JURNAL Suluh Pendidikan FKIP-UHN
Volume-5, Edisi-2, September2018
Halaman 1-8

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF DIRECT METHOD TO IMPROVE STUDENTS' ABILITY IN SPEAKING

Nurhayati Sitorus dan Harpen Pandapotan Silitonga
Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Universitas HKBP Nommensen
Email: Hayati.sitorus@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to investigate students' ability in speaking before and after using Direct Method in learning English. The method in this research was experimental quantitative method by using quasi experimental design with *one group pretest-posttest* model. The design only see students' achievement in speaking before and after using Direct Method.

The object of the research was English Department students. They were randomly selected. The technique of collecting the data was done through observation and the data were gotten from the students when they did oral communication. The instrument in this research was oral test.

The result of this study shown that the use of Direct Method could improve students' ability in speaking. It was proved from the students' average was higher after using Direct Method. The data in this research had normal distribution. Based on data analysis by using T-test was gotten that t_{count} = 7,14 at the significant level ~ = 5% and dk (n-1) = (40-1) =39 was gotten t_{table} = 1,82. So, $t_{count} > t_{table.}$ It proved that H_o was rejected and H_a was accepted. It's meant that there was a significant difference between students' ability before and after implementing Direct Method.

Keywords: Direct Method, Speaking

INTRODUCTION

Language is a tool that used to communicate and interact one each other. Through language human can express the ideas to the other. Language consists of oral language, written language and gesture. Oral language and written language are called verbal communication whereas gesture is non verbal communication.

One of the languages in the world is English. It is an International language. It is placed as an important tool in economic, politic, business, facing MEA, and looking for a job. It is very necessary to be learnt. It has been taught at Elementry School, Junior High School, Senior High School, and university level. Now, English is not only necessary to be learnt but it is as a tool of self development for everyone especially for English Department students. English Department students should have a skill. There are four skills in English, namely listening, speaking, reading, and writing. They are necessary to be known and mastered. From the skills, speaking is difficult thing for students.

Speaking is an activity to deliver information or message to the other. Speaking in English is a difficult thing that is faced by the students. It can be seen in the teaching learning process. When the educator asked them in English they were difficult to give the responses. But if the questions in written form, they could answer them. The same thing happened when they did presentation in front of the class. If the listeners asked the speakers they tended to write the answer first on their paper before answering the listeners' questions. It means that they can not do oral communication (speaking) directly in English. They just read the answer. Then, they had less vocabularies. So, they make students difficult to communicate or speak with their educators or their friends. Furthermore, students were difficult to pronounce the words based on the right punctuation. As the example, when the learners pronounced the word "about", some students pronounced it with the wrong pronunciation, namely "e′bawt". In this case they use " e hard" in pronouncing the word "about" and it should be pronounced with "ə′bawt", namely by using "e weak". It is affected by geography where they live. Usually people from toba areas tend to use "e hard".

The problems above can be solved by using Direct Method in teaching English. Direct Method is a method designed where educator uses the target language (English) in the classroom. If some students do not know the meaning of the words that spoken by educator, the educator may not translate but s/he uses visual aids or through demonstrations to illustrate the meaning of the words (Titone in Richards and Rodgers, 2007:12). The use of visual aids in Direct Method will make students be fun to learn English. In Direct Method, vocabulary is taught every meeting. So, it can enrich their vocabulary. If they have enough vocabulary they will able to speak. Then, grammar is taught inductively. Through this method, students will be motivated to improve their ability in speaking.

Therefore, a research entitled "Implementation of Direct Methods to Improve Students' Ability in Speaking".

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research method used in this research was experimental quantitative method, namely to know the using Direct Method in improving the students' ability in speaking on English Department Students. The population of the research was English Department students. They consisted of three classes (A, B, and C). Each class

consisted of 40 students. And the writer took the sample randomly. The sample was group A that consisted of 40 students. The technique of collecting data was done through observation. And the source of the data was gotten from the students when they did oral communication.

The instrument used in this research was oral test. The students were asked to do oral communication (speaking) in front of the class. There were some aspects that the writer used to asses the students's ability in speaking. They were grammar, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, pronunciation, and task. The data obtained were analyzed by using Liliefors normality test, testing homogeneity F, and testing hypothesis by using T-test.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

After the writer knew the results of the students' ability before and after using Direct Method, then the writer made the table of frequency distribution. It was done to know the mean, standart deviation, and standart error from the data (Pre-test and post-test).

Table 1 The Distribution of Students' Score Frequency in Speaking (Pre test)

X	F	Fx	x	x^2	fx^2
45	5	225	-13,75	189,06	945,3
50	6	300	-8,75	76,56	459,36
55	5	275	-3,75	14,06	70,3
60	10	600	1,25	1,56	15,6
65	8	520	6,25	39,06	312,48
70	4	280	11,25	126,56	506,24
75	2	150	16,25	264,06	528,12
	N=40	∑fX=2350			$\sum fx^2$= 2837,4

From the data above shown that the highest score is 75 in pre test. And the mean score of the data above was 58,75, the standart deviation was 8,42, and standart error of the group was 1,35.

Table 2 The Distribution of Students' Score Frequency in Speaking (Post test)

X	**F**	**Fx**	**x**	**x^2**	**fx^2**
60	4	240	-15	225	900
65	3	195	-10	100	300
70	8	560	-5	25	200
75	9	675	0	0	0
80	8	640	5	25	200
85	6	510	10	100	600
90	2	180	15	225	450
	N=40	**∑fX=3000**			**$\sum fx^2$= 2650**

From the data above shown that the highest score in post test was 90. And the mean score of the data above was 75, the standart deviation was 8,14, and standart error of the group was 1,30.

After the writer knew the mean, standart deviation and the error before and after using Direct Method, then the writer analyzed the data. Data analysis was done by using Liliefors normality test, testing homogeneity F, and testing hypothesis by using T-test.

1. Normality Test for Pre-Test Group (X)

The normality test that the writer used was normality test by *Lilliefors*. The table of normality test for variable X could be seen below.

Table 3 The Normality test for Pre-Test Group

X	F	fKum	Zi	Table	F(Zi)	S(Zi)	L
45	5	5	-1,63	-0,4484	0,0516	0,125	0,0734
50	6	11	-1,04	-0,3508	0,1492	0,275	**0,1258**
55	5	16	-0,44	-0,1700	0,3300	0,4	0,07
60	10	26	0,15	0.0596	0,5596	0,65	0,0904
65	8	34	0,74	0,2704	0,7704	0,85	0,0796
70	4	38	1,34	0,4099	0,9099	0,95	0,0401
75	2	40	1,93	0,4732	0,9732	1	0,0268

M_x= 58,75 ; N = 40; S= 8,42

Based on the table above, the greatest value among the absolute value (L_{count})= 0,1258. Then, L_{count} was consulted with critical value (L) at the level α = 0,05 (5%). Where N=40, so L_{table} with α (0,05) = 0,140

So, $L_{count} < L_{table}$ (0,1258 < 0,140). It proved that the data of variable X were normally distributed.

2. The Normality Test for Post-Test Group

The normality test that the writer used was normality test by *Lilliefors*. The table of normality test for variable Y could be seen below.

Table 4 The Normality Test for Post-Test Group

X	F	fKum	Zi	Tabel	F(Zi)	S(Zi)	L
60	4	4	-1,84	-0,4671	0,0329	0,1	0,0671
65	3	7	-1,23	0,3907	0,1093	0,175	0,0657
70	8	15	-0,61	0,2291	0,2709	0,375	**0,1041**
75	9	24	0	0	0,5000	0,6	0,1
80	8	32	0,61	0,2291	0,7291	0,8	0,0709
85	6	38	1,23	0,3907	0,8907	0,95	0,0593
90	2	40	1,84	0,4671	0,9671	1	0,0329

M_x= 75 ; N= 40; S= 8,14

Based on the table above, the greatest value among the absolute value (L_{count})= 0,1040. Then, L_{count} was consulted with critical value (L) at the level α = 0,05 (5%). Where N=40, so L_{table} with α (0,05) = 0,140

So, $L_{count} < L_{table}$ (0,1040 < 0,140). It proved that the data of variable Y were normally distributed.

3. Testing Homogeneity

The homogeneity test of variance is used to test the equality of variables. The method used is Barlet's test (Sudjana, 1989:261). The calculation can be seen below.

$Sx^2 = (8,42)^2 = 70,89$

$Sy^2 = (8,14)^2 = 66,26$

Degress of Freedom (df)

df = N – 1

= 40-1 = 39

After the writer obtained the values that use for Bartlet's test, then the writer calculated combined variance of all samples (S_2), the value for B, and the writer used the statistics chi square (¡ ^{2}). The calculation of the homogeneity data of each research variable as the following.

Table 5 The Necessary Values for Bartlett's Test

Sample	Df	1/df	S_i^2	Log S_i^2	(df)Log S_i^2
X	39	0,025	70,89	1,85	72,17
Y	39	0,025	66,26	1,82	71,03
	78				**143,20**

a.The Combined Variance of the Sample

$$S^2 = \frac{\sum (n_i - i)S_i^2}{\sum (n_i - 1)}$$

$$= \frac{(n_x - 1)S_x^2 + (n_Y - 1)S_y^2}{(n_x + n_y) - 2}$$

$$= \frac{(39)(70,89) + (39)(66,26)}{64}$$

$$= \frac{(2764,71) + (2584,14)}{78}$$

$$S^2 = 68,575$$

$$Log\ S^2 = Log\ 68,575 = 1,84$$

b. The Value for B

$$B = LogS^2 \sum (n_i - 1)$$

= (1,84) (78)

= 143,52

c. Bartlett's Test by Using Chi Square

$$X^2 = \ln 10 \quad \{B - \sum (n_{i-1}) \text{Log } Si^2\}$$

= (2,3026)(143,52 – 143,20)

= (2,3026) (0,32)

= 0,736

From the calculation above was gotten X^2_{count} (chi square) 0,736, X^2_{table} at the level of trust 95 % with df 39 was 54,572. That's why, $X^2_{count} < X^2_{table,}$ (0,736 < 54,572). It proved that the variance of population was homogen.

C. Testing Hyphothesis

To test the hyphothesis, the writer used T-test (Sudijono, 2007: 282-285):

$$t_o = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{SE_{M_1 - M_2}}$$

$$= \frac{75 - 58,75}{1,87}$$

$$= 8,689$$

So, $t_{count} = 8,69$

Based on the data above, $t_{count} = 8,69$ at the significant level ~ = 5%, dk (n-1) = (40-1) = 39 so, $t_{table} = 1,68$. It could be concluded that $t_{count} > t_{table}$ (8,69 > 1,68). It meant that H_o was rejected dan H_a was accepted. It stated that there was a significant differences between students' ability before and after implementing the Direct Method in speaking.

Based on the data analysis of the research, the findings of the research are:

1. The students' ability before implementing the direct method was enough and the average of students' achievement was 58,75
2. The students' ability before implementing the Direct method was good and the average of students' achievement was 75.
3. The data of the students' ability before and after implementing the direct method were on normal distribution, namely at the level ~ = 5 % and N = 40 is gotten

$L_{count} < L_{tablel}$ yaitu 0,1258 < 0,140 (before treatment) dan $L_o < L_{tabel}$ yaitu 0,1040 < 0,140 (after treatment).

4. The homogeneity test by using variance test was obtained F_{count} = 0,06 dan F_{table} = 79,1 jadi $F_{count} < F_{table}$ so the variance of the sample came from homogenous population.
5. By usibg T-test was obtained t_{count} = 8,69 at significant level 5% dk = (n-1) = 40-1 = 39 and t_{table} = 1,68 so $t_{hitung} > t_{tabel}$ = 8,69 > 1,68. It could be concluded that there is a significant difference between the students' ability in speaking before implementing direct method and after implementing direct method.

2. Discussion

Students' ability increase after using Direct Method. It can be seen from the mean of students' achievement before and after using Direct Method, namely 58,75 be 75 and the percentage of students' achievement also increase (57,5% be 62,5%). It is proved that the using of Direct Method can improve the students' ability in speaking.

Based on the normality and homogeneity test, the data before and after doing treatment has normal distribution and has same variance. And based on data analysis by using T-test was gotten that t_{count} = 7,14 at the significant level ~ = 5 % and dk (n-1) = (40-1) =39 was gotten t_{table} = 1,82. So, $t_{count} > t_{table.}$ It proved that H_o was rejected and H_a was accepted. It means that there was a significant difference between students' ability before and after implementing Direct Method.

Based on the result that has been described above that Direct Method is a teaching method can improve students' ability in speaking by using English as introduction language. Here, the educator uses English when s/he explain the lesson. And in the classroom, the students are not permitted to use Indonesian language when they ask something to the educator or communicate to the educator or their friends. In this case, the educator must be able to describe the words that the students do not know by using visual aid or explain them by using her words. There is no translation here. That's why the students try and try to speak in English and at last, they are able to speak in English.

V. CONCLUSION

Based on the finding of the research, it can be concluded that:

1. The students' ability in speaking before implementing Direct Method is inadequate.

2. The students' ability in speaking after implementing Direct Method is good.
3. There is a significant difference between students' ability before and after implementing Direct Method.
4. From the result of the research was known that Direct Method is very good to be implemented in speaking.

REFERENCES

[1]. Arikunto, S. (2005). *Manajemen Penelitian*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
[2]. Astuti. E. D. (2010). Meningkatkan kemampuan Percakapan Bahasa Inggris Siswa dengan Model Make a Match pada Siswa Tunarungu Wicara dan Tunagrahita VII SMPLB. J*ASSI_Anakku*. 9 (1): 66-75.
[3]. Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa. (2005). *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia (KBBI)*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
[4]. Brown. (2001). *Principle of Language Learning and Teaching*. New York: Prentice Hall.
[5]. _____. (2004). *Language Assesment Principles and Clasroom Practices.* New York: Pearson Education.
[6]. Ellyana, A. (2016). Pengembangan Media Gambar Seri untuk MeningkatkanKosakata Siswa dalam Keterampilan Berbicara bahasa Inggris. *Tesis*. Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan, Lampung.
[7]. Batool, N dkk. (2015). The Direct Method: A Good Start to Teach Oral Language. *Journal of Literature, Language and Lingistics*. 5 (1): 53-55
[8]. Richard, J & Rodgers T. (2007). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
[9]. Larsen. (2004). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
[10]. Octavia, L. (2010). Penerapan Metode Langsung dalam Meningkatkan Keterampilan Berbicara Bahasa Arab di Kelas VII A MTs Miftahul Huda Maguan Kaliori Rembang. *Skripsi*.Fakultas Tarbiyah. Universitas Sunan Kalijaga Yogyakarta.
[11]. Putra, W. (2012). Peningkatan Keterampilan Berbicara Melalui Metode Langsung Dalam Pengajaran Bahasa Inggris Secara Kuantitatif.*Thesis.* Program Pasca Sarjana. Universitas Udayana.
[12]. Stoner. G. M. (2009). Effectively Communicating With Visual Aids. Mattstoner. Net.
[13]. Sudjana. (2005). *Metoda Statistika*. Bandung: Tarsito.
[14]. Sudijono, A. (2007). *Pengantar Statistik Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
[15]. Sugiyono. (2012). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R & D*. Bandung: Alfabeta
[16]. Uno, H B. (2009). *Model Pembelajaran*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara
[17]. Ur, P. (1996). *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.