



ELEJ

English Language Education Journal

E-ISSN: 2828-5077

<https://jurnal.unikastpaulus.ac.id/index.php/elej>

Vol. 3, No. 2, April 2025, Pp. 109-130

¹THE EFFECTIVENESS OF USING ELICITATION TECHNIQUE TOWARD STUDENTS' SPEAKING ABILITY AT THE SECOND GRADE OF SMAN 7 KUPANG

¹ Eanggalita Gracella Merukh, ² Angelina M. Nahak

^{3*} Yohanes Tresno Kurnianto

^{2,3} Master of Linguistics, Warmadewa University, Denpasar,
Indonesia

¹ English Department, Artha Wacana Christian University,
Kupang, Indonesia

kurniantoyohanes99@gmail.com

*Corresponding author

Abstract: This study examines the effectiveness of the elicitation technique in enhancing the speaking abilities of second-grade students at SMAN 7 Kupang. Through a quantitative approach, 24 students participated in pre-test and post-test assessments to measure their progress in vocabulary, comprehension, pronunciation, fluency, and grammar. The findings revealed a significant improvement in the students' speaking abilities after employing the elicitation technique, as indicated by the increase in mean scores from the pre-test (65.16) to the post-test (85.83). The elicitation technique not only helped students to overcome their fear of making mistakes but also boosted their

¹ Citation in APA Style:

Merukh, E. G., Nahak, A. M., & Kurnianto, Y. T. (2025). The effectiveness of using elicitation technique toward students' speaking ability at the second grade of SMAN 7 Kupang. *English Language Education Journal (ELEJ)*, 3(2), 109-130.
<https://jurnal.unikastpaulus.ac.id/index.php/elej>

Submission: March 2025, Revision: April 2025, Publication: April 2025

motivation and confidence in speaking English. These results suggest that the elicitation technique is an effective method for improving students' speaking skills, offering valuable insights for educators seeking to enhance language instruction.

Keywords: Elicitation Technique, Speaking Ability, Language Learning, English Education.

INTRODUCTION

Encouraging pupils to acquire the four language skills; speaking, listening, reading, and writing is the aim of teaching English. It is anticipated that students would master speaking, listening, writing, and reading English after studying for a reasonable amount of time. Bailey (2005) claim that speaking is an interactive building process. It implies that in order for the message to be understood by everybody, students should accurately convey their thoughts, feelings, and views when speaking. For this reason, pupils need to develop their speaking abilities. Building and exchanging ideas via the use of both spoken and non-spoken symbols is the act of speaking.

Speaking is an essential component of teaching and learning a second language. Since students may express themselves and learn how to utilize a language in today's environment, improving students' communication skills should be the aim of speaking instruction. Speaking is the vocal use of a language for interpersonal communication, according to Fulcher (2014). Speaking involves a communication process between the speaker and the listener. Individuals express thoughts and feelings through language, hoping that others would share their understanding of them. After that, the listener attempts to piece together the impressions in order to comprehend them. The purpose of elicitation in speaking classes, according to Usman et al. (2018), is

to encourage students to talk and improve their vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, and fluency.

Teaching speech is done for three basic reasons. Speaking exercises offer the chance to practice speaking in a real-world setting inside the safety of the classroom. Speaking about tasks when students attempt to utilize all or part of their language proficiency, this brings feedback to both the teacher and the students. Finally, pupils' utilization of the many language components they have stored in their brains becomes more automatic the more opportunities they have to activate them. Everyone can see how well they are doing. Consequently, the kids develop into independent language users over time. They will therefore be able to employ words and phrases devoid of any final thinking (Harmer, 2007).

The researcher discovered that the students lacked confidence in their ability to speak English due to their fear of making mistakes and low motivation to learn the language, as per the findings of interviews and observations with the English teacher of class XI at SMAN 7 Kupang. The in edition elicitation Technique may assist students in discovering and exploring their ideas in an outstanding way during the learning process, as well as in understanding themselves.

The study "The Effectiveness of Elicitation Technique on Students' Speaking Skills in the Second Grade of SMAN 7 Kupang" piqued the interest of the researchers. "Is there a significant effect of the use of elicitation technique on students' speaking ability in the second grade of SMAN 7 Kupang?" is the key topic that this study seeks to address. Thus, the goal of this research is to determine whether or not elicitation strategies have a major impact on students' speaking abilities.

There are theoretical and practical ramifications to this study. The study's findings theoretically corroborate hypothesis, which

holds that elicitation is a method for drawing concepts, language, and information from pupils (Scrivener, 2005). This method is predicated on the idea that pupils could already be more knowledgeable than the instructor is, and that it is beneficial to start a new session by building on what the students already know. Additionally, it is frequently more useful to include students in a debriefing process that results in new findings rather than just presenting a lecture.

Through the application of elicitation techniques, it is anticipated that this study will practically increase students' speaking abilities. It is intended that this research will benefit educators by helping students become more proficient speakers and providing them with an alternate method of helping students overcome speaking issues. As a result, this research offers useful strategies to help students' speaking abilities while also contributing to the advancement of language acquisition theory.

METHOD

This research emphasizes the collection and analysis of numerical data or numbers to explain, predict, or control certain phenomena. The data in this study will also be analyzed statistically to produce generalizable conclusions, so this study uses a quantitative approach with a one group pre test and post test design. The diagram of the design, which is



The population of this study amounted to 397 taken from class XI of SMAN 7 Kupang. Of the 397 population, only 24 were

taken as samples. In sampling, a purposive approach was applied. Purposive sampling is a sampling technique with certain considerations, for example based on certain criteria or characteristics relevant to the research (Sugiyono, 2019). The criteria are; students come from the same level or class, level or class is not grouped by ability, and students have varying abilities. In addition, in selecting the sample, the researcher had also received recommendations from the English course teacher at the school. Based on the criteria and the teacher's recommendation, the researcher made the students of class XI-7 as the sample.

The data from this study were obtained from the results of speaking tests in the form of pre and post tests. To collect data, there are several steps taken, which are;

1. Making research instruments in the form of pre and post tests in the form of instructions given to the sample
2. Carry out the pre test
3. Carry out treatment
4. Carry out post test
5. Collect data
6. Analyze and conclude the results of data analysis
7. Report findings

The collected data were analyzed using SPSS. The analysis was carried out to find the results of the data normality test, and t test in order to answer research questions and prove the hypothesis of this study. The type of normality test carried out is Shapiro-Wilk because the sample used in this study amounted to less than 50. Data is said to be normal if it meets the requirements of a significance value of p or sig. (p-value) > 0.05 . Conversely, if p or sig. (p-value) < 0.05 then the data is said to be not normally distributed. If the data is not normally distributed, the statistical test performed is Wilcoxon signed-rank. The test can

simultaneously test the hypothesis. The 2 hypotheses of this study are;

1. H_0 (Null Hypothesis): Elicitation technique has no effect on improving students' speaking ability.
2. H_1 (Alternative Hypothesis): Elicitation technique has an effect on improving students' speaking ability.

In the assessment of student scores a score rubric is used. The score rubric used is the one proposed by Brown (2004) as follows;

Table 1. Five components to evaluate speaking ability

A. Vocabulary (20)	
Level	Explanation
16-20	Very good: rarely has trouble
11-15	Good: sometimes used inappropriate terms about language
6-10	Fair: frequent uses wrong words speech limited to simple vocabulary
1-5	Unsatisfactory: very limited vocabulary and make the comprehension quite difficult

B. Comprehension (20)	
Level	Explanation
16-20	Very good: few noticeable errors
11-15	Good: occasionally grammatical errors which do not obscure meaning
6-10	Fair: error of the basic structure meaning occasionally obscure by grammatical errors
1-5	Unsatisfactory: usage definitely, unsatisfactory, frequently needs to rephrase construction or restrict himself to basic structure

C. Pronunciation (20)

Level	Explanation
16-20	Very good: understandable
11-15	Good: few noticeable
6-10	Fair: error of basic pronunciation
1-5	Unsatisfactory: hard to understand because sound, accent, pitch, difficulties, and incomprehensible

D. Fluency (20)

Level	Explanation
16-20	Very good: understandable
11-15	Good: speech is generally natural
6-10	Fair: some definite stumbling but manage to rephrase and continue
1-5	Unsatisfactory: speed of speech and length of utterances are far below normal long pauses utterances, left unfinished

E. Grammar (20)

Level	Explanation
16-20	Very good: errors in grammar are quite rare
11-15	Good: control of grammar is good
6-10	Fair: construction quite accurately but does not have through or confident control of grammar
1-5	Unsatisfactory: error in grammar frequent to speak language

Furthermore, to categorize the sample values, the categories proposed by Arikunto (2014) are used, which are as follows;

The Score	Level of Achievement
81 – 100	Excellent

61 – 80	Good
41 – 60	Enough
21 – 40	Less
00 – 20	Verry less

In calculating the mean and standard deviation of pre and post test scores, researchers used the following formulas proposed by (Arikunto, 2012);

1. To get the mean score

$$X = \frac{\sum x}{N}$$

2. To finding out standard deviation

$$D = \frac{\sum D}{N}$$

RESULT

The Results of the Pre and Post Tests Score in Experimental Group

The pre-test was administered during the initial meeting with the aim of identifying the students' baseline speaking abilities prior to the implementation of the treatment. This initial assessment served as a diagnostic tool to determine the learners' starting point and to highlight areas that required improvement. A total of 24 students participated as the sample for the pre-test session.

During the assessment, the researcher evaluated four key components of the students' speaking skills: vocabulary, comprehension, pronunciation, fluency, and grammar. These components were chosen because they represent essential aspects of effective oral communication in English. Each student was scored individually based on a speaking rubric that covered these aspects, ensuring a systematic and objective evaluation of performance.

Following the administration of the pre-test, the researcher analyzed the results by assigning scores to each student in accordance with the predetermined rubric. The results of the pre-test revealed that none of the 24 students met the minimum criteria for mastery learning, commonly referred to as the student completeness score. This indicates that prior to the treatment, the students' speaking proficiency was still below the expected standard. The detailed distribution of scores obtained in the pre-test is presented in the following table:

Table 2. The Score of the Pre-test in the Experimental Group

No.	Student's	Indicators					Score
	Initial	V	C	P	F	G	
1	AVT	12	12	10	10	12	60
2	AB	15	14	11	12	13	54
3	ASP	12	11	11	10	13	71
4	AF	13	15	15	15	10	54
5	AKL	14	12	12	12	12	62
6	TDL	13	14	14	14	70	17
7	DIB	10	15	15	14	68	14
8	ERS	10	15	15	14	68	14
9	INM	15	13	14	11	68	15
10	JRA	11	10	14	10	59	14
11	JMRB	11	11	10	10	54	12
12	KKB	15	16	15	15	77	16
13	LCADG	10	15	15	14	68	14
14	MDCA	13	15	15	10	67	14
15	MMH	15	16	15	16	70	16
16	OT	15	13	14	11	68	15
17	OWT	15	15	15	13	71	13
18	RAR	10	10	10	13	58	15
19	RRT	10	15	15	14	68	14
20	SCRS	14	11	12	13	65	15

21	INM	11	11	10	11	57	14
22	YRKL	10	10	10	13	58	15
23	NFB	11	11	10	11	57	14
24	NH	13	14	14	14	72	17
	Total	334	296	309	311	301	1564

Based on the data presented in Table 2, the total score obtained from the pre-test was 1564. This total score reflects the overall speaking ability of the students before the treatment was applied. Among the five speaking indicators assessed in the test, vocabulary, fluency, pronunciation, comprehension, and grammar, the indicator that received the highest average score was vocabulary. This suggests that, prior to the implementation of the elicitation technique, students demonstrated a relatively stronger command of vocabulary compared to other aspects of speaking.

The second highest score was achieved in the fluency indicator, indicating that students were fairly capable of expressing ideas smoothly, although with occasional hesitation. Pronunciation ranked third, which implies that while some students could produce understandable sounds, issues such as stress, intonation, or articulation still posed challenges.

The fourth rank was occupied by comprehension, suggesting that students had some difficulty in understanding and responding appropriately during communication. The lowest score among all the indicators was found in grammar, which indicates that the students were least proficient in constructing grammatically correct sentences during the pre-test stage.

This pattern of scores highlights that while students may possess a fair vocabulary base, their grammatical accuracy and depth of understanding in spoken interaction were still limited, which potentially hinders their overall speaking performance.

Table 3. The Score of the Post-test in the Experimental Group

No.	Student's Initial	Indicators					Score
		V	C	P	F	G	
1	AVT	18	17	16	17	18	86
2	AB	18	18	18	19	17	88
3	ASP	16	18	16	16	16	82
4	AF	18	18	18	19	17	88
5	AKL	17	18	16	17	16	84
6	TDL	16	18	16	17	16	83
7	DIB	16	17	16	17	17	83
8	ERS	16	17	16	17	17	83
9	INM	17	18	18	19	19	91
10	JRA	16	16	18	16	16	82
11	JMRB	16	18	16	16	16	82
12	KKB	19	19	18	19	19	94
13	LCADG	16	16	16	16	16	80
14	MDCA	16	17	16	17	16	82
15	MMH	19	19	18	19	19	94
16	OT	17	18	18	19	19	91
17	OWT	18	18	18	19	17	88
18	RAR	16	18	17	16	17	84
19	RRT	16	16	16	16	16	80
20	SCRS	18	18	18	19	17	88
21	INM	18	18	19	18	17	90
22	YRKL	16	18	17	16	17	84
23	NFB	18	18	19	18	17	90
24	NH	16	18	16	17	16	83
Total		407	424	419	419	408	2060

From Table 3, it is shown that the total score of the post-test was 2060, indicating an overall improvement in students' speaking performance after the implementation of the teaching intervention. A closer examination of the scoring across different speaking indicators reveals that the highest score was achieved in the comprehension category. This suggests that students demonstrated

a strong ability to understand and respond appropriately during speaking activities, reflecting a deeper grasp of the spoken content.

The second highest score was obtained in the fluency category, indicating that students were able to speak more smoothly and with fewer hesitations or pauses compared to the pre-test. This improvement in fluency may be attributed to increased confidence and familiarity with speaking tasks as a result of the applied teaching strategy.

The third position was shared by vocabulary and pronunciation, which implies that while students expanded their word choices and improved their pronunciation, these aspects were still developing and required further reinforcement.

Lastly, the lowest score was found in the grammar component. This indicates that although students showed overall improvement, they still encountered difficulties in applying correct grammatical structures during their speaking. It suggests that grammar remains a challenge and may need to be emphasized more in future instructional sessions.

Overall, these findings reflect the varying levels of progress across different speaking skills, with comprehension leading the improvement and grammar requiring additional attention. Furthermore, the average pre and post test is shown in the following table;

Table 4. The Score of the Post Test in the Experimental Group

No.	Students' Initial	Pre-test	Post-test
1	AVT	60	86
2	AB	54	88
3	CJ	54	82
4	AF	71	88
5	AKL	62	84
6	TDL	72	83
7	DIB	68	83

8	ERS	68	83
9	INM	68	91
10	JRA	59	82
11	JMRB	54	82
12	KKB	77	94
13	LCADG	68	80
14	MDCA	67	82
15	MMH	77	94
16	OT	68	91
17	OWT	71	88
18	RAR	58	84
19	RRT	68	80
20	SCRS	65	88
21	INM	57	90
22	YRKL	58	84
23	NFB	57	90
24	NH	72	83
Total Score		1564	2060
Mean		65.16	85.83

Based on the data presented in Table 4, it is shown that the mean score of the pre-test was 65.16, while the mean score of the post-test increased significantly to 85.83. This notable improvement in the average score indicates that students' speaking ability improved after the implementation of the teaching strategy, in this case, the use of the Elicitation Technique.

The increase of 20.67 points in the mean score suggests that the treatment had a positive impact on students' performance. The pre-test results reflect the students' initial speaking competence before receiving any intervention, while the post-test results demonstrate the level of achievement after the treatment was applied.

This upward trend in the scores implies that students gained better understanding, confidence, and skills in speaking as a result of the learning activities. It can be inferred that the technique used helped to foster more interactive, responsive, and engaging speaking practices, leading to measurable improvement.

To determine whether the increase was statistically significant, a paired samples t-test (or Wilcoxon test, if the data are not normally distributed) should be conducted. However, from the descriptive statistics alone, the increase in the mean score provides preliminary evidence supporting the effectiveness of the technique used in enhancing students' speaking abilities.

Mean score of the pre-test

$$M = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$

$$M = \frac{1564}{24}$$

$$M = 65.16$$

Mean score of the post-test

$$M = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$

$$M = \frac{2060}{24}$$

$$M = 85.8$$

Standard deviation of the pre-test

$$SD = \frac{\sqrt{\sum X^2 - \frac{(\sum X)^2}{N}}}{N - 1}$$

$$SD = \frac{\sqrt{\sum 102974 - \frac{(\sum 1564)^2}{24}}}{24 - 1}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{102974 - \frac{2.446.096}{23}}$$

$$SD = 10.63$$

Standard deviation of the-post

$$SD = \frac{\sqrt{\sum X^2 - \frac{(\sum X)^2}{N}}}{N - 1}$$

$$SD = \frac{\sqrt{\sum 177226 - \frac{(\sum 2060)^2}{24}}}{24 - 1}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{177226 - \frac{4.243.600}{23}}$$

$$SD = 75.97$$

The mean and the standard deviation the pre and post test showed in table 5:

Table 5. Mean score and standard deviation of the pre-test and post-test

Test	Mean Score	Standard Deviation (SD)
Pre-test	65.16	10.63
Post-test	85.83	75.97

Based on the data presented in table 5, it can be concluded that there was a notable improvement in students' speaking performance from the pre-test to the post-test. The mean score of the pre-test was 65.16, while the post-test mean increased significantly to 85.83. This 20.67-point increase in average score indicates a positive effect of the intervention implemented during the study, suggesting that the teaching technique presumably the

Elucidation Technique had a substantial impact on enhancing students' speaking skills.

In terms of data variability, the standard deviation of the pre-test was 10.63, indicating that students' scores were relatively close to the average and exhibited less dispersion. However, the standard deviation of the post-test was 75.97, which is considerably higher. This suggests that while the overall performance improved, the range of individual student performance became more varied. In other words, some students may have shown very high improvement, while others improved at a more moderate level.

This widening of the standard deviation in the post-test could be attributed to differences in how individual students responded to the teaching intervention—some perhaps gaining greater benefits due to their learning styles, motivation, or prior knowledge. Nevertheless, the increase in mean score reflects a general trend of improvement across the group.

These findings support the hypothesis that the applied teaching strategy was effective in improving students' speaking abilities, and they provide empirical evidence that can be further explored in the results of the calculation of the t-test value.

The calculation of the t-test value

The T test has been conducted using the Wilcoxon signed-rank formula available in SPSS. Figure 1 shows the calculation results;

Figure 1. The results of the t-test calculation

Hypothesis Test Summary			
	Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig. Decision
1	The median of differences between Students' Pre-Test Scores and Students' Post-Test Scores equals 0.	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.000 Reject the null hypothesis.

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05.

Based on the result of the Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test, the significance value was 0.000, which is considerably lower than the predefined alpha level of 0.05. This indicates that the probability of the observed difference occurring by chance is extremely low. As a result, the null hypothesis, which stated that there is no difference in the median scores between the pre-test and post-test, is rejected. This statistical finding suggests that there is a significant difference in the students' performance before and after the implementation of the Elucidation Technique. The direction of the difference, supported by the increase in students' average scores, implies a positive impact of the intervention. In other words, students performed significantly better in the post-test compared to the pre-test, which is strong evidence of the effectiveness of the technique in improving their speaking skills.

Furthermore, the use of the Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test was appropriate in this context because the data did not meet the assumption of normality, as indicated by previous normality tests. This non-parametric alternative provided a reliable analysis of paired sample data without requiring the assumption of normal distribution.

In conclusion, the statistically significant result supports the idea that the Elucidation Technique can be effectively employed as

a teaching strategy to enhance students' speaking abilities. It offers a meaningful contribution to language learning practices, especially in settings where student engagement and verbal participation need to be improved.

DISCUSSION

Speaking is a skill which is worthy of attention in both first and second language. Learning the speaking skill is the most important aspect of learning a second or foreign language and success is measured based on the ability to perform a conversation in the language (David, 2003).

The elicitation technique provided students with more opportunities to actively engage in speaking activities (Fitria & Sofyawati, 2018). Through guided questions, prompts, and interactive tasks, learners were encouraged to think critically, organize their thoughts, and articulate them in English. This continuous exposure and practice in a supportive environment helped them overcome common barriers such as fear of making mistakes, limited vocabulary, and lack of confidence (Anggrisia & Robah, 2023).

The improvement in comprehension and fluency suggests that the elicitation technique promotes not only language output but also active listening and understanding (Halim & Halim, 2019). When students were asked questions that required thoughtful responses, they were motivated to process language input more deeply and to produce more meaningful utterances. This aligns with the principles of communicative language teaching (CLT), which emphasize interaction as both the means and ultimate goal of learning a language (Nhi & Due, 2024).

While grammar remained the most challenging aspect for students, this may reflect the nature of spontaneous speech, where fluency is often prioritized over grammatical accuracy. It is important to note, however, that the improvement in other aspects,

such as vocabulary and pronunciation, demonstrates that students were actively building their linguistic repertoire. These gains can serve as a foundation upon which grammatical accuracy may gradually develop through continued practice and targeted feedback.

These findings are consistent with prior research suggesting that interactive and student-centered approaches are more effective in developing oral proficiency compared to traditional, teacher-centered methods. In particular, elicitation techniques have been shown to facilitate scaffolding, where teachers guide students' language use without providing direct answers, thus encouraging learners to construct their own utterances (Restari et al., 2023).

The findings of this study offer several significant implications for English language teaching, particularly within EFL (English as a Foreign Language) contexts. From a pedagogical standpoint, it is recommended that teachers integrate elicitation techniques as a fundamental element of speaking instruction. These techniques not only contribute to a more dynamic and engaging classroom environment but also promote learner agency by encouraging students to actively participate in their own language development. In terms of curriculum design, language programs should incorporate interactive and communicative activities that provide learners with frequent and meaningful opportunities to use spoken English. Activities such as role-plays, interviews, and problem-solving discussions, which emulate authentic communication scenarios, are particularly effective in this regard. Furthermore, teacher training programs must equip educators with the skills necessary to implement elicitation techniques effectively. This includes training on how to craft open-ended questions, manage wait-time strategically, and deliver feedback that supports learner autonomy. Assessment practices

should also evolve to prioritize communicative competence alongside grammatical accuracy, thereby shifting the focus from rote memorization to meaningful language use. While the current study yields promising results, further research involving larger and more diverse participant samples, the inclusion of control groups, and rigorous statistical analysis is needed to strengthen the generalizability of the findings. Additionally, future studies might explore how elicitation can be integrated with other instructional strategies to support grammar acquisition. Overall, elicitation emerges as a valuable instructional approach that enhances students' speaking skills, fosters creativity, and encourages active engagement, ultimately contributing to the development of confident and proficient English speakers.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of this research, it is evident that the elicitation technique significantly enhances students' speaking abilities. The pre-test and post-test scores reveal a marked improvement in students' performance, with an average increase from 54 to 94. This demonstrates the efficacy of the elicitation technique in developing various aspects of speaking skills, including pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and interaction.

The findings confirm the hypothesis that there is a significant effect of using the elicitation technique on students' speaking abilities at the second grade of SMAN 7 Kupang. Students who received higher scores in the implementation of this technique exhibited better overall speaking skills. This suggests that the elicitation technique is an effective method for encouraging active participation and enhancing students' motivation in learning English.

However, the study acknowledges a limitation due to the absence of a control group, which could provide a more

comprehensive assessment of the elicitation technique's effectiveness. Future research should consider incorporating a control group to validate these findings further and ensure that improvements can be attributed to the elicitation technique rather than other external factors.

In conclusion, the elicitation technique proves to be a valuable strategy in improving students' speaking skills. This research contributes to the field by offering practical insights for educators and reinforcing the theoretical framework that supports the use of elicitation in language learning.

REFERENCES

- Arikunto, S. (2014). *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Bailey, K. M. (2005). *Practical English Language Teaching: Speaking*. New York: McGraw-Hill ESL/ELT.
- Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- David, N. (2003). *Practical English Language Teaching*. London: McGraw-Hill.
- Fulcher, G. (2014). *Testing Second Language Speaking*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315837376>
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Harlow, England: Pearson Longman.
- Scrivener, J. (2005). *Learning Teaching* (Second). Oxford: Macmillan.
- Usman, B., Ayouni, N., Samad, I. A., & Fitriani, S. S. (2018). TEACHERS ELICITATION: INVITING STUDENTS TO

SPEAK. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature and Culture*, 3(1), 51. <https://doi.org/10.30659/e.3.1.51-65>

Anggrisia, N. F., & Robah, A. (2023). Exploring challenges and strategies in English speaking among Indonesian university students: A case study of AKM university. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 11(1).
<https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v11i1.19156>

Arikunto, S. (2012). *Dasar-dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan* (2nd ed.). Bumi Aksara.

Arikunto, S. (2014). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Praktek*. Rineka Cipta.

Fitria, Y., & Sofyawati, E. D. (2018). THE USE OF ELICITATION IN IMPROVING STUDENTS' SPEAKING SKILL. *English Education and Applied Linguistics Journal (EEAL Journal)*, 1(3), 209–214. <https://doi.org/10.31980/eealjournal.v1i3.1701>

Halim, S., & Halim, T. (2019). Elicitation: A Powerful Diagnostic Tool for Actively Involving Learners in the Learning Process. *Arab World English Journal*, 1, 115–126.
<https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/efl1.9>

Nhi, N. N. P., & Due, P. H. (2024). Enhancing English Speaking Skills through the Communicative Approach for Adult Learners at the Center of Tam Nhan Tri. *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 29(8), 30–48.

Restari, K. L., Artini, L. P., Pratiwi, N. P. A., & Wiraingsih, N. P. (2023). ELICITATION TECHNIQUE EMPLOYED BY EFL TEACHERS IN MOTIVATING JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS TO SPEAK. *Journal of English Language and Culture*, 13(2), 81–96.

Sugiyono, S. (2019). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif*. Alfabeta.