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Abstract

Guideline of School Based Curriculum (KTSP), the students are expected to master four skills in English subject. They are listening, reading, speaking and writing. Speaking is one of the important skills that the students have to master. The ability to communicate is the primary goal of foreign language instruction that speaking is put ahead on the other skills. On the contrary, for most students speaking is the most difficult part when they learn foreign language. A common problem for foreign language teacher is dealing with passive class because of the students’ afraid of making mistakes and lack of vocabulary. This research was quantitative descriptive research. This research conducted to find out the effect of using information gap task in speaking class. The design of this research was one group pretest-posttest, experimental design. The subjects were class XI IPA 1 SMA YP UNILA consisting of 30 students. In collecting the data, the researcher administered speaking test and interview. The test was given to the students to see how far the students improve their speaking ability. Based on the data, the researcher found that there were significant improvements in students’ speaking ability. The data shows that value of two tail significance was 0.000 and the sign $< \alpha$ (0.000 $< 0.05$). It could be stated that the hypothesis was accepted. The mean of speaking achievement in pretest was 64 and the mean of posttest was 72. It means that there was improvement in speaking ability. Information gap task used in this research stimulated the students to speak a lot in the classroom. It can be used to increase the interactions among the students. They became more confidence to express their ideas. They started to speak their ideas and respond the teacher well.
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INTRODUCTION

Speaking has important role in human beings life because speaking is a productive skill in which the speaker produces to communicate among people in a society in order to keep the relationship going well. Speaking is the thing that we use to express ideas at the same time he/she tries to get the ideas from others. Rivers (1987:162) says that through speaking, someone can express his ideas, emotions, attentions, reactions to other person and situation and influence other person. So, through speaking, everyone can communicate well or express what he/she wants from other and responds to the speaker. Byrne (1984: 8) in Temungingsih (1997:6) further says that speaking is an activity involving two or more participants as hearers and speakers who react to what they hear and their contributions. Each participant has an attention or a set of intentions goal that he wants to achieve in the interaction. In speaking, there is a goal or a purpose to be achieved by the speaker. Speaking involves two participants at least. It means that we cannot do it individually we need partner to communicate in the same language.

So, speaking is a process of transferring information, ideas and expressions that used the good form of sentence in order to make the listener understand of what we are saying.

According to Rivers (1987:160) the teaching of speaking skill more demanding on the teacher than the teaching of any language skills. Based on the statement above, we can say that it is important for the teacher to prepare their material and the techniques in order to avoid boring class. As we know that the purpose of speaking itself is to get the message or the information from the other. In order to make them
understand each other, then the person should communicate. Kayi (2006) stated that EFL teachers should create a classroom environment where students have real-life communication, authentic activities, and meaningful tasks that promote oral language.

Referring to the description above, small group work may meet the criteria to keep the students stimulated to speak as Roger and Walters (1987: 17). In Utomo (1997) notices that small group work gives the students more time to practice the language. The effectiveness of small group work has been suggested by Mclean and Castonos (1976) in Utomo (1997:27) that the amount and variety of talk were significantly greater in small group work than in the teacher led discussion. In other words, students not only talked more, but also use a wider range of speech acts in the small group context. Like in Nation (1989:27) states that one of the factors that influences the small group work is the task. It suggests that task play an important role in the success of small group work.

Information gap is one of the tasks that may encourage the students more actively to speak English. To improve students’ speaking skill, the researcher proposed to use Information gap as the technique. This research focused on teachers as the only learning sources and speech is as the main learning strategies. Therefore, the researcher proposed Information gap as an alternative technique.

Information gap is a kind of task that will encourage the students to speak in English more so that they can improve their speaking ability. Because it gives the students opportunity to speak in the target language and students produce more speech in the target language more than they would otherwise. As Pica (1985) states that information gap task offered the largest percentage of opportunities for non native
speaker to modify their output in response to native speaker signals of request for clarification and confirmation. Furthermore, Information gap forces the students to open their background knowledge related with the topic given and then practice it. Background Knowledge will help the students able to response. Thelen (1960, p.61) in Models’ of Teaching (Bruce Joyce) stated that learners will not raise up to study unless they know how to response.

In relation to the background, this research focuses on the following problem, namely:

- Is there any significant difference of students’ speaking ability before and after pretest and posttest through information gap task?
- What are the students responses toward information gap task?

Concerning with the problem above, the objectives of this research are:

- To find out whether there is significant difference of students’ speaking ability before and after being taught using Information Gap.
- To know the students responses toward information gap task

**METHOD**

In this quantitative descriptive research, the researcher used one class only. The researcher carried out the study to find out how Information Gap task can improve the students’ speaking ability. The researcher used one group pretest-posttest, experimental design. The researcher conducted pretest, treatments and posttest.
T1 X T2

T1 : Pre test
T2 : Post test
X : treatment

A pretest is the activity to find out students’ speaking ability before treatment. Afterword, the researcher gave two treatments to the students by using Information Gap task. Finally, a posttest is administering to find out the students’ speaking ability after treatments.

- Analyzing the data

The researcher analyzed the data by using speaking score based on aspects of speaking.

Scoring System

There were two raters to judge the score the students’ speaking performance of the test. Then, the scored between two raters are taken the average to be the final score that were analyzed. In evaluating the students’ speaking scores, the researcher, used the Oral English Rating sheet proposed by David P. Haris (1974: 84). Based on the Oral English Rating sheet, there are five components that were tested to the students, namely: pronunciation, fluency, grammar, vocabulary and comprehension.

Hypothesis Testing

The hypothesis test was done to know whether the hypothesis propose was accepted. In this research, Independent Group T-Test was used. The hypothesis was analyzed at significant level pf 0.005 in which the hypothesis is approved if sign $<\alpha$.

Hypothesis of this research are:
- There were significant differences of students’ speaking ability before and after pretest and posttest being taught using Information gap task.
- The students responded the information gap task positively.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In this part, the researcher analyzed the result of pre-test and post-test.

Result of the Students’ Speaking Score from Pre-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As presented in table above, pre-test shows that the minimum and maximum score of the pretest. The minimum score of vocabulary is 12 and the maximum score is 16. The minimum score of grammar is 8 and the maximum score is 16. The minimum score of comprehensibility is 8 and the maximum score is 12. The minimum score of pronunciation is 8 and the maximum score is 12. The minimum score of fluency is 8 and the maximum score is 16.

Result of the Students’ Speaking Score from Post-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From table above it can be seen that the minimum and maximum score of each aspects in postest. The minimum score of vocabulary is 16 and the maximum score is 20. The minimum score of grammar is 12 and the maximum score is 20. The minimum score of comprehensibility is 12 and the maximum score is 20. The minimum score of pronunciation is 12 and the maximum score is 20. The minimum score of fluency is 12 and the maximum score is 20.

**The Result of Interview**

The researcher interviewed ten students of twenty nine students in the classroom to find out their opinions about the activity. the researcher concluded the result of the interview below:

Questions:

1. Bagaimana menurut kamu tentang Information gap task completing drawing activity?
2. Apakah kamu senang dengan aktifitas itu? Kalau senang kenapa? Dan, kalau tidak, kenapa?
3. Apakah ada peningkatan atau perubahan dari speaking kamu setelah belajar speaking dengan aktifitas ini?
4. Kalau ada, dalam hal apa saja? Apakah di Vocabulary, atau aspek speaking lainnya?
5. Apakah menurut kamu aktifitas ini cocok untuk speaking class di SMA

Based on the questions of interview and the result of the interview, the researcher found that most of the students like this activity. This means that the students
response of this activity, is positive. Because most of them responded positively toward this activity, the researcher assumed that Information gap task especially completing drawing activity can be used to solve the students’ problem in speaking achievement.

**Testing Hypothesis**

The hypothesis testing was used to see whether the hypothesis was accepted or not.

The hypothesis test was then analyzed by comparing the two means from both classes. The result was shown in the following table:

**Paired sample statistic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 Pretest</td>
<td>64.0000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.46063</td>
<td>0.45693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>72.0000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.20642</td>
<td>0.40972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Paired differences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
<th>Std Error Mean</th>
<th>99% confidence interval of the differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>-4.882758</td>
<td>2.33353</td>
<td>2.420328</td>
<td>-4.97946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-15.3498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.78604</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** SPSS 17.0
The Improvement of Students’ Speaking Ability

From the graph above in the pretest, the Vocabulary of the students got 40 because the students only used easy words to describe their ideas and sometimes they mix it with Indonesian. In the postest the Vocabulary of the students got 80 because the students tried to use some new vocabularies after the treatments.

Grammar, the students got 40 in the pretest because the students made some mistake in using simple sentence. They still confused in making a good sentence. While in the postest the Grammar is 80 because the students could make some good sentences clearly.

Comprehensibility, the students got 80 in the pretest because they understand what their friends talked about. Comprehensibility of the postest got 80 because they can understand more about the material and they can express their ideas.

In the pretest Pronunciation of the students got 40 because they made some mistake in pronounce some words that still rare in their ears. Meanwhile in postest, Pronunciation of the students got 80 because the students could improve their error pronunciation in pretest by making their spelling better.
Fluency of the students in pretest got 80 because most of the students speak in no doubt even their spellling or grammar are wrong. Fluency of the students in postest got 80 because they could speak more fluent and clearly.

**Discussion**

Based on the results, the researcher found that the hypothesis proposed was accepted. Besides, the students responded information gap task positively. The improvement can be seen from the mean of the pretest and the mean of the postest. It can be concluded that there were significant improvement after the students taught using information gap task. They enjoy in learning English and more interested in English learning through information gap task.

The researcher concluded that information gap can improve students’ speaking ability. There were any significant differences after the researcher gave them treatments. Besides, information gap can be an alternative technique for the teacher in English teaching learning process because the students responded information gap task positively.

**CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS**

**Conclusion**

1. There were significant improvements of the students’ speaking ability before and after treatment by information gap task. The result of the posttest was higher than the result of the pretest. The mean of posttest was 72, and mean of pretest was 64. The result of the hypothesis test shows that the hypothesis was
accepted (p<0.05, p=0.000). Based on this result, the researcher concluded that information gap task can help the teacher to improve students’ speaking ability.

2. The students' responses are positive toward information gap task.
   - Improved their ability to speak in the target language, because the students can pronounce the words well, knowing the meaning of the words, and also able to apply the words in the sentences.
   - Information gap task is not only teaching about English, but also teaches the students how to communicate and interact, express their ideas with others using target language, and how to work in groups.
   - The students enjoyed and more confident to speak in the target language in the process of teaching learning because the students practiced it first with their friends so they do not feel afraid to make mistakes in the activity.

**Suggestion**

1. The researcher suggests for English teacher to use this information gap task technique in teaching speaking skill. The students will not feel bored. For example: The teacher gives variation in their own information gap task, the teacher can try other activity in information gap task such as finding differences in pictures. Then the teacher asks the students to make a dialogue about how to find the differences between picture A and B.
2. The teacher should give more attention to the students who has difficulties in English. For example: The teacher can as the students to practice how to pronounce the word.

3. In the teaching learning process, the students should be more active than teacher. So, the teacher should give more attention to the student who makes noise in the class.
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