BORNEO JOURNAL OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION

VOLUME 3 NOMOR 1 TAHUN 2021
ISSN: 2654-329X

THE EFFECT OF INFORMATION GAP TECHNIQUE ON STUDENTS' SPEAKING ACHIEVEMENT AT THE EIGHTH GRADERS OF SMPN 11 TARAKAN

Sakina, Ridwan
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Borneo Tarakan University, Tarakan
Email: sakina.noy12@gmail.com

Abstract

This research aims to find out the effect of using the information Gap technique in improving student speaking achievement at eighth-grade students of SMP Negeri 11 Tarakan. The method used in this research was quasi-experimental. The population of this research was 58 students. The researcher used purposive sampling in took a sample. In collecting the data, the researcher used a speaking test. Before treatment, the researcher gave Pretest. After that, the researcher gave treatment. After treatment, the researcher gave a posttest. The mean score of each test was compared to know the student's improvement in speaking. The mean score of pretests in the experimental class was 45.17, and in the control, class was 46.90. The mean score of posttests in the experimental class was 70.17, and in the control, class was 65.69. The score of posttests of the experimental class was higher than the control class. The result of the independent sample t-test showed that the t-test (2.204) higher than the t-table (1.673). It was concluded that the information gap technique has a significant effect on student speaking achievement at SMPN 11 Tarakan.

Keyword: Information Gap, Speaking Achievement

INRODUCTION

Speaking is one of the skills besides writing, listening, and reading. Speaking is the process of building and sharing meaning thought in verbal and symbol of varieties in context. By speaking, we express our ideas and our thoughts. According to Thornbury (2005:08), speaking is produced utterance-by-utterance. In response to the word-by-word and utterance-by-utterance production of the people talking, it also normally happens in real-time. It showed that speaking skill is to produce words to communicate with each other and happen in real-time.

Unfortunately, in Indonesia, based on the report of *English Proficiency Index* (Education first, 2019) Indonesia's speaking skill was on the 61st out of 100 nations with the score 50,06. Meanwhile in Asia was on 13th rank out of 25 countries. Moreover, research done by Rahimi (2016) showed that the mean score of student's

speaking skills of MAN 2 Semarang was 70,76. Furthermore, Wijayanti (2017) found that the mean score of student's speaking ability MTS Al-Muhajirin Pacitan was 71,6. It is in line with the interviewed result conducted in SMPN 11 Tarakan. Some of the students do not have the confidence to speak up. When the teacher asked them to speak, they prefer to keep silent. In addition, when the teacher asked them to practice or perform the speaking activity, they are reluctant to do it because they felt shy to show it and afraid to speak up. Besides, the student has a lack of vocabulary.

Furthermore, the less varied and exciting technique is one of the main causes of this problem. The effect is the students feel bored and exhausted cause the teacher only uses the conventional technique to teach the student in the class. In the speaking activity, sometimes, the students speak by using written text or practice dialog. They do not use their own words in the activity. There is no real communication in the activity; therefore, the goal of speaking activities is not reaching.

From the problem stated above, one of the alternative techniques that can be used to solve the problem by students that implement an interesting technique, engaging and challenging in speaking time, and communicating in real-life situations is using the information gap. Defrioka (2016:116) found that the implementation of information gap technique can improve the students' speaking skills; the student-centered class included pair work and group work, contributing to improving outcomes. Then the students were active in interacting with their teacher and other students.

The used of information gap to improve speaking achievement is a beneficial technique to apply in a classroom, the teacher only gives a simple explanation about the activity to the student and review the vocabulary needed of the student and then let them speak, and also, they become more comfortable to speak by their own word. This technique also allows all the students to speak up naturally.

Harmer (2007:129) states that an information gap technique is where two speakers have different information bits. They can only complete the whole picture by sharing that information because they have different information, and there is a gap

between them. In information gap, each speaker in the conversation has information, but the other speaker has no information that needs to know.

Based on the explanation, the researcher is interested in making an effort to find out whether the use of Information gap technique show can improve students' speaking achievement and conduct the research "The effect of Information Gap on students' speaking achievement at the eighth of graders SMPN 11 Tarakan".

METHODOLODY

This research used experimental research design as one of the kinds in a quantitative method. According to Creswell (2014:156), experimental research is to tests the impact of a treatment (or an intervention) on an outcome, controlling for all other factors that might influence that outcome. In experimental design, the researcher using treatment to class to know the impact of the treatment. Furthermore, Creswell (2014:54) quantitative research approaches objective testing theories by examining the relationship among variables. There were three kinds of design in experimental design; pre-experimental, true experimental, and quasi-experimental design.

This research used quasi-experimental to conduct the experiment, quasi-experimental is the method when the researcher not possible to assign subject to groups randomly states by Gay et al. (2012: 270) supporting that thought, Creswell (2014:168) states that quasi-experimental is a form of experimental research in which individuals are not randomly assigned to groups. Based on the expert stated above, quasi-experimental is a research design that has treatment, and in determining the sample, the researcher cannot assign the population in school. Naturally formed intact group. Therefore, the research may choose the class, which will be control class and experimental class.

Gay et al. (2012: 270) states that quasi-experimental divide into three types. There are the nonequivalent control group design, counterbalanced design, and the time-series design. In this research, the researcher uses the nonequivalent control group design. Gay et al. (2012:270) state that the nonequivalent control design is like the pretest-posttest control group design except that the nonequivalent control group design does not involve random assignment.

Nonequivalent Control Group Design

Group	Pre-test	Treatment	Post-test
Experiment	O	X1	O
Control	O	X2	O

X1: Information Gap Technique

X2: Think-Pair-Share (TPS) Technique

O: Pre-Test

O: Post-Test

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

1. The Students' Score of Pretest and Posttest

In this research, the researcher described the result of pretest and posttest as below:

a. Pretest

Based on the student's score from the pretest, the researcher concluded that the number of students in frequency distribution students' speaking achievement score was classified into five predicated presented in the table below.

Classification of Students' Score in Pretest

Category	Ra-nge	Experime-ntal group Frequency	Control Group Frequency
Very good	86-100	0	0
	71-85		
Good	56-70	0	0
Fair	41-55	4	4
Poor	<40	14	15
Very Poor		11	10
Total		29	29

Based on the table above, the student's speaking achievement score in experimental class from 29 students it can be seen there are four students (14%) who got fair category, 14 students (48%) got Poor category, and 11 students (38%) Very Poor category, while none students got very good and Good category.

Meanwhile, the students' speaking achievement test score in control class showed that none students got very Good and good category, it is the same with experimental class. In control class, 4 students (14%) got fair category,15 students (52%) who got Poor category, and 10 students with a percentage (34%) got Very Poor category.

b. Posttest

Based on the student's score from the posttest, the researcher concluded that the number of students in frequency distribution students' speaking achievement score was classified into five predicated presented in the table below.

Classification of Students' Score in Posttest

Category	Ra-nge	Experime-ntal group	Control Group
		Frequency	Frequency
Very good	86-100	0	0
	71-85		
Good	56-70	12	7
Fair	41-55	16	17
Poor	<40	1	5
Very Poor		0	0
Total		29	29

From the table it can be seen speaking skill in experimental group score there were 12 students (41%) who got Good category, and 16 students (55%) who got fair category, in Poor category there was 1 student (3%). There was none student got very good and very poor score.

Meanwhile, the students' speaking skill score in control group showed that there were 7 students (24 %) who got Good category, in fair category 17 students (59%) and 5 students (17%) who got Poor category which none student (0%) got Very Good and Very Poor Category.

2. Hypothesis Testing

a. Normality of the Data

The Result of Normality Test Variance in Experimental class

Based on the result of normality test variance in experimental class computation, it indicated that Asymp.Sig. (2-tailed) of the experimental group was 0,200. It illustrated that the probability score was higher than the level of significance (0,200>0,05). For the probability value of experimental group in pretest and posttest was 0,200 and 0.064, it showed that the probability score was higher than the level of significance, which in the pretest of experimental was (0,200>0,05) and Posttest of Experimental was (0.64>0.05) It means Ha was accepted because Ha stated the sample from the population has a normal distribution.

Treatm-ent class	Sig	The Crite-rian	Decision	Result of Normality Distributed
Pretest	0.200	Sig>0.05	H_o is accepted	Normal
Posttest	0.064	Sig>0.05	H_o is accepted	Normal

The Result of Normality Test Variance in Control class

Based on the result of normality test variance in control class computation, it indicated that Asymp. sig. (2-tailed) of the control group was 0.082 in pretest and 0.166 in the posttest, it illustrated that the probability score was higher than the level of significance in pretests (0,082>0,05) in post-test and (0.166>0,05). It means that Ha was accepted because Ha stated the sample from the population has a normal distribution.

b. Homogeneity of Variance in Pretest and Posttest

The Result of Homogeneity of Variance in Experimental and Control Class

	Levene Statistic	df 1	df 2	Sig
Experimental Class	2.900	1	56	0.094
Control Class	3.277	1	56	0.076

In measuring the homogeneity of variance in the pretest and posttest of experimental and control class, the table above showed the probability value (sig) in experimental class was 0,094 and in control class was 0.076. The result means that the homogeneity of variance shows that the significance value was higher than the level of significance (0,094>0,05) and (0.076>0.05), which indicated that Ha stated the sample was a homogeneous variant. Meanwhile, Ho was rejected because Ho stated that the sample has no Homogenous variants. Based on the result, it can be concluded that two groups (experimental and control) pretest and posttest group was homogenous

3. Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Pretest and Posttest Score

a. Pretest

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation
Experimental Class	29	55	85	70.17	7.379
Control Class	29	50	80	65.69	8.098
Valid N (listwise)	29				

Based on Table, the pretest experiment group showed that the lowest score in experiment class was 25 and the highest score was 60, with a mean score was 45.17 and with a standard deviation was 10.306. meanwhile, the control group's mean score was 46.90, with the lower score was 25, and the highest score was 65 with a standard deviation of 10.808. However, the mean score of experimental group was lower than control group.

b. Posttest

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation
Experimental Class	29	25	60	45.17	10.306
Control Class	29	25	65	45.90	10.808
Valid N (listwise)	29				

Based on the posttest score, the researcher found that the mean score of experimental group was 70.17. Meanwhile, the mean score of control group was 65.69. The standard deviation of Experimental group was 7.378 and 8.098 standard deviation of Control Group. However, the mean score of Experimental group was higher than Control Group.

4. Calculation of T-test

Independent sample T-test of Pretest of Experimental and Control group

Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means				
F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
.369	.546	-.622	56	.537	-1.724	2.773
		-.622	56.874	.537	-1.724	2.773

Independent sample T-test is used to measure the mean score between two independent groups. Based on the result of the data analysis. The degree of freedom (df) was 56. From Ttable statistics, if the degree of freedom was 56, the Ttable score was 1.673. If Ttest lower than Ttable (-.622<-1.673), it means that the two-class have the same knowledge before treatment.

Independent sample T-test of Pretest of Experimental and Control group

Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means				
F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
0.655	.422	2.204	56	.032	4.483	2.034
		2.204	55.521	.032	4.483	2.034

T-test analysis of the pretest of both the experimental class and control class. It could be seen through the result of T-test computation by using SPSS V22,0. The result of the T-test was 2.204. The degree of freedom (df) was 56. From the degree of freedom, the Ttest score was higher than Ttable (2.204>1673), which means that Ha is accepted and Ho is rejected. In other words, it can be concluded that information gap technique has a significant effect on the eighth graders' speaking achievement in SMP 11 Tarakan.

Group	N-Gain (%)	Category
Experiment	44,4	Less effective
Control	35,3%	Ineffective

Based on the N-gain score test calculation result, the average N-gain score for the experimental class was 44,4392 or 44,4%, with categories as less effective. Meanwhile, the control class was 35,3207 or 35,3 %, with categories as ineffective. Therefore, it can be concluded that the use information gap was less effective in learning outcomes, while the use of Think Pair Share was ineffective in improving student speaking achievement at SMPN 11 Tarakan.

CONCLUSION

Regarding this research result, the researcher concluded that the information gap technique significantly affected speaking achievement at eighth-graders of SMP 11 Tarakan. The result was proven by the result of the computation of a mean score

from pretest to posttest in experimental class was higher than t-table, which means that the students speaking achievement have better improved after giving the treatment.

The researcher found that the mean score of student's speaking achievement between pretest to posttest was improved. Before giving the treatment, the researcher found that the pretest's mean score was 45.17; after giving the treatment, the post-test mean score in the experimental class was 70.17. The result of the computation of the t-test was 2.204. it indicated that the t-test was higher than the t-table, where the degree of freedom (df) was 56, and the level of significance was 5% p=95%. (t-test 2.204>t-table 1.6730. it means that the information gap effectively improved students' speaking achievement at the eighth graders of SMPN 11 Tarakan.

REFERENCES

Bailey, K. (2004). *Practical English Language Teaching (PELT): Speaking*. McGraw fill.

Brown, H.D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An active approach to language pedagogy. (2nd Ed).* San Francisco: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

Brown, H.D. (2003). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practice.* San Francisco: Longman,

Blaikie, N. (2003). *Analyzing Quantitative Data: From Description to Explanation.* London: SAGE publication Ltd.

Cook, V. (2008). *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching. (4th Ed).* London: Hodder Education.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research.* Boston: Pearson.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and mixed methods approaches.4thEd.* United State of Amerika: SAGE publications.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language.2nd*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Defrioka A. (2016). *The use of information gap activities in teaching speaking (classroom action research at SMK*). *Lingua Didaktika*;*10* (2), 116-126

Deswita, N. (2012). *The effect of the implementation of information gap technique toward students' speaking ability at private Islamic junior high school Nurul islam of gunung toar district of Kuantan singing regency.* Pekanbaru. Faculty of education and teacher training state Islamic University of sultan Syarif kasim Riau.

Fulcher, G. (2014). *Testing Second Language Speaking*. New York: Routledge

Fraenkel, Jack, R, & Norman, E. Wallen. (2005). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education. 6th (Ed)*. Singapore. McGraw-Hill.

Gay, L.R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Competencies for analysis and applications.10th Ed*. Boston: Pearson.

Goh, C. C. M., & Burns, A. (2012). *Teaching speaking: A holistic approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hasanah, U.E (2008). *Applying Information Gap Activities".* http://nengimoet.blogspot.com/2008/02/applying-information-gap-activities.html. Diakses pada 18-Oktober-2019 jam 19.30

Hake, R.R. 1999. Analyzing Change/Gain Scores. Dept. of Physics Indiana University. Diakses pada http://www.physics.indiana.edu Tanggal 28 Januari 2021

Harmer. J. (2007). *The Practice of English language Teaching. (4th Ed)*. United Kingdom. Pearson Longman

Harmer, J. (2007). *How to Teach English (new edition)*. London: Longman Group Ltd

Hughes, A. (2003). *Testing for Language Teacher. (2nd Ed)*. New York. Cambridge University Press.

Holcomb, E, L. (2001). *Asking the right Question: technique for Collaboration and School Change. (2nd Ed*). California: A Sage Publication Ltd.

Irona A, & Ratmanida. (2018). Using information gap activity in classroom interaction to increase the students' speaking ability. *Journal of English Language Teaching*; *7* (1), 217-218

Kagan, S & Kagan, M. (2009). *Kagan Cooperative learning.* California: Kagan Publishing.

Millis, B.J (2010). *Cooperative Learning in Higher Education: Across the disapplies, Across the academy*. USA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Nuraeni. (2014). *The effectiveness of information-gap toward students' speaking skill (A Quasi-Experimental Research at the Second Grade Students of MTs Khazanah kebajikan Pondok Cabe Ilir)*. Jakarta. Syarif hidayatullah state islamic University

Rahimi, H R. (2016). The use of information gap technique to improve speaking skill. *Journal of English Education, Literature, and Culture***.** *10* (*2*), p.59

Richard, J.C. (2008). *Teaching Listening and Speaking: From Theory to Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge Press University.

Richards, Jack C.; Schmidt, Richard, eds. (2009). *"Information gap". Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. New York: Longman.

Sugiarti, D. (2014). *Using Information-Gap Activities to Improve theEnglish-Speaking Skills of Xi Kr 4 Students at Smk Negeri 3 Yogyakarta In the Academic Year Of 2013/201*. Yogyakarta English language education study program faculty of languages and arts state university.

Thornbury, S. (2005). *How to Teach Speaking*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited

Ur, P. (1988). *Grammar practice activities: A practical guide forteachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wasoki, R.P. (2009) *CliffsNotes The Notebook Teacher's Guide*. USA: Wiley publishing Inc.