

THE APPLICATION OF INFORMATION GAP TECHNIQUE TO IMPROVE SPEAKING SKILL

Cintia Arinanda Prima Putri, Hery Yufrizal, Basturi Hasan
Cintyaarinanda.ca@gmail.com

Abstract

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menemukan kegunaan teknik *Information Gap* dalam peningkatan kemampuan berbicara siswa terkait aspek *pronunciation*, *vocabulary* dan *grammar* dilihat dari analisa *quantity of speaking* dan *quality of speaking*. Adapun sampel yang diteliti pada penelitian ini adalah 27 siswa kelas 8L SMPN 4 Bandar Lampung tahun ajaran 2014/2015. Metode dalam penelitian ini adalah metode *quasi-experimental design* yang berhubungan dengan pengukuran periodik. Alat pengumpulan datanya adalah tes berbicara (*speaking test*). Hasil penelitian menunjukkan adanya perbedaan peningkatan kemampuan berbicara siswa dalam aspek *pronunciation*, *vocabulary* dan *grammar* dalam aplikasi teknik *Information Gap*.

The objective of this study was to find out the application of Information Gap technique in improving students' speaking skill especially in terms of pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar from the analysis of quantity and quality of speaking. The sample of this study was 27 students of 8L SMPN 4 Bandar Lampung academic year of 2014/2015. This study used quasi-experimental design involving periodic measurements. The instrument of this study was speaking task. The result showed that there was a difference in students' speaking skill especially in term of pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar through speaking task in the application of Information Gap technique.

Keywords: information gap technique, speaking skill

INTRODUCTION

Speaking is one of important ability for students in learning language because it is used to carry out a communication among the people. Speaking is a way of communication, two people are exchanging information or they have a communication or conversation needs (Doff, 1987). As we know that speaking or oral ability is specific ability to give speaker a chance to express their ideas and opinion with other. Speaking is also called productive skill. Everything which has been read and listened can be expressed through speaking.

In fact, there are many techniques appropriate to teach English skill, which is interesting and it can improve student's oral ability, so teacher can select best technique which make students interested, motivated, and active in learning process. It depends on the teacher's choice of what technique would be suitable with the lesson that the teacher is going to teach, although, as we know that each technique has its strength and weakness.

In this research, the researcher used Information Gap activity as technique in teaching speaking. By the using this technique, it is assumed that students speak actively in the class, so information gap can be practiced in a pair or group work. According to Neu and Reeser (1997) in information gap activity, one person has certain that must be shared with others in order to solve problem, gather information or make decisions. By approving information gap technique, the students will be comfortable to speak everything, teacher only gives simple explanation about the activity and give example vocabulary needed for this

activity. Then, the students can get opportunity to develop their speaking ability and they will be easier and succeed in their study. Information Gap technique has many various tasks such as finding difference, finding missing information, discovering identical pairs, giving direction. But in this research the writer tried to analyze quantity and quality of speaking based on some tasks of Information Gap.

METHOD

This research applied a Quasi-experimental design that involved periodic measurements on the dependent variable for a group of test units. This was a quasi-experiment because there was no randomization of test units to treatments, and the timing of treatment presentation, as well as which test units are exposed to the treatment, may not be within the researcher's control (Gay, 2006). The population of this research was the second year students of SMP N 4 Bandar Lampung in academic year of 2014/2015. The researcher used one class as the sample of the research. The class is 8L that consists of 27 students, the class is chosen by using Purposive Random Sampling through lottery drawing. The instrument of this research was speaking task. The researcher conducted speaking task to find out the application of information gap to improve speaking skill. In conducting the task, the researcher provided three topics in three meetings. The test is orally.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

The quantity of speaking is measured by three elements, namely time of speaking, the number of turn taking, and the number of c-units, but in this research the researcher used two elements of quantity of speaking that is time of speaking and turn taking. In analyzing quantity of speaking in term of time of speak and turn taking, the researcher used Repeated Measure t-test or Paired Sample Test to test the hypotesis. By seeing the probability level (p) which h is shown by two tail significance as the value of significance, we can draw the conclusion (Setiyadi, 2006:172).

The result of students' speaking in term of time of speaking in Quantity of speaking shown that the first pair that was 1st topic and 2nd topic. Students' speaking time in the 1st topic was 331,62 and in the 2nd topic was 221,38 (difference of 110.231) showed its significant value that is 0,000 ($p < 0,05$). And then the second pair, students' speaking time in the 1st topic was 331.62 and in the 3rd topic was 306.38 (difference 25.231) showed its significant value that is 0,0336. And for the last pair that was 2nd topic and 3rd topic. Students' speaking time, 2nd topic was 221,38 and 3rd topic was 306.38 (difference of -85,00) showed its significant value that is 0,00 ($p < 0,05$).

The result showed from the Quantity of Speaking Turn taking, 1st topic was 22.38 and 2nd topic was 24.31 (difference of 1.923) showed it significant value that is 0,0241 ($p < 0,05$). The second pair that was, 1st topic and 3rd topic. For students' turn taking, 1st topic was 22.38 and 3rd topic was 27.69 (difference of -5038)

showed its significant value that is 0,001. And for the last pair that was 2nd topic and 3rd topic. Students' turn taking, 2nd topic was 24,31 and 3rd topic was 27,69 (difference of -3,385) showed its significant value that is 0,002 ($p < 0,05$). From the result it can be concluded that in each pairs have significant difference, and 3rd topic that was Giving direction have more time and more turn taking better from another topics.

In this research, researcher only analyzed three aspects of speaking that is Pronunciation, Vocabulary, and Grammar and would be describe as follow:

a. Pronunciation

In Evaluating of Students' pronunciation, the researcher used students' score in evaluating students. Given three different topic in each meeting. For the 1st topic that was finding missing information the researcher analyze each topic by tested the aspect of speaking. Based on the result of analyzed quality of speaking, it is showed that their students' pronunciation, some of them were in category "Poor: *Influenced by the mother tongue but only a few serious phonological errors*". Their intonation also still lack in making higher and lower when they made a conversation. They have mispronounced the word "*dozen/dazen/ instead of /' dʌzn*". For the second topic that is Finding Difference, the researcher found some improvement of students' pronunciation. Only four pair students was slightly influenced by their mother tongue. And for the last topic that is Giving direction, the students had improvement from their first and second treatment. Only a few students were slightly influenced by their mother tongue.

b. Vocabulary

In the aspect of vocabulary, the researcher found most of students still lack in producing words. In the first topic that is finding missing information, only two students who got scored 25. Its means that students' vocabulary was still poor. Most of students have very limited vocabulary and sometimes the rephase idea. Moreover in the second topic that was finding difference, there was significant difference in the students' score in vocabulary, there were 8 students who got score 23-26 and most of them got score 20-22, they still difficult to choice suitable words in their dialogue. And in the last topic that was Giving Direction, there was not significant difference from the second topic.

c. Grammar

In the aspect of grammar, in the first topic only one students who reached score 24. This students' grammar was good. Because only a few grammatical error in this dialogue. Meanwhile, there are 21 students who got score 18-20. Their grammar were poor. They got low score because the researcher found that students could not use the right *to be* and *verb* using past tense. For example "where did he buy at penny's flower?" and Mostly their answered using the wrong grmmar, like "he buy flowers at pennys' flower" the sentence should be used verb two "he bought flowers at pennys' flower". Beside that, in the second topic that is finding difference had same trouble with the first topic. Most of students have a few grammatical error. But only one or two errors causing confusion"

(there is two spoon in the table ... hmmm. In my picture. How about you? In my picture different there is... three spoon). The sentence showed that students still confused using to be, the sentence should be “there are” not “there is” . and students’s score grammar in the last topic, there are some improvement from first topic and the second topic. But at least, they still maked mistakes in the same point. Sometimes they didn’t use to be before verb, noun, or adverb for example “*where the museum? Where the bakery?’*”.

Discussion

From the finding it can be seen that there was a significant difference in students’ speaking skill even there was an improvement. The improvement on the students’ sepaking skil could be assumed as the result of the intervention of Information Gap technique, by which the students could practice speaking through interacting communicatively. This finding approved by Brown’s (2001) theory that as learners interact with each other through oral or written discourse, their communicative abilities are enchanced. The result of this research report that the intervention was effective in improving or enchancing students’ speaking ability.

The researcher has given three different topic of information gap technique to students that is Finding missing information, finding difference, and giving direction. In each topic have improvement in every meeting. It can be seen from score of aspect of speaking namely pronunciation, Grammar, and vocabulary. Students’ pronunciation in three diffrent topic improve from 25,08-25,12-25,23. From the students’ vocabulary was also improvement from 21,77 to 22,50, and 27,69. And for students’ grammar in three different topic increase from 19,62-

20,38-21,12. From those data, it can be said that the students became more fluent in speaking English, more concerned on producing grammatically correct utterances, and the students more concerned on producing every single word in each meeting or treatment. The researcher assumed that it might be caused by students usually used a conversation or dialog orally.

The researcher then tried to trace proof whether those differences (improvements) really indicate a significant difference. By using the same formula of testing hypothesis that is Repeated Measured t-test or Paired Sample Test. Those gains were analyzed statistically by doing pair with each topic. The gain of Pronunciation in the first pair (Pair 1 and Pair 2) (0,38) showed its significant value, that is 0,00857 ($p < 0,05$), for the second pair (Pair 1 and pair 3) the gain of pronunciation was (0,154) showed its significant value that is 0,0557 ($p < 0,05$), for the third pair (pair 2 and pair 3) the gain is 0,115 showed its significant value that is 0,00502 ($p < 0,05$). While for Vocabulary, in the first pair (Pair 1 and Pair 2) the gain of vocabulary (0,731) showed its significant value that is 0,037 ($p < 0,05$), the gain of vocabulary for the second pair (Pair 1 and Pair 3) (5,923) showed its significant value that is 0,000 ($p < 0,05$) and also for the third pair (Pair 2 and pair 3) the gain of vocabulary was (5,192) showed its significant value that is 0,001 ($p < 0,05$).

And then for the gain of Grammar in the first pair (Pair 1 and pair 2) that was (0,692) with significant value that was 0,000 ($p < 0,05$) for the second pair (Pair 1 and pair 3) the gain of grammar was (1,423) its showed significant value that is 0,000 ($p < 0,05$), and also in the third pair (pair 2 and pair 3) (0,731) showed its significant value that is 0,025 ($p < 0,05$). (see appendix 11). based on analysis

therefore, the researcher concluded that the students' speaking skill which involves its 3 aspect do improve as the effect of the application of information gap technique.

In this research, the researcher has given three different tasks with different topics in each meeting to students. In evaluating the tasks, the researcher used quantity and quality of speaking. In the quantity of speaking, researcher evaluating students with count how much time and turn taking could produce students and for the quality of speaking, the researcher used aspect of speaking such as pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar. The researcher has given three topic that is Finding Missing information, finding difference, and giving direction.

Based on the result of analyzed quality of speaking, its shown that their students' pronunciation, some of them were in category "Poor: Influenced by the mother tongue but only a few serious phonological errors".

While for students' grammar, most of them were in category "Poor : *Grammar and words make comprehension difficult most open rephrase sentence and/or restrict them to basic pattern. Several grammatical errors, some of which cause confusion (what.... is.... um he buy).* And the rest of them were in category " Fair to Poor: Make Frequent errors grammar and word order, which obscures meaning. *A few grammatical errors. But only one or two errors causing confusion*" (*how did.... he pay... chocolate?*)"

For students' vocabulary most of them were in category " Poor: *misuses of word and very limited vocabulary and sometimes students repeated word.*

Evaluating the 1st, the researcher asked the students to be more concerned with the aspect of speaking namely Pronunciation, Vocabulary, and Grammar. In the 2nd topic the researcher did the same procedures or rules, from opening until closing the teaching learning process as what did in the first topic. The second topic was Finding difference, the researcher reminded the students to be more concerned with the speaking aspect. For students' pronunciation most of them were categorized into criteria "Good to average: *is slightly influenced by the mother tongue (Bahasa Indonesia). Most utterances are correct.* And the rest was categorized into criteria "Fair to Poor: *is still moderately influenced by the mother tongue (Bahasa Indonesia) but no serious phonological errors.*

While for Grammar aspect, most of the students were categorized into criteria "Fair to Poor: *Make frequent errors of grammar and word order, which obscure meaning. A few grammatical error. But only one or two errors causing confusion*" (*there is two spoon in the table ... hmmm. In my picture. How about you? In my picture different there is... three spoon*). And the rest was categorized into criteria "Poor" *Grammar and word other make comprehension difficult must often rephrase sentence and/or restrict them to basic pattern (is there any table... in your picture? There is... any table.. in my picture)*

The last aspect is vocabulary, most of the students were categorized into criteria "Fair to Poor: *Frequently uses the wrong word, conversation somewhat limited because inadequate vocabulary*" (*is there any refrigerator.. in you picture? Yes, there is .. any refrigerator in my picture.?* And the rest was categorized into criteria "Poor: *Miss uses of words and very limited vocabulary make comprehensive quite difficult.*

The last topic was Giving direction. The researcher noticed some point. There were some improvement of students' speaking skill. Most of students can more communicate each other. For pronunciation aspect, most of students were categorized into criteria "Good To Average: *Slightly influenced by the mother tongue. Most utterances are correct.* And the rest of them was categorized into criteria "Fair to Poor" *is still moderately influenced by the mother tongue (Bahsa Indonesia)) but no serious phonological errors"*

While for grammar aspect, most of students were categorized into criteria "Good to Average" *Occasionally makes grammatical and/or word errors, which do not, however obscures meaning. A few grammatical error" (where i can.... found library? You can find library ummm.... beside museum)* and for the rest was categorized into criteria "Fair to Poor: *make frequent errors of grammar and word order, which obscure meaning.*

The last aspect is vocabulary, most of students were categorized "Good to average: *sometimes uses inappropriate term and/or must rephrase ideas because of lexical inadequacies" (do you ... where is.. the max pizza? Yes, i know where is ... max pizza, max pizza..... in front of ummmmmmm ... the bank.)* and the rest of them were categorized into criteria "Fair to Poor: *Frequently uses the wrong words, conversation somewhat limited because of inadequate vocabulary"*.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the research finding, the conclusion can accordingly be stated as follow:

1. There was a difference in students' speaking skill especially in term of pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar through speaking task in the

application of information gap technique. Moreover, those differences showed an improvement between each different task given. It can be seen from the topic 1 (finding missing information) students' mean score was 66,58 and students' mean score in topic 2 (finding difference) was 67,64 while in topic 3 (giving direction) students' mean score was 68,37. And the analysis of Repeated Measure T-test shows that there is significant difference and significant improvement of students' speaking skill in every topic. The improvement of students' speaking skill was due to the strength of Information Gap technique which gave enhancement toward the aspect of speaking.

2. In term of quantity of speaking, the three tasks have significant difference and topic that could produce more time and more turn taking was topic three (giving direction topic).
3. In term of quality of speaking, pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary. Three tasks also have significant difference, it can be seen from score each topic. And the task could produce better pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar is topic three (giving direction).

From the three points mentioned above, it can be restated that Information Gap technique could improve students' speaking skill and gave good effect on the students' performance. And the topic Giving Direction is one of the suitable topic for the application of Information Gap Technique at a speaking class and it also gives a good effect on students' speaking skill during the teaching learning process.

REFERENCES

- Brown, H. Douglas. 2001. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. San Fransisco: State University.
- Doff, Adrian. 1987. *Teaching English*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Gay, L. R. 2006. *Educational Research*. London : Longman.
- Neu. H. And Reeser, T.W. 1997. *Parle-moi-un! PEU Information Gap Activities For The Beginners*. Paris: Boston Heinle and Heinle.
- Setiyadi, A.G. Bambang. 2006. *Metode Penelitian untuk Pengajaran Bahasa Asing*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.