

The Effect of Predicting Strategy for Listening Comprehension in EFL Classroom on the Third Year Students (academic year 2012) at English Department in FKIP Universitas HKBP Nommensen Pematangsiantar

Bobby P.S Dhillon and Bertaria Sohnata Hutauruk
FKIP Universitas HKBP Nommensen Pematangsiantar
bobbydhillon2002@yahoo.com
rianahutauruk@yahoo.com

Abstract

This research will tend to find out the significance and the effect predicting strategy for Listening Comprehension in EFL classroom on the third year students (Academic Year 2012) at English Department in FKIP Universitas HKBP Nommensen Pematangsiantar. This research will use experimental research design. To answer the problems of the research, the writer uses the following theories: Nunan (2003), Ellis & Sinclair (1997), Rost (1999), Miller (2000:25), Richards and Rodgers (1986:16), Anthony (1963:15), Buck (1999), Flowerdew (1994), Swain (2000), Chamot (1999:15), Anderson and Lynch (1988), Harmer(1983), and Tiwari (2005). The population of this research is the third year students (Academic Year 2012) at English Department that sit in Listening Comprehension in FKIP Universitas HKBP Nommensen Pematangsiantar. There are 90 students taken as the sample of this research. The sample was divided into two groups: the first group (30 students) as the experimental group and the second group (30 students) as the control group. The writers will give a treatment in the class by using predicting strategy in teaching listening comprehension. The data obtained from the score of experimental group and the score of the control group were calculated by applying t-test formula. (1) the result shows that $t\text{-observed} > t\text{-table} = 6.13 > 2.00$ ($p=0.05$; $df=58$). It indicates that Prediction strategy gave significant effect to the students' listening comprehension. The students who were taught by using Prediction Strategy got higher score than those who were taught without using Prediction Strategy, (2) Teaching listening by using Prediction Strategy makes the students become active listeners and give them a better chance of general comprehension. While, the common situation found in the classroom shows that teacher often test listening skill rather than teach it. It makes listening class be passive and the students are not motivated (3) The difference of the mean scores in the pre-test and post-test of both experimental and control group were calculated by using t-test formula to find t-observed. T-test formula was used to assess whether the means score of experimental group and control group are different from each other, (4) From the calculation, it is found that t-observed (6,13) is higher than t-table (2.00). Thus, alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted.

Keywords: *predicting strategy, listening comprehension, teaching*

1. Introduction

1.1 Background of the Research

Listening is more than merely hearing words. It is active, purposeful process of what we hear (Nunan, 2003). Listening comprehension is the receptive skill in oral mode. When we speak of listening what we really mean is listening and understanding what we hear. In other words, it can be elaborated that listening is not just that process of hearing the sounds but it is a process of constructing interpretation on the speakers' utterances. According to Rost (1991) to help students to be an effective listener, the teacher should avoid using activities that tend to focus on memory rather than on that process of listening. Activities in listening should teach not test. The teacher can set the suitable activities in pre, while, and post listening in order to guide the students to the process of listening. These activities should establish the purpose of listening activities and activate the schemata by encouraging the learners to think about and discuss what they already know about the content of listening task. But, it is unfortunately many teachers often use listening activities to test listening skills rather than teach it (Miller, 2000:25). Those teachers usually begin listening some passages by introducing some difficult vocabularies, and then they play the tape and ask learners to listen carefully. After that, the students are asked to finish the comprehension exercises. When learners finish the exercises, the teachers check the answers and if they find that the students get the wrong answer, they will let the students listen again without any explanation. Students easily get tired of such listening exercises. They are not motivated. What are the worst, learners are very likely to get into bad and harmful listening habits. They are forced to memorize the content of listening passage. They learn nothing from the process of listening.

Based on the problems above, the teachers must have the competence to apply some activities that teach the student to improve their listening comprehension and guide them to the process of listening. These activities can be found in listening strategies. According to Rost (1999) there are five commonly recognized successful strategies; predicting, inferencing, monitoring, clarifying,

and evaluating. In this study the writer focused on Prediction Strategy. Prediction Strategy is the strategy to think actively about the content, the words, ideals, and feelings that the speakers might bring up (Ellis & Sinclair 1997). In this strategy the students have to activate their prior knowledge about the topic of listening material in order to anticipate the information they will hear. Prediction Strategy helps the students to become good listeners as many researchers claim, good predictors are good listeners. This strategy includes some procedures that must be applied in the classroom, they are: making prediction from the topic, making prediction from the picture clues, listening the material, matching up the prediction on the content of listening passage, an evaluating the prediction (Nunan 1999). Based on the discussion above, the writer would like to conduct a research to find the effect of using Prediction Strategy on student` listening comprehension. There are two problems of the research formulated:

1. Is there any significant effect of predicting strategy for Listening Comprehension in EFL classroom on the third year students (Academic Year 2012) at English Department in FKIP Universitas HKBP Nommensen Pematangsiantar?
2. What are the effects of predicting strategy for Listening Comprehension in EFL classroom on the third year students (Academic Year 2012) at English Department in FKIP Universitas HKBP Nommensen Pematangsiantar?

The first objective of the research is to find out the effect of predicting strategy for Listening Comprehension in EFL classroom on the third year students (Academic Year 2012) at English Department in FKIP Universitas HKBP Nommensen Pematangsiantar. And the second objective of the research is to find out the effects of predicting strategy for Listening Comprehension in EFL classroom on the third year students (Academic Year 2012) at English Department in FKIP Universitas HKBP Nommensen Pematangsiantar. The research focuses to EFL classroom in Listening Comprehension class by using prediction strategy in

learning English to increase the students' ability in Listening comprehension. The result of the research will be useful for the lecturers, teachers and EFL learners.

2. Review of Related Literature

2.1 Prediction Strategies

Strategy is action selected deliberately to achieve particular goals. An emerging skill can become a strategy when it is used intentionally. Likewise, a strategy can go underground and become a skill. Indeed strategies are more efficient and developmentally advance when they become generate and applied automatically as skills. This, strategies are skills under consideration. Chamot (1999;15) states that "Prediction is a strategy to anticipate information to prepare and give direction for the task." Input or information which people receive through their eyes or ears, both linguistic and non-linguistic is partially taken into their minds. Prediction plays crucial roles in turning intake into meaning. As Smith (1987) puts it, "in order to comprehend one must predict, in order to learn one must hypothesize". Predictions are based on something already part of our theory of the world. It is a natural part of living. Prediction as a basis for comprehension is achieved by making use of our previous knowledge, which may include the following elements: (1) Knowledge of the language, (2) General knowledge of the world (3) Cultural and background. Knowledge of the context, in which an utterance takes place. These on elements form a frame of reference, becoming intertwined an effecting each other in processing incoming information. According to Harmer (1983) the efficient listener predicts what he is going to hear and the process of understanding the text is the process of seeing how the content of the text matches up to these predictions. In the first instance his prediction will be the result of expectation he has. As he continuous to listen, however, his prediction will be changed as he receives more information from the text. In comprehension exercise itself, it is effective to provide background information, thereby to contextualize what learners are going to listen too. This enables

students to set up expectations and active relevant concept and experiences in their minds before they actually start to listen.

Making predictions active students' prior knowledge about what they will hear. Sherin (1987:127) says "Prediction is a key process in understanding spoken language". Providing some pieces of information beforehand is an effective way to help students guess the meaning and to enable more top down processing (grasping the meaning rather than processing utterances word by word. Prediction strategy can help the students to stay focus and give them a better chance of general comprehension. Jiang (2009) identifies five advantages that students got by applying Prediction Strategy, they are:

1. It rouses their original knowledge on the topic and makes it familiar.
2. The informing of new words and phrases from the text gets them well prepared and therefore the next sounds easier.
3. It makes the questions much easier because they could listen very effectively, and actually they have already known what they are going to hear.
4. It makes their mind busy and active, which greatly reduced the tendency to be sleepy on listening class.
5. It really relaxes their nerves, so listening becomes efficient. We can see that by prediction, the students will find listening class isn't very boring. On the contrary, by making and checking predictions, they will have some small victories and can smile with that. The most important thing is that listening becomes easier, and the following exercises become easier naturally.

Prediction Strategy is one of the important listening strategies. In Prediction Strategy, the students try to predict correctly what kind of words will be used and what will be said. The teacher can find many things to help them, such as: the topic of the unit, pictures, and sometimes body language by the people in the pictures, some sentences in the exercises, an even teachers explanation and instruction. Prediction Strategy can be applied in pre, while, and post listening.

According to Jiang (2009) the teacher could get the students ready to listen by doing the following instructions in three steps:

1. Pre-listening

Step one: (1) Inform them the background information, (2) Teach new vocabulary and grammar forms relevant to and materials,(3) Translate some words they might not be familiar with or some sentences difficult to understand.

Step two: conduct group discussions for the students to remind each other: (1) The speaker and the speakers' possible purpose, (2) Students' purpose for listening: to learn specific information; to understand most or the entire message (3) Students' knowledge/ experience with the subject; think about what they already know about the subject.

Step three: Predict what they will be hearing: (1) The format (how the message is organized and in what sequence), (2) Key words, phrases or sentences they might expect to hear, (3) The information or opinions.

2. While- listening

While the students listening, they need to monitor their comprehension by: (1) Check the accuracy of their predictions, (2) Deny some predictions and form new ones which may soon be denied again, (3) Decide what is and is not important to understand.

3. Post-listening

This strategy might help the students to synthesize, interpret and evaluate what they have heard: (1) Check what predictions are correct / incorrect and helpful / useless, and why, (2) Considered what they heard and how it fits with what they know, (3) Discuss the prediction strategy the used to listen – how much did they benefit from it? (4) Conclude how to make a better prediction next time

2.2 Listening Strategies

Listening is an active, purposeful process of making sense of what we hear (Nunan, 2003). Language skills are often categorized as receptive and productive. Speaking and writing are productive skills. Listening, along with reading is a

receptive skill. That is, it requires a person to receive and understand incoming information (input). Because listening is receptive, we can listen to and understand things at higher level than we can produce. For this reason, people sometimes think of it as a passive skill. Nothing could be further from the truth listening is very active. Listening strategies are techniques or activities that contribute directly to the comprehension and recall of listening input. Listening strategies can be classified by how the listeners process the input. According to Tiwari (2005), strategies in listening can be classified into three parts, they are: (1) Top Down Strategies, (2) Bottom Up Strategies, and (3) Metacognitive Strategies. Top down strategies are listeners based; the listeners tap into background knowledge of the topic, the situation or context, the type of text, and the language. These background knowledge activities a set of expectations that help the listeners to interpret what is heard and anticipate what will come next. Top down strategies include: (1) Listening for main idea (2) Predicting (3) Drawing inferences (4) Summarizing. Top down strategies knowledge can be in the form of scripts or schemata, awareness of textual features, information about different topics, or personal experiences. To approach reading as a top-down process, Richards (1990) suggests a number of activities and tasks that lead the listener to concerns that are stated implicit or exist beyond the spoken text.

Bottom up strategies are text based; the listeners relies on the language in the message, that is, the combination of sounds, words, and grammar that creates meaning. Bottom up strategies include: (1) Listening for specific details (2) Recognizing cognates (3) Recognizing word order patterns. Bottom up strategies knowledge can be in the form of scripts or schemata, awareness of textual features, information about different topics, or personal experiences. To approach reading as a bottom up strategies, Richards (1990) also points out the need to consider the interactional and transactional functions of language. Interactional uses of language involve the social functions of language, such as greetings, compliments, joking, praising, using markers of social distance among speakers and engaging in a real conversation versus chatting with friends to pass the time.

Strategic listeners also use metacognitive strategies to plan, monitor, and evaluate their listening. (1) They plan by decoding which listening strategies will serve best in particular situation, (2) They monitor their comprehension and the effectiveness of the selected strategies, (3) They evaluate by determining whether they have achieved their listening comprehension goals and whether the combination of listening strategies selective was an effective one.

2.3 Types of Listening

According to Rost (2002), there are three types of listening: (1) intensive listening, (2) selective listening, (3) interactive listening. Intensive listening refers to listening for precise sounds, words, phrases, grammatical units and pragmatics units. Although listening intensively is not often called for in everyday situations, the ability to listen intensively whenever required is an essential component of listening proficiency. As such, intensive listening needs to be included in listening instruction, although to be an effective practice it needs not be more than a small part of each class session. The prototypical intensive listening activity is dictation, the transcription of the exact words that the speakers utters. Dictation is often claimed to be an excellent integrative test (Cohen,1994; Buck, 1992) because it involves listening, vocabulary, grammar, and ability to make inferences from context. However, the administration and scoring of dictation can be time consuming, and maybe best used for self study outside of classroom time. Selective listening is a prerequisite for more complex and more extended listening. For extended texts, a popular and useful form of selective listening is note taking. As reviewed by Flowerdew (1994), note taking is widely viewed as an important macro skill in the lecture listening comprehension process, a skill that of often interacts with reading (when integrated with reading material accompanying the lecture), writing (the actual writing of the notes or writing based on the notes), and speaking (oral reconstruction of the notes or discussion based on the notes).Tasks of selective listening encourage learners to approach genuine spoken texts by adapting a strategy of focusing of specific information

rather than trying to understand and recall everything. Reconstruction of spoken materials based on selective listening tasks can help students link selective listening to global listening.

Interactive listening refers to listening in collaborative conversation. Collaborative conversation, in which learners interact with each other or with native speakers, is established as a vital means of language development. Its potential benefits seem to be both in forcing comprehensible output (Swain, 2000), that is, compelling the learner to become to understand language that is initially not understood. Interactive listening is a key component of listening ability, it can be developed through collaborative speaking tasks that focus primarily on meaning but also entail negotiation of linguistic form. One aspect of interactive listening is developed in whole class activities, with the teacher providing the oral input in the form of storytelling.

2.4 Hypothesis of the Research

The hypothesis of the research is in the following:

Ha: There is a significant effect of using predicting strategy on the students' ability in listening comprehension

Ho: There is no significant effect of predicting strategy on the students' ability in listening comprehension

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The research was conducted by using experimental design which was to find the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable. There were two group and experimental group. The pre-test was administered to both groups before treatment were given. The post-test was given after treatment. The control group was treated without using Prediction Strategy while the experimental group was treated by using Prediction Strategy.

Table 3.1 Randomized Groups Pre-Test and Post-Test Design

Group	Pre-test	Treatment	Post-test
Experimental	√	Prediction strategy	√
Control	√	Without using prediction strategy	√

3.2 Population and Sample

According to Best (1981) population is any groups of individuals that have or more characteristics in common that are of interest to the researcher. The population of the research is all the students on the third academic year (2012) who is sitting in the listening comprehension class. There are 300 students academic year (2012). There are 10 groups of listening comprehension class which consist of 30 students per class. Best and Khoan (2002:14) stated that sample is a small proportion of population selected for observation and analysis. From the whole population 25% was taken by using random sampling technique as the sample of this research, which consisted of 60 students, 30 students for experimental group and 30 students for control group. In random sample technique, the writer wrote each class in a piece of paper, then all the papers were put in the glass, the glass was shaken and two groups (A and B) were selected as the sample. Group A was chosen as experimental group and group B as control group. The reason for taking the number of the sample is based on Arikunto (1998:120) says that if the subject or population consists of a large number, the sample taken from 10-15% or 20-25% or more. It depends on the ability of the researcher. The sample was expected to represent the population.

3.3 Instrument of Collecting Data

The instruments that are used to collect the data are multiple choice questions that consist of 50 items. In multiple choice tests there is almost complete marker reliability. Students marks, unlike those in subjective formats, cannot be affected by the personal judgment. The marking, as well as being reliable, is simple, more rapid and often much more effective than other forms of

written test. The test questions are categorized by using Bloom's Taxonomy. In Bloom's Taxonomy there are six levels of ability: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation. But this study applies two levels of ability, they are knowledge and comprehension.

3.4 Procedure of Collecting the Data

In this research, the media that were used to collect the data were tape player, cassette, and answer sheet. The students were asked to listen carefully to the tape and to answer some question by choosing a correct answer in their answer sheets. The tape was played in two sections. Each section consisted of 15 minutes. In scoring the test, the writer used score ranging from 0-100 by counting the correct answer and applying this formula:

$$S = \frac{R}{n} \times 100$$

Where: S = the score

R = the number of correct answer

n = the number of the test items

a) Pre-Test

The pretest was administered before the treatment. The pre-test was given to both experimental group and control group. The aim of the pre-test is to find out the homogeneity in the mean score of experimental and control group. In doing the pre-test, the students were asked to answer some question based on their understanding about listening.

b) Treatment

The treatment was conducted to the experimental group. The experimental group was taught by using prediction strategy. Meanwhile, the control group was taught without using Prediction Strategy.

c) Post Test

The post-test was administered after the treatment. The post-test was given to both experimental group and control group. The aim of the post-test is to find out the difference in the mean score of experimental and control group. For the post test, the students were asked to answer some questions.

1. Validity of the Test

According to Bachman (1990:25), "Validity is quality of the test interpretation and use". It addressed the question whatever or measurement technique is really measuring what it purposed to be measured". According to Weir (1988:23-29) there are three kinds of validity, they are: construct validity, content validity, and constructive validity. This research applied content validity that concerned how well the test measure because the instrument had represented all the material that were measured according to the curriculum.

2. Reliability of the Test

Reliability is a necessary characteristic of any good test. Best & James (2002:208) define reliability as the degree of consistency that the instrument or procedures demonstrates; whether it is measuring, it does so consistently. The reliability of a test has to do with the stability of the score for some individuals at different occasion. In this research, the data were obtained from try out. They try out was given before doing the research. The students' scores were calculated to find the reliability of the test. The reliability was calculated by applying KR21 formula as follows:

$$r_{11} = \left(\frac{k}{k-1} \right) \left(1 - \frac{M(k-M)}{kS^2} \right)$$

In which:

$$r_{11} \text{ (coefficient reliability)} = 0,61$$

$$k \text{ (Number of the test item)} = 40$$

$$M \text{ (The mean of the score)} = 25,7$$

$$S^2 \text{ (the square of the standard deviation of the score)} = 4,71$$

According to Aruan (1983: 132) the categories of coefficient correlations are as the following:

0.00 – 0.20 : The reliability is very low

0.21 – 0.40 : The reliability is low

0.41 – 0.60 : The reliability is fair

0.61 – 0.80 : The reliability is high

0.81 – above : The reliability is very high

From the calculation, it can be concluded that the reliability of the test has high coefficient correlation.

3.5 Technique of Analyzing the Data

The technique that was used for analyzing the data was t-test formula, as follows:

$$t = \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\frac{d_x^2 + d_y^2}{(N_x + N_y) - 2 \left[\frac{1}{N_x} + \frac{1}{N_y} \right]}}}$$

Where:

M_x = The mean of experimental group

M_y = The mean of control group

d_x^2 = The standard deviation of experimental group

d_y^2 = The standard deviation of control group

N_x = The total number of samples of experimental group

N_y = The total number of samples of control group.

4. Data Analysis and Research Findings

4.1 Data

The data were obtained from pre-test and post-test scores of the experimental and the control groups. The mean score of the control group in the pre-test is 57.2 while the mean score of the experimental group is 58.08. The

mean score of the experimental group in the post-test is 73 and the control group is 58.25. The data can be seen from these following tables:

Table 4.1 Total Score of Pre-test and Post-test of Experimental Group

No	Students' names	Pre-test	Post-test
1	Rori	65	82.5
2	Romatio	55	72.5
3	Widia	57.5	77.5
4	Jesprando	62.5	77.5
5	Leonardo	50	70
6	Togu	60	82.5
7	Hasiholan	52.5	65
8	Kalpin	42.5	70
9	Pirganda	62.5	67.5
10	Yustina	67.5	80
11	Nova	67.5	75
12	Erva	60	70
13	Sandika	50	65
14	Kariaman	70	77.5
15	Roy	60	80
16	Lisnawati	50	60
17	Lusia	42.5	60
18	Risky	37.5	67.5
19	Betuet	50	62.5
20	Indraya	40	55
21	Punguan	52.5	80
22	Iyan	60	77.5
23	Timion	75	65
24	Jhon	67.5	90
25	Dini	67.5	77.5
26	Arta	57.5	70
27	Retno	60	65
28	Astri	70	77.5
29	Roida	70	85
30	Debora	70	75
TOTAL		1742.5	2190
MEAN		58.08	73

1. Pre Test

$$\sum x = 1742.5$$

$$N=30$$

Mean (M)

$$M = \frac{\sum x}{N} = \frac{1742.5}{30} = 58.08$$

2. Post Test

$$\sum x = 2190$$

$$N=30$$

Mean (M)

$$M = \frac{\sum x}{N} = \frac{2190}{30} = 73$$

In Table 4.1, there are 30 students each group of Listening class at English Department in FKIP Universitas HKBP Nommensen. First, the writer gave the students about Pre-test, and then taught them the Prediction Strategy. After the students understand about the Prediction Strategy in Listening Comprehension, the writer gave the students Post Test.

Table 4.2 Total Score of Pre-test and Post-test of Control Group

No	Students' names	Pre-test	Post-test
1	Ravi	57.5	60
2	Jan	60	62.5
3	Rosinta	62.5	57.5
4	Uli	60	70
5	Jacky	62.5	57.5
6	Erik	55	57.5
7	Romelsi	52.5	55
8	Pebri	47.5	55
9	Bongsu	57.5	50
10	Hepri	57.5	50
11	Dewi	52.5	65
12	Winda	60	72.5
13	Sri	55	60

14	Irma	62.5	65
15	Jahidin	57.5	67.5
16	Hari	57.5	60
17	Dinson	60	45
18	Maruahal	55	52.5
19	Tiaraja	47.5	60
20	Monika	60	52.5
21	Lena	45	50
22	Reka	55	62.5
23	Tricar	57.5	57.5
24	Harke	60	60
25	Herlina	65	65
26	Depson	65	52.5
27	Willi	62.5	72.5
28	Billi	70	50
29	Riski	52.5	50
30	Doli	42.5	52.5
TOTAL		1715	1747.5
MEAN		57.2	58.25

1. Pre Test

$$\sum x = 1715$$

$$N=30$$

Mean(M)

$$M = \frac{\sum x}{N} = \frac{1715}{30} = 57.2$$

2. Post Test

$$\sum x = 1747.5$$

$$N=30$$

Mean(M)

$$M = \frac{\sum x}{N} = \frac{1747.5}{30} = 58.25$$

In table 4.2, there are 30 students at each of Listening class at English Department in FKIP Universitas HKBP Nommensen Pematangsiantar. Their mark in

Listening Comprehension is without Prediction Strategy. First the writer gave them Pre-test, and the second the writer gave the students Post-test.

4.2 Data Analysis

The writer will use t-Test Formula in the data analysis to find the significant effect of using Prediction Strategy in Listening Comprehension. Every test should has Validity and Reliability to proof the coefficient of the test. So, before the writer analyzes the collected data by using t-test, she would like to count the Validity and Reliability of the t-Test.

4.2.1 Testing the Validity and Reliability of the Test

1. Testing the Validity

No	X	Y	X ²	Y ²	XY
1	82.5	60	6806.2	3600	4950
2	72.5	62.5	5256.2	3906.2	4531.2
3	77.5	57.5	6006.2	3306.2	4456.2
4	77.5	70	6006.2	4900	5425
5	70	57.5	4900	3906.2	4025
6	82.5	57.5	6806.2	3906.3	4743.3
7	65	55	4225	3025	3575
8	70	55	4900	3025	3850
9	67.5	50	4556	2500	3375
10	80	50	6400	2500	4000
11	75	65	5625	4225	4875
12	70	72.5	4900	5256.2	5075
13	65	60	4225	3600	3900
14	77.5	65	6006.2	4225	5037
15	80	67.5	6400	4556	5400
16	60	60	4225	4225	3600
17	60	45	4225	2025	2700
18	67.5	52.5	4556	2756	3543
19	62.5	60	5256.2	3600	3750
20	55	52.5	3025	2756	2887
21	80	50	6400	2500	4000
22	77.5	62.5	6006.2	5256.2	4843
23	65	57.5	4225	3906.2	3737
24	90	60	8100	3600	5400
25	77.5	65	6006.2	4225	5037

26	70	52.5	4900	2756	3675
27	65	72.5	6006.2	5256	4712
28	77.5	50	6006.2	2500	3875
29	85	50	7225	2500	4250
30	75	52.5	5625	2756	3937
TOTAL	2190	1747.5	226054	104028	167944

In the table, the writer took the result of Post-test from Experimental Group (X) and Control Group (Y). To get the validity the writer counted the mark of (X²), (Y²) and (XY). And also gained all the result of (X²), (Y²) and (XY). After that the Validity of the test by using the formula of Pearson Product Moment as follow:

$$\begin{aligned}
 r_{xy} &= \frac{N \sum XY - (\sum X)(\sum Y)}{\sqrt{\{N \sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2\} \{N \sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2\}}} \\
 &= \frac{30(167944) - (2190)(1747)}{\sqrt{\{30(226054) - (2190)^2\} \{30(104028) - (1747)^2\}}} \\
 &= \frac{5038320 - 3825930}{(6781620 - 4796100) - (3120840 - 3052009)} \\
 &= \frac{5038320 - 3825930}{1985520 - 68831} \\
 &= \frac{1212390}{1916689} \\
 &= 0.60
 \end{aligned}$$

To find the validity of a test, when it shows that the result of the test between - 1.00 and 1.00. Hence, the Validity is (0.60) so the test of the study is valid. And also the result of test (0.60) has correlation because it almost gets 1.00. The writer can conclude that this test is Valid.

2. Testing the Reliability

After finding the Validity of the test, the writer finds the Reliability of the Test. The Reliability is coefficient for the test and it was determined by using of Best and James formula as follow:

$$M = \frac{\sum X}{N} M = \frac{772}{30} M = 25,7$$

$$S = \frac{\sqrt{\sum x^2}}{N} S = \frac{\sqrt{19,937}}{30} S = \frac{141,2}{30} = 4,71 S^2 = 22.18$$

$$R = \frac{K}{K-1} \left(1 - \frac{(K-M)}{K \cdot S^2} \right)$$

$$R = \frac{40}{39} \left(1 - \frac{25,7 (40-25,7)}{40 (22,18)} \right)$$

$$R = 1.03 \left(1 - \frac{367,51}{887,2} \right) R = 1.03 \times 0.59 R = \mathbf{0.61}$$

To find the Reliability of a test we should find the validity first. Because the writer get the validity(0.60) it easy to find the Reliability. And the test is coefficient (can 0.61), we show from this pattern:

0.00 – 0.20 : The reliability is very low

0.21 – 0.40 : The reliability is low

0.41 – 0.60 : The reliability is fair

0.61 – 0.80 : The reliability is high

0.81 – above : The reliability is very high

4.2.2 Analyzing the Data by Using t-Test Formula

1. Control Group

No	Students' Name	Pre-test (T1)	Post-test (T2)	T2-T1 (d)	da (d-ma)	da ²
1	Ravi	57.5	60	2.5	1.42	2.02
2	Jan	60	62.5	2.5	1.42	2.02
3	Rosinta	62.5	57.5	-5	-6.08	12.16
4	Uli	60	70	10	8.92	79.57
5	Jacky	62.5	57.5	-5	-6.08	36.97
6	Erik	55	57.5	2.5	1.42	2.02
7	Romelsi	52.5	55	2.5	1.42	2.02
8	Pebri	47.5	55	7.5	6.42	41.22
9	Bongsu	57.5	50	-7.5	-8.58	73.62
10	Hepri	57.5	50	-7.5	-8.58	73.62
11	Dewi	52.5	65	12.5	11.42	130.42
12	Winda	60	72.5	12.5	11.42	130.42

13	Sri	55	60	5	3.92	15.37
14	Irma	62.5	65	2.5	1.42	2.02
15	Jahidin	57.5	67.5	10	8.92	79.57
16	Hari	57.5	60	2.5	1.42	2.02
17	Dinson	60	45	-15	-16.08	258.57
18	Maruahal	55	52.5	-2.5	-3.58	12.82
19	Tiaraja	47.5	60	15.5	11.42	130.42
20	Monika	60	52.5	-7.5	-8.58	73.62
21	Lena	45	50	5	3.92	15.37
22	Reka	55	62.5	7.5	6.42	41.22
23	Tricar	57.5	57.5	0	-1.08	1.17
24	Harke	60	60	0	-1.08	1.17
25	Herlina	65	65	0	-1.08	1.17
26	Depson	65	52.5	-12.5	-13.58	184.42
27	Willi	62.5	72.5	10	8.92	79.57
28	Billi	70	50	-20	-21.08	444.37
29	Riski	52.5	50	-2.5	-3.58	12.82
30	Doli	42.5	52.5	10	8.92	79.57
		1715	1747.5	32.5		2021.34
	MEAN	57.2	58.25			

$$Ma = \frac{\sum d}{N} Ma = \frac{32.5}{30} = 1.08$$

In the table, it is the calculation of students in control Group. First, the writer find the result of (d) first, it is the Gain of Pre-test and Post-test in control Group. And then find the (Ma) and also (da) and (da)². And also the result of the (d), (Ma), (da) and (da)².

2. Experimental Group

No	Students' Name	Pre-test (T1)	Post-test (T2)	T2-T1 (d)	da (d-ma)	da ²
1	Rori	65	82.5	17.5	3.2	10.42
2	Romatio	55	72.5	17.5	3.2	10.42
3	Widia	57.5	77.5	20	5.7	32.49
4	Jesprando	62.5	77.5	15	0.7	0.49
5	Leonardo	50	70	20	15.7	32.49
6	Togu	60	82.5	22.5	8.2	67.24
7	Hasiholan	52.5	65	12.5	-1,8	3.24
8	Kalpin	42.5	70	27.5	13.2	174.24

9	Pirganda	62.5	67.5	5	-9.3	86.49
10	Yustina	67.5	80	12.5	-1.8	3.24
11	Nova	67.5	75	7.5	-6.8	46.24
12	Erva	60	70	10	-4.3	18.49
13	Sandika	50	65	15	0.7	0.49
14	Kariaman	70	77.5	7.5	-6.8	46.24
15	Roy	60	80	20	5.7	32.49
16	Lisnawati	50	60	10	-4.3	18.49
17	Lusia	42.5	60	17.5	3.2	10.24
18	Risky	37.5	67.5	30	15.7	246.49
19	Betuet	50	62.5	12.5	-1.8	3.24
20	Indraya	40	55	15	0.7	0.49
21	Punguan	52.5	80	27.5	13.2	174.24
22	Iyan	60	77.5	17.5	-6.8	46.24
23	Timion	75	65	-10	-24.3	590.49
24	Jhon	67.5	90	22.5	8.2	67.24
25	Dini	67.5	77.5	10	-4.3	18.49
26	Arta	57.5	70	12.5	-1.8	3.24
27	Retno	60	65	5	-9.3	86.49
28	Astri	70	77.5	7.5	-6.8	46.24
29	Roida	70	85	15	0.7	0.49
30	Debora	70	75	5	-9.3	86.49
TOTAL		1742.5	2190	427.5		1962.95
MEAN		58.08				

$$Ma = \frac{\sum d}{N}$$

$$Ma = \frac{427.5}{30} = 14.3$$

In the table, it is the calculation of students in Experimental Group. First, the writer find the result of (d) first, it is the Gain of Pre-test and Post-test in Experimental Group. And then find the (Ma) and also (da) and (da)². And also the result of the (d), (Ma), (da) and (da)².

Further, the writer applied that t-test formula as follow:

$$t = \frac{Ma - Mb}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{da^2 + db^2}{(Na + Nb) - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{Na} + \frac{1}{Nb}\right)}} t = \frac{14.3 - 1.08}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1962.95 + 2021.34}{(30 + 30) - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{30} + \frac{1}{30}\right)}} t = \frac{13.2}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{3984.29}{58}\right)\left(\frac{2}{30}\right)}} t = \frac{13.2}{\sqrt{68.7 \times 0.067}}$$

$$t = \frac{13.2}{\sqrt{4.6029}} = \frac{13.2}{2.15} t = 6.13$$

So, the writer gets (6.13) as the t-Test. And to get t-Test, when writer finds (Ma) from the Experimental Group and (Mb) from Control Group first. And then calculated (Ma), (Mb) by using t-Test Formula.

4.3 Findings

Based on the research problem, in this thesis the writer wants to know the effect of using Prediction Strategy in Listening Comprehension. And after gets the data and analyzing the data of the students Listening skill, the writer got the findings:

1. The data obtained from the score of experimental group and the score of the control group were calculated by applying t-test formula.
2. The result shows that $t\text{-observed} > t\text{-table} = 6.13 > 2.00$ ($p=0.05$; $df=58$). It indicates that Prediction strategy gave significant effect to the students' listening comprehension. The students who were taught by using Prediction Strategy got higher score than those who were taught without using Prediction Strategy.
3. Teaching listening by using Prediction Strategy makes the students become active listeners and give them a better chance of general comprehension. While, the common situation found in the classroom shows that teacher often test listening skill rather than teach it. It makes listening class be passive and the students are not motivated.
4. The difference of the mean scores in the pre-test and post-test of both experimental and control group were calculated by using t-test formula to find t-observed. T-test formula was used to assess whether the means score of experimental group and control group are different from each other.
5. From the calculation, it is found that t-observed (6,13) is higher than t-table (2.00). Thus, alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted.

4.4 Interpretation and Discussion

Table 1 shows a significant improvement of students' score in the pre-test and post-test of experimental group. The mean score of the experimental group in the pre-test is 58,08 while in post-test is 73. From the data above, there were four students (Rori, Togu, Roy, Risky, Punguan, Jhon, Widia) whose scores increase extremely with the range between their scores in pre-test and in the post-test were approximately twenty (20) points. It is because during the treatment, those students show great curiosity. They listened to the teacher's explanation seriously and followed the teacher's instructions. In the first meeting, those students showed that they could understand how to apply this strategy by following teacher's guidance and it can be seen from the score they got while doing exercises. They could answer the exercise quite good. In the last meeting, they could apply this strategy automatically without teacher's guidance and they were able to answer the exercise correctly. But, there was a student (Timion) whose score is decrease (from 75 to 65). It happened because the student was absent when the treatment was given. Table 2 presents the students' scores in the pre-test and post-test of the control group. For the control group, the increasing of students' score from pre-test and post-test is low which is the mean score in the pre-test is 57,2 and in the post-test is 58,25. The higher range between pre-test and post-test is 12,5 points. The score of two students (Dewi and Winda) in the pre-test is 52,5 and in the post-test is 65, the range is 12,5 points. The difference of the mean scores in the pre-test and post-test of both experimental and control group were calculated by using t-test formula to find t-observed. T-test formula was used to assess whether the means score of experimental group and control group are different from each other. From the calculation, it is found that t-observed (6,13) is higher than t-table (2.00).

Based on the data analysis, in experimental group there were seven students (Rori, Togu, Roy, Risky, Punguan, Jhon, Widia) whose scores increase extremely with the range between their scores in pre-test and in the post-test were approximately twenty (20) points. It is because during the treatment, those

students show great curiosity. They listened to the teacher's explanation seriously and followed the teacher's instructions. In the first meeting, those students showed that they could understand how to apply this strategy by following teacher's guidance and it can be seen from the score they got while doing exercises. They could answer the exercise quite good. In the last meeting, they could apply this strategy automatically without teacher's guidance and they were able to answer the exercise correctly. But, there was a student (Timion) whose score is decrease (from 75 to 65). It happened because the student was absent when the treatment was given. And in the control group, the increasing of students' score from pre-test and post-test is low which is the mean score in the pre-test is 57,2 and in the post-test is 58,25. The higher range between pre-test and post-test is 12,5 points. The score of two students (Dewi and Winda) in the pre-test is 52,5 and in the post-test is 65, the range is 12,5 points

5. Conclusion

After analyzing the data, some conclusions are drawn as observed:

1. t -observed (6.13) is higher than t -table (2.00) at the level of significance 0.05 of two tailed test and the degree of freedom (df) is 58.
2. Prediction Strategy significantly affects students' listening comprehension.
3. null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted.

References

- Amato, P.A.R. and Snow, A 1998. *Academic Success For English Language Learners*. New York; Longman
- Anderson, R, and Lynch, T. 1988. *listening*. In Nunan, D. (Ed), *Practical English Language Teaching*. Maschusetts: Heinle and Heinle
- Arikunto, S.1988, Proses Penelitian: *Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*(edisi revisi V) Jakarta Bhineka Cipta
- Bachman, L. F. 1990. Fundamental consideration in Language Testing. Oxford: Oxford University
- Best, J,W and Kahn,V. J. 2002. *Research in Education*. New Delhi: Prentice Hall

- Brown, H.D.2004. Language Assesment: *Principles and Classroom Practices*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Buck, G.1999. *Teaching Listening*. In Rost, M., *Teaching and Researching Listening*, Harlow: Pearson Education, pp.137-143
- Chamot, A.U.et.al.1999. *Learning Strategy Handbook*. New York; Pearson Education
- Cohen, A. 1994.*Teaching Listening*. In Rost,M.,*Teaching and Researching Listening*. Harlow: Pearson Education,pp. 137-143
- Ellis, G. and Sinclair, B. 1997.*Learning to Learn English*. In http://le.ust.hk/centre/conf_2004/Sinclair.html.accessed on September, 7th 2012
- Harmer, J. 1983.*The Practice of English Language Teaching* (First Edition). New York: Longman
- Holden, R.W. 2000. *Facilitating Listening Comprehension* in ELT.In <http://udedition.cast.org/strategypredict.html>. Accessed on on Sepetember 15th 2012
- Miller, L.A. 2000.*Facilitating Listening Comprehension in ELT*. In <http://udedition.cast.org/strategypredict.html>.accessed on August 15th 2012
- Nunan, D. 1999. *Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Massachusetts: Heinle and Heinle
- Richards, C.J. and Rodgers, S.T. 1986. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. London: Cambridge University.
- Rost, M. 2002. *Teaching and Researching Listening*. England: Pearson Education.
- Sheerin, S. 1987.*Listening Comprehension: Teaching or Testing*. ELT Journal, vol.41,pp.2. Oxford University.In www.51share.net/download.asp?id=83278. Accessed on August 15th 2012
- Smith, F. 1987. *A Practical Study of Ways to Improve English Listening Comprehension in High Schools*. Report of the faculty of education, Gumma University, cultural science series vol.40,pp.53-69
- Swain, M. 2000. *Teaching Listening*. In Rost, M., *Teaching and Researching Listening*. Harlow: Pearson Education
- Tiwari, D. 2005. *Encyclopedia of Modern Methods of Teaching*, New Delhi: Crescent
- Weir, C.J. 1990.*Communicative Language Testing*. Wiltshire: Prentice Hall International (UKI)