

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

This chapter presents the quantitative results based on the research question. The question was what extent does Cultural Experiential Instruction have the effects on English oral communication ability of lower secondary school students. This chapter reported the overall quantitative results obtained from the pretest and posttest mean scores. In addition, the scores from each item in the pretest and posttest were also presented in detail in order to show the effectiveness of Cultural Experiential Instruction on students' English oral communication ability.

English Oral Communication Ability

The research question focused on the effects of Cultural Experiential Instruction on students' English oral communication ability. The data from the pretest and posttest mean scores were analyzed. The research question and the hypothesis were stated as follows:

Research question: To what extent does Cultural Experiential Instruction improve English oral communication ability of lower secondary school students?

Hypothesis: The posttest mean scores on English oral communication of lower secondary school students are higher than the pretest mean scores at the significant level of .05.

This research question aimed at exploring whether Cultural Experiential Instruction improved English oral communication scores of lower secondary

school students. The English Oral Communication Test was used to evaluate students' English oral communication ability. Table 4.1 shows the pretest and posttest mean scores, standard deviations, and t-values.

Table 4.1

Means, standard deviations, t-values, and the significance of the pre English Oral Communication Test and the post English Oral Communication Test (N = 45)

Pictures	\bar{X}		Mean Differences	S.D.	t.	df.	Sig.
	Before	After					
1. Hi! What's up?	28.89	48.67	-19.77	5.83	-22.74	44	.000*
2. World Food	28.89	49.11	-20.22	6.21	-21.83	44	.000*
3. Festivals and Celebrations	26.67	46.00	-19.33	5.80	-22.36	44	.000*
4. Will you marry me?	26.00	45.56	-19.55	7.05	-18.59	44	.000*
5. Around the World	25.33	46.00	-20.66	5.80	-23.90	44	.000*
6. Superstition	25.33	42.00	-16.66	6.39	-17.48	44	.000*
7. Body Language	28.67	47.56	-18.88	5.31	-23.82	44	.000*

*p < .05

The results from Table 4.1 showed that the posttest mean scores of the English Oral Communication Test was higher than the pretest mean scores. The mean differences of Picture 1 "Hi! What's up?" was -19.77 and the t-value was -22.74. The mean differences of Picture 2 "World Food" was -20.22 and the t-value was

-21.83. The mean differences of Picture 3 “Festivals and Celebrations” was -19.33 and the t-value was -22.36. The mean differences of Picture 4 “Will you marry me?” was -19.55 and the t-value was -18.56. The mean differences of Picture 5 “Around the World” was -20.66 and the t-value was -23.90. The mean differences of Picture 6 “Superstition” was -16.66 and the t-value was -17.48. The mean differences of Picture 7 “Body Language” was -18.88 and the t-value was -23.82. It is apparent that there were significant differences between the pretest and posttest mean scores of the English oral communication test at a significant level at the .05 level.

Furthermore, Table 4.2 to Table 4.15 illustrated the frequency, percentage, mean scores, standard deviations of the pretest and the posttest score distribution of students’ English oral communication ability before and after studying Cultural Experiential Instruction.

Table 4.2

Picture 1 (Hi! What’s up?): Means and Standard Deviation of the Pretest and Posttest Score Distribution of Students’ English Oral Communication Ability before and after studying Cultural Experiential Instruction

	\bar{X}	S.D.	t.	Sig.
Before	28.89	8.58	-22.74	.000*
After	48.67	7.86		

*p < .05

Table 4.2 shows that for the first lesson “Hi! What’s up?”, the findings indicated that before receiving Cultural Experiential Instruction, the students’ mean score of English oral communication ability was 28.89 and the standard deviation was

8.58. On the contrary, the students' mean scores of English oral communication ability after receiving Cultural Experiential Instruction changed significantly to 48.67 ($p < .05$) and the standard deviation was 7.86.

Table 4.3

Picture 1 (Hi! What's up?): Frequency and Percentage of the Pretest and Posttest Score Distribution of Students' English Oral Communication Ability before and after studying Cultural Experiential Instruction

TSE Score	Frequency		Percentage	
	Before	After	Before	After
20	16	-	35.6	-
30	21	-	46.7	-
40	5	17	11.0	37.8
50	3	17	6.7	37.8
60	-	11	-	24.4
Total	45	45	100.0	100.0

From the TSE Scores of Picture 1, the pretest scores showed that the majority or 21 students (46%) scored at 30. In contrast, the posttest scores showed that the majority or 17 students (37.8%) scored at 40 and 50 respectively. This indicated that the students' English oral communication ability had increased after receiving Cultural Experiential Instruction.

Table 4.4

Picture 2 (World Food): Means and Standard Deviation of the Pretest and Posttest Score Distribution of Students' English Oral Communication Ability before and after studying Cultural Experiential Instruction

	\bar{X}	S.D.	t.	Sig.
Before	28.89	8.84	-21.83	.000*
After	49.11	7.92		

* $p < .05$

Table 4.4 shows that for the second lesson "World Food", the findings indicated that before receiving Cultural Experiential Instruction, the students' mean score of English oral communication ability was 28.89 and the standard deviation was 8.84. On the contrary, the students' mean scores of English oral communication ability after receiving Cultural Experiential Instruction changed significantly to 49.11 ($p < .05$) and the standard deviation was 7.92.

Table 4.5

Picture 2 (World Food): Frequency and Percentage of the Pretest and Posttest Score Distribution of Students' English Oral Communication Ability before and after studying Cultural Experiential Instruction

TSE Score	Frequency		Percentage	
	Before	After	Before	After
20	17	-	37.8	-
30	19	-	42.2	-
40	6	16	13.3	35.6
50	3	17	6.7	37.8
60	-	12	-	26.7
Total	45	45	100.0	100.0

From the TSE Scores of the picture 2, the pretest scores showed that the majority or 19 students (42.2%) scored at 30. In contrast, the posttest scores showed that the majority or 17 students (37.8%) scored at 50. This indicated that the students' English oral communication ability had increased after receiving Cultural Experiential Instruction.

Table 4.6

Picture 3 (Festivals and Celebrations): Means and Standard Deviation of the Pretest and Posttest Score Distribution of Students' English Oral Communication Ability before and after studying Cultural Experiential Instruction

	\bar{X}	S.D.	t.	Sig.
Before	26.67	7.38	-22.36	.000*
After	46.00	8.36		

*p < .05

Table 4.6 shows that for the third lesson "Festivals and Celebrations", the findings indicated that before receiving Cultural Experiential Instruction, the students' mean score of English oral communication ability was 26.67 and the standard deviation was 7.38. On the contrary, the students' mean scores of English oral communication ability after receiving Cultural Experiential Instruction changed significantly to 46.00 ($p < .05$) and the standard deviation was 8.36.

Table 4.7

Picture 3 (Festivals and Celebrations): Frequency and Percentage of the Pretest and Posttest Score Distribution of Students' English Oral Communication Ability before and after studying Cultural Experiential Instruction

TSE Score	Frequency		Percentage	
	Before	After	Before	After
20	21	-	46.7	-
30	19	3	42.2	6.7
40	4	19	8.9	42.2
50	1	16	2.2	35.6
60	-	7	-	15.6
Total	45	45	100.0	100.0

From the TSE Scores of Picture 4, the pretest scores showed that the majority or 20 students (46.7%) scored at 20. In contrast, the posttest scores showed that the majority or 19 students (42.2%) scored at 40. This revealed that the students' English oral communication ability had increased after receiving Cultural Experiential Instruction.

Table 4.8

Picture 4 (Will you marry me?): Means and Standard Deviation of the Pretest and Posttest Score Distribution of Students' English Oral Communication Ability before and after studying Cultural Experiential Instruction

	\bar{X}	S.D.	t.	Sig.
Before	26.00	7.50	-18.59	.000*
After	45.56	9.66		

*p < .05

Table 4.8 shows that for the fourth lesson "Will you marry me?", the findings indicated that before receiving Cultural Experiential Instruction, the students' mean score of English oral communication ability was 26.00 and the standard deviation was 7.50. On the contrary, the students' mean scores of English oral communication ability after receiving Cultural Experiential Instruction changed significantly to 45.56 (p<.05) and the standard deviation was 9.66.

Table 4.9

Picture 4 (Will you marry me?): Frequency and Percentage of the Pretest and Posttest Score Distribution of Students' English Oral Communication Ability before and after studying Cultural Experiential Instruction

TSE Score	Frequency		Percentage	
	Before	After	Before	After
20	24	-	53.3	-
30	16	6	35.6	13.3
40	4	17	8.9	37.8
50	1	13	2.2	28.9
60	-	9	-	20.0
Total	45	45	100.0	100.0

From the TSE Scores in Picture 5, the pretest scores showed that the majority or 24 students (53.3%) scored at 20. In contrast, the posttest scores showed that the majority or 17 students (37.8%) scored at 40. This shows that the students' English oral communication ability had increased after receiving Cultural Experiential Instruction.

Table 4.10

Picture 5 (Around the World): Means and Standard Deviation of the Pretest and Posttest Score Distribution of Students' English Oral Communication Ability before and after studying Cultural Experiential Instruction

	\bar{X}	S.D.	t.	Sig.
Before	25.33	6.25	-23.90	.000*
After	46.00	8.36		

* $p < .05$

Table 4.10 shows that for the fifth lesson "Around the World", the findings indicated that before receiving Cultural Experiential Instruction, the students' mean score of English oral communication ability was 25.33 and the standard deviation was 6.25. On the contrary, the students' mean scores of English oral communication ability after receiving Cultural Experiential Instruction changed significantly to 46.00 ($p < .05$) and the standard deviation was 8.36.

Table 4.11

Picture 5 (Around the World): Frequency and Percentage of the Pretest and Posttest Score Distribution of Students' English Oral Communication Ability before and after studying Cultural Experiential Instruction

TSE Score	Frequency		Percentage	
	Before	After	Before	After
20	24	-	53.3	-
30	18	3	40.0	6.7
40	3	19	6.7	42.2
50	-	16	-	35.6
60	-	7	-	15.6
Total	45	45	100.0	100.0

From the TSE Scores of Picture 5, the pretest scores showed that the majority or 24 students (53.3%) scored at 20. In contrast, the posttest scores showed that the majority or 19 students (42.2%) scored at 40. This indicated that the students' English oral communication ability had increased after receiving Cultural Experiential Instruction.

Table 4.12

Picture 6 (Superstition): Means and Standard Deviation of the Pretest and Posttest Score Distribution of Students' English Oral Communication Ability before and after studying Cultural Experiential Instruction

	\bar{X}	S.D.	t.	Sig.
Before	25.33	6.25	-17.48	.000*
After	42.00	9.19		

*p < .05

Table 4.12 shows that for the sixth lesson "Superstition", the findings indicated that before receiving Cultural Experiential Instruction, the students' mean score of English oral communication ability was 25.33 and the standard deviation was 6.25. On the contrary, the students' mean scores of English oral communication ability after receiving Cultural Experiential Instruction changed significantly to 42.00 (p<.05) and the standard deviation was 9.19.

Table 4.13

Picture 6 (Superstition): Frequency and Percentage of the Pretest and Posttest Score Distribution of Students' English Oral Communication Ability before and after studying Cultural Experiential Instruction

TSE Score	Frequency		Percentage	
	Before	After	Before	After
20	24	-	53.3	-
30	18	10	40.0	22.2
40	3	21	6.7	46.7
50	-	9	-	20.0
60	-	5	-	11.1
Total	45	45	100.0	100.0

From the TSE Scores of Picture 6, the pretest scores showed that the majority or 24 students (53.3%) scored at 20. In contrast, the posttest scores showed that the majority or 21 students (46.7%) scored at 40. This revealed that the students' English oral communication ability had increased after receiving Cultural Experiential Instruction.

Table 4.14

Picture 7 (Body Language): Means and Standard Deviation of the Pretest and Posttest Score Distribution of Students' English Oral Communication Ability before and after studying Cultural Experiential Instruction

	\bar{X}	S.D.	t.	Sig.
Before	28.67	8.14	-17.48	.000*
After	47.56	8.56		

* $p < .05$

Table 4.14 shows that for the seventh lesson "Body Language", the findings indicated that before receiving Cultural Experiential Instruction, the students' mean score of English oral communication ability was 28.67 and the standard deviation was 8.14. On the contrary, the students' mean scores of English oral communication ability after receiving Cultural Experiential Instruction changed significantly to 47.56 ($p < .05$) and the standard deviation was 8.56.

Table 4.15

Picture 7 (Body Language): Frequency and Percentage of the Pretest and Posttest Score Distribution of Students' English Oral Communication Ability before and after studying Cultural Experiential Instruction

Score	Frequency		Percentage	
	Before	After	Before	After
20	16	-	35.6	-
30	21	3	46.7	6.7
40	6	14	13.3	31.1
50	2	19	4.4	42.2
60	-	9	-	20.0
Total	45	45	100.0	100.0

From the TSE Scores of Picture 7, the pretest scores showed that the majority or 21 students (46.7%) scored at 30. In contrast, the posttest scores showed that the majority or 19 students (42.2%) scored at 50. This indicated that the students' English oral communication ability had increased after receiving Cultural Experiential Instruction.

In addition to the statistical significance (judged by the p value), Becker (2000) contends that research should also report its practical significance in forms of the effect size. The value of effect size was used to measure the magnitude of the effects of using Cultural Experiential Instruction based on Cultural Experience Model (Moran, 2001) on students' English oral communication ability, so the effect size was calculated.

The result of the mean effect size correlation ($r_{Y\lambda}$) was 0.80 and Cohen's d was 2.74, which represented the large effect size according to Cohen's (1998). The effect size of effects of Cultural Experiential Instruction on students' English oral communication ability was illustrated in Table 4.16.

Table 4.16

The Effect size of effects of Cultural Experiential Instruction on students' English oral communication ability

Cohen's d	Effect Size ($r_{Y\lambda}$)	Meaning
2.74	0.80	Large

From Table 4.16, the effect size of 0.80 represented the large effect size. It showed that the posttest mean scores on students' English oral communication ability were higher than the pretest mean scores. Therefore, the hypothesis which stated that the posttest mean scores on English oral communication of lower secondary school students were higher than the pretest mean scores was accepted.

Conclusion

This chapter presented the findings under one main aspect: English oral communication ability in response to one research question: To what extent does Cultural Experiential Instruction improve English oral communication ability of lower secondary school students?

The findings show that lower secondary school students gained higher posttest mean scores than pretest mean scores on the English Oral Communication Test after receiving Cultural Experiential Instruction. The hypothesis which stated that there was significantly higher average score on the post English Oral Communication Test was accepted.

These findings supported that Cultural Experiential Instruction can promote English oral communication through the features of the Four Cultural Knowings: Knowing How; Knowing About; Knowing Why; Knowing Oneself used in Cultural Experiential Instruction. Through these features, students participated in cross-cultural activities, describe cross-cultural information, interpret and analyze values, beliefs, and attitudes cross-culturally. They also reflected their thoughts, feelings, beliefs, attitudes across culture, as well as expressed cultural awareness. It can be obviously seen that students showed a significant improvement on their English oral communication ability after receiving Cultural Experiential Instruction. Consequently, the findings from this study indicated that Cultural Experiential Instruction is an effective instructional framework that promotes students' English oral communication ability.