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ABSTRACT: This study aims to find out the difference in the oral fluency of students who are taught using 4/3/2 technique and those who are taught without using it. This study adopted true-experimental research design. The experiment took place at SMAN 2 Malang. This study yields two findings related to students’ oral fluency. Firstly, 4/3/2 technique does not give significant effects on students’ oral fluency in terms of their speaking speed. Secondly, 4/3/2 technique does not give significant effects on the students’ oral fluency in terms of the students’ hesitations, repetitions, and false starts.
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The use of English for everyday communication all over the world has made it an important language to be learnt. In Indonesia, English is taught as an elective subject in primary school and as a compulsory subject in secondary school. The students formally study English for 8 years or more. Nevertheless, Savignon, (1983: 39) states that no matter how long they learn English, they will find themselves in difficulty when they have to communicate in the real situation. This phenomenon normally happens since the students do not have much time to practice it. In line with Savignon’s statement, Priyono, cited in Suryawira (2011), points out that the national final examination and the university entrance test still emphasize structural knowledge rather than communicative skills. Students focus more on studying grammar, reading, and listening skill rather than speaking skill in order to achieve a good result. This focus misleads the learners’ aim of learning English. They learn English primarily should be in order to be able to communicate effectively.

In order to help the students be able to communicate effectively, in this study the researchers used 4/3/2 technique. According to Nation (1983), the 4/3/2 technique is a technique for developing fluency and includes the features that are needed in fluency development activities. This technique offers three advantages, i.e.: 1) the speaker has different listener in every 4, 3, and 2 minutes she/he speaks. This will lead the speaker to focus on the message being communicated to three different listeners, 2) the speaker will repeat the same talk for three times. This
will help her/him to improve her/his confidence and lessen mistakes/error, 3) the reduced time from 4 to 3 and to 2 minutes means that as the speaker delivers her/his talk more fluently, there is no need to add additional information to fill the available time.

In determining students’ oral fluency, the teacher must know how to measure fluency. According to Nation (1989), fluency can be measured by calculating the number of words per minute spoken during each of the three deliveries of the talk, and by calculating the number of hesitations, repetitions, and false starts per 100 words for each delivery. The number of words spoken in each delivery will be decreased with the number of hesitations like *um* and *ah*, repetitions such as *well I, I, see that, that he*, and false start.

Some studies had been conducted related to this technique. As Suryawira (2011) stated on his study, previous studies had investigated the effect of the technique on the fluency of advanced learners and adult learners. Suryawira had investigated whether the use of 4/3/2 technique is effective or not to be implemented to junior high school level. The results of previous studies had shown that the 4/3/2 technique is effective to improve students’ oral fluency.

This study investigated the effectiveness of 4/3/2 technique in senior high school level. This technique was implemented to senior high school students grade X or adolescents in SMAN 2 Malang.

**METHOD**

This study intended to find out the effectiveness of the 4/3/2 technique in fluency learning strategy by comparing two groups. By finding the measurement of the effectiveness of the 4/3/2 technique in fluency, this study can prove the hypothesis and answer the problem of the study. Thus, this study used true-experimental design which belongs to quantitative methods. The type of true-experiment implemented in this study is *randomized posttest only control group design*. This is a typical design that does not use pretest because the samples are equal.

The sample of this study was eight students of grade X majoring in language program (X-G). The students were divided into two groups: four students were in the experimental group (Group E), and four others were in the control group (Group C). Before dividing the sample into two groups, the writer
had to ensure that the two groups had equal competence. The competence of the students was determined by their academic transcripts from the school.
In this study, the data were collected through measuring the fluency of both groups.

In giving treatment, the writer conducted the treatment to Group E for four meetings. The first meeting was for introducing the technique, while the second and the third meetings were for getting them used to the technique. In applying the technique, the students were given topics to get them focus on what they had to deliver. In another side, Group C was not given any treatment. Yet, the writer still conducted four meetings for Group C. The first three meetings were for speaking activities in which the 4/3/2 technique was not applied. The students in Group C were given the same topics as in Group E. They also delivered their talk but they did not have any pressure in time constraint of the 4/3/2 technique. The last meeting was used for testing the technique and collecting the data from Group E and Group C. The students’ talks from each group were recorded and analyzed to be compared.

**FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS**

There are two findings of this study: the students’ speaking speed in words per minute and the number of hesitations, repetitions, and false starts per 100 words for each delivery.

**Speaking Speed in Words Per Minute**

The oral fluency of the students was measured by calculating the number of words per minute spoken during each of the three deliveries (Nation, 1989). The speaking speed of Group E and Group C is illustrated in table 3.1 and 3.2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.1</th>
<th>The Students’ Speaking Speed in Words per Minute of Experimental Group (Group E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Wpm in 4 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>42.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>44.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>43.875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the data above, both students of Group E and Group C made improvement in their oral fluency between deliveries. Group E showed an increase in the rate of speaking from the first to third delivery, ranging from 36.26% to 63.13%. Group C also showed an increase in the rate of speaking from the first to third delivery, ranging from 26.82% to 74.13%. Group C had bigger range (27.05%) than Group E (47.31%). Yet, Group E increased in average 45.02% while Group C increased in average 42.73%. The mean of Experimental Group is bigger than Control Group. However, it cannot be concluded that Group E achieves better than Group C and the null hypothesis is rejected. To decide it, the writer needed to do a hypothesis testing. Here are the statements of null hypothesis and alternative hypothesis of the students’ speaking speed.

Null hypothesis

\[ H_0 : \mu_A = \mu_B \]  
there is no difference between the students’ speaking speed of experimental group and control group

Alternative hypothesis

\[ H_1 : \mu_A \neq \mu_B \]  
there is a difference between the students’ speaking speed of experimental group and control group

In order to know whether null hypothesis is rejected or not, the data of the students’ speaking speed in words per minute was analyzed using Independent Samples T-test to test the hypothesis as represented in the table below.

Table 3.2  The Students’ Speaking Speed in Words per Minute of Control Group (Group C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Wpm in 4 minutes</th>
<th>Wpm in 3 minutes</th>
<th>Wpm in 2 minutes</th>
<th>Percentage increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>74.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>55.25</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>36.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>51.25</td>
<td>60.33</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>26.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>88.33</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>50.75</td>
<td>63.415</td>
<td>70.25</td>
<td>42.73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.3  Independent Samples T-test of the Students’ Speaking speed in Words per Minute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students’ Speaking Speed</th>
<th>Equal variances assumed</th>
<th>Equal variances not assumed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>4.902</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the analysis shows that calculated significance level is the same or less than 0.05 (sig. level ≤0.05), the null hypothesis is rejected and vice versa. In addition, if t-value is the same or bigger than t-table (t-value ≥t-table), the null hypothesis is rejected and vice versa.

According to the table above, the Sig. value is 0.363 of significance level 0.05. Sig. value > significance level (0.363 > 0.05) and t-value < t-value from the table (0.184 < 1.943). Therefore it can be inferred that null hypothesis cannot be rejected and there is no difference of students’ speaking speed in words per minute between Group E and Group C.

**Hesitations, Repetitions, and False Starts per 100 Words**

The oral fluency of the students was measured by calculating the number of hesitations, repetitions, and false starts per 100 words for each of the three deliveries (Nation, 1989). The hesitations, repetitions, and false starts per 100 words of Group E and Group C are illustrated in table 3.4 and 3.5 below.
According to the data above, the number of hesitations, repetitions, and false starts decreased in each delivery. Some students tended to increase the number of hesitations, repetitions, and false starts from first delivery (4 minutes) to second delivery (2 minutes). Yet, they decreased it in the third delivery (2 minutes). Group E showed a decrease in the number of hesitations, repetitions, and false starts from the first to third delivery, ranging from 31.86% to 71.99%. Group C also showed a decrease in the number of hesitations, repetitions, and false starts from the first to third delivery, ranging from 28.67% to 55.85%. Group E had bigger range (40.13%) than Group C (27.18%). The average of percentage decrease of between two groups is different. The average of Group E (52.55%) is bigger than Group C (43.20%). However, it cannot be concluded that Group E achieves better than Group C and the null hypothesis is rejected. To decide it, the writer needed to do a hypothesis testing. Here are the statements of null hypothesis and alternative hypothesis of students’ hesitation, repetitions, and false starts.
Null hypothesis

$H_0: \mu_A = \mu_B$  
there is no difference between the students’ hesitation, repetitions, and false starts of experimental group and control group

Alternative hypothesis

$H_1: \mu_A \neq \mu_B$  
there is a difference between the students’ hesitation, repetitions, and false starts of experimental group and control group

In order to know whether null hypothesis is rejected or not, the data of the students’ hesitation, repetitions, and false starts per 100 words was analyzed using Independent Samples T-test to test the hypothesis as represented in table below.

| Table 3.6 Independent Samples T-test of the Students’ Hesitations, Repetitions, and False Starts per 100 Words |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Levine’s Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| | F | Sig. | 1 | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | Lower | Upper |
| not assumed | .881 | 5.137 | .418 | 9.35000 | 10.61545 | -17.72107 | 36.42107 |

If the analysis shows that calculated significance level is the same or less than 0.05 (sig. level ≤0.05), the null hypothesis is rejected and vice versa. In addition, if t-value is the same or bigger than t-table (t-value ≥t-table), the null hypothesis is rejected and vice versa.

According to the table above, the Sig. value is 0.246 of significance level 0.05. Sig. value > significance level (0.246 > 0.05) and t-value < t-value from the table (0.881 < 1.943), therefore it can be inferred that null hypothesis cannot be
rejected and there is no difference of students’ hesitation, repetitions, and false starts of Group E and Group C.

Both null hypothesis of students’ speaking speed and students’ hesitation, repetitions, and false starts cannot be rejected though the mean of experimental group is bigger than control group.

Discussions

Based on the result of the statistical analysis of students’ speaking rate and students’ hesitations, repetitions, and false starts, it can be concluded that the 4/3/2 technique does not give significance effects on the students’ oral fluency, both on the students’ speaking speed and the students’ hesitations, repetitions, and false starts.

On average, the percentage increase of speaking speed of experimental group (Group E) increased by 45.02% from the first delivery to the third delivery. While the percentage increase of speaking speed of control group (Group C) increased by 42.73% from the first delivery to the third delivery. Though the percentage increase of Group E is higher than that of Group C, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. According to the statistical analysis using Independent Samples T-test, the difference between the two groups is not significant.

The percentage of students’ hesitations, repetitions, and false starts of Group E decreased by 52.55% from the first to the third delivery. At the same time, the percentage decrease of students’ hesitations, repetitions, and false starts of Group C decreased by 43.20% from the first to the third delivery. Still, the percentage increase of Group E is higher than Group C, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. According to the statistical analysis using Independent Samples T-test, the difference between the two groups is not significant.

There are numbers of possible reasons why the 4/3/2 technique does not give significant effects on students’ oral fluency. First of all, the students felt bored since they had to speak in 4, 3, and 2 minutes continually without a break. Repetitious drills can bore the students (Brown, 2007: 331).

Second, the students kept talking with the same topic without any response or interaction from the listener. Speaking without any interaction would rob speaking skill of its richest component (Brown, 2007: 327). The 4/3/2
technique does not allow the listener to respond to what the speaker said. If the listener can respond, the speaker might have a conversation which makes his/her talk goes naturally and improved by exchanging or share the message or information about the topic being talked. In this study, control group had discussion on their unrecorded meeting. Though the result shows that experimental group achieved better percentage average, it does not show that both groups have significance difference. In other words, the 4/3/2 technique is not much better than the conventional way, discussion.

The third reason is the intensity. The implementation of the 4/3/2 technique is only done once for control group and 4 times for experimental group. This is, of course, not sufficient to improve their oral fluency, since oral fluency is not a temporary skill. In order to improve oral fluency, the 4/3/2 technique might be implemented several times in a long period of time.

The forth reason might be because of feedback that was not given during the implementation of the 4/3/2 technique in this study. As Nation (1989) states that listener does not interrupt and does not ask questions, the listener’s job is merely to listen. Even the teacher cannot make correction or give feedback when the student makes error or mistake. Brown (2007: 331) explains that feedback is important for the students to take advantage of the teachers’ knowledge of English to inject the kinds of corrective feedback that are appropriate for the moment. Yet, this study focuses on the oral fluency, not oral accuracy. Davies & Pearse (2000:35) define that oral fluency focuses on how the students convey the information without hesitation of grammar awareness. Thus, the feedback for the students in this study is merely to boost them to speak more.

The fifth reason can be because of the noise made by other students’ outside the classroom and the time. The X-G class is located near the canteen and the data collection was done during the break time and after the bell rang. Therefore, they cannot fully concentrate on what they were talking about.

Another reason is that this technique is not practical. If it is applied in a class, the teachers must manage each pair and the turn of speaking. It was also quite confusing for the writer to decide which student that will be speaker and listener. Furthermore, the students who have not got the turn to speak or to listen will make a noise or do other things in order that they will not get bored. To solve this problem, the teachers can divide the students into several groups consisting of
four students. Each group will manage the turn and the students who have not got the turn to speak or to listen can set the time.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Conclusions
Based on the research problem, findings, and data analysis, it can be concluded that there is no difference between experimental group who was taught using 4/3/2 technique and the control group who was taught without using 4/3/2 technique in terms of speaking speed, students’ hesitations, repetitions, and false starts.

First, Table 3.1 and Table 3.2 show that the percentage of students’ speaking speed of experimental group and control group increased. The experimental group had bigger percentage increase of speaking speed than control group’s percentage increase. However, according to statistical analysis, the significance value is 0.363 of significance level 0.05. Significance value > significance level (0.363 > 0.05) and t-value < t-value from the table (0.184 < 1.943). Therefore it can be inferred that null hypothesis cannot be rejected and there is no difference of students’ speaking speed in words per minute between two groups.

Second, Table 3.4 and Table 3.5 show that the percentage of students’ hesitations, repetitions, and false starts of experimental group and control group decreased. The experimental group had bigger percentage decrease of students’ hesitations, repetitions, and false starts than control group’s percentage decrease. Meanwhile, it is statistically proven that students’ hesitations, repetitions, and false starts of the Sig. value is 0.246 of significance level 0.05. Sig. value > significance level (0.246 > 0.05) and t-value < t-value from the table (0.881 < 1.943). Thus, it can be inferred that null hypothesis cannot be rejected and there is no difference of students’ hesitation, repetitions, and false starts of both group.

Suggestions
The results of this study are expected to give contribution to English teachers and future researchers. Although the findings show that there is no significant difference of the students who were taught with 4/3/2 technique and the students who were taught without using 4/3/2 technique, English teachers can still apply
Technique to improve students’ oral fluency. There are some reasons why English teachers can still apply this technique. Nation (1989) states that 4/3/2 technique has three advantages, that is: 1) the speaker has different listener in every 4, 3, and 2 minutes she/he speaks. This will lead the speaker to focus on the message being communicated to three different listeners, 2) the speaker will repeat the same talk for three times. This will help her/him to improve her/his confidence and lessen mistakes/error, 3) the reduced time from 4 to 3 and to 2 minutes means that as the speaker delivers her/his talk more fluently, there is no need to add additional information to fill the available time.

For variation in their teaching, teachers can apply 4/3/2 technique once per week in several months to avoid boredom of the students.

There are some suggestions for further researchers who want to conduct similar topic for their study. First, they might consider analyzing students’ oral accuracy or analyzing both students’ oral accuracy and fluency. Second, before conducting the same topic of this study, they are suggested to do a pre-test of speaking proficiency rather than using general English pre-test or achievement.
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