ea subtopic in detail, particularly about expression of opinion.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Borg, Walter R and Gall, Meredith Damien. 1979. Educational Research: An Introduction. Third Edition. Longman Inc.,
- Brown, H. Douglas. 2004. *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. San Francisco State University.
- Brown. G and G. Yule. 1983. *Teaching the Spoken Language; An Approach Based on the Analysis of Conversational English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Gay, L. R.1987. Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application (3rd ed.) Columbus, OH:Merrill.
- Harris, David. 1974. *Testing English as a Second Language*. New York: Mc. Graw. Hill Book Company.
- Hornby, AS.1974. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English. London:Oxford University.
- Kramersch, C. 1986."From Language Proficiency to Interactional Competence". *The Modern Language Journal*. 70 (4):366-372.
- Nunan, David.1989. Designing Task for the communicative classroom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, David.2003. *Practical English Language Teaching*. New York: McGraw- Hill.
- O'Malley J. Michael, Pierce V Lorraine. 1996. *Authentic Assessment for English Language Learners*. Addison Wesley Publishing Comp, Inc.
- Oxford English Dictionary.1995. 2nd ed. 20 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pollard, Andrew.2008. *Reflective Teaching 3rd Edition: Evidence Informed Professional Practice*. Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Richard, Jack.2008. *Teaching Listening and Speaking*.New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Putu Sudira.2006. *Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan SMK*. Departemen Pendidikan Nasional
- Vanderkevent.1990. *Teaching Speaking and Component of Speaking*. New York: Cambridge University Press.