CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

This chapter deals with background of research, the research questions, the purposes of the research, the limitation of the research, the significances of the research, the rational, the hypotheses, the research methodology, and research subject.

A. Background of Research

The purpose of this research is to prove that the use of Information Gap Activities can improve students’ speaking ability. In learning English, there are four skills that the student should master. They are listening skill, writing skill, reading skill, and speaking skill. Speaking is one of the productive activities in daily life and the most important language skill because it is the main skill needed to carry out a conversation. Besides, speaking is an interactive process for constructing and receiving information. Specifically, the mastery of speaking skill in English is a priority for second language or foreign language learner (Richard 2008). In the communicative model of speaking class, the students should be taught how to speak well by using the components of English speaking skills, such as pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension.

However today, most of the language learners have a lack of speaking even they have been taught for many years. They consider that speaking is becoming the most difficult skill of English language learning. Based on limited experience during PPL, this condition also happened in SMP Karya Budi that
many students could not express their idea and opinions to speak in English. They were hesitant and worried if they perform using English in front of class. Those conditions could happen because they did not understand the meaning of word, they did not have sufficient vocabulary, and they could not pronounce the words well. Therefore, they were lack of confidence to come forward in front of the class, and they still not well enough to speak in English. In fact, the average score of examination is 60 which means ‘low’ because the minimum passing score for English subject in SMP Karya Budi is 75.

Based on the phenomena above, it is interesting to find an effective way to motivate and to improve the students’ speaking ability. The activities should motivate the students that they can enthusiastically engage in the learning process. The English teacher also needs to contribute by giving the appropriate feedback that can help the students in the activity (Harmer, 1998: 87-88).

One of the speaking activities that promote the communicative situation is Information Gap Activities (IGA). According to Neu and Reeser (1997), “Information Gaps Activities (IGA) is one person has certain information that must be shared with others in order to solve a problem, gather information or make decisions.” Another advantage of Information Gap Activities is that students are forced to negotiated meaning because they must make what they are saying comprehensible to others in order accomplish the task (Neu and Reeser, 1997). It means that this technique is appropriate for students to improve their speaking ability. Teaching speaking by using information gap activities self has been confirmed by some previous researches.
The first previous research was done by Ismaili (2016). The result of the research showed that teaching speaking by using information gap activities can make students more active in the speaking class. The second previous research was done by Wolther (2014). He had been studied conversation activity in English by using information gap activities at the sixth grade students. The result of the research showed that the students felt motivated and confident to speak in English. Both type of research showed that round table technique was effective in improving students’ speaking ability. All of those previous studies are in the area of speaking skill at the elementary school. However, a study on using IGA in speaking skill at junior high school is still rare.

Based on the problems above, the present research is motivated to conduct the research to another grade; it is information gap activity for second grade students. The information gap activity is chosen as the implementation of interactive approach in language learning. Thus, it is assumed that the information gap activities can be effective to improve students’ speaking ability. Therefore, this study given a title; THE USE OF INFORMATION GAP ACTIVITIES TO IMPROVE STUDENTS’ SPEAKING ABILITY (A Quasi Experimental Study at the Second Grade Students of Junior High School Karya Budi Bandung).

B. The Research Questions

Based on the background above, the researcher formulates three research questions as follows:

1. What are the results of students’ speaking ability using Information Gap Activities (IGA)?
2. What are the results of students’ speaking ability using Role Play?
3. How is the significant of differences between students’ speaking ability by using Information Gap Activities (IGA) and using Role Play?

C. The Purposes of the Research

Based on the research questions, the purpose of this study is to know:

1. The students’ speaking ability using Information Gap Activities (IGA).
2. The students’ speaking ability using Role Play.
3. The significant differences between students’ speaking ability by using Information Gap Activities (IGA) and using Role Play.

D. Limitation of the Research

In reference to the background of study and identification of the problem, the researcher focuses on how the students’ speaking skill that can be improved by using IGA. The present research is focused on the components of speaking; there are Pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.

E. The Significances of the Research

The significances of the research are as follows:

1. Theoretical Significance

This study is expected to contribute to the current theory about the strategy in teaching speaking and the result of the research can be used by the teachers in teaching speaking to improve students’ speaking ability.
2. **Practical Significance**

   a. **For students**

   This study is expected that students can improve their speaking skill by using Information Gap Activity in the class. Therefore, they learn English more motivate and more interestingly in learning English especially in speaking class.

   b. **For teachers**

   This study can encourage English teacher to apply the information gap activities which potentially enhances students’ speaking ability to support their language skill. As the result, it helps the teacher in increasing the quality of teaching in facilitating the students in learning English.

   c. **For researcher**

   This study can give the researcher new experience in conducting a teaching speaking technique especially in speaking skill. Also, the researcher fines the answer on the effectiveness of teaching speaking by using Information Gap toward students’ speaking ability. The researcher can give a contribution for the teachers to solve the problems in teaching English.

F. **Rationale**

   The Information Gap Activities (IGA) is an optional approach to language teaching where activities engage students in real world. According to Neu and Reeser (1997), “Information Gaps Activities (IGA) is one person has certain information that must be shared with others in order to solve a problem, gather information or make decisions. Among various activities in communicative approach the “IGA” seems very beneficial for students who try to practice
interaction in their classroom. It is a type of activity which requires students to use the language to exchange some information and get their meaning across.

Sometimes students speak more willingly in class when they have a reason for communicating to solve a problem or to give other classmates some information they need. Information Gap Activities (IGA) is “A particularly interesting type of task which is based on the need to understand or transmit information finding out what is in a partner. According to Freeman (2010), an IGA exists when one person in an exchange knows something that the other person does not and they complete the task by giving each other a clue or solution to the problem.

Everyone needs communication as the basis of their language comprehension. Besides it helps to make sense of an utterance, it also can prevent from ambiguity and misunderstanding. Speaking is “the process of building and sharing meaning through the use of verbal and non-verbal symbols, in a variety of contexts” (Kayi Hayriye, 2006). It means that speaking is very important in our life to communicate. People can be able to express their thought and feeling by using language.

The frequency in using the language can determine the success in speaking ability. Without implementing the experience of learning the language in the real life, it is difficult for the students to master speaking ability. Hence, speaking competence can be accomplished by practicing it orally. Therefore, in helping students to learn speaking ability, the teachers must be creative in using strategy to improve their speaking.
Teaching speaking by using IGA as the implementation of interactive approach in language learning, the research is expected that it can improve students’ speaking ability in SMP Karya Budi. Then, to finding out the effect of IGA technique to improve students’ speaking ability, the research figure out the framework as follows:

Figure 1.1 Research Framework

This schema explains the procedures of the research planned by the researcher. The first step the researcher does the pretest in the experimental and control class. The second step the researcher gives treatment using IGA technique in experimental class and does not give treatment in the control class. Next step the researcher gives posttest to recognize the final result after the class given by treatment and the class does not given that treatment. Finally, the researcher gets the result of experimental class and control class.
G. **Hypothesis**

According to Creswell (2012:111), hypotheses are statements in quantitative research in which the investigator makes a prediction or conjecture about the outcome of the relationship among attributes or characteristics. It means in hypotheses, it predicts whether the research influences the outcome or not.

According to the explanation above, the hypotheses of this study are as follows:

1. **Null Hypothesis (H$_0$)** accepted if $t_{\text{accounted}} < t_{\text{table}}$
   
   It means that there is no significant improvement on students’ speaking ability using Information Gap Activities at SMP Karya Budi.

2. **Working Hypothesis (H$_a$)** accepted if $t_{\text{accounted}} > t_{\text{table}}$
   
   It means that there is a significant improvement of students’ speaking ability using Information Gap Activities at SMP Karya Budi.

H. **Research Methodology**

This research is a quantitative approach since the aims of this research is to explain how one variable affects another. In this case, the aim is to explain how interactive information gap activity affects students’ speaking ability. According to Creswell (2012: 295), the major or characteristics of quantitative research among other things are investigating a research problem by explaining a relation among variables, collecting numeric data from a large number of people using instruments with fixed questions and responses, and analyzing data, comparing group, or relating variables using statistical analysis. Hence, to finish this quantitative research can use several steps which are explained below:
1. Research Design

Quantitative approach is used in this research. Through this method, students’ improvements are recognized and the data have collected. The research is used quasi-experimental design to conduct this quantitative research. According to Sugiyono (2009: 13), “quantitative is the data in the form of numbers, and analysis using statistics”. Quantitative research creates meaning through objectively uncovered in the collected data. “Quantitative research involves the collection of the data so that information can be quantified and subject to statistical treatment in order to support or refute “alternate knowledge claims” (Cresswel, 2003: 153).

This research has consists of two variables. IGA technique is independents, students’ speaking ability is dependent. This research was conducted to two groups. The first group was an experimental group which received the treatment by applying IGA technique and the second group was a control group which did not received the treatment. Both groups were given pretest and posttest with the same items. It was applied in order to know the improvement of students’ speaking ability.

2. Research Site

The data collected in SMP Karya Budi that is located at Jl. Tagog No.28, Cimekar, Cileunyi, Bandung. The research site is chosen because based on the problem happened to the students in SMP Karya Budi. Based on researchers’ limited experience during PPL, most of students have problem in speaking. The students were lack of speaking and the teacher needs to decide a speaking
teaching approach which is suitable to be applied for the students in more interesting.

3. Participants

a. Population

According to Arikunto (2010, p. 8), “A population is a set or collection of all elements processing one or more attributes of interest”. In this research, the participants are students in the second grade at SMP Karya Budi. SMP Karya Budi have four classes in the second grade, they are A up to class D. Each class has about 30 to 32 students. Thus, the population of the students in the second grade at SMP Karya Budi is about 125 students.

b. Sample

According to Arikunto (2006), if the populations are there is less than 100, it is better to use all populations. If the population is large, it can be taken between 10-15% or 20-15% or more based on the present research ability concerning time, available, financial, etc. In this research, the population in the second grade students at SMP Karya Budi is about 125 students or more than 100, as the result, the present research did not used all of the population as the research sample. The present research decides to take 20% of the population or two classes from four classes they are Class A and B. Classes A and B chosen as the research subject in this research. The first class is class A consists of 30 students as the experimental group. The second class is class B consists of 31 as the control group. The class A got the treatment and in the class B there is no treatment.
c. Sampling Technique

The sampling technique of this research is non-probability (nonrandom) sampling method. According to Burn and Grove (2001: 804), “non-probability sampling implies that not every element of the population has an opportunity for being included in the sample”. It means the participants are not randomly selected. In this study, the research uses non-probability sampling to choose the sample according to the English teachers’ recommendation.

Two classes were taken as the sample to represent the entire population. Because this is a quasi-experimental research, the sample then was selected by the teacher. Then, they were divided into two groups: the first was the experimental group and the second was the control group.

I. Instrument

The data was collected through two instruments of test, pretest and posttest.

a. Pre-test

This test is the way to know how is the students’ perception about their speaking ability. According to Creswell (2012:297) a pre-test provides a measure on some attributes or characteristics that you assess for participants in an experiment before they receive a treatment. This test used to know students understanding in speaking skill before they are given treatment and tested in post-test.

The pretest was carried out to know the students’ skill both experimental and control class in speaking. The test was oral test. Therefore, the pretest is used
to measure the students’ speaking ability. It was given in the first meeting to find out their skill before the students in the experimental class got the treatment.

b. Post-test

The posttest was carried out after the treatments of teaching speaking by using IGA technique for the experimental class. The test was given to the experimental and the control class. The test was in oral test. Creswell (2012: 297) states that a post-test is a measurement on some attributes or characteristics that are assessed for participants after a treatment has been given.

After doing the treatment for several times, the posttest was conducted. The posttest materials were still similar with the pretest materials. The posttest was used to measure the students’ improvement of speaking skill after using IGA technique in English lessons given to experimental group.

To assess the speaking to rubric indicators of speaking is used adopted in the rubric from Harris (1969: 84) there are pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehensions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have few traces of foreign accent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Always intelligible, though one in conscious of definite accent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pronunciation problems necessitate concentrated listening and occasionally lead to misunderstanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Very hard to understand because of pronunciation problems. Must</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
frequently be asked to repeat.

1 Pronunciation problems so severe as to make speech virtually unintelligible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Make few (if any) noticeable errors of grammar or word order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Occasionally makes grammatical and/or word order that do not, however, obscure meaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Makes frequent errors of grammar and word order, which occasionally obscure meaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grammar and word order make comprehension difficult. Must often rephrase sentences and/or restrict him to basic pattern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Errors in grammar and word order as severe as to make speech virtually unintelligible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Use of vocabulary and idioms is virtually that of a native speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sometimes uses inappropriate terms and/or must rephrase ideas because of lexical inadequacies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Frequently uses the wrong words: conversation somewhat limited because of inadequate vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Misuse of words and very limited vocabulary make comprehension quite difficult.
1 Vocabulary limitations so extreme as to make conversation virtually impossible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Speech as fluent and effortless as that of a native speaker.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Speed of speech seems to be slightly affected by language problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Speed and fluency are rather strongly affected by language problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Usually hesitant: often forced into silence by language limitations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Speech is halting and fragmentary as to make conversation virtually impossible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Appears to understand everything without difficulty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Understands nearly everything at normal speed, although occasional repetition may be necessary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Understands most of what is said at slower-than-normal speed with repetitions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Has great difficulty following what is said. Can comprehend only “social conversation” spoken slowly and with frequent repetitions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cannot be said to understand even simple conversation English.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1.2 The Rubric of Speaking

J. Data Analysis

To answer the quantitative research questions, after having students’ scores as the data research from pretest and posttest, some steps and statistical formula for analyzing quantitative data. This research uses standard t-test to detect a statistically significant difference from two groups by conducting these following steps (Lestari and Yudhanegara, 2015):

a. Counting the normality of pretest and posttest score data uses Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test.

b. Calculating the homogeneity of two variance.

c. Determining hypotheses by testing the differences between two interrelated averages score using t-table.

d. Determining the improvement of students, speaking ability after treatment by the N-Gain.