

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF POSTER Vs VIDEO IN SPEAKING SKILL OF EFL LEARNERS

Zakky Yavani

yavaniaja@gmail.com

Nur Anani

nur.anani123@gmail.com

IAIN Syekh Nurjati, Cirebon

Abstract: *EFL Learners' difficulties in speaking are complex. Often times, the problems are on what to speak which leads the EFL learners hesitate and become not confidence when speaking. This study aims to know the effectiveness of poster and video in assisting students when speaking. Using quasi experimental method by setting X AK2 class as an experimental (using poster) and PM2 class as control group (using video), Independent sample t-test was used to test the hypothesis in this study. the finding shows that using poster significantly gives affects more on students' speaking performance. This conclusion is based on the significance value calculation of 0.000 which is smaller than 0.05. while, t-count (4.870) is higher than t-table (1.994). Therefore, the hypothesis of this study is accepted. It means that the using poster significantly improves the students' speaking ability in the English teaching.*

Key words: *Poster, Video, Speaking Skill, EFL learners*

Introduction

For EFL learners, there are four basic skills that they have to master namely listening, reading, speaking, and writing. Those four have their own challenges to master, and speaking is the skill that could be a predictor showing one master foreign language; that is able to speak the language. Tarigan (1990) define speaking as the ability to pronounce sound or

word to express or deliver thought, idea or feeling, opinion and wish. While to Brown (2000) speaking means the interaction between two modes of performance applies especially to conversation.

Mastering speaking skill is important in learning foreign language, yet to master the skill is not that simple. Often times, students' difficulty begin from deciding what to speak. Prior to produce utterances, students are struggling to decide a content to address when speaking and to negotiate when interacting. Bygate in (Derakhshan, Khalili, & Beheshti, 2016) identified two elements that occurs when speaking: it is a combination of production skill and interaction skill. In production skill, speaking ability take place without time limit environment and in interaction skill, there is a negotiation between learners. Therefore, speaking is a complex activity.

lead them to have less confidence when speaking. Zhang in Al nakhalah (2016) argued that speaking still become mostly a difficult skill to master for most of EFL learners the fact is that they are still less competent to communicate orally in English. Ur in Al nakhalah (2016), describes factors that could hinder someone's speaking as follows: (1) Students feel worried about committing mistakes, afraid of critics of others, or simply shy. (2) Students have no idea that motivate them to be expressed when speaking. (3) Students have less chance to practice. Usually, only one participant can talk at a time because of large classes and the tendency of some learners to dominate, while others speak very little or not to speak at all. (4). Students tendency to use mother-tongue. Learners who share the same mother tongue tend to use it because it is easier and because learners feel less exposed if they are speaking their mother tongue. Therefore, to note the difficulty in learning the skill, such as the existence of learning methods and learning media that possibly ease learners to master the skill is very important.

Teaching Speaking

English language teachers use many ways to teach speaking just as drilling or memorization of dialogues. However, to speaks is more than just reproducing the utterances it should improve students' communicative skills, which adress to speak correctly in appropriate context and fit to the person we talk to. According to Nunan (2003), Teaching speaking

should; (1) use words and sentence stress, intonation patterns and the rhythm of the second language; (2) select appropriate words and sentences according to the proper social setting, audience, situation and subject matter; (3) organize their thoughts in a meaningful and logical sequence; (4) use language as a means of expressing values and judgments; and (5) Use the language quickly and confidently with few unnatural pauses, which is called fluency.

Meanwhile, Hughes (2002) define the goal of teaching speaking is to communicate efficiently. So, in learning speaking, students should be able to make themselves understood and they should try to avoid confusion in the message due to its pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary and to observe the social rule that apply in communication situation. However, a teacher needs to make the speaking class to be fun and enjoyable. Teacher has to create activities that give students many opportunities to practice speaking to their peers. So, enjoyable and fun activities will certainly boost students' secure feeling to speak more and express their feeling freely. Eventually, to note the difficulty in learning the skill, the existence of learning methods and learning media that possibly ease learners to master the skill is important.

Learning and Media

Learning is a complex activity. It is the involvement of selection, and delivery of information in an appropriate environment and the way we interact with the information (Smaldino et al, 2012). Hence, media in teaching and learning process is very crucial. It is to bridge or ease the complexity. According to Briggs in Ekayani (2017) learning media is the physical means to deliver the content of the material: books, movies, videos, posters etc. these can be considered instructional media when providing message for instructional purposes.

Poster

Posters are commonly used to explain something using pictures or photographs accompanied by textual cues or captions. In this study, the purpose of the posters is to encourage student participation and provide controlled practice in a given English structure or concept hoping that students would get benefits when producing utterances when speaking. Susilana R and Riana.C (2009) explains that the poster is a combination of visual

presentation which is clear, conspicuous, and attractive with a view to attract the attention of passersby. Reilly (2007) claims that posters are essential in teaching EFL. Posters also enhance the confidence of teachers with limited background in English by giving them a structured way to promote students' speaking. Controlled practice, such as teachers use with posters, serves as scaffolding. In addition,

Some studies have shown that the use of poster could show improvements on students' performances. Triatmajayanti .N (2013) and Khamsiah (2016) concluded that by implementing poster in a story, students get easily organize ideas, it helps them to be more focus on their story, helping them in telling the story fluently, and more make them aware of the text linguistic features. Mulyana.T.N (2012) found that by using Movie Posters improves the students' achievement in writing descriptive.

RESEARCH METHOD

The design used in this study is quasi experimental design. This study aims at finding out the influence of particular treatment Sugiono (2015). In this study the analysis toward students' speaking ability of the first grade of SMK Wahidin Kota Cirebon in the school year 2017-2018 before and after giving treatment was employed.

Table 1: Research Design

	Pre test	Treatment	Post test
Experimental group	O1	X	O2
Control group	O1	-	O2

Where:

O1 : pre test = X : poster media (treatment)

O2 : post test = - : using video

Population and Sample of The Research

The population is the whole subjects that stay in one area and have definite characteristics related to problems of the research that will be investigated Arikunto (2006). The population of this research is all of the first grade of students at SMK Wahidin Kota Cirebon. While, the Sample is the smaller group or subset of population. Sugiono

(2015) states that sample is part of population which representative. The samples were 36 students of X PM 6 class as control class and 36 students of X AK 2 class as experiment class. The total samples of the research were 72 students.

Technique of Data Collection

To conclude the result of the study three steps are implemented; 1) pre-test, 2) treatment, 3) post-test Cohen (2007).

To collect the data about the research, the researcher choose test to measure students' prior knowledge, skill, and ability. It included pre-test and post-test with the same instrument. In order to avoid misunderstanding in students' mind, the researcher informed the kind of test that used in this research. To know students' score of speaking performance, a classification of students' score are based on the following speaking scoring rubric.

Table 2 : Speaking Scoring Rubric Based on Harris, D. P. (1969)

Components	Assessments	Score	
Pronunciation	• The pronunciation is clear and quite understandable for elementary students	5	(95-100)
	• There are some pronunciation problems, but still quite understandable	4	(85-94)
	• Pronunciation problem necessitate listening and occasionally lead a misunderstanding	3	(75-84)
	• Very hard to understand because of pronunciation problem. Must frequently be asked to repeat	2	(65-74)
	• Pronunciation problem so severe as to make speech virtually unintelligible	1	(below 65)
Grammar	• Errors in grammar are quite rare	5	(95-100)
	• There are few grammatical errors but still intelligible	4	(85-94)
	• Makes frequent errors grammar and word order occasionally obscure meaning	3	(75-84)
	• Grammar and word order errors make comprehension difficult. Must often rephrase sentences or restrict him to basic patterns	2	(65-74)
	• Errors in grammar and word order so severe as to make speech virtually unintelligible	1	(below 65)

Vocabulary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Almost all vocabularies used are in a proper use 	5	(95-100)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequently use inappropriate terms or must replace ideas but still intelligible 	4	(85-94)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequently uses the wrong word, conversation somewhat limited because of inadequate vocabulary 	3	(75-84)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Misuse up words and very limited vocabulary make comprehension quite difficult 	2	(65-74)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vocabulary limitation so extreme as to make conversation virtually impossible 	1	(below 65)
Fluency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Able to use the language fluently, rare skip, and the speed of speech are at the normal rate 	5	(95-100)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speed of speech seem to be slightly affected by language problem 	4	(85-94)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speed and fluency are rather strongly affected by language problem 	3	(75-84)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Usually hesitant often forced into silent by language limitation 	2	(65-74)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speech is so halting and fragmentary as to make conversation virtually impossible 	1	(below 65)
Comprehension	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand most of what is said at average speed 	5	(95-100)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand what is said at average speed, but occasional repetition may be necessary 	4	(85-94)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand what is said is at slower than average speed repetition 	3	(75-84)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has great difficulty following what is said. Can comprehend only, “social conversation” spoken slowly and with frequent repetition. 	2	(65-74)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cannot be said to understand even simple conversational English 	1	(below 65)

Technique of Data Analysis

In analyzing the data from the test, several analysis with different steps are employed.

1. The average of the test

$$M = \frac{\sum N}{n}$$

<p>M = Average $\sum N$ = Total of score N = Total of students</p>

2. Testing Normality (One sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test)

Before the test result processed, researcher conducted test of normality againts the test itself in order to determine the distribution used. According to Sujarweni (2014), data normality test should be done before the data is processe. Good data and fit for use in this study is that the data has a normal distribution. Normality can be viewed by using Kolmogorov Smirnov test Normal.

3. Test Homogeneity

It is necessary to test whether or not the sample variance was homogeneous. Homogeneity test is used to determine whether multiple variants of the same population exist or no by using SPSS version 21.

4. T- test (Independent Sample Test)

Regarding the assumption of normality of experimental class and control class data is fulfilled, then further to see difference of two mean value of experiment class and control class is done by Independent Sample test.

Hypothesis Test

The data from the field, the analyze and do the testing of hypotesis. The hypothesis of statistic that used in this research is:

$$H_0 : \mu_1 = \mu_2$$

$$H_a : \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$$

H₀ : Null Hypothesis

H_a : Alternative Hypothesis

μ_1 : The students' speaking ability, who are taught by using poster media.

μ_2 : The students' speaking ability, who are taught using video

The assumption of the hypothesis as follows:

1. If $t\text{-test} > t\text{-table}$ in significant level of 5%, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that there is significant difference between the students' speaking ability by using poster media and the students' speaking ability without using poster media at the first grade students of SMK Wahidin Kota Cirebon ($\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$). The use of poster media is influence to improve students' speaking ability.
2. 2. If $t\text{-test} < t\text{-table}$ in significant level of 5%, the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternative hypothesis is rejected. It means that there is no significant difference between the students' speaking ability by using poster media and the students' speaking

ability without using poster media at first grade students of SMK Wahidin Kota Cirebon ($\mu_1 = \mu_2$). The use of poster media is not influence to improve students' speaking ability.

FINDING

Students' speaking ability before using poster media

1. Statistical Description

Table 3
Statistics

		Pre- Test Experimental Class	Pre- Test Control Class
N	Valid	36	36
	Missing	0	0
Mean		50.3333	51.4444
Mode		48.00	44.00
Minimum		36.00	36.00
Maximum		68.00	72.00
Sum		1812.00	1852.00

Based on table statistics above the number of respondents of experiment class and control class are 36 students. Missing 0 indicates that the missing data is zero, thus no data has not been processed. The mean or average pretest experiment is 50.33. Mode obtained 48 while the minimum and maximum value of each of 36 and 68 with the total pretest experiment class 1812. While Mean or average pretest control class of 51.44, Mode obtained 44 while the minimum and maximum value of each of 36 and 72 with the total pretest control of 1852.

2. Normality Test

According to Sujarweni (2014), data normality test should be done before the data is processed by the research model. Normality test is performed to determine whether the data is normally distributed or not. In this discussion, the normality test was performed using the

Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Basic decision-making in testing the normality of pretest experimental class and control class by using Kolmogorov-Smirnov test are:

- Sig value. or significance or probability value > 0.05 , then the data is normally distributed.
- Sig value. or significance or probability value < 0.05 , then the data is not normally distributed data.

Table 4
One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Pre- Test Experimental Class	Pre- Test Control Class
N		36	36
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	50.3333	51.4444
	Std. Deviation	8.57238	10.82443
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.117	.153
	Positive	.117	.153
	Negative	-.115	-.091
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.704	.916
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.704	.371

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

Normality test results in the test of normality table above the pre test of experimental class, data showed significant value on the kolmogorov test of 0.704. Because the significant value is above 0.05. Then, the pretest data of the experimental class is normally distributed. The pretest data of the control class, data showed significant value on the kolmogorov test of 0.371. Because the significant value is above 0.05. Then the control class preview data is normally distributed.

3. Homogeneity Test

Homogeneity test is done to know the similarity between state or population. To test the homogeneity of the two samples was done by analyzing the respective variance of the data. Here are the results of the homogeneity test performed:

Table 5 Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Pre- Test			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.

3.711	1	70	.058
-------	---	----	------

The result table of homogeneity test *Lavene Test* above shows that the level of significance or probability value is above 0.05, hence H_0 is accepted, meaning that the data comes from a population having the same variance.

Students' speaking ability after using poster media

1. Statistical Description

Table 6
Statistics

		Post- Test Experimental Class	Post- Test Control Class
N	Valid	36	36
	Missing	0	0
Mean		76.6667	68.7778
Mode		76.00	72.00
Minimum		60.00	52.00
Maximum		88.00	80.00
Sum		2760.00	2476.00

Based on table statistics above the number of respondents of experiment class and control class are 36 students. Missing 0 indicates that the missing data is zero, thus no data has not been processed. The mean or average posttest of experiment class is 76.67. Mode obtained 76 while the minimum and maximum value of each of 60 and 88 with the total number of posttest experimental is 2760. While Mean or average posttest of control class is 68.78, Mode obtained 72 while the minimum and maximum value of each of 52 and 80 with total number of posttest control is 2476.

2. Normality Test

Normality test is performed to determine whether the data is normally distributed or not. In this discussion, the normality test was performed using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test.

Basic decision-making in testing normality of posttest experimental class and control class by using Kolmogorov-Smirnov test are:

- Sig value. or significance or probability value > 0.05 , then the data is normally distributed.
- Sig value. or significance or probability value < 0.05 , then data is not normally distributed data.

Table 7
One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Post- Test Experimental Class	Post- Test Control Class
N		36	36
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	76.6667	68.7778
	Std. Deviation	6.08511	7.57858
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.155	.192
	Positive	.155	.087
	Negative	-.151	-.192
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.928	1.155
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.355	.139

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

Based on the the result normality test on the table above posttestexperimental class showed significant value on the kolmogorov test of 0.355, because the significant value is above 0.05. Thus, the posttest data of the experimental class is normally distributed.

The normality test of posttestcontrol class showed significant value on kolmogorov test of 0.139, because the significant value is above 0.05. Then, the posttest data of the control class is normally distributed.

3. Homogeneity Test

Homogeneity test is done to know the similarity between state or population. To test the homogeneity of the two samples was done by analyzing the respective variance of the data. Here are the results of the homogeneity test performed:

Table 8

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Post- Test

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
2.245	1	70	.139

The result table of homogeneity test Levene Test above shows that the level of significance or probability value is above 0.05, hence H₀ is accepted, meaning that the data comes from a population having the same variance.

The influence of Students in Speaking Ability with Using Poster Media

T- test (Independent Sample Test)

Regarding the assumption of normality of experiment and control data is fulfilled, then further to see difference of two experiment and control mean value is done by Independent Sample test. The hypothesis for this test is formulated as follows:

H₀: There is no difference posttest experiment class with posttest control class

H_a: There is difference posttest experiment class with posttest control class

Table 9

Group Statistics

	Class	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Post- Test	Experimental	36	76.6667	6.08511	1.01419
	Control	36	68.7778	7.57858	1.26310

Based on Group Statistics table above shows the number of respondents of each experiment class and control 36 students. The average posttest experiment was 76.6667 with standard deviation is 6,08511. While The average posttest control was 68,7778 with standard deviation 7.57858. Thus there is a difference average between post-experiment and post test control.

Table 12

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	t-test for Equality of Means
--	---	------------------------------

		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Post-Test	Equal variances assumed	2.245	.139	4.870	70	.000	7.88889	1.61987	4.65816	11.11962
	Equal variances not assumed			4.870	66.879	.000	7.88889	1.61987	4.65550	11.12227

Basic decision making, namely:

If the value is sig. > 0.05 and t count < t table, then H₀ is accepted

If the value is sig. < 0.05 and t count > t table, then H₀ is rejected

If t-table is searched with $\alpha = 0,05$ and $df = 70$, so t-table = 1.99444

Based on the test results of independent sample test above the significant value of 0.000. Because the significant value is smaller than 0.05 and t-count (4.870) is higher than t-table (1.994) then H₀ is rejected, it means there is difference of posttest experiment class with posttest control class.

DISCUSSION

Both poster and video are beneficially help students in speaking, however poster media seems to have more impacts. This is due to the use of poster and video which are a bit different. Using poster, students could easily see the picture again and again making them have more experience when they are about to express idea, Yule (2010) highlighted speaking as the category system inherent in the language determines how the speaker interprets and articulates experience. Video media, in fact, also help students to improve. However, when begin to talk most of students apparently miss some informations in the video. The problem is simply on the availability of sources. The former gives a chance to engage the source anytime; students are easily see the poster when speaking. Sudjana and Rivai (2010) poster in learning is as a driver which direct the flow of information about an issue. While the latter, students need more concentration to remember the information; students can not see the video when performing.

CONCLUSION

The conclusion of this research study is supported by three findings. The pre-test result of the experimental class revealed that the mean score was 50.33. Meanwhile, the post-test result showed that the mean score was 76.67. It improved by 26.34 gain. It can be concluded that the students' speaking ability of the experimental group was significantly improved. The pre-test result of the control class illustrated that the mean was 51.44. Meanwhile, the mean score for the post-test was 68.78. It improved by 17.34 gain. It can be concluded that the students' speaking ability of the control group was slightly improved. The post-test result showed that the mean score of the experimental class was higher than the control class. The mean score of experimental group in the post-test was 76.67 while the control group was 68.78. Then, the standard of school or KKM is 75.00. It indicates the average of students in experimental class have achieved the standard score and students in control class did not yet achieved the standard score. It means that in teaching speaking, students who were taught by using poster media had higher scores than those who were not.

Based on the calculation of t-test, the result of the student's speaking ability to first grade students of SMK Wahidin Kota Cirebon is t-count (4.870) is higher than t-table (1.994.) then Null hypothesis (H₀) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted. The results of the research show that there is a significant difference in the speaking ability between the students who were taught by poster media and those who were not taught by poster. Therefore, the hypothesis of this study is accepted. It means that the poster media significantly improves the students' speaking ability in the English teaching at SMK Wahidin Kota Cirebon.

REFERENCES

- Al nakhalah, A. M. M. (2016). Problems and Difficulties of Speaking That Encounter English Language Students at Al Quds Open University. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, 5, 2319–7722.
- Arikunto, S. (2006). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Teaching by Principle* (2nd ed.). California: Longman.
- Cohen, L, et al. (2007). *Research Method in Education* (6th ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Derakhshan, A., Khalili, A. N., & Beheshti, F. (2016). Developing EFL Learner's Speaking

- Ability, Accuracy and Fluency. *Canadian Center of Science and Education*, 6(2).
- Ekayani, N. L. P. (2017). Pentingnya Penggunaan Media Pembelajaran Untuk Meningkatkan Prestasi Belajar Siswa.
- Harris, D. P. (1969). *Testing English As a Second Language*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Khamsiah. (2016). *Improving Students' Speaking Skill in Expressing Personal Identity through Picture Media at Grade VII A SMPN 1 Tandun*. University of Pasir Pengaraian.
- Mulyana, T. N. (2012). *Improving Students Achievement in Writing Descriptive Paragraph by Using Movie Posters at SMA Negeri 1 Galang*. State University of Medan.
- Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical english language teaching*, Singapore: Mc Grew Hill.
- Hughes, R. (2002). *Teaching and Researching Speaking*. Pearson Education. Great Britain.
- Reilly, P. (2007). Using practice posters to address EFL challenges. *English Teaching Forum Journal. Mexico*.
- Smaldino, S.E et al. (2012). *instructional technology and media for learning*. Ohio: Pearson.
- Sudjana, N., & Rivai, A. (2010). *Media Pengajaran*. Bandung: Sinar Baru Algensindo.
- Sugiono. (2015). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, and R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sujarweni, V. Wiratna. 2014. *Metode Penelitian: Lengkap, Praktis, dan Mudah Dipahami*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Baru Press.
- Susilana, R., & Cipi, R. (2009). *Media Pembelajaran*. Bandung: CV. Wacana Prima.
- Tarigan, H. G. (1990). *Membaca Sebagai Suatu Keterampilan Berbicara*. Bandung: Angkasa.
- Triatmajayanti, N. (2013). *Using Posters to Improve The Eight Grades' Skills in Speaking at SMP Negeri 2 Malang*. State University of Malang.
- Yule, G. (2010). *The Study of Language* ((4th ed.)). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.