

## CHAPTER 4

### RESULTS OF THE STUDY

This chapter presented the results obtained in the study. The study addressed the questions if the five communicative tasks affected students' English speaking proficiency and which task was most effective, and how students' attitude towards the five communicative tasks. The data were collected using lesson plans and the students' attitude questionnaire. The presentation and interpretation of the data was divided into three main sections which were the efficiency of students' English speaking proficiency using the five communicative tasks, the most effective task, and students' attitude towards the five communicative tasks.

#### **The findings of data analysis**

1. **Analysis for the effectiveness of the five communicative tasks on students' English speaking proficiency of Mattayomsuksa 6 students in Nongbuapittayakarn School with the standard criteria 80 / 80.**

The first 80 meant students could do the formative test during the teaching program with average 80%. The last 80 meant students could do the speaking proficiency test after the teaching program with the standard criteria 80%.

The researcher analyzed data from 25 sample divided into five groups according to the five communicative tasks, Jigsaw, Information-gap, Decision-making, Problem-solving, and Opinion-exchange. The data from the speaking test conducted during and after the teaching program were analyzed using percentage (As shown in Table 3 to Table 7).

In order to know how the Jigsaw task affected English speaking proficiency, the results were shown in Table 3 on the next page.

**Table 3:** The effectiveness of the Jigsaw task on English speaking proficiency of Mattayomsuksa 6 students in Nongbuapittayakarn School with the standard criteria 80 / 80.

Number of students	Tests during teaching program		Posttest		Efficiency $E_1 / E_2$
	Total score	Average score	Total score	Average score	
5	200	162	40	34.40	81.00 / 86.00

Table 3 illustrates the scores for the English speaking test of Mattayomsuksa 6 students in Nongbuapittayakarn School using the Jigsaw task. The average scores during the teaching program were 162 and the percentage was 81.00. The average scores for the posttest were 34.40 and the percentage was 86.00.

The effectiveness of Jigsaw task on English speaking proficiency of Mattayomsuksa 6 students in Nongbuapittayakarn School was 81.00 / 86.00. This was higher than the standard criteria for efficiency which were determined at 80 / 80.

The results of the effectiveness of the Information-gap task on English speaking proficiency were displayed in Table 4 below.

**Table 4:** The effectiveness of the Information-gap task on English speaking proficiency of Mattayomsuksa 6 students in Nongbuapittayakarn School with the standard criteria 80 / 80.

Number of students	Tests during teaching program		Posttest		Efficiency $E_1 / E_2$
	Total score	Average score	Total score	Average score	
5	200	161.40	40	37.00	80.70 / 92.50

Table 4 illustrates the scores for the English speaking test Mattayomsuksa 6 students in Nongbuapittayakarn School using the Information-gap task. The average

scores during the teaching program were 161.40 and the percentage was 80.70.

The average scores for the posttest were 37.00 and the percentage was 92.50.

The effectiveness of Information-gap task on students' English speaking proficiency of Mattayomsuksa 6 students in Nongbuapittayakarn School was 80.70 / 92.50. This was higher than the standard criteria for the efficiency which was determined at 80 / 80.

The results of the effectiveness of the Decision-making task on English speaking proficiency were displayed in Table 5 below.

**Table 5:** The effectiveness of the Decision-making task on English speaking proficiency of Mattayomsuksa 6 students in Nongbuapittayakarn School with the standard criteria 80 / 80.

Number of students	Tests during teaching program		Posttest		Efficiency $E_1 / E_2$
	Total score	Average score	Total score	Average score	
5	200	162.60	40	31.80	81.30 / 79.50

Table 5 illustrates the scores for the English speaking test of Mattayomsuksa 6 students in Nongbuapittayakarn School using the Decision-making task. The average scores during the teaching program were 162.60 and the percentage was 81.30. The average scores for the posttest were 31.80 and the percentage was 79.50.

The effectiveness of the Decision-making task on English speaking proficiency of Mattayomsuksa 6 students in Nongbuapittayakarn School was 81.30 / 79.50. This was lower than the standard criteria for efficiency which were determined at 80 / 80.

The results of the effectiveness of the Problem-solving task on English speaking proficiency were displayed in Table 6 on the next page.

**Table 6:** The effectiveness of Problem-solving task on English Speaking proficiency of Mattayomsuksa 6 students in Nongbuapittayakarn School with the standard criteria 80 / 80.

Number of students	Tests during teaching program		Posttest		Efficiency $E_1 / E_2$
	Total score	Average score	Total score	Average score	
5	200	160	40	32.20	80.00 / 80.50

Table 6 illustrates the scores for the English speaking test of Mattayomsuksa 6 students in Nongbuapittayakarn School using the Problem-solving task. The average scores during the teaching program were 160 and the percentage was 80.00.

The average scores for the posttest were 32.20 and the percentage was 80.50.

The effectiveness of the Problem-solving task on English speaking proficiency of Mattayomsuksa 6 students in Nongbuapittayakarn School were 80.00 / 80.50. This was higher than the standard criteria for the efficiency which was determined at 80 / 80.

The results of the effectiveness of the Opinion-exchange task on English speaking proficiency were displayed in Table 7 below.

**Table 7:** The effectiveness of the Opinion-exchange task on English speaking proficiency of Mattayomsuksa 6 students in Nongbuapittayakarn School with the standard criteria 80 / 80.

Number of students	Tests during teaching program		Posttest		Efficiency $E_1 / E_2$
	Total score	Average score	Total score	Average score	
5	200	165	40	28.20	82.60 / 70.50

Table 7 illustrates the scores for the English speaking test of Mattayomsuksa 6 students in Nongbuapittayakarn School using the Opinion-exchange task. The average scores during the teaching program were 165 and the percentage was 82.60. The average scores for the posttest were 28.20 and the percentage was 70.50.

The effectiveness of the Opinion-exchange task on students' English speaking proficiency of Mattayomsuksa 6 students in Nongbuapittayakarn School was 82.60 / 70.50. This was lower than the standard criteria for efficiency which was determined at 80 / 80.

Overall, the effectiveness of the five communicative tasks on students' English speaking proficiency of Mattayomsuksa 6 students in Nongbuapittayakarn School with the standard criteria 80/80 ranging from Information-gap task (80.70 / 92.50), Jigsaw task (81.00 / 86.00), Problem-solving task (80.00 / 80.50), Decision-making task (81.30 / 79.50), and Opinion exchange task (82.60 / 70.50) respectively. Two tasks gained lower effectiveness than the determined standard criteria, Decision-making task and Opinion-exchanging task.

**A comparison of English proficiency scores prior to and after using the five communicative tasks.**

After the teaching program, the sample was given the posttest in order to compare the proficiency scores prior to and after using the five communicative tasks of Mattayomsuksa 6 students in Nongbuapittayakarn School and the findings were displayed in Table 8 on the next page.

**Table 8:** A comparison of English proficiency scores prior to and after using the five communicative tasks of Mattayomsuksa 6 students in Nongbuapittayakarn School.

Test	Number of students	Total score	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	t
Pretest	25	40	15.56	2.80	19.612**
Posttest	25	40	32.72	3.12	

Table 8 illustrates the test results prior to and after using the five communicative tasks were significantly different at the .01 level. The average scores after the lesson were significantly higher than prior to the lesson.

The English proficiency scores prior to and after using the Jigsaw task were displayed in Table 9 below.

**Table 9:** A comparison of English speaking proficiency scores prior to and after using the Jigsaw task of Mattayomsuksa 6 students in Nongbuapittayakarn School.

Test Type	Number of students	Total score	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	t
Pretest	5	40	13.60	1.14	42.458**
Posttest	5	40	34.40	1.14	

Table 9 illustrates the test results prior to and after using Jigsaw task were significantly different at the .01 level. The average scores after the lesson were significantly higher than prior to the lesson.

The English proficiency scores prior to and after using the Information-gap task was displayed in Table 10 below.

**Table 10:** A comparison of English proficiency scores prior to and after using the Information-gap task of Mattayomsuksa 6 students in Nongbuapittayakarn School.

Test Type	Number of students	Total score	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	t
Pretest	5	40	15.40	2.70	19.243**
Posttest	5	40	37.00	1.00	

Table 10 illustrates the study results prior to and after using the Information-gap task were significantly different at the .01 level. The average scores after the lesson were significantly higher than prior to the lesson.

The English proficiency scores prior to and after using the Decision-making task were displayed in Table 11 below.

**Table 11:** A comparison of English speaking proficiency scores prior to and after using the Decision-making task of Mattayomsuksa 6 students in Nongbuapittayakarn School.

Test Type	Number of students	Total score	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	t
Pretest	5	40	19.00	2.54	12.551**
Posttest	5	40	31.80	0.83	

Table 11 illustrates the test results prior to and after using the Decision-making task were significantly different at the .01 level. The average scores after the lesson were significantly higher than prior to the lesson.

The English proficiency scores prior to and after using the Problem-solving task were displayed in Table 12 below.

**Table 12:** A comparison on English speaking proficiency scores prior to and after using the Problem-solving task of Mattayomsuksa 6 students in Nongbuapittayakarn School.

Test Type	Number of students	Total score	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	t
Pretest	5	40	14.60	2.88	11.707**
Posttest	5	40	32.20	1.30	

Table 12 illustrates the test results prior to and after using the Problem-solving task were significantly different at the .01 level. The average scores after the lesson were significantly higher than prior to the lesson.

The English proficiency scores prior to and after using the Opinion-exchange task were displayed in Table 13 below.

**Table 13:** A comparison of English speaking proficiency scores prior to and after using the Opinion-exchange task of Mattayomsuksa 6 students in Nongbuapittayakarn School.

Test Type	Number of students	Total score	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	t
Pretest	5	40	15.20	1.64	14.534**
Posttest	5	40	28.20	0.83	

Table 13 illustrates the test results prior to and after using the Opinion-exchange task were significantly different at the .01 level. The average scores after the lesson were significantly higher than prior to the lesson.

2. Analysis of comparing of the differences on the English speaking proficiency results for each communicative task using the five communicative tasks and examining the paired differences between the five communicative tasks.

The five communicative tasks consisted of Jigsaw, Information-gap, Decision-making, Problem-solving, and Opinion-exchange. In this section, there were two aspects to analyze. First, the English speaking proficiency results of the five communicative tasks were compared after the teaching program to examine the differences using One-Way ANOVA. Second, pairs of the five communicative tasks were analyzed to examine the differences using Least Significant Difference (As shown in Table 14 to Table 15).

In order to know the results when comparing the differences on the English speaking proficiency results using the five communicative tasks, they were displayed in table 14 below.

**Table 14:** A comparison of the differences on the English speaking proficiency results for each communicative task using the five communicative tasks.

Sources of variation	SS	df	MS	F
Between groups	213.440	4	53.360	49.407**
Within groups	21.600	20	1.080	
Total	235.040	24		

The findings to analyze a comparison on the differences of the English speaking proficiency results using the five communicative tasks were displayed below.

As shown in Table 14, the English speaking proficiency results using the five communicative tasks were significantly different at the .01 level. It was clearly stated that the average scores of at least one pair of the five communicative tasks was different. In other words, there was at least one pair of the five communicative tasks making students' English speaking proficiency results different.

A comparison of the differences on each pair of the five communicative task was displayed in Table 15 below.

**Table 15:** A comparison of the differences on each pair of the five communicative tasks.

Communicative tasks	Jigsaw ( $\bar{X}$ = 34.40)	Information gap ( $\bar{X}$ = 37.00)	Decision- making ( $\bar{X}$ = 31.80)	Problem solving ( $\bar{X}$ = 32.20)	Opinion Exchange ( $\bar{X}$ = 28.20)
Jigsaw ( $\bar{X}$ = 34.40)	-	-	-	-	
Information gap ( $\bar{X}$ = 37.00)	2.60**	-	-	-	
Decision-making ( $\bar{X}$ = 31.80)	-0.60**	-5.20**	-	-	
Problem solving ( $\bar{X}$ = 32.20)	-0.20**	-4.80**	0.40	-	
Opinion Exchange ( $\bar{X}$ = 28.20)	-0.20**	-8.80**	-3.60**	-4.00**	-

The findings to analyze a comparison of the differences on each pair of the five communicative tasks

As shown in Table 15, each pair of the five communicative tasks was compared as follows:

A comparison between Jigsaw and other tasks including Information-gap, Decision-making, Problem-solving, and Opinion-exchange. A comparison between Information tasks and other tasks including Decision-making, Problem-solving, and Opinion-exchange. A comparison between Decision-making and Opinion-exchange. A comparison between Problem-solving and Opinion-exchange.

In summary, the overall pairs of the five communicative tasks were significantly different at the .01 level. However, there was one pair: Problem-solving and Decision-making which was not different.

### 3. Analysis for students' attitudes towards the five communicative tasks.

In this section, the researcher had collected the data from 25 sample. The data from the students' attitude questionnaire were collected after the teaching program.

To study the effect of the five communicative tasks to students' attitude, the researcher had examined students' attitude of their roles towards the five communicative tasks using the students' attitude questionnaire which consisted of 20 items. They were used to examine the sample's opinions towards the five communicative tasks. The students' attitude questionnaire was administered after the teaching program. The attitude questionnaire used a five-point Likert's rating scale ranging from 5 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree) and the results were presented in table 16.

**Table 16:** Students' attitudes towards the five communicative tasks.

No	Items	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
1	I have fun and enjoy doing speaking activities using the five communicative tasks.	4.75	0.44
2	I can speak English fluently after learning using the five communicative tasks.	4.45	0.51
3	I can apply the five communicative tasks in real life situations.	4.45	0.51
4	I speak English with confidence after doing speaking activities using the five communicative tasks.	4.75	0.44

**Table 16:** Students' attitudes towards the five communicative tasks (Continued).

No	Items	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
5	English speaking activities using the five communicative tasks enhance me to communicate in various situations.	4.65	0.48
6	English speaking activities using the five communicative tasks provide me pleasure while speaking.	4.70	0.47
7	English speaking activities using the five communicative tasks encourage me to express more ideas and opinions.	4.60	0.50
8*	English speaking activities using the five communicative tasks make me bored while learning.	2.25	0.55
9*	I am confused of the speaking activities using the five communicative tasks.	2.15	0.58
10*	The contents are confusing because there are too many materials.	2.40	0.68
11*	I don't like doing speaking activities in pairs or groups.	2.00	0.56
12*	I don't like to speak English because I don't know the vocabulary, grammar and technique using the five communicative tasks.	2.20	0.52
13*	I am confused of the speaking activities using the five communicative tasks.	2.20	0.69
14*	The contents are confusing because there are too many materials.	2.05	0.51
15*	I don't like doing speaking activities in pairs or groups.	2.40	0.68
16	The steps of doing speaking activities using communicative tasks are very confusing.	4.60	0.50

**Table 16:** Students' attitudes towards the five communicative tasks (Continued).

No	Items	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
17	The students perform pair works and group works effectively.	4.55	0.51
18	The students can apply using five communicative tasks in real life situations.	2.40	0.50
19	The pretest / posttest are relevant to the contents.	4.65	0.48
20	I am content with the scores for English listening and speaking course using the five communicative tasks	4.55	0.51
Total		3.64	0.12

\* means negative attitudes

As shown in Table 16, the average scores of the individual items concerning the students' attitude towards the five communicative tasks also supported the overall results. The first three ranks were shown respectively. The first rank consisted of two items (1 and 4). The students strongly agreed that they had fun and enjoyed doing speaking activities using the five communicative tasks and also, they spoke English with confidence after doing speaking activities using the five communicative tasks which the Mean was at 4.75. The second rank was item 6. The students strongly agreed that English speaking activities using the five communicative tasks provided them pleasure while speaking which the Mean was at 4.70. The third rank consisted of two items (5, 19). The students agreed that English speaking activities using the five communicative tasks encouraged them to communicate in various situations and also, the pretest / posttest were deemed relevant to the contents which the Mean was at 4.65.

However, only the item 11 was found that the students disagreed that they didn't like doing speaking activities in pairs or groups for which the Mean was at 2.00.

The average scores of the overall attitudes were at 3.64