THE EFFECTIVENESS OF USING NEAR-PEER ROLE MODELING ON STUDENTS' SPEAKING ABILITY AT THE FIRST GRADE OF SMP SWASTA AL MASDAR BATANG KUIS

SKRIPSI

Submitted to Faculty of Tarbiyah Science and Teacher Training UIN-SU Medan as a Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Educational Bachelor S.1. Program

By:

ZULFIANI FUTRI

34.14.3.040

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH EDUCATION
FACULTY OF TARBIYAH SCIENCE AND TEACHER TRAINING
STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF NORTH SUMATERA MEDAN
2018

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF USING NEAR-PEER ROLE MODELLING (NPRM) ON STUDENTS' SPEAKING ABILITY AT THE FIRST GRADE OF SMP SWASTA AL MASDAR BATANG KUIS

SKRIPSI

Submitted to Faculty of Tarbiyah Science and Teacher Training UIN-SU Medan as a Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Educational Bachelor S.1. Program

By

ZULFIANI FUTRI
NIM. 34143040

Advisor I   Advisor II

Dr. Sholihatul Hamidah Dly, S.Ag., M.Hum   **Maryati Salmiah, M.Hum**
NIP. 19750622 200312 2 002   NIP. 19820501 200901 2 012

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH EDUCATION

FACULTY OF TARBIYAH AND TEACHER TRAINING

STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF NORTH SUMATERA

MEDAN

2018

Nomor : Istimewa   Medan, 09 Agustus 2018

Lamp   : 6 (Enam) sks   Kepada Yth;

Prihal   : Skripsi   Bapak Dekan Fakultas Tarbiyah

           a.n **Zulfiani Futri**   UIN-SU

                                   di –

                                     Tempat

Assalamualaikum Wr.Wb

       Setelah membaca, meneliti, dan memberikan saran-saran perbaikan seperlunya terhadap skripsi mahasiswi :

Nama   : **Zulfiani Futri**

NIM   : **34.14.3.040**

Jur / Prodi   : **Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris**

Judul   : **"The Effectiveness Of Using Near-Peer Role Modelling (NPRM) On Students' Speaking Ability At The First Grade Of SMP Swasta Al Masdar Batang Kuis"**

       Maka kami menilai bahwa skripsi ini sudah dapat diterima untuk di munaqosyahkan dalam sidang munaqosyah skripsi Fakultas Tarbiyah UIN – SU Medan.

       Demikian kami sampaikan, atas perhatian Bapak kami ucapkan terima kasih.

                                     Wassalam,

Advisor I   Advisor II

Dr. Sholihatul Hamidah Dly, S.Ag., M.Hum   **Maryati Salmiah, S.Pd., M.Hum**
NIP. 19750622 200312 2 002   **NIP. 19820501 200901 2 012**

PERNYATAAN KEASLIAN SKRIPSI

Saya yang bertanda tangan di bawah ini :

Nama   : Zulfiani Futri

NIM   : 34.14.3.040

Jur / Prodi   : Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris

Judul   :**" The Effectiveness Of Using Near-Peer Role Modelling (NPRM) On Students' Speaking Ability At The First Grade Of SMP Swasta Al Masdar Batang Kuis"**

Menyatakan dengan sebenarnya bahwa skripsi yang saya serahkan ini benar-benar merupakan hasil karya sendiri kecuali kutipan-kutipan dari ringkasan-ringkasan yang semuanya telah saya jelaskan sumbernya.

Apabila di kemudian hari terbukti atau dapat dibuktikan skripsi ini hasil jiplakan, maka gelar ijazah yang diberikan Universitas batal saya terima.

Medan, 09 Agustus 2018

Yang Membuat Pernyataan

Zulfiani Futri
NIM. 34.14.3.040

ABSTRACT

The Effectiveness Of Using Near-Peer Role Modelling (Nprm) On Students' Speaking Ability At The First Grade Of SMP Swasta Al-Masdar Batang Kuis Thesis. Department of English Education. Faculty of Tarbiyah Science and Teachers training. State Islamic University of North Sumatera Medan 2018.

<u>ZULFIANI FUTRI</u>

34.14.3.040

Keyword: Speaking and Near-Peer Role Modeling

The aim of this research is to find the effectiveness of Near-Peer Role Modeling method on Students' speaking ability which was observed and analyzed from students of seventh grade at SMP Swasta Al-Masdar Batang Kuis. The method applied in this research was the quantitative method with the experimental research design. The population of this study was the students of SMP Swasta Al-Masdar. This study was conducted with two groups namely experimental group (22 students) and control group (22 students). Then the researcher taught in the experimental class by using near-peer role modeling method and in control class without using near-peer role modeling method. After treatment, the researcher gave the post-test to both classes. The scores of pre-test and post-test were collected from one topic in oral test, then, it was analyzed by using statistic. The finding of this research shows that teaching speaking by using near-peer role modeling method was effective. It is proved by t_{value} (3.181) which is higher than t_{table} in the degree significance 5% (1.675). Furthermore, the test of hypotheses showed that sig 2 tailed (p) was 0.003 while alpha (α) was 0.05 (0.003 < 0.05) meaning that H_0 (Null Hypothesis) was rejected and H_α (Alternative Hypothesis) was accepted. In others words, the use of near-peer role modeling method in teaching speaking give effect in improving toward the students' speaking ability.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

بِسْمِ ٱللَّهِ ٱلرَّحْمَٰنِ ٱلرَّحِيمِ

All praise be to Allah, Lord of the worlds, who has given His loving and blessing until he writer can finish her "Skripsi". Peace and gratitude may always be upon the Prophet Muhammad, who has guided all creatures from the darkness to the lightness, from stupidly era to the cleverness within Islamic regional.

This "Skripsi" is presented to English Education Department, Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teachers' Training State Islamic University of North Sumatera Utara as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of S.Pd.

The researcher is fully aware that this skripsi cannot be finished without other people's help. Therefore, in this opportunity she would like to express her deep gratitude to the following people:

1. Prof. Dr. H. Saidurrahman, M.A, the Rector of State Islamic University of North Sumatera Medan.

2. Dr. Amiruddin Siahaan, M.Pd, the Dean of Tarbiyah Science and Teacher Training State Islamic University of North Sumatera Medan.

3. Dr. Sholihatul Hamidah Daulay, S.Ag. M.Hum, the Head of English Education Department., and as an advisor I, for her time, valuable guidance, helps, correction, suggestion, and kindness during completing this "skripsi".

4. Maryati Salmiah, S.Pd., M.Hum., as an advisor II, for her time, valuable guidance, helps, correction, suggestion, and kindness during completing this "skripsi".

5. All lecturers of the Department of English Education who always give their motivation and valuable knowledge and also unforgettable experience during her study at Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teachers Training.

6. M. Idris Siregar, S.H and Suriyani, S.Pd as the principal and teacher of YP SMP Swasta Al-Masdar that has received her with gratefully to do research very well.

7. The writer's parents, (Zubaidah and Arpani Z), and also her younger brother and sister (Afreza Pahlefi, M. Zaki Anshory, M. Ryan and Keysha Assyfa), and all of her family who have given the greatest love, prayer and everything to support her.

8. Beloved friends (Defitri, Afika, Puput, Amik, Saadah,) and all my classmates of PBI-5 Department of English Education, and dearest people (Zulhafidz MY, Tio, Rara Puspa, Kholidi) for all of the kindness, happiness, support, love and never ending humor.

9. Everyone who has helped her in finishing the thesis and whose names cannot be mentioned one by one.

Finally, the writer realizes that this proposal is still far from being perfect. Therefore, constructive suggestion is needed for the progress of the next study. The writer hopes that this research will give an important contribution to the Department of English Education. May God always bless us and lead us in His right path. Aamiin.

Medan, 09 Agustus 2018

Zulfiani Futri

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Study

As we realize that English is popular since it becomes of International Language. It used by million of people all over the world. Nowadays, English has become the language of commerce, technology, politics as well as education. For Indonesian, English as a foreign language. Learning a foreign language is an integrated process that the learner should study the four basic skill: listening, speaking, reading and writing. For this study the writer focuses on speaking skill.

According to Fulcher speaking is the verbal use of language to communicate with others.[1] So speaking is very important in language learning because speaking can help us to communicate to the other persons. There are six types of speaking which are expected to carry out in the classroom they are: Imitative, Intensive, Responsive. Transactional (Dialogue), Interpersonal (Dialogue), Extensive (Monologue).[2] The speaking have some types that differences between one situation and the other situation.

Unfortunately, a lot of problems found in students to speak English. Students are usually afraid to start speaking English because they feel lack of vocabulary, or making mistakes and errors while speaking, students have low motivation to learn English, students keep using their own language.[3] So, this

---

[1] G. Fulcher . (2003), *Testing Second Language Speaking*. New York, Longman. P.23

[2] Brown, H. Douglas. (2001), *Teaching by Principles an Interactive Approach to Language Paedagog*. Addison Wesky Longman, P.271-274

[3] David, Nunan, (1999). *Second language teaching and learning*. Boston, Massachusetts. Heinle & heinle publishers. P. 26

might happened because they want to communicate something important, and so they use language in the best way they know. They have difficulty to say something and because they do not want losing their face in front of their peers, they think that they better use their native language ad so others can understand them.

According to Philips, the teachers can do the following things to help their students to speak: 1. encourage students interactions, 2. make speaking activities communicative, 3. and plan speaking activities carefully.[4] It is very important for teacher to encourage students to speak in the classroom, if they do not encourage them to use the language the student's speaking ability will never improve and if the students any mistakes, the teacher can help to correct their mistakes.

Expectation in this research is students can speaking minimal simple sentence about introduction, and the students have memorize many vocabulary to speak each other.

Furthermore based on observation writer's findings the same problems with paragraph above at SMP Swasta Al Masdar Batang Kuis, it was found that students were afraid to start speaking in English. And based on interview with their English teacher they speaking ability is still low and usually felt doubt to try speaking as lacking of vocabulary although the teacher had encouraged them to speak. Based on observation in the classroom teacher used strategy like take a conversation/dialogue from books to be memorized and practiced by students. The teacher used book for media in teaching English, it is mean the teacher not make

---

[4] D. Phillips, (1994) the function of silence withint the context of teacher training. *ELT Journal*. 48(3) 266-271 (http:///www.teachingenglish.org.uk/article/teaching-speaking-skills-2-overcoming-classroom-problems) 28-3-2018

vary technique in teaching English and make the students boring in the class, the last problem that writer was found in observation is the students need motivation and self-efficacy in speaking English.

From this problem, the students might need a model which can give them more self-efficacy and motivation. A peer model can definitely give a positive influence to the students as seeing or visualizing people similar to oneself perform successfully typically raises efficacy beliefs in observers that they themselves possess the capabilities to master comparable activities.

As we know, there are some method in teaching speaking English such as, Direct Method, Conversation Method, Phonetic Method, Near-Peer Role Modeling Method. From explanation above writer use near-peer role modeling method because this method can improve motivation and self-efficacy students in speaking English, and according to the above writer's problem.

Near-Peer Role Modeling, a method which emerges from an underlying principle that peers can be a trusted and credible source of information. The peers can share similar experiences and social norms. It encourages students' interaction during the class under the influence of the close peer to use English successfully. Using a peer model to deliver information to students can ensure that each of peers can take an equal role in informing, shaping, and passing on information, especially in speaking English.

Based on statements above, the writer has motivation to make a classroom action research about the effectiveness of using near-peer role modelling on students' speaking ability at SMP Swasta Al Masdar Batang Kuis

B. Statements of the Problems

Those are the some problems based on researcher delivered in background of study above, it can be identified the problems that related to this researcher as follows:

1. The students' speaking ability is still low.

2. The students' lack confidence and afraid to try speak English.

3. The students' need motivation and self-efficacy in speaking English

4. The teacher uses a monotonous technique in teaching and focusing on memorized text in the book.

C. Research Questions

Based on the background above the writer formulated the research questions as follows: Does Near-Peer Role Modeling (NPRM) affect on students' speaking ability in English?

D. Purpose of the Study

To find out whether Near-Peer Role Modeling (NPRM) affects on students' speaking ability.

E. Significances of the Study

The study aimed to give some significances contribution to the following individual and institution:

1. For the English Teachers, especially those who teach at SMP Swasta Al Masdar Batang Kuis, they can use the result of the research as feedback on teaching language activities or can be of the choices to do in their classroom.

2. For the students, the writer is hoped can improve students' speaking ability.

3. For the writer, the result of the research will answer the question which is the basic of conducting this research and it is expected that it will be useful knowledge for the researcher when he starts his profession as a teacher in future time.

F. Limitation of the Study

The writer concerns and limits this research on the affect of Near-Peer Role Modeling (NPRM) method on students' speaking ability.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Review of Literature

In conducting a research, theories are needed to explain some concepts or terms which are applied in the research. Writer will present some theories related to the study in order to strengthen this study. It useful to avoid misunderstanding between writer and readers. The theoretical framework is presented in order to give clear concepts and much better understanding so that the readers will get the point clearly.

1. Speaking

McDonough and Shaw states, "Speaking is not the oral production of written language, but involves learners in the mastery of a wide range of sub-skills which, added together, constitute an overall competence in the spoken language."[5] So, it means that speaking is an activity which involves several sub-skills such as pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary.

According to Martin Bygate, speaking is a skill which deserves attention every bit as much as literary skills, in both first and second languages.[6] So that is means the speaking also be important for us to understand more deeply and develop.

These statement are supported by Al-Quran. Allah states in the glorious Al-Quran Ar-Rahman 1-4:

---

[5] McDonough and Christopher Shaw, (1993), *Materials and Methods in ELT-A Teacher's Guide*, Oxford: Blackwell, p. 151.

[6] Martin Bygate, (1978), *Speaking,* New,Toronto: Oxford University Press, p. 1

الرَّحْمَنُ(١) عَلَّمَ الْقُرْآنَ (٢) خَلَقَ الإِنْسَانَ (٣) عَلَّمَهُ الْبَيَانَ (٤)

Which means : 1. (god) most gracious, 2. who has taught the quran, 3. he create human, 4. teach them how to speak.

Speaking is a productive skill that involves genuine exchange of information.[7] It means that speaking is an activity which produces something, in this case words to share and produce good or right information.

While according to Tarigan, "Speaking is an ability to say sounds, articulation, or words to express, convey, or deliver thoughts, ideas, and feelings."[8] Therefore, speaking is determined as a skill which deals the way of pronouncing words and give information from the speaker's side whether it is the ideas, thought, or even feelings.

Moreover Tarigan enforces that speaking is beyond uttering words or make sounds. It is called as "an instrument to communicate ideas which are arranged and developed according to the needs of listener or hearer."[9] Through speaking, human can converse each other. To conclude, speaking can be defined as an activity which enactive several skills such as knowledge of vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammatical features to encode and express an oral idea for accomplishing a purpose.

a. Purpose of Speaking

McDonough and Shaw who states: As a skill to produce utterances, when genuinely communicative, speaking is desire and purpose driven, in

---

[7] Swaminatha Pillai, (2008), *English Language Teaching-First Year*, Chennai: Tamilnadu Corporation, p. 106.

[8] Henry Guntur Tarigan, (2008), *Berbicara Sebagai Suatu Keterampilan Berbahasa*, (Bandung: Angkasa, p. 16.

[9] *Ibid.*

other words we genuinely want to communicate something to achieve a particular end. This may involve expressing ideas, opinions, expressing a wish or a desire to do something; negotiating and/or solving a particular problem; or establishing and maintaining social relationships and friendship.[10] It is means Speaking also refers to a desire which enables people to produce certain words in a purpose.

Boer said that there are three general purposes of speaking: a) to inform, the speaker gives the *how* or what of a topic, with an aim of getting the listener in believing something. b) to persuade, the speaker gives the *why*, with an aim of getting the listeners to do something. c) to entertain, only giving the listeners an enjoyment.[11] Those general purposes are all based on what the speaker wants to do with their words to other people. It can informative, persuasive, or even entertaining.

Whitman and Boase notes that the function of speaking (public speaking) are to interest, to entertain, to inform, to inquire, to persuade, to convince, to stimulate, to denounce, to impress, to warn, to arouse, to instruct, to explore, to move, and to confuse.[12] It means the speaking not just have one of function and can be developing. While according to Tarigan, speaking has three general purposes: a) to inform, b) to entertain, and c) to persuade.[13] Even the mixture of those three into one purpose is also a possibility.

---

[10] McDonough and Shaw, *op.cit*., p. 152.

[11] John J. Boer,(1982) *Basic Language Messages and Meanings*, New York: Harper & Row Publishers, p. 162.

[12] Yayan G. H. Mulyana, (1995), *A Practical Guide for Public Speaking*, Bekasi: Kesaint Blanc, p. 2─3.

[13] Tarigan, *op.cit*., pp. 16─7.

b. Kinds of Speaking Activities

According to Snow, in a process of producing a sentence in English, students need to struggle with the goal of speaking idea, strategy, listener's background knowledge, word choice, grammar, pronunciation, gestures and facial expression. There are several classes activities can be done in teaching English as follows:

1. *Memorization of material*, students are encouraged to speak by memorizing some passages or dialogues.

2. *Choral drill*, the all-class repeat what the teacher says.

3. *Classroom chat*, it is the informal communication which is more fun, nonthreatening, and like a model of genuine communication.

4. *Model-based dialogues*, using a dialogue in a textbook and act the dialogue with the moves that illustrate the dialogue.

5. *Presentations*, students prepare and practice material within its grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and intonation in front of the class.

6. *Role plays*, pair practice of freedom to play, improvise, and create a role.

7. *Survey*, asking the same few questions several times to different students.

8. *Interviews*, converse in greater depth with a pair.

9. *Cocktail parties*, an endless talk with a person and close the conversation, then move on for some chat with another person.

10. *Pair or small-group tasks*, students work together in pairs or group with a task to deal.

11. *Debates*, argue with an issue and there is only one person can give an idea at a time in debate phase.

12. *Large-group discussion*, it can arise students" interest in topic about something.[14]

2. Speaking Ability

Speaking ability is a condition where a speaker has a capability in using their own subconscious understanding to utter every single sentence. Mostly, students learn English in order to speak as well as native speakers. Therefore, it is needed several competences to be able to speak. As what has been noted by a sociolinguist Hymes in Harmer, "grammatical competence is not enough; native speakers also have communicative competence-that is a subconscious knowledge of language use, and of language as discourse."[15] But while speaking, the words come out are one-shot production. So, the complete grammatical features which are involved in speaking cannot be redrafted as in written text. No matter what, those competences are needed to build a good speaking ability.

To have good speaking ability, it is required to have the language use knowledge. It is the competence of a speaker to use a language based on the context. The speaker knows how to choose and pick a word in every sentence stated. Harmer affirms that there are several factors which affect language users in

---

[14] Don Snow, (2007), *From Language Learner to Language Teacher*, Virginia: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, p. 108.
[15] Jeremy Harmer, (1991), *The Practice of English Language Teaching*, New York: Longman, p. 14.

choosing some words, they are: "setting, participants, purpose, channel, and topic."[16] Setting is the place and situation which the speaker has to deal with.

It is the circumstances which make the speaker use formal or informal way to speak up. Participants are people who take charge in the speaking with the speaker. It can be speaker's friends, parents, acquaintances, or even bosses. Purpose is the goal of speaking. The purpose itself can be anything, e.g. expressing any thoughts, suggestions, greeting, and warnings. Every purpose will make a different way of utterances. Channel is the way of the speaker takes the communication. It can be face to face, on telephone, or video call. While topic is the content of the speaking itself, it is the main idea of the speaking is about.

Harmer states, "In speech we use intonation and restatement of points together with a range of speech phenomena to structure what we say."[17] So, The knowledge of language as a discourse means the competence of how a speaker uses the organized grammar and vocabulary based on the purpose of the speaking

Besides the knowledge of language use and discourse, there is also another type of competence which should be recognized in speaking. It is strategic competence. It is the competence which let the speaker can give the feedback of each words spoken to them. Strategic competence "is not knowledge about anything but rather knowledge of how to evaluate what is said to us and how to plan and execute what we want to say back."[18] While sociolinguistic competence is the competence to respond appropriately the speaker non-verbally based on the

---

[16] *Ibid*., p. 15.
[17] *Ibid*., p. 16
[18] *Ibid*

purpose of the talk. To sum up, speaking is referred into four kinds of competences, grammatical competences, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence.[19] Moreover, when somebody succeeds on building good communication, this shows their personality has been mature.

As what has been said by Powers in Tarigan, the characteristics of mature personality are: social skill, semantic skill, phonetic skill, and vocal skill.[20] Those skills are the ones which allow and make somebody to be able to speak well.

3. Near-Peer Role Modeling (NPRM)

NPRM is one kind of method which encourages a peer teaching. There has been some peer teaching method before. It also encourages students to be a leader in the class tutoring others.[21] An English teacher even has been forced by the students to keep doing peer teaching. Tee Hwa said that, "More conversations with him and other students led me to realize that they all shared the same frustrations. He and his peers had access to a broad range of interesting and rich media outside the classroom, but the school still subjected them to the traditional way of passive and rote learning." [22] To students, peer teaching is fun learning, These statement are supported by Al-Quran.

Allah states in the glorious Al-Quran As-Shofat : 102

فَلَمَّا بَلَغَ مَعَهُ السَّعْيَ قَالَ يَا بُنَيَّ أَرَىٰ إِنِّي أَرَىٰ فِي الْمَنَامِ أَنِّي

---

[19] Kang Shumin,(2002), "*Factors to Consider: Developing Adult EFL Students" Speaking Abilities*", in Jack C. Richards (eds.), (1986), *Methodoloy in Language Teaching-An Anthology of Current Practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 207.

[20] Tarigan, *op.cit.*, p. 20.

[21] Tim Murphey, National Foreign Language Resource Center, (2003), *What is Near Peer Role Modeling?*, (http://www. nflrc.hawaii.edu). on February 15, 2018

[22] Tan Tee Hwa, (2009), *Student Peer Teaching Strategy*, Bangkok: UNESCO Bangkok, p. 2.

أَذْبَحُكَ تَرَىٰ مَاذَا فَانْظُرْ قَالَ يَا أَبَتِ افْعَلْ مَا تُؤْمَرُ سَتَجِدُنِي

إِنْ شَاءَ اللَّهُ مِنَ الصَّابِرِينَ ﴿102﴾

Which mean: So when the child arrived (at the age of) he tried together with Abraham, Abraham said: "My child, indeed I see in a dream that I slaughter you. Then think about what you think!" He replied: "O my father, do what is commanded to you; God willing, you will find me, including those who are patient."

Based on Murphey, "near can mean different things: age, ethnicity, gender, interest, near in proximity, and near in frequency."[23] So near not must same in all things. Peer means a child who is roughly equivalent in development to the observer.[24] And peer means same in level of learning development. Role means "a role or social role is a set of connected behaviours, rights, obligations, beliefs, and norms as conceptualised by actors in a social situation and modeling means behavioral, cognitive, and affective changes deriving from observing one or more models."[25] So it means an individual whose behavior, verbalizations, and expressions are attended to by the observer and serve as cues for subsequent modeling.

There are three models of learning: reception, construction, and co-construction.[26] It can be seen that models of learning can be a teacher, individual's experience, or even from others. The third model of learning can be called as co-construction. It includes the learners "to create knowledge and they may create a

---

[23] Tim Murphey, *op. cit.*
[24] Dale H. Schunk, (1987), *Peer Models and Children's Behavioral Change.* Review of Educational Research, p. 1.
[25] Dale H. Schunk, (2012), *Learning Theories-An Educational Perspective,6th ed.*, Boston: Pearson Education, p. 123.
[26] Chris Watkins, Eileen Carnell, and Caroline Lodge, (2007), *Effective Learning in Classrooms*, London: Sage Publication, p. 15.

collaborative product from this."[27] The teacher encourages learners to have dialogues or any kinds of collaborative activities to help students make sense of the experiences.

عَنْ أَنَسٍ ابْنِ مَالِكٍ ﷺ قَالَ : قَالَ رَسُوْلُ اللهِ ﷺ طَلَبُ الْعِلْمِ فَرِيْضَةٌ عَلَى كُلِّ مُسْلِمٍ
(رواه ابن ماجه)

From Anas ibn Malik r.a, says, Rasulullah SAW says, "Demanding that knowledge is a duty for every Muslim". (H.R. Ibn Majah).

Besides NPRMs is also described as "people who might be near to their tutees in age, ethnicity, gender, interest, past or present experiences and also proximity and in frequency of social contact."[28] So, it can be concluded that NPRM is a method which encourage students by a model from the near one, can be respect, and admire because of the ability/experiences in learning English owned. From the model, the students are hoped to be motivated to learn English.

This method emerged from an idea that native speaker may not be available for modeling. As stated by Ruddick and Nadasdy, "The idea behind NPRM is that we may identify more closely with those people that are near to us in the above categories and doing so we may want to imitate them or imitate some aspect or talent that NPRMs have."[29] This method promotes the advantages of using the peer from higher level to be imitated as teaching learning process

---

[27] *Ibid*., p. 17

[28] Michael Ruddick and Paul Nadasdy, (2013), The Influence of Near Peer Role Models (NPRMs) in Second Language Classrooms Intended to Improve Students‟ Pronunciation When Teacher Intervention is Not Enough, *Asian EFL Journal, Professional Teaching Articles*, Vol. 65, p. 29.

[29] *Ibid*., p. 140

begins. "Competent models teach skills, but similar models are best for self efficacy."[30]

Self efficacy can influence what the students want to do in their daily lives. Students with low efficacy may avoid doing the task given. They themselves judge that they are capable or not in doing the task. While those who are in high efficacy will do some trial until the problems faced are solved. Even students' self-efficacy may change in the count of day. It is due to the individual's preparation, physical condition (sickness, fatigue), and affective mood, as well as external conditions such as the nature of the task (length, difficulty) and social milieu (general classroom conditions).[31] To see that a role model is very important in leading students to speak English, so a close/near peer role model can be the best role model.

Murphey initiated a peer-model to increase students" motivations and self-efficacy. Heckhausen points out that, "Even if there are many potential positive incentives, one will only be motivated to strive for them if one expects that: 1) the behaviors one is capable of performing will lead to successful task performance, and 2) successful task performance will lead to incentives (i.e., possesses high instrumentality)."[32] The students can speak when they believe that they could do it so.

Moreover it is noted by Murphey that Bandura suggests, "seeing or visualizing people similar to oneself perform successfully typically raises efficacy beliefs in observers that they themselves possess the capabilities to master

---

[30] Schunk, *Learning Theories-An Educational Perspective*, *op. cit.,* p. 157
[31] *Ibid*., p. 148
[32] Tim Murphey, Self and Other Modeling: Strenghtening Imagined Ideal Selves for Students and Teachers, *Independent Learning Association*, 2007, p. 200

comparable activities."[33] It is obvious to see whether NPRM would be successfully done in teaching English as the students were helped to speak with other students effectively without feeling doubt of making mistakes. The students are motivated to speak English as others are also initiated to speak English similar to the peers.

As what has been noted by Schunk, "Observing a peer model raised self-efficacy and achievement more than observing a teacher or no model; the teacher-model condition promoted these outcomes better than no model."[34] So, Near-Peer Role Modeling (NPRM) is a method which promotes students' interaction during the class under the influence of the close peer to use English successfully.

a.   Advantages of Near-Peer Role Modeling

Response refers to the actions which have to be copied and performed from the model. Inhibition refers to the positive expectations of the observer that they will have the same experience like the model. Observational learning refers to the paying attention process of new information/behavior from the model. While, according to Schunk, there are several advantages can be attained from NRPM:

1. Peer models may be especially helpful with students who hold self-doubts about their capabilities for learning or performing well.

2. Teachers often apply these ideas by selecting one or more students to demonstrate a skill to other class members.

---

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 201

[34] Schunk, *Learning Theories-An Educational Perspective*, *op. cit.*, p. 150

3. Peers also can be used to enhance observers' self-efficacy in the context of small-group work.[35]

b. Disadvantages of Near-Peer Role Modeling

Observational learning refers to the paying attention process of new information/behavior from the model. While,

1. Students can not be conductive in the class

2. The role model mush have bigger voice when be role model.

B. Related Study

The same topic of near-peer role modeling has been also researched by Tim Murphey from Nanzan University and Troy Miller from Nagoya University. Tim Murphey dealt with the ways to highlight the potential Near Peer Role Models (NPRMs) and ways to notice their impact. He stimulated students to speak freely through conducting seminar and video project. The result was quite interesting. Students" belief of speaking could be changed. The students recorded in the video had inspired students who watched to speak English too. Models could change student beliefs about risk-taking, making mistakes, and the importance of enjoying what they are studying.

While Troy Miller took a research on the effective use of Near Peer Role Modeling (NPRM) combined with video clips as a way to model interactive strategies. He focused on the theoretical background behind interactive strategies, interaction and learning, and NPRM. He also explained and gave

---

[35] *Ibid.,* p. 151

examples of how to use the clips in activities or as strategy reviews in conversation classes. The result was compiling video clips, creating activities, and using in several classes of the past year as the method of teaching to the lower classes, could be helpful. He could find an idea of showing the perfect interactive strategies to other student peers to be an effective way of teaching the strategies. And that was through a video which encourages students to speak English well.

Another research concerning peer modeling was also done by Dale H. Schunk. He critically reviewed the research literature on peer modeling among children as a function of model attributes. Peer modeling is hypothesized to depend in part on perceived similarity between model and observer.54 He assumed that similarity can serve important source of information for judging the behavioral appropriateness, formulating outcome expectations, and assessing one's self-efficacy for learning or performing tasks. It was assessed from the effects of model age, model sex, model competence, number of models, and model background. The attributes which support behavioral change were discussed. The result was peer modeling could help students in social skill training and self-efficacy enhancement. He suggested that classroom peers can help train social skills, enhance self-efficacy, and remedy skill deficiencies.

To conclude, the results of researches show that there was a positive effect on students" capability in speaking through Near-Peer Role Modeling method. From the nearest model of the students, students can apt to copy the models because they are motivated to have the same chance and power to be as good

as the models. The difference of research which the writer did lies on the object of the research. The writer chooses to do a research in a Junior High School. The sameness of the research lies on the way to do the research. It applies the near- peer from the higher-grade students to act as the model. The models are not too far the objects age, so the models can give the strong effect to the lower-grade students to have good self efficacy and motivation in speaking English.

C. Conceptual Framework

Speaking skill cannot be attained easily. It needs some pre-requisite sub-skills such as grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary. Therefore, to have a good speaking skill, it is needed more chances for students to speak up. Unfortunately, in Indonesia English is not used largely by its citizen. The citizen usually use the mother language (Bahasa). So that, there should be a good teaching speaking method applied.

By using Near-Peer Role Modeling, students are encouraged to speak up in front of class. Consequently, school will provide the chance for students to speak while they merely get little opportunities to speak in their out of school circumstances. Near-Peer Modeling is a method which allow students to keep speaking even they make several mistakes. Mistakes are not a problem, because it is the way students learn the language. From the peer-models, students will look how to have so good speaking-skill that they can also be motivated to speak as well. It is worth to learn speaking English from the students who have already been successful enough in speaking.

D. Hypotheses

Based on review of literature and conceptual framework, so the writer formulated the hypotheses as follows:

H_0 : NPRM does not affect on students' speaking ability

H_a : NPRM affects on students' speaking ability

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Location of Research

This research was conducted at SMP Swasta Al Masdar Batang Kuis. There are some considerations why the researcher chooses as the location of the research, such as:

1. The school is easy to reach for the purpose of the data collection.

2. The school welcome that aimed to improve the teaching learning quality.

3. Collaboration with the teacher of the school is easier for the researcher.

B. Research Design

In this study, experimental research method was used. To collect the data, the sample was divided into two classes. The researcher would expose one group of participants (the experimental or treatment group) and the other group (the control or comparison group).

Experimental group was the group that receives treatment, while the control group is a separate group that receives no treatment or a different treatment than the experimental group.[36] The procedure of administrating the assignment as the instrument of the study was the test administered to both sample groups before they were taught about speaking skill. Then, the same assigment was administered to both sample groups after they were taught about speaking.

---

[36] Marguerite G. Lodico, et al. *Methods In Educational Research From Theory to Practice second edition*, (San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010).,p.229 & 234

The experiment design in this study was:

Table 3.1 Research Design

Group	Pre –Test	Treatment	Post- test
Experimental	✓	Near-Peer Role Modeling	✓
Control	✓	Conventional Method	✓

C. Population and Sample

Identifying the target population require the decision criteria to determine the case which one be participate and which one not be participate.[37] Sample is small proportion of a population selected for observation and analysis.[38] So, the research will not be happened without object on the research.

1. Population

The population of this study is the students in the grade VII SMP Swasta Al Masdar Batang Kuis. The population of this research is the second year students of SMP Swasta Al Masdar Batang Kuis. There are 3 classes of the second year students in academic 2017/2018.

2. Sample

---

[37] Syaukani, (2015). *Metode penelitian pedoman praktis dalam bidang pendidikan,* (medan: perdana publishing), p.24

[38] Suharsimi Arikunto, *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktek,* (Jakarta: PT Rineka Cipta, 1993), p.131

The selecting sample that happen if the population is large and the researcher unable to learn all of the population.[39] The sample of this research are VII-A and VII-B. Those classes consisted of 22 students in each class.

Table 3.2 Research Design

Class	Group	Pre –Test	Treatment	Post- test
VII-A	Experimental	✓	Near-Peer Role Modeling	✓
VII-B	Control	✓	Conventional Method	✓

D. Technique of Collecting Data

The writer collected the data by using: Test (Pre-test and Post-test). The writer did a pre-test and post-test and took two classes as her research participants. Pre-test is the test which is administered to assess the participants of experiment before they receive a treatment. While post-test is the test which is administered to assess the participants of experiment after they receive a treatment. One of the class was given a treatment of Near-Peer Role Modeling while another one (controlled class) was given the followed learning system as usual-memorizing texts.

The materials given are based on the syllabus of the school in the first year of grade seven. At the end of the semester, the result of each student would be

---

[39] Indra Jaya & Ardat, *Penerapan Statistik Untuk Pendidikan* (Bandung: Citapustaka Media Perintis, 2013),p.32

seen and compared. To assess the oral test, the writer used a scoring instrument as noted by Hughes below[40]:

Table 3.3 Scale for Assessing the Students' Speaking Ability

SCORE	LEVEL	CRITERIA
ACCENT	13-16	1 .Pronunciation, frequently, unintelligible.
		2. Frequent gross errors and a very heavy accent make understanding difficult, require frequent repetition.
	17-21	3. "Foreign accent" requires concentrated listening, and mispronunciations, lead to occasional misunderstanding and apparent errors in grammar or vocabulary.
	22-26	4. Marked „foreign accent" and occasional mispronunciations which do not interfere with understanding.
	30-27	5. No conspicuous mispronunciations, but would not be taken for a native speaker.
		6. Native pronunciation, with no trace of "foreign accent"
GRAMMAR	7-9	1. Grammar almost entirely inaccurate except in stock phrases.
		2. Constant errors showing control of

---

[40] Arthur Hughes, Testing for Language Teachers, 2nd Ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 131─3.

	10-13	very few major patterns and frequently preventing communication.
		3. Frequent errors showing some major patterns uncontrolled and causing occasional irritation and misunderstanding.
	14-17	4. Occasional errors showing imperfect control of some patterns but no weakness that causes misunderstanding.
	20-18	5. Few errors, with no patterns of failure.
		6. No more than two errors during the interview.
VOCABULARY	7-9	1. Vocabulary inadequate for even the simplest conversation
		2. Vocabulary limited to basic personal and survival areas (time, food, transportation, etc.)
	10-13	3. Choice of words sometimes inaccurate, limitations of vocabulary prevent discussion of some common professional and social topics.
		4. Professional vocabulary adequate to discuss special interest; general vocabulary permits discussion of any non-technical subject with some circumlocutions.
	14-17	5. Professional vocabulary broad and precise; general vocabulary adequate to cope with complex practical problems and varied social situations.
	18-20	6. Vocabulary apparently as accurate and extensive as that of an educated native speaker.
FLUENCY	5-10	1. Speech is so halting and fragmentary that conversation is virtually impossible.
		2. Speech is very slow and uneven

		except for short or routine sentences.
	11-17	3. Speech is frequently hesitant and jerky; sentences may be left uncompleted.
	18-21	4. Speech is occasionally hesitant, with some unevenness caused by rephrasing and groping for words
		5. Speech is effortless and smooth, but perceptively non-native in speed and evenness.
	25-22	6. Speech on all professional and general topics as effortless and smooth as a native speaker's.
COMPREHENSION	2	1.Understands too little for the simplest type of conversation.
	3	2. Understands only slow, very simple speech on common social and touristic topics; requires constant repetition and rephrasing.
		3. Understands careful, somewhat simplified speech when engaged in a dialogue, but may require considerable repetition and rephrasing.
	4	4. Understands quite well normal educated speech when engaged in dialogue, but requires occasional repetition or rephrasing.
	5	5.Understands everything in normal educated conversation except for very colloquial or low-frequency items, or exceptionally rapid or slurred speech.
		6. Understands everything in both formal and colloquial speech to be expected of an educated native speaker.
TOTAL SCORE :		

E. Technique of Analyzing Data

The data of this study will be analyzing by using t-test formula because it used to find out the differences between students' pre-test, and post-test score in each of experimental and control group. Before analyzing the data by using t-test, first will be tasted with normality test using formula Lilliefors and Homogenity test using formula the comparison of Varians.

1. The Validity Test

The accuracy of the research must be consideration in quantitative research. One of many ways to know the accuracy is by measuring the validity of the test was given in the research. According to Heale and Twycross, validity is the extent to which a concept is accurately measured in a quantitative study.[41] It means validity is degree to which a test any measuring measures what it is intended to measure.

Actually, there are three types of validity: content validity, construct validity, and criterion validity. Content validity is kind of validity which focus on whether the instrument covers all of the variable contents. In other word, content validity focuses on what students have learnt in the classroom. All of the materials that students have learned will be given to test then. A test is said to have content validity if its contents represent of the language skill being tested. Meanwhile, construct validity refers to whether a researcher can draw the conclusion about test scores related to the concept being learned. And criterion validity is any other instrument that measures the same variable.[42]

---

[41] Roberta Heale and Alison Twycross, Validity and Reliability in Quantitative Studies,*Evid Based Nurs,* 18, 2015, pp. 66 – 67.
[42] *Ibid.*

In this research, the researcher emphasizes on the construct validity to know validity of instruments research of pretest and posttest. The researcher measures validity of the instrument tests by using SPSS V 22. The validity of each item of instrument tests r_{count} is compared with r_{table}. In this research r_{table} is 0.324. If $r_{count} > r_{table}$ then the test items are valid, with the significance level α= 0. 05.

2. The Reliability Test

Reliability relates to the consistency of an instrument. Creswell said that reliability is the stability and consistency of students" scores when administered the instrument in many times at different times.[43] A test is said to have reliable if it is used in the same situation on repeated occasions and the result of measurements obtained relatively consistent. Otherwise, a test is said to have unreliable if it is used in the same situation on repeated occasions and the result of measurements obtained relatively different.

The researcher concludes that reliability helps the researcher to know whether the instrument research was suitable to use in pretest and posttest or not. For analyzing the reliability in this researcher, the researcher uses statistic.. This can be checked through the Cronbach"s alpha score 0.672 that was higher than the significance level 0.60 (0.672 > 0.60). Therefore, the instrument of the research was reliable.

3. The Normality Test

Normality test is to determine whether the data normally or not. The data were considered normal if score of the test is more than 0.05. To count the normality test, the writer used statistic, as follows:[44]

a. Mean

---

[43] Creswell, *op.cit.*, p. 159.
[44] Andrew Garth, *Analysis Data Using SPSS (A Practical Guide for those Unfortunate Enough to Have to Actually Do It)*, (Sheffield: Sheffield Hallam University, 2008), p. 73

$$\bar{x} = \frac{\sum fi\, Xi}{\sum fi}$$

Where: $\bar{x}$ = Mean of Variable x

$\sum FiXi$ = Total number of score

$\sum Fi$ = Number of sample

b. Variant

$$S^2 = \frac{N \sum FiXi^2 - (\sum FiXi)^2}{N(N-1)}$$

Where S^2 = variant

N = Number of sample

c. Standard Deviation

$$S = \sqrt{S^2}$$

d. Finding Z score

Formula: $Zi\ 1 = \dfrac{xi - \bar{x}}{s}$

e. Finding S(Zi)

$$S(Zi) = \frac{F\ kum}{N}$$

4. The Homogenity Test

Homogeneity test is to determine the similarity between two groups. To get the homogenous data, the significant level of the test is more than 0.05. Homogeneity test used in this study were statistic, as follows:[45]

$$F_{obs} = \frac{S1^2}{s2^2}$$

Where: $S1^2$ = the biggest variant

---

[45] *Ibid.,* 71-72

$S2^2$ = the smallest variant

5. The $t - test$

Pre-test and post-test were done in order to see the difference of vocabulary retention before and after the students were taught by using Pictionary game. After the data were collected from the tests, they were analyzed by using statistic. Hypothesis test could be done if the data of the tests showed that they were both homogeneous and normal. The t-test is used to see whether there is a difference between two variables in this research. In statistic, T-test was done through Independent-Samples t-test. Here are the steps to analyze the data: [46]

$$t = \frac{Ma - MB}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{da^2 + db^2}{na + nb - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{na} + \frac{1}{nb}\right)}}$$

Where:

t = the effect

Ma = the mean of exprimental group

Mb= the mean of control group.

Da= the standard deviation of exprimental group.

Db= the standard deviation of control group.

Na= the total sample of exprimental group.

Nb= the total sample of control group.

F. **Research Procedure**

There are some procedures that were used in collecting the data for this research, they are: pre-test, treatment, and post-test. Each of the procedures is described as follows:

1. Pre-test

---

[46] *Ibid.,* 45-46

Pre-test is a test given before the experimental treatment in order to see if the groups are equal.[47] The pre-test administrated before the treatment. Both experimental and control group were given the same pre-test. This test used to find the ability of students in speaking of both groups. The result of the test were administered and compared between two groups if they were in the same of speaking.

2. Treatment

The treatment conducted after administering the pre-test. The experimental group was taught by using the Near-Peer Role Modeling while the control group with the untreatment or taught by using conventional method. Both experimental and control groups were taught with the same material.

3. Post-test

After the treatment completed, both experimental and control group was given a post test. Post test was conducted to see the effectiveness of the treatment based on the score. The post-test used the same test and the same difficulties with the pre-test.

G. Statistical Hypothesis

H_0 : $\mu a = \mu b$
Ha : $\mu a \geq \mu b$
μa = Experimental
μb = Control

---

[47] Marguerite G. Lodico, et al, *Ibid*,. P.228

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

A. Findings

In this chapter, the result of the research based on collected and analyzed data will be described. The aim is to find out the result of using Near-Peer Role Modeling method to teach speaking skill at 7th grade students of SMP Swasta Al Masdar Batang Kuis in the academic year of 2017/2018. The research had been conducted on May 30th to June 9th 2018. This research had been carried through 4 steps. They involve pre-test, two times treatment and post-test.

1. Description of Data

The data of this study were quantitative data. Quantitative data was taken from mean of students' score in some tests. This research was conducted in VII A (Experimental class) with 22 students and VII B (Control class) with 22 students. This research was accomplished in pre-test and post-test. It is to find out that groups are normal and have same variant.

The learning process in the experimental class using nprm method, while the control class used conventional method (lecturing). After the both classes conducted the learning process, students were asked to do the assignment. This assessment is hoped would help the students to speak up.

a. Quantitative Data

Quantitative data was taken from the result of the tests given by the researcher in the class, which was carried out in pre-test and post-test.

The test was given to the students in the form of pre-test, post-test. The result of the students' score could be seen in the following tables.

Experimental Class (VII-1)

Table 4.1 The Scores of Pre-Test

No	Name	ACCENT	GRAMMAR	VOCABULARY	FLUENCY	COMPREHENSION	TOTAL
				Criteria			
1	AJR	3	3	2	2	3	**52**
2	LA	3	3	2	2	2	**48**
3	NI	3	4	4	3	4	**72**
4	SR	2	2	2	1	1	**32**
5	AK	4	4	4	3	4	**76**
6	CA	2	2	3	2	3	**48**
7	SLT	4	3	4	4	4	**76**
8	MS	3	3	3	3	3	**60**
9	EM	3	2	3	2	3	**52**
10	AS	4	4	4	3	4	**76**
11	MAI	2	2	2	2	2	**40**
12	PPH	3	4	4	3	4	**72**
13	RZL	2	2	3	2	3	**48**
14	ZL	2	3	3	2	3	**52**
15	ASS	2	2	2	1	2	**36**
16	RP	2	2	2	1	2	**36**
17	TK	2	2	2	1	2	**36**
18	AAF	2	2	2	1	2	**36**
19	WD	2	2	2	2	2	**40**
20	KN	2	2	2	2	2	**40**
21	RYS	3	3	4	3	3	**64**
22	NRL	2	2	3	2	2	**64**
N=22	**TOTAL**						1136
	MEAN						52,54

Based on the table above, the students' achievement speaking English in experimental group showed the lowest score pre test was 32, and the highest score of pre test was 76 and the mean of pre test was 52.54.

Table 4.2 The Scores of Post-Test

No	Name	ACCENT	GRAMMAR	VOCABULARY	FLUENCY	COMPREHENSION	TOTAL
				Criteria			
1	AJR	3	3	3	2	3	56
2	LA	3	3	3	3	3	60
3	NI	4	4	4	4	4	80
4	SR	2	3	2	2	3	48
5	AK	4	4	4	4	4	80
6	CA	2	3	2	2	3	48
7	SLT	4	4	4	4	4	80
8	MS	3	4	4	3	4	72
9	EM	3	3	3	3	3	60
10	AS	4	4	4	4	4	80
11	MAI	2	3	3	2	3	52
12	PPH	4	4	4	3	4	76
13	RZL	3	4	4	3	4	72
14	ZL	2	3	3	3	3	56
15	ASS	2	3	3	3	3	56
16	RP	2	2	3	2	3	48
17	TK	3	3	4	3	4	68
18	AAF	2	2	3	3	3	52
19	WD	2	3	3	3	3	56
20	KN	2	3	3	2	3	52
21	RYS	3	4	4	4	4	76
22	NRL	3	4	4	3	4	72
N=22	TOTAL						1400
	MEAN						63,63

Based on the table above, the students' achievement speaking English in experimental group showed the lowest score of post test was 48, and the highest score of post test was 80 and the mean of post test was 63.63.

Table 4.3 The Scores of Pre Test and Post Test of Experimental Group

NO	SCORE POST TEST	SCORE PRE TEST	DECREASE
1	56	52	4
2	60	48	12
3	80	72	8
4	48	32	16
5	80	76	4
6	48	48	0
7	80	76	4
8	72	60	12
9	60	52	8
10	80	76	4
11	52	40	12
12	76	72	4
13	72	48	24
14	56	52	4
15	56	36	20
16	48	36	12
17	68	36	32
18	52	36	16
19	56	40	16
20	52	40	12
21	76	64	12
22	72	64	8
TOTAL			244
MEAN			11.09

Based on the table above, the students' achievement speaking English in experimental group showed the lowest score pre test was 32, and the highest score of pre test was 76 and the mean of pre test was 52.54. On the other hand the

lowest score of post test was 48, and the highest score of post test was 80 and the

mean of post test was 63.63.

b. Control Class (VII-2)

Table 4.4 The Scores of Pre-Test

No	Name	ACCENT	GRAMMAR	VOCABULARY	FLUENCY	COMPREHENSION	TOTAL
				Criteria			
1	DH	3	3	3	2	2	**52**
2	MS	2	3	3	2	3	**52**
3	SF	3	3	3	3	3	**60**
4	FR	2	3	2	2	3	**48**
5	YP	3	2	2	2	3	**48**
6	FMP	2	3	2	2	3	**48**
7	IM	4	4	2	4	4	**76**
8	MDI	2	2	2	1	2	**36**
9	ZAF	3	3	3	3	3	**60**
10	ID	4	4	4	2	4	**72**
11	US	2	3	3	2	3	**52**
12	MA	4	2	4	3	4	**72**
13	HN	3	4	2	2	4	**60**
14	MAA	2	3	3	3	3	**56**
15	SZ	2	3	3	3	3	**56**
16	VA	2	2	3	3	3	**48**
17	ML	2	2	1	2	2	**36**
18	RS	2	2	3	3	3	**52**
19	ABD	2	3	3	3	3	**56**
20	DO	2	2	2	1	2	**36**
21	MI	3	4	4	4	4	**48**
22	FB	2	2	3	2	2	**44**
N=22				**TOTAL**			**1196**
				MEAN			**54,37**

Based on the table above, the students' achievement speaking English in control group showed the lowest score pre test was 36, and the highest score of pre test was 76 and the mean of pre test was 54.36.

Table 4.5 The Scores of Post-Test

No	Name	ACCENT	GRAMMAR	VOCABULARY	FLUENCY	COMPREHENSION	TOTAL
1	DH	3	3	2	2	3	**52**
2	MS	3	3	3	3	3	**60**
3	SF	4	4	3	4	4	**76**
4	FR	2	3	2	2	3	**48**
5	YP	4	3	4	4	3	**72**
6	FMP	2	3	2	2	3	**48**
7	IM	4	4	4	4	4	**80**
8	MDI	3	4	4	3	4	**72**
9	ZAF	3	3	3	3	3	**60**
10	ID	4	4	4	3	4	**76**
11	US	2	3	3	2	3	**52**
12	MA	4	4	4	3	4	**76**
13	HN	3	4	4	3	4	**72**
14	MAA	2	3	3	3	3	**56**
15	SZ	2	3	3	3	3	**56**
16	VA	2	2	3	2	3	**48**
17	ML	3	3	4	3	4	**68**
18	RS	2	2	3	3	3	**52**
19	ABD	2	3	3	3	3	**56**
20	DO	2	3	3	2	3	**52**
21	MI	3	3	2	2	2	**48**
22	FB	2	2	3	3	3	**52**
N=22	TOTAL						**1332**

	MEAN		60,54

Based on the table above, the students' achievement speaking English in control group showed the lowest score of post test was 48, and the highest score of post test was 80 and the mean of post test was 60.54.

Table 4.6 The Scores of Pre Test and Post Test of Control Group

NO	SCORE POST TEST	SCORE PRE TEST	DECREASE
1	52	52	15
2	60	52	8
3	76	60	16
4	48	48	0
5	72	48	24
6	48	48	0
7	80	76	4
8	72	36	36
9	60	60	0
10	76	72	4
11	52	52	0
12	76	72	4
13	72	60	12
14	56	56	0
15	56	56	0
16	48	48	0
17	68	36	32
18	52	52	0
19	56	56	0
20	52	36	16
21	76	48	28
22	52	44	8
TOTAL			207
MEAN			9.409090909

Based on the table above, the students' score in reading text in control group showed the lowest score of pre test was 36, and the highest score of pre test

was 76 and the mean of pre test 54.36. On the other hand the lowest score of post test was 48, and the highest score of post test was 80 and the mean of post test 60.54.

Based on the explanation above, it shows that the students' score in experimental group was higher than students' score in control group, where in pre test (52.55) and the score in post test (63.63). The total score of the mean score in experimental and control group showed that there was significant effect in improvement of students' score between pre test and post test.

2. Analysis of Data

Data analysis in this research is quantitative data. Which writer explained by normality, homogenity, and t-test result.

a. Normality Test

Normality testing used to determine if a data set is well-modeled by normal distribution and to compare how likely it is for a random variable underlying the data set to be normally distributed.

Table 4.7 Frequency Distribution of Pre Test in Experimental Group

No	Xi	Fi	FiXi	Xi^2	$FiXi^2$
1	32	1	32	1024	1024
2	36	4	144	1296	5184
3	40	3	120	1600	4800
4	48	3	144	2304	6912
5	52	3	156	2704	8112
6	60	1	60	3600	3600
7	64	2	128	4096	8192
8	72	2	144	5184	10368
9	76	3	228	5776	17328
TOTAL		22	1156	27584	65520

Based on the data above, the result of $FiXi^2$ is 65520 and FiXi is 1156.

Then the following is the calculation of mean, variant and standard deviation.

a. Mean

$$\bar{x} = \frac{\sum fi\, Xi}{\sum fi}$$

Where: $\bar{x}$ = Mean of Variable x

$\sum FiXi$ = Total number of score

$\sum Fi$ = Number of sample

So,

$$\bar{x} = \frac{\sum fi\, Xi}{\sum fi}$$

$$= \frac{1156}{22} = 52.54$$

b. Variant

Where : S^2 = variant

N = Number of sample

So'

$$S^2 = \frac{N \sum FiXi^2 - (\sum FiXi)^2}{N(N-1)}$$

$$= \frac{22 \times 65520 - (1156)^2}{22(22-1)}$$

$$= \frac{1441440 - 1336336}{462}$$

$$= \frac{105104}{462}$$

$$= 227{,}50$$

c. Standard Deviation

$$S = \sqrt{S^2}$$

$$= \sqrt{227{,}50}$$

$$= 15{,}08$$

After getting the calculation of mean, variant and standard deviation, then the next step is to found out the normality of the test. It means that the test was given to the students is observed by Liliefors test. The calculation of normality speaking can be seen in the following table:

Table 4.8 Normality Testing of Pre-Test in Experimental Group

No	Score (Zi)	F	Fkum	Zi	F(Zi)	S(Zi)	f(Zi)-S(Zi)
1	32	1	1	-1,36	0,0869	0,0454	-0,0415
2	36	4	5	-1,09	0,1379	0,227	-0,0891
3	36	4	5	-1,09	0,1379	0,227	-0,0891
4	36	4	5	-1,09	0,1379	0,227	-0,0891
5	36	4	5	-1,09	0,1379	0,227	-0,0891
6	40	3	8	-0,83	0,2033	0,36	-0,1567
7	40	3	8	-0,83	0,2033	0,36	-0,1567
8	40	3	8	-0,83	0,2033	0,36	-0,1567
9	48	3	11	-0,30	0,3821	0,5	-0,1179
10	48	3	11	-0,30	0,3821	0,5	-0,1179
11	48	3	11	-0,30	0,3821	0,5	-0,1179
12	52	3	14	-0,35	0,3632	0,63	-2668
13	52	3	14	-0,35	0,3632	0,63	-2668
14	52	3	14	-0,35	0,3632	0,63	-2668
15	60	1	15	0,49	0,6879	0,68	-0,0079
16	64	2	17	0,75	0,7734	0,77	-0,0034
17	64	2	17	0,75	0,7734	0,77	-0,0034
18	72	2	19	1,29	0,9015	0,86	-0,0415
19	72	2	19	1,29	0,9015	0,86	-0,0415
20	76	3	22	1,55	0,9394	1	-0,0606
21	76	3	22	1,55	0,9394	1	-0,0606
22	76	3	22	1,55	0,9394	1	-0,0606
TOTAL	1156	Lo= -0,0655					
MEAN	52.5455	Lt= 1,61					

d. Finding Z score

Formula: $Z_i\,1 = \dfrac{x_i - \bar{x}}{s}$

$Z_i\,1 \qquad = \dfrac{32 - 52,54}{15,08} = -1,36$

$Z_i\,2 \qquad = \dfrac{36 - 52,54}{15,08} = -1,09$

$Z_i\,3 \qquad = \dfrac{40 - 52,54}{15,08} = -0,83$

$Z_i\,4 \qquad = \dfrac{48 - 52,54}{15,08} = -0,30$

$Z_i\,5 \qquad = \dfrac{52 - 52,54}{15,08} = -0,035$

$Z_i\,6 \qquad = \dfrac{60 - 52,54}{15,08} = 0,49$

$Z_i\,7 \qquad = \dfrac{64 - 52,54}{15,08} = 0,75$

$Z_i\,8 \qquad = \dfrac{72 - 52,54}{15,08} = 1,29$

$Z_i\,9 \qquad = \dfrac{76 - 52,54}{15,08} = 1,55$

e. Finding S(Zi)

$S(Z_i) \qquad = \dfrac{F\ kum}{N}$

$$S(Zi) \quad = \frac{1}{22} \quad = 0,0454$$

$$S(Zi) \quad = \frac{5}{22} \quad = 0,227$$

$$S(Zi) \quad = \frac{8}{22} \quad = 0,36$$

$$S(Zi) \quad = \frac{11}{22} \quad = 0,5$$

$$S(Zi) \quad = \frac{14}{22} \quad = 0,63$$

$$S(Zi) \quad = \frac{15}{22} \quad = 0,68$$

$$S(Zi) \quad = \frac{17}{22} \quad = 0,77$$

$$S(Zi) \quad = \frac{19}{22} \quad = 0,86$$

$$S(Zi) \quad = \frac{22}{22} \quad = 1$$

From the table above, it can be seen that Liliefors observation or Lo = - 0,0264with n = 32 and at real level α = 0,05 from the list of critical value of Liliefors table Lt = 0,161 It is known that the coeficient of Lo (-0,0264) < Lt (0,161). So it can concluded that the data distribution of the students' ability in speaking normal.

Table 4.9 Frequency Distribution of Post-Test in Experimental Group

No	Xi	Fi	FiXi	Xi²	FiXi²
1	48	3	144	2304	6912
2	52	3	156	2704	8112
3	56	4	224	3136	12544
4	60	2	120	3600	7200
5	68	1	68	4624	4624
6	72	3	216	5184	15552
7	76	2	152	5776	11552
8	80	4	320	6400	25600
TOTAL		22	1400	33728	92096

Based on the data above, the result of FiXi² is 92096 and FiXi is 1400.

Then the following is the calculation of mean, variant and standard deviation.

a. Mean

$$\bar{x} = \frac{\sum fi\, Xi}{\sum fi}$$

Where: $\bar{x}$ = Mean of Variable x

$\sum FiXi$ = Total number of score

$\sum Fi$ = Number of sample

So,

$$\bar{x} = \frac{\sum fi\, Xi}{\sum fi}$$

$$= \frac{1400}{22}$$

$$= 63{,}63$$

b. Variant

Where : S^2 = variant

N = Number of sample

So'

$$S^2 = \frac{N \sum FiXi^2 - (\sum FiXi)^2}{N(N-1)}$$

$$= \frac{22 \times 92096 - (1400)^2}{22(22-1)}$$

$$= \frac{2026112 - 1960000}{462}$$

$$= \frac{66112}{462} = 143{,}09$$

c. Standard Deviation

$$S = \sqrt{S^2}$$

$$= \sqrt{143{,}09} = 11{,}96$$

After getting the calculation of mean, variant and deviation standard, then the next step is to found out the normality of the test. It means that the test was given to the students' is observed by Liliefors test. The calculation of normality speaking English can be seen in the following table:

Table 4.10 Normality Testing of Post-Test in Experimental Group

No	Score (Zi)	F	Fkum	Zi	F(Zi)	S(Zi)	f(Zi)-S(Zi)
1	48	3	3	-1,30	0,0968	0,1363	-0,1363
2	48	3	3	-1,30	0,0968	0,1363	-0,1363
3	48	3	3	-1,30	0,0968	0,1363	-0,1363
4	52	3	6	-0,97	0,166	0,272	-0,106
5	52	3	6	-0,97	0,166	0,272	-0,106
6	52	3	6	-0,97	0,166	0,272	-0,106
7	56	4	10	-0,89	0,1867	0,45	-0,2633
8	56	4	10	-0,89	0,1867	0,45	-0,2633
9	56	4	10	-0,89	0,1867	0,45	-0,2633
10	56	4	10	-0,89	0,1867	0,45	-0,2633
11	60	2	12	-0,65	0,2578	0,54	-0,2822

12	60	2	12	-0,65	0,2578	0,54	-0,2822
13	68	1	13	-0,36	0,3594	0,59	-0,2306
14	72	3	16	0,69	0,2451	0,72	-0,4749
15	72	3	16	0,69	0,2451	0,72	-0,4749
16	72	3	16	0,69	0,2451	0,72	-0,4749
17	76	2	18	1,03	0,1515	0,81	-0,6585
18	76	2	18	1,03	0,1515	0,81	-0,6585
19	80	4	22	1,36	0,0869	1	-0,9131
20	80	4	22	1,36	0,0869	1	-0,9131
21	80	4	22	1,36	0,0869	1	-0,9131
22	80	4	22	1,36	0,0869	1	-0,9131
TOTAL	1400	Lo= -0,0655					
MEAN	63.6364	Lt= 1,61					

d. Finding Z score

Formula: $Zi\ 1 = \dfrac{xi - \bar{x}}{s}$

Zi 1 $\quad = \dfrac{48-63,63}{11,96}$ = -1,30

Zi 2 $\quad = \dfrac{52-63,63}{11,96}$ = -0,97

Zi 3 $\quad = \dfrac{56-63,63}{11,96}$ = -0,83

Zi 4 $\quad = \dfrac{60-63,63}{11,96}$ = -0,65

Zi 5 $\quad = \dfrac{68-63,63}{11,96}$ = -0,36

Zi 6 $\quad = \dfrac{72-63,63}{11,96}$ = 0,69

$$\text{Zi } 7 = \frac{76-63,63}{11,96} = 1,03$$

$$\text{Zi } 8 = \frac{80-63,63}{11,96} = 1,36$$

e. Finding S(Zi)

$$S(Zi) = \frac{F\ kum}{N}$$

$$S(Zi) = \frac{3}{22} = 0,1363$$

$$S(Zi) = \frac{6}{22} = 0,272$$

$$S(Zi) = \frac{10}{22} = 0,45$$

$$S(Zi) = \frac{12}{22} = 0,54$$

$$S(Zi) = \frac{13}{22} = 0,59$$

$$S(Zi) = \frac{16}{22} = 0,72$$

$$S(Zi) = \frac{18}{22} = 0,81$$

$$S(Zi) = \frac{22}{22} = 1$$

From the table above, it can be seen that Liliefors observation or Lo= -0,0037 with n = 32 and at real level α= 0,05 from the list of critical value of Liliefors table Lt = 0,161. It is known that the coeficient of Lo (-0,0037) < Lt

(0,161). So it can be concluded that the data distribution of the students' ability in speaking English normal.

Table 4.11 Frequency Distribution of Pre-Test in Control Group

No	Xi	Fi	FiXi	Xi²	FiXi²
1	36	3	108	1296	3888
2	44	1	44	1936	1936
3	48	5	240	2304	11520
4	52	4	208	2704	10816
5	56	3	168	3136	9408
6	60	3	180	3600	10800
7	72	2	144	5184	10368
8	76	1	76	5776	5776
TOTAL		22	1168	25936	64512

Based on the data above, the result of FiXi² is 64512 and FiXi is 1168. Then the following is the calculation of mean, variant and standard deviation.

    a. Mean

$$\bar{x} = \frac{\sum fi\, Xi}{\sum fi}$$

Where: $\bar{x}$ = Mean of Variable x

           $\sum FiXi$ = Total number of score

           $\sum Fi$ = Number of sample

So,

$$\bar{x} = \frac{\sum fi\, Xi}{\sum fi}$$

$$= \frac{1168}{22}$$

$$= 53,09$$

    b. Variant

Where : S^2 = variant

         N   = Number of sample

So'

$$S^2 = \frac{N \sum FiXi^2 - (\sum FiXi)^2}{N(N-1)}$$

$$= \frac{22 \times 64512 - (1168)^2}{22(22-1)}$$

$$= \frac{1419264 - 1364224}{462}$$

$$= \frac{55040}{462} = 119,13$$

c. Standard Deviation

$$S = \sqrt{S^2}$$

$$= \sqrt{119,13} = 10,93$$

After getting the calculation of mean, variant and deviation standard, then the next step is to found out the normality of the test. It means that the test was given to the students' is observed by Liliefors test. The calculation of normality speaking English can be seen in the following table:

Table 4.12 Normality Testing of Pre Test in Control Group

No	Score (Zi)	F	Fkum	Zi	F(Zi)	S(Zi)	f(Zi)-S(Zi)
1	36	3	3	-1,56	0,0594	0,1363	-0,0769
2	36	3	3	-1,56	0,0594	0,1363	-0,0769
3	36	3	3	-1,56	0,0594	0,1363	-0,0769
4	44	1	4	-0,83	0,2033	0,272	-0,0687
5	48	5	9	-0,46	0,3228	0,45	-0,1272
6	48	5	9	-0,46	0,3228	0,45	-0,1272
7	48	5	9	-0,46	0,3228	0,45	-0,1272
8	48	5	9	-0,46	0,3228	0,45	-0,1272

9	48	5	9	-0,46	0,3228	0,45	-0,1272
10	52	4	13	-0,09	0,4641	0,54	-0,0759
11	52	4	13	-0,09	0,4641	0,54	-0,0759
12	52	4	13	-0,09	0,4641	0,54	-0,0759
13	52	4	13	-0,09	0,4641	0,54	-0,0759
14	56	3	16	0,26	0,3974	0,59	-0,1926
15	56	3	16	0,26	0,3974	0,59	-0,1926
16	56	3	16	0,26	0,3974	0,59	-0,1926
17	60	3	19	0,63	0,2643	0,72	-0,4557
18	60	3	19	0,63	0,2643	0,72	-0,4557
19	60	3	19	0,63	0,2643	0,72	-0,4557
20	72	2	21	1,73	0,0418	0,81	-0,7682
21	72	2	21	1,73	0,0418	0,81	-0,7682
22	76	1	22	2,09	0,0183	1	-0,9817
TOTAL	**1168**	**Lo= -0,0655**					
MEAN	**53.0909**	**Lt= 1,61**					

d. Finding Z score

Formula: $Zi \; 1 = \dfrac{xi - \bar{x}}{s}$

$Zi \; 1 \qquad = \dfrac{36 - 53,09}{10,93} \quad = -1,56$

$Zi \; 2 \qquad = \dfrac{44 - 53,09}{10,93} \quad = -0,83$

$Zi \; 3 \qquad = \dfrac{48 - 53,09}{10,93} \quad = -0,46$

$Zi \; 4 \qquad = \dfrac{52 - 53,09}{10,93} \quad = -0,09$

$Zi \; 5 \qquad = \dfrac{56 - 53,09}{10,93} \quad = 0,26$

Zi 6 $\quad = \dfrac{60-53,09}{10,93} = 0,63$

Zi 7 $\quad = \dfrac{72-53,09}{10,93} = 1,73$

Zi 8 $\quad = \dfrac{76-53,09}{10,93} = 2,09$

f. Finding S(Zi)

S(Zi) $\quad = \dfrac{F\ kum}{N}$

S(Zi) $\quad = \dfrac{3}{22} = 0,1363$

S(Zi) $\quad = \dfrac{6}{22} = 0,272$

S(Zi) $\quad = \dfrac{10}{22} = 0,45$

S(Zi) $\quad = \dfrac{12}{22} = 0,54$

S(Zi) $\quad = \dfrac{13}{22} = 0,59$

S(Zi) $\quad = \dfrac{16}{22} = 0,72$

S(Zi) $\quad = \dfrac{18}{22} = 0,81$

S(Zi) $\quad = \dfrac{22}{22} = 1$

From the table above, it can be seen that Liliefors observation or Lo= -0,0037 with n = 22 and at real level α= 0,05 from the list of critical value of Liliefors table Lt = 0,161. It is known that the coeficient of Lo (-0,0037) < Lt (0,161). So it can be concluded that the data distribution of the students' ability in speaking English normal.

Table 4.13 Frequency Distribution of Post Test in Control Group

No	Xi	Fi	FiXi	Xi²	FiXi²
1	48	3	144	2304	6912
2	52	5	260	2704	13520
3	56	3	168	3136	9408
4	60	2	120	3600	7200
5	68	1	68	4624	4624
6	72	3	216	5184	15552
7	76	4	304	5776	23104
8	80	1	80	6400	6400
TOTAL		22	1360	33728	86720

Based on the data above, the result of FiXi² is 86720 and FiXi is 1360. Then the following is the calculation of mean, variant and standard deviation.

a. Mean

$$\bar{x} = \frac{\sum fi\, Xi}{\sum fi}$$

Where: $\bar{x}$ = Mean of Variable x

$\sum$FiXi = Total number of score

$\sum$Fi = Number of sample

So,

$$\bar{x} = \frac{\sum fi\, Xi}{\sum fi}$$

$$= \frac{1360}{22}$$

$$= 61,81$$

b. Variant

Where : S^2 = variant

N   = Number of sample

So'

$$S^2 = \frac{N \sum FiXi^2 - (\sum FiXi)^2}{N(N-1)}$$

$$= \frac{22 \times 86720 - (1360)^2}{22(22-1)}$$

$$= \frac{1907840 - 1849600}{462}$$

$$= \frac{58240}{462} = 126{,}06$$

c. Standard Deviation

$$S = \sqrt{S^2}$$

$$= \sqrt{126{,}06} = 11{,}22$$

After getting the calculation of mean, variant and deviation standard, then the next step is to found out the normality of the test. It means that the test was given to the students' is observed by Liliefors test. The calculation of normality speaking English can be seen in the following table:

Table 4.14 Normality Testing of Post Test in Control Group

No	Score (Zi)	F	Fkum	Zi	F(Zi)	S(Zi)	f(Zi)-S(Zi)
1	48	3	3	-1,32	0,0934	0,1363	-0,1363
2	48	3	3	-1,32	0,0934	0,1363	-0,1363
3	48	3	3	-1,32	0,0934	0,1363	-0,1363
4	52	5	8	-0,87	0,1922	0,363	-0,1708
5	52	5	8	-0,87	0,1922	0,363	-0,1708

6	52	5	8	-0,87	0,1922	0,363	-0,1708
7	52	5	8	-0,87	0,1922	0,363	-0,1708
8	52	5	8	-0,87	0,1922	0,363	-0,1708
9	56	3	11	-0,51	0,305	0,5	-0,195
10	56	3	11	-0,51	0,305	0,5	-0,195
11	56	3	11	-0,51	0,305	0,5	-0,195
12	60	2	13	-0,16	0,4364	0,59	-0,1534
13	60	2	13	-0,16	0,4364	0,59	-0,1534
14	68	1	14	0,55	0.2912	0,63	-0,3388
15	72	3	17	0,90	0,1841	0,77	-0,5859
16	72	3	17	0,90	0,1841	0,77	-0,5859
17	72	3	17	0,90	0,1841	0,77	-0,5859
18	76	4	21	1,26	0,1038	0,95	-0,8462
19	76	4	21	1,26	0,1038	0,95	-0,8462
20	76	4	21	1,26	0,1038	0,95	-0,8462
21	76	4	21	1,26	0,1038	0,95	-0,8462
22	80	1	22	1,62	0,0526	1	-0,9474
TOTAL	1360	Lo= -0,0655					
MEAN	61.8182	Lt= 1,61					

d. Finding Z score

Formula: $Zi\ 1 = \dfrac{xi - \bar{x}}{s}$

$Zi\ 1 \qquad = \dfrac{48 - 61,81}{11,22} = -1,23$

$Zi\ 2 \qquad = \dfrac{52 - 61,81}{11,22} = -0,87$

$Zi\ 3 \qquad = \dfrac{56 - 61,81}{11,22} = -0,51$

$Zi\ 4 \qquad = \dfrac{60 - 61,81}{11,22} = -0,16$

$Zi\ 5 \qquad = \dfrac{68 - 61,81}{11,22} = 0,55$

$$\text{Zi 6} \quad = \frac{72 - 61{,}81}{11{,}22} = 0{,}90$$

$$\text{Zi 7} \quad = \frac{76 - 61{,}81}{11{,}22} = 1{,}26$$

$$\text{Zi 8} \quad = \frac{80 - 61{,}81}{11{,}22} = 1{,}62$$

e. Finding S(Zi)

$$S(Zi) \quad = \frac{F\ kum}{N}$$

$$S(Zi) \quad = \frac{3}{22} = 0{,}1363$$

$$S(Zi) \quad = \frac{8}{22} = 0{,}363$$

$$S(Zi) \quad = \frac{11}{22} = 0{,}5$$

$$S(Zi) \quad = \frac{13}{22} = 0{,}59$$

$$S(Zi) \quad = \frac{14}{22} = 0{,}63$$

$$S(Zi) \quad = \frac{17}{22} = 0{,}77$$

$$S(Zi) \quad = \frac{21}{22} = 0{,}95$$

$$S(Zi) \quad = \frac{22}{22} = 1$$

From the table above, it can be seen that Liliefors observation or Lo= -0,0037 with n = 22 and at real level α= 0,05 from the list of critical value of

Liliefors table Lt = 0,161. It is known that the coeficient of Lo (-0,0037) < Lt (0,161). So it can be concluded that the data distribution of the students' ability in speaking English normal.

b. Homogenity Testing

    1. Homogenity Testing of Pre Test

$$F_{obs} = \frac{S1^2}{s2^2}$$

Where: $S1^2$ = the biggest variant

$S2^2$ = the smallest variant

Based on the variants of both samples of pre test found that:

S^2_{ex} = 51,63   N = 22

S^2_{co} = 54,37   N = 22

So :

$$F_{obs} = \frac{54,37}{51,63} = 1,053$$

Then the coefficient of F_{obs} = 1,053 is compared with F_{table}, where F_{table} is determined at real α = 0,05 and the same numerator dk = N-1 = 22-1 that was exist dk numerator 21, the denominator dk = n-1 (22-1= 21). Then F_{table} can be calculated $F_{0,05(21;21)}$ = 1,822

So $F_{obs} < F_{table}$ or (1,053<1,822) so it can be concluded that the variant is homogenous.

    2. Homogenity Testing of Post Test

$$F_{obs} = \frac{S1^2}{s2^2}$$

Where: $S1^2$ = the biggest variant

$S2^2$ = the smallest variant

Based on the variants of both samples of pre test found that:

S^2_{ex} = 63,63 $\qquad\qquad$ N = 22

S^2_{co} = 60,54 $\qquad\qquad$ N = 22

So :

$$F_{obs} = \frac{63,63}{60,54} = 1,051$$

Then the coefficient of F_{obs} = 1,051 is compared with F_{table}, where F_{table} is determined at real α = 0,05 and the same numerator dk =N-1 = 21 that was exist dk numerator 21, the denominator dk = n-1 (22-1= 21). Then F_{table} can be calculated $F_{0,05(21;21)}$= 1,822

So $F_{obs} < F_{table}$ or (1,051< 1,822) so it can be concluded that the variant is homogeneous.

c. Hypotheses Testing

The hyppothesis testing in this research, it is used two average similarity test by using statistic, as follow:

$$t = \frac{Mx - My}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{dx + dy^2}{nx + ny - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{nx} + \frac{1}{ny}\right)}}$$

$$= \frac{11,09 - 9,40}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{11,96 + 11,22}{22 + 22 - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{22} + \frac{1}{22}\right)}}$$

$$= \frac{1{,}69}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{23{,}18}{22+20}\right)\left(\frac{1}{22}+\frac{1}{22}\right)}}$$

$$= \frac{1{,}69}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{23.18}{42}\right)(0{,}04+0{,}04)}}$$

$$= \frac{1{,}69}{\sqrt{(0{,}55190(0{,}08)}}$$

$$= \frac{1{,}69}{\sqrt{(0{,}044)}}$$

$$= \frac{1{,}69}{0{,}2}$$

$$= 8{,}45$$

From the computation above, it can be seen that $t_{obs} = 8{,}45$. The testing hypothesis is conducted in order to find out whether that hypothesis is accepted or rejected. The basis of testing hypothesis is that H_a is accepted if the $t_{obs} > t_{tab}$. In this study the calculation of the scores uses t-test for the degree of freedom 42(df = N+N-2) at the level of significant 0,05 that the critical value is 1,999. So it can be seen that $t_{tab} = 1{,}999$.

After the scores were calculated, it was found that in this study the t_{obs} is higher than the t_{tab}. It can be seen as follow:

$T_{obs} > t_{tab}$ (0,05) with df 42

8,45> 1,999

From the result above, it shows that the alternative hyphothesis(H_a) is accepted and the null hypothesis (H_o) is rejected. It means that speaking English by using NPRM Method effect students' ability in speaking.

B. Research Findings

The result indicated that there was on increasing on the students' speaking ability by using near-peer role modeling method. The mean of pre-test was 52,54 it was good enough. The mean of post-test was 63,63, it indicate that the scores and the mean in post-test were better than pre-test.

The percentage of students who got point ≥70 also grew up. In the pre-test, the students who got point ≥70 up were 5 students (20%). In the post-test students who got point ≥70 up were 15 students (70%). For the total increasing of the students' score from pre-test to pos-test was 77%. In other words, the students' speaking ability and became well in the first meeting and to the next meeting.

C. Discussion

The research was conducted to find out the increasing of the students speaking ability by using near-peer role modeling method. The near-peer role modeling method was one of method that could be used by the teacher in teaching English to increase the students speaking ability.

The research that had been done by the researcher indicate that near-peer role modeling method was effective of cloud be used in teaching writing. It could be seen from the tables that showed us the increasing of students' score from pre-test and post-test. The increasing because of the teacher knew how to control the class and create the active class. Beside that, near-peer role modeling method helped the students to understand the subject easily.

Based on the result of quantitative data could be seen from the tables that showed us the increasing of students' score from pre-test there was only 20% (five students) who got point 70 above, it's occurred because the students still not understood about speaking and they didn't know how to begin speak.

So it could be concluded that the result of the research showed that the effectiveness of near-peer role modeling could improve the students' speaking ability. It could be seen from the quantitative data by prove the students' scores got better in the post-test.

CHAPTER V

CLOSING

A. Conclusion

After analyzing the data, it could be concluded that:

Near-peer role modeling method was effective and could be used in teaching speaking. It could be seen from the quantitative data, that showed the increasing of students score from pre-test and post-test. In pre-test five students who passed the test and seventeen students failed on the test. In the post-test fifteen students who passed of the test and seven students failed on the test. Besides, based on the result of quantitative showed, it could be conclude that the students response were more active, enthusiastic.

B. Suggestions

Based on the result of the research, the researcher would like to give some suggestions as follow:

1. Stakeholder

For the principal of SMP Swasta Al-Masdar batang kuis, it is good to motivate the teachers, especially English teacher to teach the students by using near-peer role modeling method.

2. Teacher

For English teacher, the English teacher can use near-peer role modeling method as an alternative in learning speaking. English teacher to make the learning activity not monotonous and enjoyable.

3. Students

   For students, it is suggested to foster their speaking ability. By applying near-peer role modeling method, the students could improve their speaking ability because this method give students opportunity to show their confidence and self efficacy, and fluency in speaking. So, students will have a habit to use English language in classroom activity even in outside classroom activity.

4. Researcher

   For the researcher, the researcher hopefully can be operated in conducting further research/ study for obtaining better result.

5. Further Researcher

   For other researcher, the result of this research can give information or reference about implementation of near-peer role modeling method in teaching speaking.

REFERENCES

Arikunto, Suharsimi. *Prosedure Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*, Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta, 1993

Boer, John J. *Basic Language Messages and Meanings*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc., 1982

C Richards, Jack. *Methodology in Language Teaching-An Anthology of Current Practice,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986

Fulcher, G. *Testing Second Language Speaking.* New York: Longman, 2003

Guntur Tarigan, Henry. *Bicara Sebagai Suatu Keterampilan Berbahasa,* Bandung: Angkasa, 2008

H Douglas, Brown. *Teaching by Principles an Interactive Approach to Language Paedagog.* New York: Addison Wesky Longman. 2001

Harmer, Jeremy. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. New York: Longman, 1991.

Hughes, Arthur. *Testing for Language Teachers*, 2nd Ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003

Hwa, Tan Tee. *Student Peer Teaching Strategy*. Bangkok: UNESCO Bangkok, 2009.

Jaya, Indra & Ardat. *Penerapan Statistik Untuk Pendidikan*, Bandung: Citapustaka Media Perintis, 2013

Marguerite, G. Lodico. *Methods In Educational Research From Theory to Practice Second Edition,* San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010

Martin Bygate. *Speaking,* New,Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1978

McDonough and Shaw, Christopher. *Materials and Methods in ELT-A Teacher's Guide.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.

Mulyana, Yayan G. H. *A Practical Guide for Public Speaking*. Bekasi: Kesaint Blanc, 1995

Murphey, Tim. *Motivating with Near Peer Role Models*, JALT'97: Trends & Transitions, 1998.

Nunan, David. *Second Language Teaching and Learning.* Boston: Massachusetts. Heinle & heinle publisher. 1999

Paul, A. Geng. *Introduction to The Principles Of Language*, New York: Harper & Row Publisher, 1971

Phillips, D. the function of silence within the context of teacher training. *ELT Journal.* 48(3) 266-271. 1994

Pillai, Swaminatha. *English Language Teaching-First Year*. Chennai: Tamilnadu Corporation, 2008.

Richards, Jack C. and Rodgers, Theodore S. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*, 1st ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Ruddick, Michael and Nadasdy, Paul. The Influence of Near Peer Role Models (NPRMs) in Second Language Classrooms Intended to Improve Students' Pronunciation When Teacher Intervention is Not Enough, *Asian EFL Journal, Professional Teaching Articles*. Vol. 65, 2013

Sandra, J. Savignon. *Communicative Competence*, USA: Addison-Wesley Publishing, 1983

Schunk, Dale H. *Learning Theories-An Educational Perspective*, 6th ed. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc., 2012

Snow, Don. *From Language Learner to Language Teacher*. Virginia: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc., 2007

Sukardi. *Metodologi Penelitian Pendidikan, Kompetensi dan Praktiknya*, Jakarta: PT. Bumi Angkasa, 2005

Syaukani. *Metode Penelitian Pedoman Praktis dalam bidang pendidikan,* Medan: Perdana Publishing, 2015

Tarigan, Henry Guntur. *Berbicara Sebagai Suatu Keterampilan Berbahasa*. Bandung: Angkasa, 2008

Wahyuna, Sri. *Statistik Pendidikan*, Medan: Fakultas Tarbiyah UIN Sumatera Utara, 2017

Watkins, Chris, et.al. Effective Learning in Classrooms. London: Sage Publication, 2007.