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Abstract
This study is aimed at 1) describing the students’ speaking competence and 2) students critical thinking skill; 3) finding out the positive and the significant difference in speaking competence between the students who were taught by using Socratic Questioning Technique (SQT) and those who were taught by using Information Gap Technique (IGT); 4) finding out the positive and the significant differences in students speaking competence between those who had high and low critical thinking; and 5) finding out the positive and significant interaction in students speaking competence between teaching techniques and the critical thinking skill. A quasi experiment method (pre-posttest non-equivalent control group design) through the $2 \times 2$ factorial designs used to represents an independent variable and a dependent variable with different level of thinking. The results showed that there were significantly differences in speaking ability between students who had high critical thinking and those who had low critical thinking. The value of R was 0.840 with interval correlation (0.80 – 1.00) meaning coefficient correlation was very strong and significant in linear regression or gained regression criteria in addition there was a positive and significant interaction in speaking competence between teaching techniques and critical thinking skill.
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Introduction

Speaking in a foreign language learning context has often been viewed as the most demanding of the four language skills for learners. This is because speaking does not cover just knowing the linguistic feature; linguistic feature of the message expanding oral communication requires more than memorized vocabulary and grammatical comprehension (Derakhshan, Khalili, & Beheshti, 2016). In other words, communicative competence should be based on the level of knowledge in presenting ideas that is critically produced by learners own thinking. Thus, it is better for schools to engage students in a high cognitive activity at class discussion. One of the important thinking abilities that should be acquired by learners in school and university is the ability of a critical thinking (Abdi, 2012). For that reason, it is a must for teachers to fostering students’ critical thinking by using the critical questions. The questioning level are presented by the teacher in order to provide completeness of students thinking and build up their understanding about the material. Teachers play an important role in engaging students in higher order thinking skills by asking higher order questions (Khan & Inamullah, 2011). Furthermore, it can be said that the students' speaking competences are measured by thinking; they can understand the topic by thinking and analyze the issues presented to them through asking suitable questions.

The researcher conducted his preliminary study by observing students speaking activities and their critical thinking in SMA Negeri 11 Ambon especially at class MIA I. To support the authentic data in relation to that observations, the researcher delivered the questionnaire for the students in order to know their responses in the following the lesson, their difficulty in responding to the teacher questions, their speaking ability and critical thinking, their response to the characteristic and the influence of questions for their speaking ability and their critical thinking. Through overall answer of the students based on questionnaire, the researcher found some problems such as; students’ critical thinking level and their speaking competence was low. This occurred because; the students could not explore their ideas in depth, based on the questions which are provided by the teacher. She always asked questions that require a same reasoning answer but more than that focus on yes or no answers and tell all the information related to the topic. On the other hand, the deep reasoning teacher questions predict positively cognitive learning activity and motivation (Jurik, Gröschner, & Seidel, 2014). Asking students questions that only require a one-word response could not foster an active learning environment and the quality of each question was not fully effective to explore students’ concept of thinking, because the level of student thinking is directly proportional to the level of questions asked. When the teacher designs questions, she must consider the purpose of each question and then develop the appropriate level and type of question to accomplish the
purpose because students need experience with higher level questioning that their familiar with it.

Moreover, teachers should play a great role in developing the critical thinking level and dispositions of students by asking many questions and give them all the information. Regarding the problems that have been explained before, the researcher proposed Socratic Questioning Technique to overcome the problems. This technique of questioning has been proven to explore students' idea in depth and to guide them in generating thoughtful questions, thus fostering their speaking competence and critical thinking level. Socratic questioning is disciplined questioning that can be used to pursue thought in many directions and for many purposes, including: to explore complex ideas, to get to the truth of things, to open up issues and problems, to uncover assumptions, to analyze concepts, to distinguish what we know from what we don't know, and to follow out logical implications of thought (Paul & Elder, 2007). They argue that both Socratic questioning and CT share common end which leads to thinking at a deep level.

Some previous relevant study also approved the connection of communication indeed speaking competence and their critical thinking skill. First, In relation to The Influence of Socratic Questioning towards Students’ Speaking Competence; A study into the Use of Socratic Seminar in Teaching Speaking on Hortatory Exposition Text by (Andriyani et al., 2014) showed a positive and strong effect toward students’ speaking achievement at eleventh grade students of SMA Negeri 2 Pontianak in academic year 2013/2014. There were class IPA 3 as the experimental group and class IPA 4 as the control group. The computation of t-test is higher than t-table, therefore the alternative hypothesis was accepted. The effect size of the treatment was 0.99 and qualified as very strong. It leads to better attention in learning and stimulate them to participate in learning process. From this result, they stated that the students' response the Socratic Seminar is enjoyable.

Second, in relation to the Influence of Critical Thinking on Students’ Speaking Competence. Its development begins by conducting and providing students’ time to explore their communication in deeply thought. A study by (Afshar & Rahimi, 2014) who investigated the relationship among critical thinking, emotional intelligence, and speaking abilities of Iranian EFL learners. The multiple correlation of result analyses revealed a) emotional intelligence, followed by critical thinking, correlated significantly highly with speaking abilities; b) all components of emotional intelligence correlated significantly highly with speaking abilities; and c) there was a significant positive relationship between critical thinking and emotional intelligence. The results of multiple regression analyses revealed that emotional intelligence was a stronger predictor of speaking abilities with critical thinking standing at the second place. Meaning,
speaking competence was highly assessed when students have high emotional intelligent supported by critical ideas to create a meaningful learning activities or it plays important role for students to communicate and to provide evidence more than just giving the information.

Third, The Influence of Socratic Questioning and Critical Thinking towards Students’ Speaking Competence; A study about the effects of Socratic questioning on veterinary students' critical thinking skills (Yang, Newby, & Bill, 2005) showed positive effects. The study was of an interrupted time series quasi-experimental style on sixteen students of a distance-learning course took part in online asynchronous discussion forums, eleven of whom during treatment I and five during treatment II. The types of questions used were clarification questions, questions asking for reason and evidence and questions probing assumptions. Students who participated in facilitated discussions in Treatment II were of a significantly higher quality than those from the counter group in Treatment I who had not followed the facilitated online discussion. At the end of experiment, all the students seemed to more critically ask and answer questions to clarify ideas and to negotiate meaning and identify areas of agreement and disagreement. From its results showed the more challenging interaction from the use Socratic questioning because this technique leads learner to engage in the deeper level of thinking.

Based on the problems stated and the result of previous study above, this study is addressed to gain the objectives, such as: 1) to explain the students speaking competence and 2) to describe the students’ critical thinking level. 3) To find out a positive and significant difference in students speaking competence between the students who are taught by Socratic Questioning Technique and those who are taught by Information Gap Technique. 4) To find out a positive and significant difference in students speaking competence between the students who have high critical thinking and those who have low critical thinking. 5) To find out a positive and significant interaction in students speaking competence among the students who are taught by Socratic Questioning Technique (SQT) and their critical thinking with those who are taught by Information Gap Technique (IGT) and their critical thinking. In order to explain clearly about the objectives of the study, the proposed hypothesis is shown also as follows:

1. There was a positive and significant difference in the students speaking competence between the students who are taught with SQT and those who are taught with IGT.

2. There was a positive and significant difference in students speaking competence between the students who had high critical thinking and those who had low critical thinking.
3. There was a positive and significant interaction in students speaking competence among the students who are taught by SQT and their critical thinking with those who are taught by IGT and their critical thinking.

**Method**

The method used in this study was quasi experimental research with *pre-posttest nonequivalent control group design*. As expressed by (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007) in pre-posttest nonequivalent control group design, the experimental and control groups have not been equated by randomization because the equivalence of groups can be strengthened by matching them followed by random assignment to experimental and control treatments by using intact group. The $2 \times 2$ factorial designs were used because each of the technique represents an independent variable and a dependent variable with the different level of thinking.

| B (Critical Thinking) | A (Technique) |
|-----------------------|---------------|
|                       | A1 (SQT)     |
| B1 (High)             | Y1.1, Y1.2, ... n |
| B2 (Low)              | Y2.1, Y2.2, ... n |

| Explanation: |
|--------------|
| A : Technique |
| A1 : Socratic Questioning Technique |
| A2 : Information Gap Technique |
| Y : Speaking Competence |
| n : Subject |

| B : Critical Thinking |
|-----------------------|
| B1 : High Critical Thinking Level |
| B2 : Low Critical Thinking Level |

The research setting was at the *SMA Negeri 11 Ambon*. The subjects for both experimental class and control class were the students in the first grade. The experimental class is X-MIA$^7$ with 40 number of students and the control class was X-MIA$^3$ with 40 number of students. The variables of this research consist of one independent variable (SQT). One moderate variable was critical thinking skill divided into 2 level (low and high level) and also one dependent variable (students’ speaking competence). Meanwhile control variable is also used in order to neutralize its influence toward the dependent variable. It consists of; a) the prior knowledge of research subjects, b) the scope of teaching materials, c) the similar ability of English teachers who involved in this study, d) time allocation of speaking test, d) time allocation for teaching speaking.

The research instrument used consists of two types (oral and written test) and its content made by the researcher itself after getting the input from some experts. The form of oral test instruments such the questions for speaking competence (pre and posttest) in oral performance. Oral test instrument based
on the certain topics and assessed students' oral speaking competence by using analytical scale scoring procedure adapted from (Mukminatien, 2015) and it divided into four elements, such as: 1) pronunciation, 2) grammatical accuracy, 3) vocabulary resources, and 4) interactive communication. Meanwhile, in the written test instrument used the Critical Thinking Assessment which consist of six elements or components, such: 1) analysis, 2) critique, 3) evaluation, 4) generativity, 5) precision, and 6) synthesis were analyzed descriptively using score analytic scaled (Variable, 2012). In this study, the data is analyzed by using t-test with factorial design $2 \times 2$. Furthermore, the normality and homogeneity test were analyzed for testing the first and second hypothesis while for third hypothesis used t-test (independent t sample test) to compare two independent variables in order to test the significant result of the research or to compare two average samples. The significant level of this test was 0.05 and measured by software SPSS (statistical package for social science) 17.00 for Windows. The steps of formula were testing the validity and reliability of try out instrument, testing the normality and homogeneity of sample, and the testing hypothesis.

**Results**

**Learning Stages**

**Pre-Experimental Stage**

In this stage, there were some of activities prepared by the researcher such as; selecting the topics as teaching materials based on students' level, needs and interests, designing lesson plans, procedures of SQT and IGT and developing the critical thinking and speaking test instrument. The topics of teaching speaking were selected based on English Syllabus for X-Science Program and focused on updated issues and students' interest. The topics are; learning through music, describing historical places, describing people, and talking about an idol. Thereupon, the researcher continued to designing the lesson plans in which one topic is taught for two times of teaching. In lesson plans also clearly explain about the procedure of both SQT as experimental group and IGT as control group. The implementation of try out instrument for both critical thinking and speaking test is done at the end of April. The tryout instrument of critical thinking was applied on 26th April 2016 whereas speaking test was conducted two days at 29th – 30th April 2016. Then, the researcher continued to analyze the validity and reliability of the instruments. The preparation is also made by the researcher in order to share about the topics or teaching materials, procedures of information gap technique and speaking assessment together with one of the English teacher who taught in control class.
**The Experimental Stage**

The data collection of this study was done by following some steps: a) implemented pre-test of speaking competence, b) implemented the pre-test for critical thinking, c) implemented SQT and IGT. The post-test is conducted also in order to measure the students’ critical thinking, and d) did the post test for speaking competence. This study was conducted since 26th April 2016 until 27th May 2016 and done in 15 times teaching activities. It consist of one time critical thinking test which done at 28th April 2016, two times to implemented pre-test of speaking competence conducted at 29th – 30th April, 2016. Both of Socratic Questioning and Information Gap techniques were treated in 8 times begin from 9th May 2016 until 21st May 2016, one time to measure students’ critical thinking done at 23rd May 2016 and two times of post-test for speaking competence at 24th – 27th May, 2016. In conducting this research especially for speaking competence, both of techniques were implemented in order to improve students’ speaking competence and their critical thinking. In this case, Socratic questioning as experimental group was manipulated technique and it known later have significant influence to improve students speaking competence and their critical thinking. It is expected also that the students who are taught by Socratic questioning technique have high critical thinking than those who are taught by information gap technique.

**Hypothesis**

In order to reject or to accept the null hypothesis, the researcher compared the null hypothesis with its level of significance, 0.05 (5%) and also compared the mean score of both experimental and control group. The results of testing hypothesis are explained in the following paragraphs.

1. **There was a positive and significant difference in students speaking competence between those who were taught by using SQT and those who were taught by using IGT.**

| Table. 1.a. Group Statistics |
|------------------------------|
| Technique | N | Mean   | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| Speaking Competence Pretest  |   |        |                |                |
| SQT       | 40| 12.1913| 2.96380        | .46862         |
| IGT       | 40| 12.1990| 2.68173        | .42402         |
| Speaking Competence Posttest |   |        |                |                |
| SQT       | 40| 13.6922| 3.37211        | .53318         |
| IGT       | 40| 13.4422| 2.98395        | .47180         |

To answer the first research question that shown in the table 1.a., it is reported that the *Mean* score as the result of testing hypothesis in pre-test of students speaking competence by using SQT was 12.19 and 12.19 for IGT. After the students were treated by using Socratic questioning technique as
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A manipulated variable then the mean score of post-test from speaking competence show in experimental group was 13.69 and 13.44 for control group.

Table. 1.b. Independent Samples Test

|                | Levene’s Test | t-test for Equality of Means |         |         | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
|----------------|---------------|-------------------------------|---------|---------|-----------------------------------------|
|                | F  | Sig. | T   | Df | Sig. | Mean | Std. Error | Difference | Lower | Upper |
| Speaking Competence Pretest | Equal variances assumed | 1.155 | .286 | -.012 | 78 | .990 | .00775 | .63198 | -1.26592 | 1.25042 |
| Speaking Competence Posttest | Equal variances not assumed | -.012 | 77.233 | .990 | -.00775 | .63198 | -1.26612 | 1.25062 |

Meanwhile, for the next table 1.b, it is reported that F count for teaching techniques was 1.44 with the significant value 0.24 indicated that F count greater than alpha value 0.05 (p > 0.05) means that the data was homogenous. Thus, the table also reported that t –test was 0.73 which means that the t-test greater than t-table (p > 0.05). The result shows that there were significantly differences in speaking ability between the students who were taught by using SQT than those who were taught by using IGT. The mean score of speaking ability in experiment group was 13.69 and 13.44 for control group. Based on this description, it implied that the students who were taught by using SQT had better speaking competence than those who were taught by using IGT even it had a little bit differences of speaking competence between both of groups.

2. There was a positive and significant different in students’ speaking competence between those who had high critical thinking and those who had low critical thinking

Table. 2.a. Group Statistics

| Critical Thinking Level | N  | Mean  | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|-------------------------|----|-------|----------------|-----------------|
| Speaking Competence     |    |       |                |                 |
| High                    | 48 | 15.7225 | 1.76097       | .25417          |
| Posttest                |    |       |                |                 |
| Low                     | 32 | 10.3344 | 1.69266       | .29922          |
To answer the second research question, the table 2.a., the number of students was 80 students which consist of 48 students have high critical thinking skill and 32 students had low critical thinking. The table also shown the mean score of students who had high critical thinking was 15.72 whereas the mean score of the students who had low critical thinking was 10.33.

| Table. 2.b. Independent Samples Test |
|------------------------------------|
| Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances | t-test for Equality of Means |
| Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | Lower | Upper |
| Equal variances | .319 | .574 | 13.615 | 78 | .000 | 5.38813 | .39576 | 4.60022 | 6.17603 |
| Equal variances assumed | | | | | | | | |
| Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances | t-test for Equality of Means |
| Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | Lower | Upper |
| Equal variances | .319 | .574 | 13.724 | 68.391 | .000 | 5.38813 | .39261 | 4.60477 | 6.17148 |
| Equal variances not assumed | | | | | | | | |
| Speaking Competence Pretest |  |
|  |
| Speaking Competence Posttest |  |

Meanwhile, in the next table 2.b. above reported that the significant tailed of t-test is 0.000 meaning that the t-test was less than t-table. Therefore, from the result of the table above show that there was significantly differences in speaking ability between the students who had high critical thinking and those who had low critical thinking.

3. There was a positive and significant interaction in students speaking competence between those who were taught by using SQT and their critical thinking with those who were taught with IGT and their critical thinking.

In order to find out the value of coefficient correlation whether to answer the third research question in this study, the weak and strong level determined by using the guidance of interpretation value of coefficient correlation based on (Sugiyono, 2013). The interpretation of value shown in following table 3.a

| Table 3.a. The Interpretation Value of Coefficient Correlation |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| Coefficient Interval | Level of Correlation/Influence |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| 0.00 – 0.1999        | Very weak                     |
| 0.20 – 0.399         | Weak                          |
| 0.40 - 0.599         | Fair/Enough                   |
The table 3.a showed the result of analyzing the interaction influence between the teaching techniques and critical thinking skill towards speaking competence. The table 3.b shown the value of $R$ was 0.84 in interval correlation (0.80 – 1.00) which indicated that coefficient correlation was very strong. Thereby, it can be reported that there was a very strong interaction influence between the teaching techniques and critical thinking towards speaking competence.

Table 3.b. Model Summary

| Model | R     | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------|----------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| 1     | .840a | .705     | .698              | 1.74071                   |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Critical Thinking Level, Technique

Table 3.c. ANOVA

| Model          | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F      | Sig.  |
|----------------|----------------|----|-------------|--------|-------|
| Regression     | 558.662        | 2  | 279.331     | 92.186 | .000a |
| Residual       | 233.316        | 77 | 3.030       |        |       |
| Total          | 791.979        | 79 |            |        |       |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Critical Thinking Level, Technique
b. Dependent Variable: Speaking Competence Posttest

c. The table 3.d showed the result of analyzing the interaction influence between the teaching techniques and critical thinking skill towards speaking competence. The table 3.b shown the value of $R$ was 0.84 in interval correlation (0.80 – 1.00) which indicated that coefficient correlation was very strong. Thereby, it can be reported that there was a very strong interaction influence between the teaching techniques and critical thinking towards speaking competence.
Therefore, from the result of the data showed in Table 3.c. mentioned that the F-test was 92.186 with the significant value 0.000 reveals that the value of F-test was less than the value of F-table (p value < 0.05). The findings reported that the data was significant in linear regression or because it gained the regression criteria.

Discussion

The Description of Students’ Speaking Competence

According to the result of the study, the students’ speaking competence for those who were taught by using SQT was in high level. It can be seen from their highest score was 19 and lower score was 7.67. The score that has many frequency such the interval 14-16 in high category with total percentage is 17.5% (14 students). Then it continued in the interval level with range score 8-10 with total percentage is 11.25% (9 students) in the low category followed by one person (1.25%) who had very low level in the range very low level category. Thereby, the result showed that the first grade of science program students of SMA Negeri 11 Ambon had high level of speaking because it can be seen from the total number of students who were in the range score high and very high (14 – 19) was 22 students thus it large than the total of students who were in the very low category until the fair category (< 7 – 13) was 18 students. These results also mention that to acquire speaking competence the students should know the purpose of communication effectively and efficiently. In the process of speaking, the students were treated to improve their speaking competence by using SQT.

The Description of Students’ Critical Thinking (CT) Skill

In critical thinking aspect reported those there were 48 students who had high critical thinking and 32 students who had low critical thinking. In assessing students critical thinking, Mathew’ Critical thinking assessment is used and adapted by the researcher. The assessment components were analyze, criticize, evaluation, generatively, precise and synthesize. There were five questions in the form of essay written in Bahasa Indonesia, whether this research aimed about to test the theory especially the influence of the use of technique for their critical thinking skill in English subject but it was better for them to think and to answer more easily if the questions were provided in their first language. In the analysis process, the positive responses showed by the students about the topics or instruments that they got in the questions form related to specific issues. At this analysis step, the student could demonstrates critical thinking through well-reasoned and developed their own responses in relation to breaking down problems, issues, or questions into meaningful part of their idea and thinking.
The Influence of SQT towards Students’ Speaking Competence

From the result of testing hypothesis, SQT shown that there was significantly difference in students’ speaking competence compared in control group. Based on previous data analysis, the mean score in students speaking competence who were taught by using SQT was 13.69 meanwhile the mean score of students speaking competence who were taught by using information gap was 13.44. The result indicated that the SQT was more influence in improving students speaking competence than Information Gap technique even the score result showed the small influence. This findings support from the previous relevant study also claimed that the students who are taught by using Socratic questioning was better to speak, because this technique can picked ability to speak up and influence speaking achievement (Andriyani et al., 2014). In other words, theoretically and practically, this technique provides teachers responsibility to promote students speaking competence for independent thinking and give ownership of what students were learning. Thus, communication in classroom setting was shaped by the teacher questions and students answers were considered as a powerful teaching approach if those used to expose contradictions, challenge assumption, and lead to new wisdom and knowledge. The influence of Socratic questioning technique provides probing questions about the topic or material that presented by the teacher in classroom and students were engaged in useful communication.

The Influence of Students’ CT towards Students’ Speaking Skill

Based on the result of testing hypothesis showed that mean score of students who had high critical thinking was 16.03 while the mean score of the students who had low critical thinking was 15.41 indicated that students’ critical thinking had the significantly effect in improving the students speaking skill. In relation to theoretical explanation, (Tittle, 2011) stated that critical thinking is important because people who engage in critical thinking tend to be able to provide evidence and reasoning for the opinions they hold. It involves the ability to engage in deep reflective and independent thinking will be useful in order give the high challenge for students not only to speak but more than that it can increase their skill to think critically.

The Significant Interaction between SQT and CT towards Students’ Speaking Competence.

In this step, the result of the findings in testing hypothesis showed that there was a very strong interaction between teaching techniques (Socratic Questioning Technique versus Information gap Technique). It can be shown from the data result; the value of coefficient correlation was 92.19 with the significant value 0.05 (5%) revealed that the F-test was greater than the value of F-table (p > 0.05). The
findings reported that the data was significant in linear regression or because it gained the regression criteria.

**Conclusion**

From the discussion above, the researcher can conclude that; 1) The first grade of science students at *SMA Negeri 11 Ambon* had high English competency. 2) The students' critical thinking skill can be categorized in high level and low level. The students who had high critical thinking consist of 48 students while the students who had low critical thinking were 32 students. 3) The students' speaking competence was significantly influenced by SQT. The students who were taught by using SQT had better achievement in speaking competence than those who were taught by using IGT. 4) The students' speaking competence was significantly influenced by critical thinking skill. The students who had high critical thinking skill were significantly differences in their speaking ability with the students who had low critical thinking skill. 5) There was a significant interaction between SQT as teaching technique and students' critical thinking towards the students' speaking competence.

Whereas, the recommendation as the implication of this study is purposed for further researchers or the teacher who wants to continue or to apply this technique should consider about 1) the suitable time schedule provided by the school when a researcher or even the teacher who wants to continued or applied SQT. 2) The total population sample, because the efficient implementation of this technique need more time. 3) English teacher or further researcher can provide critical thinking questions using English if it was match with condition and level of students' English competency. 4) In this study, critical thinking as moderate variable and there were many moderate variables that can be explored deeply through conduct the experiment study. Therefore, it is suggested to choose any different kind of moderate variables.
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