

THE EXAMPLES, NON-EXAMPLES TECHNIQUE FOR TEACHING SPEAKING IN ENGLISH

By
Sofyan A. Gani
Veni Nella Syahputri

University of Syiah Kuala, Banda Aceh

ABSTRACT

The objective of this study is to find out whether there is a significant difference in speaking performance between students who are taught using the Examples Non-Examples Technique (ENET) and those who are taught using the Grammar Translation Method (GTM). To achieve the goal of this study, the experimental design method was used with an experimental class and a control class. The sample of study was a class of 45 students as the experimental class and another class of 45 students as the control class. The instruments used for the study were tests. The data was analyzed through statistical formula including finding the frequency distribution, range (R), class of data (K), class of interval (I), mean, standard deviation, and Z-score. The results showed that the Z-score pre-test of experimental and the control classes was 1.3 ($Z \text{ count} < Z \text{ table}$) in which the Z table was 2.04. This means that there was no significant difference between the scores of both classes in pre-treatment. However, in post-treatment the Z-score for the experimental class and control classes was 5.1 ($Z \text{ count} > Z \text{ table}$) which indicated that there was a significant difference between the experimental class and the control class in post-treatment. In conclusion, ENET can be applied as an alternative technique in teaching speaking. The research hypothesis (H_a) is also proven that the use of ENET provides a positive contribution for the development of students' speaking performance.

Key Words: *Examples Non-Examples Technique, Speaking, English Class*

INTRODUCTION

In learning English, there are four basic skills that must be learnt namely: listening speaking, reading, and writing. All of these language skills influence the language ability of the learners especially in speaking. According to the National Education Standards Agency (or *Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan* (BNSP), 2006:126) the aim of teaching speaking at senior high school level is to develop the communicative competence of students in the form of speaking to obtain information. Students are expected to be able to express meaning in both formal and informal spoken transactions and interpersonal exchanges accurately, fluently, and acceptably in the context of daily life for expressing love, sorrow, embarrassment, anger, annoyance, approval, disapproval etc. (ref KD.9.1 and 9.2).

In achieving this goal, teachers must be creative to design communication activities for the classroom. Nunan (2004:21) states that the first task of the teacher is creating the communicative learning activity for the students to use. In other words, the teachers play an important role in selecting and applying the appropriate strategies and techniques that will encourage students to communicate orally. In addition, the teachers need to modify the materials available creatively. Materials are taken from various references such as books, the internet, journals, articles, and seminars. Hence, the teachers should give rewards and appreciation to students who want to share their ideas.

Conversely, Larsen-Freeman (1986:24) mention that language which is learned through the Grammar Translation Method (GTM) leads students to the following problems:

- (a) It makes students easily forget the materials since the students are not active during the teaching learning process
- (b) It decreases students' motivation as it reduces the development of critical thinking
- (c) It encourages students to cheat/copy from each other since the result of the translation is always nearly the same, and
- (d) It provides no communicative learning activity in the classroom, thus, students can easily get bored and not enjoy the class.

Related to the problems mentioned above, English teachers have to find and use an appropriate technique for teaching speaking. A good technique is considered a problem solver since the good technique can increase students' critical thinking, develop students' communicative competence and arouse students' interest in learning speaking. One of

the techniques with the characteristics mentioned above is the Examples-Non-Examples Technique (ENET).

The Examples-Non-Example Technique (ENET) which was developed by Slavin (1991: 36) is a technique that encourages students to analyze the example through picture given by the teacher. Here, the students ask, give and share their ideas to complete a specific task in groups. The students have to master the topic they are discussing deeply since they are having a short presentation about the picture and prepare oral answers for the questions that they anticipate from the teachers. It is a technique that challenges students to make plans to present their ideas when they go up in front of the class. Furthermore, Kagan (1992:32) convinces that in applying ENET, the teachers should consider two principles: (1) Examples refer to the real samples given by teachers through picture related to the topic being discussed and that they should be understood by students, and (2) Non Examples are the samples that do not match with the topic being discussed. As we know, pictures are attractive media to use in the teaching and learning processes so that the students will become more interested in trying to practice speaking English. Bainbridge (2001:51) mentions that pictures are a popular medium to elicit oral language performance. Moreover, Harmer (2007:92) states that pictures are an interesting medium to use due to their simplicity and attractiveness.

Based on the explanation above, the research question of this study is: Is there any significant difference in speaking performance between students who are taught using the Examples-Non-Examples Technique and those who are taught using the Grammar Translation Method?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Notion of Speaking

Speaking, as one of the four basic competencies, plays a major role in language learning. According to Campbell (1989:39), speaking is an activity on the part of one individual to make one understood by others and the activity on the part of the others is to understand what is in the mind of the first. This means that by speaking someone expresses himself about who, what, and why he is. Furthermore Clark (1997:223) defines speaking as an act whereby the speaker have some effect on a listener by giving information to change the listeners state of knowledge or asking questions to get information or requesting the listener to do things for the speaker. This refers to oral proficiency.

Brown (2001:267) says that speaking is a situation in which people involved in conversation have some linguistics competence in the language spoken. The message which is delivered by the speaker should be understood by the listener so that the listener can give an appropriate response. In addition, Richards and Rodgers (2002: 204) state that effective oral communication requires the ability to use the language appropriately in social interactions that involves not only verbal communication but also paralinguistic elements of speech such as pitch, stress, and intonation plus appropriate body language.

Besides, teachers need to know the characteristics of a successful speaking teaching-learning activity. Ur (1996:120) has indicated some characteristics of a successful speaking activity:

- (a) Learners talk a lot. Hence the teachers should give a lot of time to the students to speak in the classroom: Let the students speak as much as possible in the discussions. The more the students talk, the more effective the learning of speaking becomes.
- (b) Participation needs to be even. The teacher should control the classroom and not let dominant students dominate the discussions. Each student has the same chance to speak in the classroom.
- (c) High motivation. The teacher should support the students to have high motivation for learning to speak better. Having a good, interesting topic will increase the students' motivation to achieve task objectives.
- (d) The level of language is at an acceptable level. The teacher must know what can be taught to their students, meaning that the lesson will be interesting for the students so that they can express themselves using the target language to communicate with each other.

To sum up, speaking skill is always related to communication. If effective communication is achieved, then the teacher should see successful speaking performances.

Examples-Non-Examples Technique

The Examples-Non-Examples Technique (ENET) is a technique that uses pictures as a media to encourage students to speak and to learn critical thinking by solving problems through examples (Kagan, 1992:76). In addition, Istarani (2012:9) is convinced that the use of pictures in ENET encourages teachers to modify and explain the material that will be taught in accordance with basic competencies. It is suggested that if students are learning English in fascinating and

motivating circumstances it will help them to enjoy and comprehend English and to be more successful at speaking. Thus, the media is an essential part of the teaching-learning process. Since ENET uses pictures as the main media, this technique is considered an appropriate technique to foster critical thinking by the students, enriching their vocabulary as they have to present the results of discussions, respecting others so that they, too, will be respected, and creating an attractive learning experience.

ENET is deemed necessary because the description of the concept is necessary to understand the topic being discussed. Focusing the students' attention to the examples and non-examples is expected to encourage the students to have a deeper understanding of the material. Moreover, Tennyson and Pork (1980), as cited in Slavin (1991:39) suggest that if the teacher presents an example of a concept then there are three things that should be addressed: 1. Collect and sort interesting examples and non-examples, 2. Select examples and non-examples that differ markedly from each other, and 3. Compare and contrast the examples with the non-examples.

In conclusion, setting up the lessons with examples and non-examples will help students to construct meanings related to the picture they analyze and thus they will be able to speak communicatively.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study used an experimental research study design. It was intended to obtain comparative information on the implementation of the ENET for the teaching of English speaking to second grade students at SMAN 1 Seunagan in Nagan Raya District in Aceh. The target population of this study was all the second grade students from the school who are suitable to be the subjects of this research. The school has 19 classes. The total number of students at the school was 762 and 269 of them were in the second grade. By implementing random sampling, XI Science 2 class was chosen as the experimental group and XI Science 3 class was chosen as the control group.

Procedure

In this study, data was collected using experimental research procedures. In evaluating the students' scores, the writer used a recorder to record the pre-tests and the post-tests from both classes. Before conducting this experimental research, the pre-test was given to

both classes: the experimental and the control classes. The pre-test was conducted in the first meeting to find out the prior speaking performance of both groups of students. In teaching speaking to the experimental group, the researcher used ENET as the treatment for the students to improve their speaking performance. Meanwhile, the control group class was taught speaking using the standard GTM as usually used by the English teachers of the school. Both classes were taught by the second writer.

The first topic that the second writer gave to the experimental class concerned with expressing love where the students were shown a picture on the whiteboard. Then, she asked them to formulate and define the conditions concerned with that picture. To do the formulating, they worked in groups of three to discuss the topic given. The second topic was expressions of sorrow. All the activities in the classroom followed the same pattern as those in the previous meeting. The third topic covered expressions of embarrassment in the same manner. During this meeting, she noted improvements in their speaking performance. The fourth topic that she gave them dealt with expressions for anger. In this class, they showed that they were accustomed to state their expressions since they had already practiced stating expressions in the previous meetings. The fifth topic referred to expressions of annoyance. This meeting was the last meeting in for the treatment. The post test was given on the day after that meeting. The purpose of this test was to know whether or not the students' speaking performance had improved during the treatment relative to the performance of the control class.

GTM was the method used in teaching-learning speaking with the control class. Students were asked to memorize conversations as well as language patterns that they were going to practice in front of the class. Before practicing their performance, students were given directions related to the topics. All the topics given to the control class were the same as those given to the experimental class. Only the learning technique used with the control class differed from that used with the experimental class. Afterwards, the students in the control class had to translate all sentences from the conversations which made it easier for them to practice without making mistakes. The post-test was given to the control class as the experimental class, on the day after the last meeting for the control class. The test given in the post-test was similar to that given in the pre-test.

DATA ANALYSIS

Some statistical formulas were used in this study for analyzing the results: frequency distribution, range (R), class of data (K), class of interval (I), mean, standard deviation and Z-score.

Normal Distribution Test for the Pre-test Scores

In analyzing the normal distribution of the test, the writers used the following hypotheses:

H_o = the scores of the experimental group if normally distributed

H_a = the scores of the experimental group if not normally distributed

The hypotheses will have been proven if the level of significance is less than 5% (= 0.05) with the criteria:

If χ^2 obtained $< \chi^2$ table, H_o is accepted

If χ^2 obtained $> \chi^2$ table, H_o is rejected

RESULTS

Table 1 shows the normal distribution of the pre-test results from the experimental class.

Table 1. Results of Normal Distribution of the Experimental Class Pre-test.

Score	Mid	Z-score	Normal Distribution	Area	Expected	Observed
	35.5	-1.73	0.0418			
36 – 41				-0.0752	-3.384	6
	41.5	-1.19	0.1170			
42 – 47				-0.1376	-6.192	8
	47.5	-0.66	0.2546			
48 – 53				-0.1976	-8.892	7
	53.5	-0.12	0.4522			
54 – 59				0.2607	11.7315	8
	60.5	0.5	0.1915			
60 – 65				-0.1570	-7.0650	7
	66.5	1.03	0.3485			
66 – 71				-0.0933	-4.1985	5
	72.5	1.57	0.4418			
72 – 77				-0.0365	-1.6425	4
	77.5	2.02	0.4783			

The data obtained was used to find out whether the students' results were normally distributed or not by applying the chi-square formula as set out below:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \chi^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{(Q_i - E_i)^2}{E_i} \\
 &= \frac{(6 - (-3.3840))^2}{-3.3840} + \frac{(8 - (-6.192))^2}{-6.192} + \frac{(7 - (-8.8920))^2}{-8.8920} + \frac{(8 - 11.7315)^2}{11.7315} + \frac{(7 - (-7.0650))^2}{-7.065} + \frac{(5 - (-4.1985))^2}{-4.1985} + \frac{(4 - (-1.6425))^2}{-1.6425} \\
 &= (-2.77) + (-32.52) + (-28.40) + (-0.31) + (-28.00) + (-20.15) + (-19.38) \\
 &= -131.53
 \end{aligned}$$

Based on the results of the normal distribution above, it can be seen that the χ^2 obtained was -131.53. The level of significance of $\alpha = 0.05$ and $df = k - 1 = 7 - 1 = 6$. Therefore, the distribution label of chi-square was $\chi^2_{(0.05)(6)} = 12.5$. According to this calculation, the data of χ^2 obtained was $< \chi^2$ table of 12.5 in which -131.53 was < 12.5 . This means that the pre-scores of the experimental class were normally distributed in the test.

Table 2 shows the normal distribution of the pre-test results from the control class.

Table 2: Results of Normal Distribution of the Control Class Pre-test.

Score	Mid	Z-score	Normal Distribution	Area	Expected	Observed
	35.5	-1.82	0.0344			
36 - 40				-0.0676	-3.0420	5
	40.5	-1.27	0.1020			
41 - 45				-0.1338	-6.0210	8
	45.5	-0.72	0.2358			
46 - 50				-0.1967	-8.8515	7
	50.5	-0.17	0.4325			
51 - 55				0.2882	12.9690	8
	55.5	0.37	0.1443			
56 - 60				-0.2042	-9.1890	8
	61.5	1.03	0.3485			
61 - 65				-0.0933	-4.1985	5
	66.5	1.57	0.4418			
66 - 70				-0.0360	-1.620	4
	70.5	2.01	0.4778			

Based on the table above, the chi-quadrade can be calculated as follow:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \chi^2 &= \sum_{t=1}^k \frac{(Q_i - E_i)^2}{E_i} \\
 &= \\
 &= \frac{(5 - (-3.0420))^2}{-3.0420} + \frac{(8 - (-6.0210))^2}{-6.0210} + \\
 &= \frac{(7 - (-8.8515))^2}{8.8515} + \frac{(8 - 12.9690)^2}{12.9690} + \frac{(8 - (-9.1890))^2}{-9.1890} + \\
 &= \frac{(5 - (-4.1985))^2}{-4.1985} + \frac{(4 - (-1.620))^2}{-1.620} \\
 &= (-21.26) + (-32.65) + (-28.38) + (1.90) + (-32.15) + (-20.15) + \\
 &= (-19.49) \\
 &= -152.18
 \end{aligned}$$

Based on the data, χ^2 obtained was 12.05 at a level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ and in which $df = k - 1 = 7 - 1 = 6$. Consequently, the chi-quadrade score was $\chi^2_{(0.95)(6)} = 12.5$. According to this calculation from the data, χ^2 obtained was $< \chi^2$ table 12.5 In which -152.18 was < 12.5 . This showed that the scores in the pre-test of the control group are considered normal.

The Homogeneity of Variance Test for the Pre-test of the Experimental and Control Classes

In order to find out the homogeneity of variance, the pre-test data of the experimental class and of the control class should be identified first, therefore the data obtained were normally distributed. The hypotheses were as follow:

H_o =the score of the experimental group are homogeneous

H_a =the score of the experimental group are not homogeneous

The hypotheses has been proven by using level of significance 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$) with the criteria:

If $F_{obtain} < F_{table}$, H_o is accepted

If $F_{obtain} > F_{table}$ H_o is rejected

Based on the pre-test scores it was found that $x = 54.9$ for the experimental class and $x = 52.1$ for the control class.

$$F = \frac{\text{the experimental score}}{\text{the control score}}$$

$$= \frac{11.18}{9.12}$$

$$= 1.22$$

According to the significance level at 5% (0.05), the $F_{\alpha(n_1-1, n_2-1)}$ or $F_{0.05(44,44)}$ and the result is 1.69. From the calculation, it was found that $F_{obtain} < F_{table}$ in which F_{obtain} is 1.22 while F_{table} is 1.65 thus $1.22 < 1.69$. The findings from the data indicates that H_o is accepted. This means that the variance of both the experimental and the control classes is homogenous.

Table 3 shows a summary of the pre-test results from both classes.

Table 3. Statistical Summary from the Pre-test Results of both Groups.

	Experimental Group (EG)	Z-Score	Control Group (CG)
N (Number of Students)	45	1.3	45
R (Range)	36		34
X (Mean Score)	54.9		52.1
S (Standard Deviation)	11.18		9.12

The statistical summary presented in the table above illustrates that the number of students in the experimental class is the same as in the control class (45 students). The range of scores of the control class is smaller than that of the experimental class, but both scores are considered as normal since there are no significant differences in the scores. The calculation of the range is obtained by subtracting the lowest score from the highest score in the test. Thus, for the pre-test of the experimental class the range is $72 - 36 = 36$, while for the pre-test of the control class the range is $70 - 36 = 34$.

Furthermore, the mean score for the experimental class is 54.9 and for the control class is 52.1. The distribution indicates that the scores of the two classes are not widely scattered. The standard deviation for the experimental class is 11.18 while for the control class is 9.12. Z-score of the experimental class and control class is 1.3, so the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternative hypothesis is rejected.

Table 4 shows the statistical summary of the post-test results from both classes.

Table 4. Statistical Summary of the Post-test Results from both Groups.

	Experimental Group (EG)	Z Score	Control Group (CG)
N (Number of Students)	45	5.1	45
R (Range)	41		34
X (Mean Score)	67.8		56.5
S (Standard Deviation)	11.45		9.15

Based on the data in the table above, the range of the post-test scores from the experimental class is 41 which is the result of 89-48 and the range of the post-test scores for the control class is 34 which is the result of 74-40. The mean score and the standard deviation from the experimental class' post-test scores are 67,8 and 11.45 while the

mean score and the standard deviation of the control class' post-test scores are 56.5 and 9.15. Both the mean score and the standard deviation from the experimental class post-test results are significantly more than the mean score and the standard deviation from the control class post-test results. This indicates a significant difference between the post-test scores of the two classes.

The writers further found that the calculation of Z-score showed a great significant difference between the post-test of the experimental class (5.1) and the post-test of the control class (5.1); this score is outside the given limits (-2.04 and +2.04) so the alternative hypothesis is accepted and the null hypothesis is rejected. And so, it can be concluded that the use of ENET can achieve better results for teaching speaking than the standard GTM.

In other words, the results from the two classes were significantly different, with the experimental class getting significantly higher results. This means that the results proved that ENET gave positive effect on the students' results.

Discussion

After analyzing the test data, it was found that the post-test results from both classes were different: the post-test results of the experimental class were much better than the post-test results from the control class. According to Heffner (2014), the first aspect that must be considered in a test is the central tendency or mean score since it takes all the scores into account. Therefore, the first result that the writers looked at in this study was the mean score since the mean score is the central tendency of the test. The mean score of the experimental group was 67.8, whilst the mean score of the control group was 56.6 at a 5% (0.05). level of significance. Then, the second measurement to examine in a statistical test is the variance that is equal to the standard deviation as a measure of the differences of the scores from the average or mean score. Based on the calculations from the data, the standard deviation of the results from the post-test of the experimental class was 11.45 while the standard deviation of the results from the post-test of the control class was 9.15.

After conducting the research, it was found that the experimental class pre-test mean score was 54.9 while their post-test mean score was 67.8. At a 0.05 level of significance, the Z-score for this result was 5.1 which indicated that H_a is accepted and H_o is rejected where Z-count > Z-table (5.1 > 2.04). This means that there was a significant difference

between the results from the experimental class students who were taught speaking using ENET and the control class students who were taught using the basic GTM.

A number of reasons are then considered as the factors that made the learning activity a success by implementing ENET. The first reason is presenting the pictures. This activity was interesting for the students since they can see the expressions of emotions and this encouraged them to remember and memorize the vocabulary related to each picture. The second reason is the construction of meaning. This kind of activity got the students' to think critically and deeply since they have to find appropriate words, phrases or sentences related to each picture and arrange those words in the correct order. The third reason is working in groups. The cooperative activity made the students learn on how to share ideas with others since every member of the group had the same opportunity to speak. The fourth reason is giving the script that describes the situation of the feelings. In this activity, the students found it easier to identify the particular vocabulary since they got clues from the teacher.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

The Examples-Non-Examples Technique (ENET) used pictures as a primary medium; this enabled the students to apply critical thinking to get meanings from the pictures. In this activity, every student tried to match the vocabulary with the pictures displayed on the whiteboard. In getting meaning, after the students saw the expressions of emotions displayed in the pictures they would combine words from the vocabulary list to get the correct meaning. The students became active and creative because the pictures were from daily life interactions that enabled the students to explore ideas freely.

The positive contribution of ENET was proven by the higher scores that were obtained by the experimental class compared to the control class. The mean score for the post-test of the control class was 56.9 and the standard deviation was 9.15 whilst the mean score for the post-test of the experimental class was 67.8 and the standard deviation was 11.45.

After obtaining the mean score and the standard deviation, the researcher calculated that the Z-score from the pre-tests of both the experimental class and the control class was 1.3 which is within the limits given ($-2.04 \leq 1.3 \leq 2.04$), thus the null hypothesis is accepted

and the alternative hypothesis is rejected (as the Z count is lower than the Z table) which indicated that there is no significant difference between the two scores.

Conversely, the Z-score from the post-tests of both the experimental class and the control class was 5.1 ($-2.04 \leq 5.1 \leq 2.04$). This showed that there was a significant difference between the post-test results from the experimental class and the results from the control class so the alternative hypothesis is accepted and the null hypothesis is rejected (the Z count is higher than the Z table value). Thus the data showed that the research question was positively answered and the research hypothesis was proven.

According to the research findings, it was found that ENET is an alternative technique to enhance and improve the performance of student speakers when supported by motivation, explanation, instruction, and appreciation from the teacher. The writers therefore have some suggestions for English teachers and for other researchers.

As educators who transfer knowledge to their students, teachers use pictures in their teaching performances. In selecting suitable pictures, teachers should find interesting, attractive and topical pictures. Pictures of the Examples should be related to the topic whilst pictures of the Non- Examples should not be related to the topics. The performance of the students then became the core consideration on using this technique. As a result of this activity, the students could perform well since they learn about the technique over several meetings. When the students worked in groups, they could overcome difficulties that might make it hard for them to speak individually. Furthermore, class management is a factor that must be considered in the teaching and learning process.

In conducting further research, it is suggested that other researchers combine ENET with another technique such as Group Investigations, Information Gaps, Talking Sticks, and so on. Moreover, it is expected that this study can be used as a starting point for further studies at different levels with different needs. A larger number of research studies should result in more accurate data. Thus, for further research it is suggested that this study be used as an example for conducting research in listening, reading and writing ESL using ENET.

REFERENCES

- Bainbridge, C. (2001). *Gifted Kid, Cooperative and Collaborative Learning Strategy*. Retrieved 24 December 2013 from: <http://giftedkids.about.com/bio/Carol-Bainbridge-19284.htm>
- BSNP. (2006). *Panduan penyusunan kurikulum tingkat satuan pendidikan jenjang pendidikan dasar dan menengah* [A guideline to develop school-based curriculum for primary and secondary schools]. Jakarta: Badan Standar.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Characteristic of Successful Speaking Activities*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Campbell, R. N. (1989). *Linguistics and Social Aspects of Communicative Competence*. USA: Wm. C. Brown Company Press.
- Clark E.V. (1997). *Psychology and Language: An Introduction to Psycholinguistics*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publisher.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching, Second Edition*. Cambridge, UK: Longman Press.
- Heffner, C. L. (2014). *Measures of Central Tendency*. Retrieved 9 July 2015 from: <http://allpsych.com/researchmethods/centraltendency/#.VZ4lorV51rd>
- Istarani, 2012. *58 Model Pembelajaran Inovatif*. Medan: Media Persada.
- Kagan, S. (1992). *The Structural Approach to Cooperative Learning in Cooperative learning: A Response to Linguistics and Cultural Diversity*. Edited by Daniel. London: Longman Inc.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching Second Edition*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nunan, D. & Jo Ane L. (2004). *Content Area Speaking: Literacy and Learning Across the Curriculum. Seventh Edition*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2002). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Slavin, R. E. (1991). Synthesis of research on cooperative learning. *Educational Leadership*, 48, 71-82.
- Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press