Probing prompting strategy to improve young learner's speaking skills in Palopo city

Muhammad Iksan[*]
Institut Agama Islam Negeri Palopo, Indonesia
miksan@iainpalopo.ac.id

Amalia Yahya
Institut Agama Islam Negeri Palopo, Indonesia
amalia_yahya@iainpalopo.ac.id

Rosmita Rosmita
Institut Agama Islam Negeri Palopo, Indonesia
rosmita_mhs@iainpalopo.ac.id

Recommended APA Citation
Iksan, M., Yahya, A., & Rosmita, R. (2021). Probing prompting strategy to improve young beginner's speaking skills in Palopo city. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities, 8*(2), 54-71. https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v8i2.8255

ABSTRACT

This paper attempted to examine the efficacy of the Probing-Prompting Technique in teaching speaking skills to young beginner English learners. This study employed the experimental method with a pre-experimental design. The subjects of this study were English learners age 16 to 19 in Palopo City who were chosen using a purposive sampling technique to select the active learners. Using the oral presentation task, the writers compiled three aspects of the learner's score, i.e. accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility. The experimental teaching was conducted in six meetings, preceded by a pre-test and ended by a post-test. The pre-test found that the learners' speaking skill ability is low (mean score: 25.75). In post-test, the authors found that the learners' language ability substantially improved. Some learners get significant improvement in every aspect of speaking skills, i.e. fluency, accuracy, and comprehensibility. The strategy also contributed to the increase in the mean score (51.50). As a result, the writers concluded that Probing-Prompting Strategy successfully improves the learners' speaking skills. It is proven by the result of the paired-sample test which showed that t-count (7,584) is higher than t-table (2,365).

---

[*] Corresponding author

1. Introduction

English, as an international language, become an urgent language to be mastered to communicate and interact with people around the world. Furthermore, globalization, as well as free trade, and the ASEAN Economic Community Era, demand people to be active communicator of international language, including English. In the context of Indonesia, English has been taught at schools since Elementary school. However, the English proficiency of Indonesian people still considered low. According to the EF English Proficiency Index, Indonesians' English proficiency ranks 74 out of 100 countries worldwide and ranks 15th out of 25 countries in Asia (EF, 2020). This data showed that the government as well as the English educators of Indonesia, still need to work harder to improve the English proficiency of the people to maintain competitiveness in this disruptive global era. This effort should be started at an early age, in elementary education level, and be strengthened in the next level, in junior until senior high school level.

Having a look at the English proficiency of young learners, especially in speaking skills as a productive skill, an unpleasant fact was later discovered. Mostly, after learning English formally and non-formally for at least 9-12 years, their speaking skill is still considered low (Sukirmiyadi, 2018). The problems become homework for English Educators to take a look back at their English language teaching. They need to modify and adapt their method, techniques, strategies, and teaching materials to help the learners improve their English Proficiency (Iksan & Dirham, 2018).

In English classes, the learners often feel uncomfortable using English in their communication and interactions, and they feel unconfident doing so. Young learners are very sensitive and some of them are too shy to speak English in the classroom. Getting learners to speak English and keeping them on-tasked isn't always easy. Still, educators should always find a way by experimenting with different techniques and activities and a way of helping them deal with this problem. Applying some techniques and strategies in the English classroom is one of the possible solutions for their English Language Teaching. In this study, the writers tried to use a probing-prompting strategy to help the learners to get out from their English learning obstacles and improve their speaking skills. Probing-prompting is a learning strategy in which the teacher conveys questions that are guided and explored that can trigger the thinking process. As a result, they can find new information related to the knowledge that they have and this strategy can direct learners to get used to talking and dare to convey ideas and require learners to think critically in facing problems.

Literally, "probing" means an investigation, examination. While "prompting" means pushing or guiding. Investigation or examination aims to obtain information that already exists in learners to use it to understand new knowledge or concepts. In probing-prompting strategy, the teacher poses numerous questions that can make students

explore their knowledge. A thought process arises that links the knowledge and experience of each student with new knowledge they learned. With this learning model, all learners will participate actively because the question and answer (Q&A) phase are done randomly so that they cannot escape the current learning process. After all, every student engages in the Q&A cycle (Elvandari & Supardi, 2016). Therefore, to solve the learners' problem in speaking, the writer did the study to find out whether the probing prompting strategy is effective or not in improving the learners' speaking skills.

2. Literature review

2.1. Research on probing prompting technique

The writer found multiple studies exploring the use of the probing prompting technique in English language teaching and learning relevant to the study of teaching speaking in English. Marliasari and Okta (2018) examined eighth-grade reading teaching by SMPN 7 Palembang students using a technique to encourage probing. The study showed that by using the questioning prompting technique, there was an improvement in the reading achievement of students after learning. It can be seen from the data of experimental study, where one student got the lowest score of 50 with the top score of 80. So, the writers can infer that in the learning process, the efficient probing prompting technique is used. Another study about maximizing the ability to read narrative texts by using probing prompting learning technique was also investigated by Pratiwi, Tria, and Dewi (2017). The writers carried out this research in the tenth grade of Kartikatama Metro High School and found that the probing prompting technique has a maximum effect on the ability of students to read narrative texts, as shown by their improved scores. In the learning process, the students were chosen randomly. Therefore, students must participate actively and cannot avoid the learning process. As a result, all students got involved in the question and answer process to make them understand how to get general and specific information from the text easily.

Besides, in simple past tense learning at *Madrasah Tsanawiyah Negeri* 2 Medan, Hasibuan (2018) conducted a study using prompting probing technique. In the pre-test, she found that the control class mean score was 64.67, and the experimental class's mean score was 80.50. From the average value of these two classes, it can be seen that there is a difference between the two and also after using the probing prompting strategy student achievement increases. Thus, the researcher concluded that the use of probing prompting strategies could affect student learning (Hasibuan, 2018). In comparison, Alfian, Dwijanto, and Sunarmi (2017) investigated students' ability to think creatively and enthusiasm in mathematics learning by using the probing prompting learning model with the scaffolding strategy. This researcher used an experiment with a control class design. The application of these two strategies is very effective because stimulated mathematical creative thinking abilities and curiosity in the learning process.

Based on the previous studies above, the writers can generalize that the use of the

probing-prompting strategy in teaching reading skills, teaching simple past tense, and teaching mathematics, can improve students learning. Especially in teaching reading, it can make the students understand the simple past tense easily and make students creative. While teaching mathematics, evokes the students' curiosity. Meanwhile, this paper tried to apply probing prompting to improve students' speaking skills.

2.1.1. Probing prompting

The term probing-prompting consists of the words "probing" and "prompting". The word "probing" means digging or track. While in the common term, probing means trying to obtain clearer or deeper information. Syamsir and Noviarni (2018) define probing in-class learning as a technique to guide students to use the knowledge that already exists to understand the symptoms or the current situation observed to form comprehension. They suggested that the probing technique can be used as a technique to improve the quality and quantity of student answers. The questions intended to guide the student so that the contents can find a correct answer. The probing technique begins by exposing students to the situation new containing puzzles or real objects. The new situation makes students experience conflict with the knowledge they already have to provide opportunities for students to assimilation, and this is where probing begins to be needed

Further, the word "prompting" means "directing, demanding". According to Chin and Osborne (2008), prompting means questions that can give direction to students in the process of thinking. Chin and Osborne (2008) suggest three types of forms of prompting questions: first, changing the order of questions in simpler words which brings them back to the original question; second, asking questions with different simpler words that are adjusted to meet the students' knowledge and giving a review of the information provided, and third, asking questions which help students to remember or see the answer.

Probing prompting strategy is very closely related to questions. In probing prompting learning, a teacher asking questions to students that dig student knowledge and guide students to associate new knowledge he gained with the knowledge he had obtained. In learning probing prompting, there are two forms of questions, namely probing question and prompting question.

Therefore, it can be inferred that probing prompting strategy is a learning method that offers questions that can direct and explore student responses to find out the degree to which students' current knowledge, and provide students with opportunities to get fresh information from their peers.

2.1.1.1. The procedure for applying probing prompting

The probing prompting learning steps are administered through seven stages, as suggested by Huda (2013 as cited in Utami, 2016), which can be adapted into the context of English language teaching. Firstly, the whole students wait for several

minutes to allow the learners to create responses or have a short discussion, the teacher poses issues with specific learning goals or indicators. Secondly, the teacher waits a while to allow the learners to construct responses or hold a small discussion. Thirdly, the teacher designates one student to respond to the question. Fourthly, when the response is correct, the teacher requests feedback from other learners about the response to clarify the whole learners are engaged in ongoing activities. However, if students' response is incorrect or keeps silent, the teacher requests other questions as a follow-up that allows students to think earlier about the questions to answer the questions with true questions. Next, the teacher asks questions that make the students thinking at a higher level, and the students will be able to answer the questions based on their prior knowledge. After that, all students must be involved in probing prompting activities, and the teacher can ask different questions to several students. Lastly, the teacher must recognize that the indicators are comprehensible for all students so that by the end of the final task, the teacher stresses and challenges students. Prompting can be done by reorder-rephrasing, using simple and relevant questions with questions early, and providing additional information so students can answer.

2.1.2. Speaking skills

Several experts proposed different theories about speaking skills. For example, Richard (2008) describes speaking as a way to communicate something effectively and it is necessary since speaking is one kind of communication. At the same time, Bygate (2003) mentions that speaking, as literary skill also deserve attention, both in the first and second languages. It can also improve professional and business progress, social rankings and are very good for social solidarity. Since speaking has an important goal which is to foster self-confidence and therefore, when speaking someone must express ideas, opinions, and the desire to do something, solve certain problems, and create good social relations as well as friendship (McDonough & Shaw, 2012).

The researchers may infer from the explanation that speaking is one of the essential skills to have in life. Because when we often talk to someone, it will increase solidarity in the community to create good social relationships and friendships, thus solving the problems we face in society.

2.1.2.1. Teaching speaking

According to Wong and Nunan (2011), teaching speaking is to teach English learners to generate English speech sounds and their patterns; to use word and sentence stress, intonation patterns and the second-language rhythm; to choose appropriate words and phrases in the right social context, audience, circumstance and the right subject; to organize their thought in a coherent and logical sequence; to be fluent and confident in using the language with few unnatural delays called fluency

Nunan (2003) also suggests that teaching means providing an individual with information (skills, etc.) while teaching speaking means instructing a person to connect

with others. Therefore, teachers and learners must get involved in the active and communicative teaching and learning process. In this process, teachers sometimes downplays precision and emphasizes how students speak the target language.

2.1.2.2. The assessment of speaking

One of the tasks in teaching speaking is an evaluation or assessment of the learners' progress in their language skill mastery. Rahmawati and Ertin (2014) mention several aspects regarding the assessment criteria in teaching speaking skills which include grammar, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, and pronunciation. In terms of Grammar, the teacher should see students' use of sentences, whether it is correct and accurate, and avoid grammatical errors in speaking. For vocabulary, the teacher should see the accurate vocabulary the learners use in their speaking. For comprehension, the teacher should see the students' ability in understanding what a person is saying which will help to give a good response to a question. In terms of fluency, it is necessary to see students' ability in producing good pronunciation, which will create a good presentation so that listeners can easily give feedback on what they have heard. While for pronunciation, the teacher should see the students' accuracy in pronouncing words to make the listener can easily understand what the speaker said.

In short, the conclusion is the assessment of speaking is very important to understand. Assessment of speaking will become important think to listeners because they can accept any information from the speaker and give the feedback to respond to what the speaker says.

3. Method

3.1. Research design

This research is a quantitative study with a pre-experimental design. The research included a pre-test, treatment, and post-test. The pre-test is to assess the speech skills of the learners before moving to the treatment stage while the post-test intended to measure the speaking skills of students after the treatment stage.

3.2. The subject of the study

The subjects of this study were young English learners in Palopo, age range between 16-19 years old. They consisted of senior high school and first-year university students. 53 learners were being observed, and using purposive sampling technique, the writers chose eight learners who met the criteria: active English learners with low English proficiency (beginner level).

3.3. The instruments of the study

3.3.1. Speaking test

This test was given to learners to find out their ability to speak. There were two tests given, namely pre-test and post-test. In the pre-test, the learners gave their opinion

about Education. The second test, post-test, was given after treatment and the topic was to give opinions about learning online and each student has 3-5 minutes to express their opinions in the pre-test and post-test.

3.3.2. Tape recorder

The writers used a tape recorder to record the learners' voice. If there was something unclear in the expression of opinions by learners, the writers can listen again through a tape recorder.

3.4. The procedure for collecting data

In gathering the data, the writers followed the procedure below:

3.4.1. Pre-test

The pre-test was given before the treatment. In this stage, the writers asked the students to come in front of the class. The writers then asked the students to give an opinion about Education and each student has 3-5 minutes to express their opinions.

3.4.2. Treatment

The writers conducted the treatment for five meetings in the class. The steps were as follow:

   a. In meeting 1, the writers explained the material about asking and giving opinions. Then the writers gave some examples of dialogues that contain giving and asking opinion, and the writers asked learners to practice dialogue with their friend. After that, the writers gave learners a topic is about "What do you think about friendship?" and then the writers asked students to respond to the question one by one. If the answers given were wrong, the writers asked a follow-up question that required learners to think in the direction of the original question so that the student could answer the question correctly.

   b. In meeting 2, the writers explained the material about asking and giving opinions. Then the writers gave some examples of dialogues that contain giving and asking opinion, and the writers asked learners to practice dialogue with their friend. After that, the writers gave learners a topic is about "What do you think about family?" and then the writers asked learners one by one to answer the question. If the answers given were wrong, the writers asked a follow-up question that requires learners to think in the direction of the original question so that the student could answer the question correctly.

   c. In meeting 3, the writers explained the material about asking and giving opinions. Then the writers gave some examples of dialogues that contain giving and asking opinion, and the writers asked learners to practice dialogue with their friend. After that, the writers gave learners a topic is about "What do you think about the sport?" and then the writers request the learners to respond to

the question one by one. If the answers were incorrect, the authors asked a follow-up question that demanded that students to think towards the original question to address the question correctly.

d. In meeting 4, the writers explained the material about asking and giving opinions. Then the writers gave some examples of dialogues that contain giving and asking opinion, and the writers asked learners to practice dialogue with their friend. After that, the writers gave learners a topic is about "What do you think about the holiday?" and then the writers requested the learners to respond to the question one by one. If the responses were incorrect, the authors asked a follow-up question that required learners to think in the direction of the original question so that the student could answer the question correctly.

e. In meeting 5, the writers explained the material about asking and giving opinions. Then the writers gave some examples of dialogues that contain giving and asking opinion, and the writers asked learners to practice dialogue with their friend. After that, the writers gave learners a topic about "What do you think about smoking?" and then the writers requested the learners to respond to the question one by one. If the answers given were wrong, the writers asked a follow-up question that required learners to think in the direction of the original question so that the student could answer the question correctly.

3.4.3. Post-test

The post-t-test was conducted in the sixth meeting. In the post-test, the writers did the same activities as in the pre-test. The topic was to give opinions on learning online at home. The writers tested the learners' speaking one by one, whether learners speaking had improved or still the same with the pre-test.

3.5. The technique of data analysis

The writers then analyzed the data that has gone through the Pre-test, treatment, and Post-test in the following stages:

Scoring classification

In analyzing the speaking test results, the writers followed the assessment criteria given by J.B. Heaton (1988) that includes accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility.

1. Accuracy

Table 1

Accuracy Scores.

Classifications	Scores	Indicators
Excellent	6	There are two or more small grammatical and lexical errors and are a little influenced by your mother tongue in speech.

	5	The pronunciation is quite correct; there are some
Very good		small grammatical and lexical errors and are influenced a little by the mother tongue.
Good	4	The mother tongue quite influences the pronunciation to make the listener a little confused. However, there are not many phonological errors.
Average	3	There are serious phonological errors influenced by the mother tongue, giving rise to many grammatical and lexical errors.
Poor	2	Many basic grammatical and lexical errors cause interference in communication because the mother tongue influences it
Very poor	1	Do not practice in the course so that you do not master any of the language skills. It causes many basic grammar and lexical mistakes that lead to serious mispronunciation

2. Fluency
Table 2.
Fluency score.

Classifications	Scores	Indicators
Excellent	6	Occasionally think of words in a short time and speak casually, using quite extensive expressions.
Very good	5	Occasionally think of words, but the pronunciation is fluent.
Good	4	Trying to think of words with pauses that are not too long, the pronunciation is smooth enough to convey the general meaning.
Average	3	It requires a lot of time to think about what to say, the meaning conveyed is clear and the expressions used are limited.
Poor	2	Requires a lot of time to think about what to say, stuttering, and limited expression.
Very poor	1	Thinking of arranging words in a long time lag so that there are no expressions and unclear pronunciation.

3. Comprehensibility
Table 3
Comprehensibility score.

Classifications	Scores	Indicators
Excellent	6	There's a little interference, but the audience can understand the speaker quickly.
Very good	5	There are some disturbances by the audience, so it needs to be clarified. The submission of meaning by the speaker is quite clear.
Good	4	Most of the pronunciation is easy to understand even though it takes time to clarify what the speaker said.

Average	3	The audience is unable to understand many more complex sentences. However, the audience can comprehend what he says.
Poor	2	The speaker only conveys sentences and short phrases, so with difficulty, it must be understood by someone who is listening to the speaker.
Very poor	1	The speaker cannot clarify what he is saying. Even when the listener tries hard to understand what the speaker is saying, almost no one can understand.

Source: Heaton (1988)

3.6. Classification of learners score

Based on the research above, the writers also list the rating classifications used to provide the grades obtained by learners. The following is in the classification scale rating:

Table 4

Classifications of the learner's score.

Classifications	Scales	Ratings
Excellent	6	86-100
Very Good	5	71-85
Good	4	56-70
Average	3	41-55
Poor	2	26-40
Very Poor	1	≤ 25

Calculation of the learners' score percentage using the formula:

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100\%$$

Where:

P = Percentage

F = Frequency of Items

N = Total Number of Learners

The Hypothesis Acceptability Criteria:

t-table $\geq$ t-count: The rejected null hypothesis

t-count < t-table: Received null hypothesis

4. Findings

4.1. Pre-test

Within this part, the writers display the speaking skills scores of the learners in the pre-test, the learners' mean and standard deviation scores, as well as the percentage score of the learners' speaking skills. The writers show the scores in tables, then

compute the scores with the assistance of SPSS 20.

Table 5

The learners' score in the pre-test.

No	Respondent	The Aspects of Speaking			Score of Test
		Accuracy	Fluency	Comprehensibility	
1	R1	1	1	1	18
2	R2	1	1	1	18
3	R3	2	2	2	33
4	R4	1	1	2	20
5	R5	1	2	2	33
6	R6	2	2	1	33
7	R7	2	1	2	33
8	R8	1	1	1	18
Total		11	11	11	206
		Mean Score			25.75

Within this part, the writers describe the learners' speaking skills average score in series starting from accuracy, fluency, and finally comprehensibility:

1. Accuracy

In calculating the average score of learners' accuracy in the pre-test, the writers used SPSS 20 application to determine descriptive statistics and the rate of percentage of accuracy. The results are presented in the following table:

Table 6

Accuracy descriptive analysis.

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Accuracy	8	1.00	2.00	1.3750	.51755
Valid N (listwise)	8				

Table 7

The rate of percentage score of learners' accuracy in the pre-test.

Classification	Score	Rating	Pre – Test	
			Frequency	Percentage (%)
Excellent	86-100	6	0	0
Very Good	71-85	5	0	0
Good	56-70	4	0	0
Average	41-55	3	0	0
Poor	26-40	2	3	37.5 %
Very Poor	≤25	1	5	62.5 %
Total			8	100%

2. Fluency

In computing the average score of learners' fluency in the Pre-test, the writers utilized SPSS 20 to determine descriptive statistics and the rate of percentage of fluency. The results are presented in the following table:

Table 8
Fluency descriptive analysis.

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Fluency	8	1.00	2.00	1.3750	.51755
Valid N (listwise)	8				

Table 9
The rate of percentage score of learners' fluency in the pre-test.

Classification	Score	Rating	Pre – Test	
			Frequency	Percentage (%)
Excellent	86-100	6	0	0
Very Good	71-85	5	0	0
Good	56-70	4	0	0
Average	41-55	3	0	0
Poor	26-40	2	3	37.5 %
Very Poor	≤25	1	5	62.5 %
Total			8	100%

3. Comprehensibility

In calculating the average score of learners' comprehensibility in the pre-test, the writers utilized SPSS 20. The SPSS 20 was used to analyze the descriptive statistics and the percentage of comprehensibility. The results are presented in the following table:

Table 10
Descriptive statistics of comprehensibility in the pre-test.

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Comprehensibility	8	1.00	2.00	1.5000	.53452
Valid N (listwise)	8				

Table 11
The learners' comprehensibility percentage score.

Classification	Score	Rating	Pre – Test	
			Frequency	Percentage (%)
Excellent	86-100	6	0	0
Very Good	71-85	5	0	0
Good	56-70	4	0	0
Average	41-55	3	0	0
Poor	26-40	2	4	50%
Very Poor	≤25	1	4	50%
Total			8	100%

Post-test

Within this part, the writers display the scores of the learners' speaking skills in the post-test, as well as the learners mean and standard deviation scores, and the percentage score of the learners' speaking skills. The writers show the scores in tables, then compute the scores with the assistance of SPSS 20:

Table 12

The learners' speaking skill comprehensibility score.

No	Respondent	The Aspect of Speaking			Score of Test
		Accuracy	**Fluency**	**Comprehensibility**	
1	R1	2	2	3	41
2	R2	3	3	3	55
3	R3	4	4	4	64
4	R4	2	3	2	41
5	R5	3	4	4	64
6	R6	2	3	3	53
7	R7	2	2	3	41
8	R8	3	2	3	53
Total		21	23	25	412
			Mean Score		51.50

Within this part, the writers describe the learners' speaking skills average score in series starting from accuracy, fluency, and finally comprehensibility:

1. Accuracy

To calculate the average score of learners' accuracy in the Post-test, the writers used SPSS 20 to analyze the descriptive statistics and the percentage of accuracy. The results are presented in the following table:

Table 13

Accuracy descriptive analysis.

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Accuracy	8	2.00	4.00	2.6250	.74402
Valid N (listwise)	8				

Table 14

The learners' accuracy percentage score.

Classification	Score	Rating	Post – Test	
			Frequency	**Percentage (%)**
Excellent	86-100	6	0	0
Very Good	71-85	5	0	0
Good	56-70	4	1	12.5%
Average	41-55	3	3	37.5 %
Poor	26-40	2	4	50 %
Very Poor	≤25	1	0	0
Total			8	100%

2. Fluency

To calculate the average score of learners' fluency in the Post-test, the writers used SPSS 20 to analyze the descriptive statistics and the percentage of accuracy. The results are presented in the following table:

Table 15

Fluency descriptive analysis.

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Fluency	8	2.00	4.00	2.8750	.83452
Valid N (listwise)	8				

Table 16

The rate of percentage score of learners' fluency in post-test.

Classification	Score	Rating	Post – Test	
			Frequency	Percentage (%)
Excellent	86-100	6	0	0
Very Good	71-85	5	0	0
Good	56-70	4	2	25%
Average	41-55	3	3	37.5%
Poor	26-40	2	3	37.5 %
Very Poor	≤25	1	0	0
Total			8	100%

3. Comprehensibility

To calculate the average score of learners' comprehensibility in the Post-test, the writers used SPSS 20. The writers used SPSS 20 to analyze the descriptive statistics and the percentage of comprehensibility. The results are presented in the following table:

Table 17

Descriptive statistics of comprehensibility in post-test.

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Comprehensibility	8	2.00	4.00	3.1250	.64087
Valid N (listwise)	8				

Table 18

The comprehensibility percentage score.

Classification	Score	Rating	Pre – Test	
			Frequency	Percentage (%)
Excellent	86-100	6	0	0
Very Good	71-85	5	0	0
Good	56-70	4	2	25%
Average	41-55	3	5	62.5%
Poor	26-40	2	1	12.5%
Very Poor	≤25	1	0	0
Total			8	100%

The mean score and standard deviation of pre-test and post-test

After presenting the descriptive statistics table and the learners' scores percentage in pre-test and post-test according to the speaking aspects (accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility), the writers also obtained the mean and standard deviation values

using SPSS 20. It can be seen in the paired sample statistic table below:

Table 19
The mean score and standard deviation of pre-test and post-test paired samples statistics.

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pre-test	25.7500	8	7.77817	2.75000
	Post-test	51.5000	8	9.71008	3.43303

Table 19 is about pre-test and post-test paired sample statistics. It can be found that the speaking skills of the learners are improved and that the pre-tests and post-tests differ significantly and that writers used the test study and measured the hypothesis with SPSS 20 to determine acceptance. As shown in the following table, the outcome is:

Table 20
The paired-samples correlation of pre-test and post-test paired-samples correlations.

	N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1 Pre-test & Post-test	8	.414	.308

Table 21
The paired-sample test of pre-test and post-test paired-samples test.

		Paired Differences					T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Pre-test - Post-test	-25.75000	9.60283	3.39511	-33.77816	-17.72184	-7.584	7	.000

In table 20, the writers found that to (tcount)= 7,584 and df (degree of freedom) = 7.While the tt= 2,365, the degree of freedom (df) = 7, with the standard of significant = 5%

$$7{,}584 > 2{,}365$$

Based on the findings above, it is shown that the $t_{\text{-count}}$ (t_0) is higher than the $t_{\text{-table}}$ (t_t). It can be determined that there is a significant deficiency between the learners' speaking skills score before and after the teaching using the probing prompting strategy.

5. Discussion

In this section, the writers discussed the study's findings, and the statistical analysis result to answer the research questions this. In this study, three items were analyzed by the writers based on the speaking assessment procedures, namely the accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility. The writers selected eight learners as the respondent and gave five meetings of treatments. Before and after the treatment, the writers gave a pre-test and post-test to determine the learners' speaking skill score.

In the pre-test, the writers gave the question "what learners think about education"? to the learners and found that in the accuracy and fluency, there were no learners (0%) who got excellent, very good, good, and average. There were only 3 learners (37.5%) who got poor and 5 others (62.5%) who got very poor. As in the comprehensibility, none of the learners (0%) got excellent, good, very good, and average. There were 4 learners (50%) who got poor, and, the last there are also 4 learners (50%) who got very poor.

In Post-test, the writers asked "What learners think about learning at home/online learning?" to the learners. The post-test was carried out after giving five treatments to learners. This was done to determine the increase in learners' speaking skills. On accuracy, there was 1 learner (12.5%) who got good scores, 3 learners (37.5%) got average, 4 learners (50%) got poor scores. In fluency, there are 2 learners (25%) who got good grades. There are 3 learners (37.5%) who got average, and 3 learners (37.5%) got poor. Meanwhile, 2 learners (25%) got a good grade in comprehensibility skill. There were 5 learners (62.5%) who got on average, 1 student (12.5%) got it poor.

The analysis result figured out that probing prompting strategy successfully helped the learners to improve their speaking skills. It is shown by the pre-test mean scores of learners were 25.75 and the Post-test 51.50, and the standard deviation from the pre-test was 7.77, and the Post-test was 9.71 (Table 19). This result is in line with the previous studies conducted by Marliasari and Okta (2018). They found that there is progress in learners' reading achievement after learning by using probing prompting strategy. The similarity of this study with Marliasari and Okta (2018) study is both of the studies investigated the application of the probing prompting strategy in teaching English. The difference between these studies is the language skills that each of the studies focused on.

The final result of this study figured out that probing prompting strategy is not only effective for teaching reading skills but also speaking skills (Marliasari & Okta, 2018). This finding is also similar to what Pratiwi et al. (2017), found from the investigation of the implementation of the probing prompting strategy to maximize the learners' reading skills on narrative texts. They found that probing prompting strategy provides the maximum on learners' abilities in narrative texts as indicated by the improved scores.

The discussions above shows that probing prompting is a good strategy to use in helping the learners to improve their learning in English skills (reading and speaking),

also in English Competence, i.e. grammar, especially simple past Tense. It is also good for teaching another subject, such as mathematics. The writers assume that this efficacy is due to the characteristics of the probing prompting strategy which is a derivative of student active learning method that encourages students to think critically and creatively. The probing prompting strategy guides and explores students' ideas to accelerate the thinking process that can link students' knowledge and experiences with the new knowledge they studied. It also encourages the students to construct conceptual rules into new knowledge. Thus, new knowledge for learners is not shared but they discover it themselves. The finding deals with what Hamdani (2011) suggests that such a strategy guides students to be able to discuss ideas and to accelerate their thinking process. This can help the learners to connect their understanding and experiences with the new knowledge they learned. It also inspires them to build conceptual rules into new knowledge.

6. Conclusion

Considering the study results and discussions, the writers concluded that probing prompting strategy effectively improves the learners' speaking skills. Statistical analysis found a significant disparity between learners' scores in the pre-test (25.75) and post-test (51.50). This finding showed that the application of probing prompting strategy could improve the learners' speaking skills. The writers believe that the success of this strategy in improving the learner's speaking skill was due to the characteristics of the probing prompting strategy encourage students to think critically and creatively. The probing prompting strategy guides and explores students' ideas to accelerate the thinking process that can link students' knowledge and experiences with the new knowledge they studied. It also encourages the students to construct conceptual rules into new knowledge. Thus, new knowledge for learners is not shared but they discover it themselves.

References

Alfian, M. H., Dwijanto, S., & Sunarmi, S. (2017). Effectiveness of probing-prompting learning models with scaffolding strategy to mathematic creative thinking ability and enthusiasm. *Unnes Journal of Mathematics Education*, *6*(2), 249–257. https://doi.org/10.15294/ujme.v6i2.17172

Bygate, M. (2003). *Language teaching, a scheme for teaching education: Speaking*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Chin, C., & Osborne, J. (2008). Students' questions: A potential resource for teaching and learning science. *Studies in Science Education*, *44*(1), 1–39. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057260701828101

EF. (2020). *EF English Proficiency Index*. Retrieved from https://www.ef.com/wwen/epi/regions/asia/indonesia/

Elvandari, H., & Supardi, K. I. (2016). Penerapan model pembelajaran probing-prompting berbasis active learning untuk meningkatkan ketercapaian kompetensi siswa. *Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan Kimia*, *10*(1), 1651-1660.

Hasibuan, Y. (2018). *The effect of probing prompting strategy in teaching simple past tense at MTsN Medan. 1*, 430–439.

Hamdani. (2011). *Strategi belajar mengajar*. Bandung, Indonesia: Pustaka Setia.

Heaton, J. B. (1988). *Writing English language tests*. New York, NY: Longman.

Iksan, M., & Dirham, D. (2018). The influence of the economic students' motivations and language learning strategies towards their English achievement in STIE Muhammadiyah Palopo. *Ethical Lingua: Journal of Language Teaching and Literature*, *5*(1), 110-121.

Marliasari, S., & Okta, T. (2018). Teaching reading eighth-grade students of SMPN 7 Palembang using probing prompting strategy. *Journal of English Education, Literature, and Linguistics*, *1*(1), 14–18.

McDonough, J., & Shaw, C. (2012). *Materials and methods in ELT*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English language teaching*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Pratiwi, W., Tria, D., & Dewi, C. (2017). Maximizing reading narrative text ability by probing prompting learning technique. *IQRA' (Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Pendidikan)*, *2*(2), 385–402. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.25217/ji.v2i2.161

Rahmawati, Y., & Ertin, E. (2014). Developing assessment for speaking. *IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education)*, *1*(2), 199–210. https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v1i2.1345

Richard, J. C. (2008). *Teaching listening and speaking: From theory to practice.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Sukirmiyadi, M. (2018, October). Teaching English through games. In *1st International Conference on Social Sciences (ICSS 2018)* (pp. 1617-1622). Atlantis Press.

Syamsir, N. F., & Noviarni, N. (2018). Peningkatan kemampuan komunikasi matematis: pengembangan lembar kerja siswa berbasis probing-prompting untuk siswa sekolah menengah pertama. *JURING (Journal for Research in Mathematics Learning)*, *1*(2), 171. https://doi.org/10.24014/juring.v1i2.5642

Utami, D. (2016). Penerapan model pembelajaran probing prompting dalam pembelajaran mengabstraksi teks negosiasi pada siswa kelas X SMA/MA. *Riksa Bahasa: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pembelajarannya*, *2*(2), 151-158.

Wong, L. L. C., & Nunan, D. (2011). The learning styles and strategies of effective language learners. *System*, *39*(2), 44-163. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.05.004