

**THE EFFECT OF USING PLUS MINUS INTERESTING TECHNIQUE  
TOWARD STUDENTS' SPEAKING ABILITY AT  
THE SECOND YEAR OF STATE  
SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL 2  
PEKANBARU**



**By**

**ELISA KURNIA  
NIM.10814002223**

**FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING  
STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF SULTAN SYARIF KASIM RIAU  
PEKANBARU  
1434H/2013 M**

**THE EFFECT OF USING PLUS MINUS INTERESTING TECHNIQUE  
TOWARD STUDENTS' SPEAKING ABILITY AT  
THE SECOND YEAR OF STATE  
SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL 2  
PEKANBARU**

Thesis

Submitted to Fulfill One of the Requirements  
For Undergraduate Degree in English Education  
(S. Pd.)



**By**

**ELISA KURNIA  
NIM.10814002223**

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH EDUCATION  
FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING  
STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF SULTAN SYARIF KASIM RIAU  
PEKANBARU  
1434H/2013 M**

## ABSTRACT

**Elisa Kurnia (2012) : The Effect of Using Plus Minus Interesting Technique toward Students Speaking Ability at the Second Year Student of Senior High School 2 Pekanbaru.**

This research was conducted because some problems were faced by students in learning English, especially in speaking. The writer found that some of the second year students had lack of speaking ability, proved that they found difficulties in communicating by using English. The objectives of the research were to find out students' speaking ability taught without using Plus Minus Interesting Technique; to find out students' speaking ability taught by using Plus Minus Interesting Technique and even to obtain the significant effect of using Plus Minus Interesting Technique toward students' speaking ability at the second year of State Senior High School 2 Pekanbaru.

In this research, the writer took two classes; experimental and control class from seven classes. It means that 46 students were the sample of 180 students of population by using clustering sample randomly based on group. The design used in this research was *nonequivalent control group design* in Quasi-Experimental research. In collecting data, the writer used oral test. The tests consisted of two tests: Pretest was used to determine students' speaking ability before getting the treatment and Post test was used to determine students' speaking ability after getting the treatment. In analyzing the data, the writer used speaking assessment. The scores from the tests were analyzed by using test "T" formula in SPSS.

From the research findings, the score of  $t_o$  was higher than  $t_{table}$ . It can be concluded that  $H_o$  is rejected and  $H_a$  is accepted. It means that there was significant effect of using Plus Minus Interesting Technique towards students' speaking ability at the second year of State Senior High School 2 Pekanbaru, proved that the students' speaking ability taught by using Plus Minus Interesting Technique was categorized into good level meanwhile students' speaking ability which was taught without Plus Minus Interesting Technique was categorized into bad level.

## ABSTRAK

**Elisa Kurnia (2012) : Pengaruh Penggunaan Teknik Plus Minus Interesting terhadap Kemampuan Berbicara Siswa Kelas 2 SMAN 2 Pekanbaru.**

Penelitian ini dilaksanakan karena ada beberapa permasalahan yang ditemukan pada siswa dalam pembelajaran bahasa Inggris khususnya dalam berbicara. Peneliti menemukan bahwa beberapa orang murid kelas dua memiliki kemampuan yang lemah dalam berbicara, dibuktikan dengan mereka menemukan kesulitan dalam berkomunikasi dengan menggunakan Bahasa Inggris. Penelitian ini dilaksanakan dengan tujuan untuk mengetahui kemampuan berbicara siswa yang diajarkan dengan menggunakan teknik *Plus Minus Interesting*; kemampuan berbicara siswa tidak diajarkan dengan teknik *Plus Minus Interesting* dan juga untuk mengetahui apakah ada pengaruh yang signifikan menggunakan teknik *Plus Minus Interesting* terhadap kemampuan berbicara pada siswa kelas dua SMAN 2 Pekanbaru.

Pada penelitian ini, peneliti mengambil 2 kelas; kelas eksperimen dan kelas control dari tujuh kelas yang terdiri dari 46 siswa sebagai sampel dari jumlah populasi 180 siswa secara acak berdasarkan kelas. Desain penelitian yang digunakan adalah penelitian quasi-eksperimental (*nonrandomized control group pretest-posttest design*). Dalam pengumpulan data, penulis menggunakan *oral tes*. Ada dua macam tes: *Pretest* digunakan untuk menentukan kemampuan berbicara siswa sebelum mendapatkan perlakuan dan *posttest* digunakan untuk menentukan kemampuan menulis siswa setelah mendapatkan perlakuan. Dalam menganalisis data penulis menggunakan *pengukuran nilai speaking*. Nilai yang diperoleh dianalisis menggunakan rumus T-test dalam SPSS.

Berdasarkan hasil temuan penelitian, nilai  $t_0$  lebih besar dari  $t_{tabel}$ , sehingga bisa disimpulkan bahwa  $H_0$  ditolak dan  $H_a$  diterima. Bisa diartikan bahwa ada pengaruh yang signifikan menggunakan teknik *Plus Minus Interesting* terhadap kemampuan berbicara siswa pada siswa kelas dua SMAN 2 Pekanbaru, dibuktikan dengan kemampuan berbicara siswa yang diajarkan dengan menggunakan Teknik *Plus Minus Interesting* yang dikategorikan pada level baik, sedangkan kemampuan berbicara siswa yang tidak diajarkan dengan Teknik *Plus Minus Interesting* dikategorikan pada level yang kurang.

إيلياسا كورنيا (2012): تأثير استخدام طريقة ف- .

## الثاني بالمدرسة المتوسطة العالية الحكومية 2

إن المدرسة المتوسطة العالية الحكومية 2 باكنبارو من المدراس التي تقوم باستخدام منهج الدراسات للوحدة التربوية في عملية التعلم و التعليم. كشفت الباحثة عدة المشكلات أن بعض الطلاب لهم قدرة التكلم الضعيفة، لذلك تشوقت الباحثة في أداء هذه الدراسة تحت العنوان تأثير استخدام طريقة ف- .أ إلى قدرة الطلاب على التكلم. هذه الدراسة هي دراسة تجريبية على شكل شبه التجربة. الموضوع في هذه الدراسة هي طلاب الصف الثاني بالمدرسة المتوسطة العالية الحكومية 2 باكنبارو. أخذت الباحثة فصلين اثنين لعينات هذه الدراسة من الاجتماعية، الفصل التجربة و الفصل الضبط. العينات في هذه الدراسة نحو 46 180 طالب. في جمع البيانات استخدمت الباحثة الاختبار الشفهي الذي ينقسم إلى مرحلتين هما الاختبار

المعاملة باستخدام تقنية ف- .أ قبل الاختبار البعدي و الفصل الضبط بدونها. في تحليل البيانات

بالأساس على حصول هذه الدراسة فإن النتيجة الهامة هي  $0.05 > 0.000$ .

الفرضية الصفرية مرفوضة و الفرضية البديلة مقبولة. ودلم على علم في متوسط النتيجة عن ترقية  $10 \ 43 \ (23 \ 23)$  في المائة، بينما متوسط النتيجة في الفصل الضبط هو  $1 \ 30 \ (3 \ 17)$  في المائة). الاستنباط في هذه الدراسة هي أن هناك الفرق عن ترقية قدرة الطلاب على التكلم بين الطلاب الذين يدرسون باستخدام طريقة ف- .أ و الطلاب الذين يدرسون بدونها. إذن، هناك تأثير استخدام طريقة ف- .

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT



In the name of Allah SWT, the most gracious and merciful. All praises belong to Allah Almighty, the lord of universe, who rewards the writer health, opportunity, times, financial, energy, idea and the most belief so the writer is able to accomplish this project paper to fulfill one of the requirements for the award of undergraduate degree at English Department of Education and Teaching Training of State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau. Shalawat and gratitude to do our noble character, the prophet Muhammad SAW peace be upon him.

In conducting and finishing this project paper, the writer got advice, support and motivation from many people. In this opportunity, the writer would like to express the great thanks to:

1. Prof. Dr. H. M. Nazir, the Rector of State Islamic University of Sultan SyarifKasim Riau.
2. Drs. H. Promadi, MA. Ph.D, the Caretaker Dean of Education and Teacher Training Faculty of UIN SUSKA Riau.
3. Dr. Hj. Zulhiddah, M.Pd, the Chairperson of English Education Department for her guidance to complete this thesis.
4. Dedy Wahyudi, M.Pd, the secretary of English Education Department and Teacher Training Faculty of UIN SUSKA Riau.
5. Nur Aisyah Zulkifli, M.Pd, gratefully thanks to the Supervisor for her guidance, support, and advice to complete this thesis.
6. All lecturers who gave the knowledge and information to the writer.
7. Drs. H. Ali Anwar, M.Pd, as the Headmaster of SMAN 2 Pekanbaru and his staff, and also Dra. Etika Dewayani, the English Teacher who has helped in conducting this research.

8. My beloved parents, Syahrial Tanjung and Lindawati Simarmata who given their wonderful-greatest love, pray, support, advice, financial and spirit. My beloved grandma, Martha Sinaga. My beloved brothers Edu Pratama and Elvran. My beloved relatives, my uncles and aunties, my cousins, who always supports me too. I love you all as always.
9. My pals, Elfi Rahmi Jufri, S.Pd, Widiya Tri Rahayu, S.Pd, Dona Rahmawati, S.Pd, Sy. Oktiya Sari, S.Pd, Enita Rahayu, S.Pd, M. Rais, S.pd, Winda Widiastuti, S.Pd, Ahmad Hafizon, S.Pd, Rauf Tetuko Baruansyah, S.Pd, who have supported and have motivated me. My other pals Heni Cicilya, Liony, Amd.Keb, Wella Oktavia Novalis for coloring my life. My extra ordinary friends, Vebi Wulandari, S.Pd, Deni Irawan, S.Pd, for our togetherness during the fighting journey. You Guys, Rock!
10. My classmates, Akil, Bibi, Hawa, Ning, Jumi, Ani, Yeni, Yus, Iwan, Anggi, Widnov, Vebyo, Supri, Rahmad, Sepri, Khairizam, Tika, Rila, Novri, and all students of EED '08.

May Allah Almighty, the lord of the universe bless you all. Amin.....

Pekanbaru, December 3<sup>rd</sup> 2012

The Writer

Elisa Kurnia

NIM: 10814002223

## LIST OF CONTENTS

<b>SUPERVISOR APPROVAL</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>EXAMINER APPROVAL</b> .....	<b>ii</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b> .....	<b>v</b>
<b>LIST OF CONTENT</b> .....	<b>viii</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLE</b> .....	<b>ix</b>
<b>CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION</b>	
A. Background .....	1
B. The Definition of Term .....	6
C. Problems .....	7
D. The Objective and the Significance of the Research .....	9
<b>CHAPTER II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE</b>	
A. Theoretical Framework .....	11
1. The Nature of Speaking .....	11
2. The Nature of P-M-I Technique .....	19
B. Relevant Research .....	23
C. Operational Concept .....	24
D. Assumption and Hypothesis .....	26
<b>CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHODOLOGY</b>	
A. Research Design .....	27
B. Location and Time of the Research .....	28
C. Subject and Object of the Research .....	28
D. The Population and Sample of the Research .....	29
E. The Technique of Collecting Data .....	29
1. Reliability .....	30
2. Validity .....	31
F. The Technique of Data Analysis .....	32
<b>CHAPTER IV PRESENTATION OF DATA ANALYSIS</b>	
A. Description of Data Analysis .....	33
B. Data Presentation .....	34
C. Data Analysis .....	41
<b>CHAPTER V CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION</b>	
A. Conclusion .....	53
B. Suggestion .....	54
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b> .....	<b>55</b>
<b>APPENDICES</b>	

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### A. The Background

Speaking is a language skill that is much needed, because it is used by someone to communicate with each other. It is a crucial skill in English that should be learnt by anyone to communicate with each other. It takes place every where and has become part of the people daily activities. In speaking, we have to share an idea directly, without thinking for its writing. Nunan says “speaking is harder than reading, writing, and listening for two reasons. First, unlike reading or writing, speaking happens in real time. Second, when you are speaking, you cannot edit and revise what you wish to say, as you can if you are writing.<sup>1</sup> It means that speaking comes naturally and there is limited time to set or to edit your speech during conversation.

Brown and Yule state in their book, speaking is to express the needs—request, information, service, etc.<sup>2</sup> The speakers say words to the listener not only to express what in their mind is but also to express what they need. Communication involves at least two people where both sender and receiver need to communicate to exchange information, ideas, opinions, views, or feelings.

---

<sup>1</sup> Nunan, David. *Practical English Language Teaching*. (New York: McGraw Hill, 2003), p. 48

<sup>2</sup> Brown, Gillian and Yule, George. *Teaching the Spoken Language : Approach Based on the Analysis of Conversational English*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 14.

The people do the conversation for particular goal, so it is important that everything we want to say is delivered in an effective way, because speaking is not only producing sounds but also a process of achieving goals that involves transferring messages across.

Speaking is used as one of the measurements of students' ability in English subject. It can also be inferred from the definition as follows:

“Speaking is one of four language skills. If students want to speak English fluently, as Harmer says, they have to be able to pronounce correctly. In addition, they need to master intonation, conversation, either transactional or interpersonal conversation. Transactional function has main purpose in conveying information and facilitating the exchange of goods, and service, whereas the interpersonal function is all about maintaining and sustaining good relations between people. Speaking is called productive skill because when we speak, we produce the language.<sup>3</sup>”

According to this case, teacher has to motivate the students in increasing students' speaking ability in English class. The students also have to do some efforts to develop their speaking ability.

In School Based Curriculum (KTSP), it is clearly stated that one of the objectives of the English subject in Senior High School is developing the ability to communicate in English, either in written or oral form which covers listening, speaking, reading and writing. SMAN 2 Pekanbaru is also one of the schools that uses School Based Curriculum (KTSP) as its guidance in teaching and learning process.

---

<sup>3</sup> Kimtafsirah, Zainal and Yahmawati. *Teaching Speaking*. (Jakarta: Center for Development and Empowerment of Language Teachers and Education Personnel, 2009), p.

In this school, the basic speaking competence stated in the syllabus of SMAN 2 Pekanbaru for second year is that students will be able to express the information of genre of texts, such as monologue of report, narrative, spoof, hortatory, and analytical exposition.

Based on the writer's preliminary observation at SMAN 2 Pekanbaru, English subject has been taught since the first year of English teaching period. It was taught twice in a week with time duration 45 minutes for one hour learning process.

In teaching English at the second year of SMAN 2 Pekanbaru, the teacher use three phase technique started with introducing the lesson, giving some explanation about the topic, and question and answer section. Sometimes, the teacher had given the opportunity to the students to speak what they wanted to talk in front of the class. The teacher had motivated the students to speak English bravely in front of the class.

From the explanation above, ideally the students at the second year of SMAN 2 Pekanbaru should be able to speak English well. In short, they have no problem in speaking. Unfortunately, the fact has shown that the students are quite difficult to communicate by using English. They are accustomed to using their native language in their daily life rather than using English. In class, the students get difficulties to use English for communicative objectives, even in the simple form. Another fact is the students are able to point the answer of the question on a conversation but they cannot explain their reason in choosing the answer. Then, the students are frightened of making mistake

because they have lack of vocabulary and students do not know how to pronounce the words. Sometimes, the students are shy to speak English.

Ur states that some problems that may prohibit the students to develop their speaking skill, which are inhibition, lack of ideas to say, low participation, and students' preference to use their mother tongue language.<sup>4</sup> So, the statement above explains that the teacher has to be able to find out a good technique in order that the students become active in the class.

In this school, based on teacher's evaluation, there are some various things that happened to the students' speaking ability which can be seen based on the following phenomena:

1. Some of the students are accustomed to using their native language in their daily life.
2. Some of the students are not able to respond the interlocutor's point of view.
3. Some of the students have lack vocabularies to express their idea in English.
4. Some of the students are difficult to pronounce English well.
5. Some of the students are brave to express their idea in the discussion or in front of the class.

---

<sup>4</sup> Ur, Penny. *A Course in Language Learning: Practice and Theory*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p.121.

Based on those conditions, the writer tries to solve the problem by offering one teaching technique of teaching speaking called P-M-I Technique.

According to Wormely, PMI stands for P-Pluses, M-Minuses, I-Interesting. Plus Minus Interesting Technique will work well for summarization and analysis. The technique is still very useful today. Because it can help the students make the right decision based on what they have been studying. Although some people use Plus Minus Interesting Technique purely for getting students to consider their decisions and opinions carefully.<sup>5</sup>

In the implementation of Plus Minus Interesting Technique, the students have to do this by discussion in groups. After three minutes a spokesman for each group gave the output or the result of the discussion.<sup>6</sup> The students' share their ideas by announce their discussion result of the end of Plus Minus Interesting term. Therefore, based on the explanation and the symptom above, the writer feels interested to carrying out a research entitled: "The Effect of Using Plus Minus Interesting Technique towards Students' Speaking Ability at The second Year of State Senior High School 2 Pekanbaru"

---

<sup>5</sup> Wormeli, Rick. *Summarization in Any Subject : 50 Techniques to Improve Student Learning*. (Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Alexandria, 2005), p. 124

<sup>6</sup> De Bono, Edward. *De Bono's Thinking Course*. (London : BBC Books, 1982), p. 19

## **B. The Definition of the Term**

The topic of this research is the effect of using Plus Minus Interesting Technique toward students' speaking ability at the second year of state senior high school 2 Pekanbaru.

In order to avoid misunderstanding and misinterpretation in this research, it is necessary to explain the term used in this research as follows:

### **1. Plus Minus Interesting Technique**

Plus Minus Interesting is a technique found by Edward De Bono. This technique uses the table to divide the pluses, minuses, and interesting point from the statement given by the teacher. Based on Supartinah, Plus Minus Interesting can improve the students' vocabulary and pronunciation so that it implied to the improvement of students' speaking ability.<sup>7</sup> In the implementation of Plus Minus Interesting Technique, the students do the discussion in a group, and in the end of Plus Minus Interesting Technique term, the spokesman for each group gave the result of the discussion. In this research, Plus Minus Interesting Technique is the teaching procedure that could be applied to students' own decisions about ideas or actions.

---

<sup>7</sup> Supartinah. *The Use of PMI to Develop the Students' Critical Thinking through Speaking Activities (An Action Research in Acceleration I of SMP 1 Karanganyar in the Academic Year 2008/2009)*. (Surakarta: Unpublished, 2009), p.1 (retrieved on July, 1<sup>st</sup> 2013) <http://pasca.uns.ac.id/?p=654>

The students share their ideas by spoken up the result of discussion, that is why Plus Minus Interesting Technique will work well for improving students' speaking ability.

## 2. **Speaking Ability**

Speaking skill is a proficiency of using the language orally.<sup>8</sup> In this research, speaking ability means competency of the students to express their ideas, opinions or feeling in oral communication.

### **C. The Problem**

#### **1. The Identification of the Problem**

Based on the background explanation and the phenomena of students' speaking ability that happen at the State Senior High School 2 Pekanbaru, the writer identifies the problems as follows:

- a. Some of the students are accustomed to use their native language in their daily life.
- b. Some of the students are not able to respond the interlocutor's point of view.
- c. Some of the students have lack of vocabularies to express their idea in English.
- d. Some of the students are difficult to pronounce English well.

---

<sup>8</sup> Thornbury, Scott. *An A-Z of ELT: A Dictionary of Terms and Concepts Used in English Language Teaching*. (Oxford: Macmillan Education, 2006), p. 208

- e. Some of the students are brave to express their idea in the discussion or in front of the class.

## **2. The Limitation of the Problem**

Based on the identification of the problem above, the problems of this research are limited to:

- a. Some of the students are not able to respond the interlocutor's point of view.
- b. Some of the students have lack of vocabularies to express their idea in English.

Based on limitation of the problem above, the researcher offered Plus Minus Interesting Technique as the teaching technique to solve those problems.

## **3. The Formulation of the Problem**

According to limitation of the problem above, the problem of this research is formulated into research questions as follows:

- a. How is the students' speaking ability that is taught without using Plus Minus Interesting technique at the second year at state senior high school 2 pekanbaru?
- b. How is the students' speaking ability taught by using Plus Minus Interesting Technique?

- c. Is there any significant effect of the students' speaking ability between the students who are taught and those who are not taught by using Plus Minus Interesting Technique?

## **D. The Objectives and Significant of the Research**

### **1. The objectives of the research**

- a. To find out the students' speaking ability, taught without using Plus Minus Interesting Technique.
- b. To find out the students' speaking ability taught by using Plus Minus Interesting Technique at the second year at state senior high school 2 pekanbaru.
- c. To find out significant effect of using Plus Minus Interesting Technique toward students' speaking ability of the second year at state senior high school 2 pekanbaru.

### **2. The Significance of the Research**

The research activity is significantly carried out in the following needs, they are:

- a. To give some information to the teacher about Plus Minus Interesting Technique in teaching speaking.
- b. To give some contributions to the students in order to develop students' ability in speaking by using Plus Minus Interesting Technique.

- c. To enhance the writer's knowledge about teaching speaking by using Plus Minus Interesting Technique.
- d. To accomplish the task as the last requirement of the study at Tarbiyah Faculty.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

#### A. Theoretical Framework

##### 1. The Nature of Speaking

Speaking is a key of communication. It plays a very crucial part in people's daily life. Most of the aspects in our life are covered by speaking. A lot of people think that mastering speaking is one of the most important aspect of learning a second or foreign language, because the purpose of learning a language is to be able to communicate by using a language.

Speaking is either as interaction or a social and situations based on activity<sup>9</sup>. Speaking is the productive aural/oral skill.<sup>10</sup> We can say that the speaker must consider the person they are talking to as listener. The people speak for some reason or based on particular goal. So, it is important that everything we want to say is delivered in an effective way, because speaking is not only producing sounds but also a process of achieving goals that involves transferring messages to other.

Speaking is prominent skill among the others. It is an application after measuring other language skill such as listening, reading, and writing. These cannot be separated with each other. Therefore, it is important to practice speaking a lot to develop our ability, because no one can achieve the

---

<sup>9</sup> Alderson, J. Charles. *Assesing Speaking*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 9

<sup>10</sup> Nunan, David . Op. Cit. p. 48

maximum without practicing. In addition, speaking process should pay attention to willingness and how to say as well as to whom appropriately.

The successful speaking of people can be characterized by talking a lot, participation is even, motivation is high, and language is one of the acceptable levels. There are five basic types of speaking or oral production. They are:<sup>11</sup>

a. Imitative

It is someone interested in what is labelled by “pronunciation.” She/he imitates a native speaker’s pronunciation.

b. Intensive

It is someone’s ability to gain the meaning of the conversation based on the context.

c. Responsive

It refers to someone’s comprehension of the short conversation, standard greeting and small talk, simple request and comment, and the like.

d. Interactive

Interaction consists of two forms. They are transactional language, which has the purpose of exchanging specific information and interpersonal exchanges, which have the purpose of maintaining social relationship. It is more complex than responsive.

---

<sup>11</sup> Brown, H. Douglas. *Language Assessment: Principle and Classroom Practice*. (San Francisco: San Francisco State University, 2004), p.141

e. Extensive (monologue)

Extensive oral production includes speech, oral presentation, and storytelling, in which the opportunity for oral interaction from listeners is either highly limited (perhaps to nonverbal responses) or ruled out all together.

All of the components can sign how far students' speaking proficiency is.

Students' speaking ability can be seen by their communication orally and their skill in spoken language activities directly. Hasibuan says "to help students develop communicative efficiency in speaking; instructors can use a balanced activities approach that combines language input, structured output, and communicative output."<sup>12</sup>

He also says that "language learners need to recognize that speaking involves three areas of knowledge:

- a. Mechanics (pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary)
- b. Functions (transaction and interaction)
- c. Social and cultural rules and norms (turn-taking, rate of speech, length of pauses between speakers, relative roles of participants)."

In addition Brown states that there are two kinds of skill that must be mastered in speaking ability<sup>13</sup>:

1. Microskills

- a. Produce chunks of language of different lengths.

---

<sup>12</sup> Kalayo Hasibuan. *Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL)*. (Pekanbaru: Alaf Riau Graha UNRI Press. 2007), Pp. 101-102

<sup>13</sup> Brown, H. Douglas. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. (New York: Pearson Longman, 2007), p. 328

- b. Orally produce differences among the English phonemes and allophonic variants.
  - c. Produce English stress patterns, words in stressed and unstressed positions, rhythmic structure, and intonational contours.
  - d. Produce reduced forms of words and phrases.
  - e. Use an adequate number of lexical units (words) in order to accomplish pragmatic purposes.
  - f. Produce fluent speech at different rates of delivery.
  - g. Monitor your own oral production and use various strategic devices- pauses, fillers, self-corrections, backtracking-to enhance the clarity of the message.
  - h. Use grammatical word classes (nouns, verbs, etc.), systems (e.g., tense, agreement, and pluralisation), word order, patterns, rules, and elliptical forms.
  - i. Produce speech in natural constituents-in appropriate phrases, pause groups, breath groups, and sentences.
  - j. Express a particular meaning in different grammatical forms.
2. Macroskills
- a. Use cohesive devices in spoken discourse.
  - b. Accomplish appropriately communicative functions according to situations, participants, and goals.
  - c. Use appropriate registers, implicature, pragmatic conventions, and other sociolinguistic features in face-to-face conversations.

- d. Convey links and connections between events and communicate such relations as main idea, supporting idea, new information, given information, generalization, and exemplification.
- e. Use facial features, kinesics, body language, and other nonverbal cues along with verbal language to convey meanings.
- f. Develop and use a battery of speaking strategies, such as emphasizing key words, rephrasing, providing a context for interpreting the meaning of words, appealing for help, and accurately assessing how well your interlocutor is understanding you.

So, in delivering a message, the speaker has to be careful because delivering aims not only produce sentences but also consider the understanding of the interlocutor's point of view.

Speaking is crucial part of the second language learning and teaching. Despite its importance, for many years, teaching speaking has been evaluated and English language teachers have continued to teach speaking just as a repetition of drills or memorization dialogue. However today's world requires that the goal of teaching speaking should improve students' communicative skills, because, only in that way, students can express themselves and learn how to follow the social and culture rules appropriate in each communicative circumstance.

The mastery of speaking skills in English is a priority for many second or foreign language learners. Learners consequently often evaluate their success in language learning as well as the effectiveness of their English

course on the basis of how well, they feel they have improved in their spoken language proficiency. Speaking skill is also one of the aspects involved in curriculum of language teaching that has to be taught by the teachers.

According to Hughes “The purpose of teaching spoken language is to develop students’ ability in interacting success of the language, involving comprehension as well as production.”<sup>14</sup> In addition Ur states that, there are four characteristics of successful speaking activity:<sup>15</sup>

1. Learners talk a lot. As much as possible of the period of time allotted to the activity is in fact occupied by learner talk.
2. Participation is even. Classroom discussion is not dominated by a minority of talkative participants: all get a chance to speak, and contributions are fairly evenly distributed.
3. Motivation is high. Learners are eager to speak: because they are interested in the topic and have something new to say about it, or because they want to contribute to achieve a task objective.
4. Language is of an acceptable level. Learners express themselves in utterances that are relevant, easily comprehensible to each other, and of an acceptable level of language accuracy.

---

<sup>14</sup> Hughes, Arthur. *Testing for Language Teacher*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 113

<sup>15</sup> Ur, Penny. Op. Cit. p.120

Then, in evaluating students' speaking skill, Brown suggests some form as follows<sup>16</sup>:

1. Grammar.
2. Vocabulary
3. Comprehension
4. Fluency
5. Pronunciation

For additional explanation, here we see the meaning of indicators above:

1. Grammar.

Grammar is sometimes defined as 'the way words are put together to make correct sentences'<sup>17</sup>. Grammar is one of the language components. Grammar is the role by which we put together meaningful words and parts of words of a language to communicate messages that are comprehensible.

2. Vocabulary

One of the important aspects that supports speaking in certain language is vocabulary. It deals with the right and appropriate words. Vocabulary plays important role in speaking skill. It cannot be ignored in speaking learning. Vocabulary can be defined, roughly, as the words we teach in the foreign language. However, a new item of vocabulary may be more than a single word: for example, post *office* and mother-in law, which are made up of two or three words but express a single idea.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Brown, H. Douglas. *Language Assessment*. Op. Cit. p. 142

<sup>17</sup> Ur, Penny. Op. Cit. p. 75

<sup>18</sup> Ibid. p. 60

### 3. Comprehension

Comprehension is the ability to understand. Comprehension also means knowing about something; ability to get knowledge that has earned. It is derived from the students themselves who are able to understand the lesson

### 4. Fluency

Fluency means the quality of being able to speak or write a language, especially for a foreign language. Schmidt said that fluent language use involves the processing of language in real time. That is, learners demonstrate fluency when they take part in meaning-focused activity and do it with the speed and ease without holding up the flow of talk<sup>19</sup>. It means that fluency consists of the ease and speed of flow of speech and comprehension for oral communication.

### 5. Pronunciation

Pronunciation means the way in which a language or a particular word or sound is pronounced. Therefore, as an English teacher, you not only teach well pronunciation but also make it possible for the students to acquire good pronunciation by imitating you.

---

<sup>19</sup> I. S. P Nation and J. Newton. *Teaching ESL/EFL Listening and Speaking*. (New York: Routledge, 2009), p.151

## 2. The Nature of Plus Minus Interesting Technique

The aim of teaching speaking is to make students become an active learners. In order to achieve it, the teacher needs to use a technique to help the students speak bravely. According to Cambridge advanced learner's dictionary technique means a way of doing activity which needs skill. From the statement above, we conclude that if the students know about lot of techniques in learning, it will be easy for them to be the active learners.

One of the techniques can be used by the students in order to ease them to speak is Plus Minus Interesting Technique. As womelli says Plus Minus Interesting Technique stands for pluses, minuses, and interesting<sup>20</sup>. In addition, this technique help students to share the idea by announce the result from what they have been discussed in Plus Minus Interesting term. In the activity of Plus Minus Interesting, the students need to consider the plus point, the minus point, and the interesting point on the chart of Plus Minus Interesting.

Edward de Bono was the first to explain this technique. Edward de Bono states that The Plus Minus Interesting is an attention-directing tool<sup>21</sup>. Moreover, Plus Minus Interesting is an important Decision Making tool: The mind tools used so far in this section have focused on selecting

---

<sup>20</sup> Wormeli, Rick. Op. Cit., p. 124

<sup>21</sup> De Bono, Edward. *De Bono's Thinking Course*. Op. Cit. p. 18

a course of action from a range of options<sup>22</sup>. From the statements above, this teaching technique is a good processing activity, this can be used within a range of classroom activities, examining issues, and also enhance the students' speaking ability.

A Plus Minus Interesting is a useful way of recognizing the value of an idea, rather than being influenced by the emotions that surround it. It works well by holding back an action and reconsidering the positive, negative, and interesting aspect of the situation before making a decision about what to do, particularly if the decision-making meant to be directed towards improvement in the situation. In doing Plus Minus Interesting, we deliberately direct our attention first towards the Plus points, then towards the Minus points and finally towards the Interesting points.

In other words, Plus Minus Interesting chart can help the students to enlarge their opinion about the current issue in many aspects, not only think in one side, but the students become a wise decision maker because Plus Minus Interesting gives them chance to think both negative and positive sides of the issue itself by exploring and discussing the idea that they already got from the issue, so that the students can explore their critical thinking and think clearly also speak bravely after considering plus, minus, and interesting point from the statement given by the teacher.

---

<sup>22</sup> [http://www.mindtools.com/pages/article/newTED\\_05.htm](http://www.mindtools.com/pages/article/newTED_05.htm) retrieved on March 30<sup>th</sup> 2011

The language objective of Plus Minus Interesting as Sanpatchayapong mentioned in her journal are; to improve students' grammar, to help the students learn how to ask questions, to encourage discussion in English at a classroom.<sup>23</sup> Based on what Sanpatchayapong wrote on her journal, we can conclude that Plus Minus Interesting is beneficial for improving students' speaking ability.

In order to enhance students' understanding in using Plus Minus Interesting Techniques, Wormeli mention the steps to use the PMI technique. There are four steps of PMI Technique<sup>24</sup>:

1. The teacher asks the students to set up a Plus Minus Interesting chart.
2. After students make their charts, the teacher gives them statement to consider about something they have been studying.
3. The teacher asks students to record their response to the statement at the top of their Plus Minus Interesting chart.
4. After students finish, the teacher asks them to share their responses with a partner or small group, and announce the result of the discussion.

---

<sup>23</sup> Sanpatchayapong Ubon. *PMI (PLUS-MINUS-INTERESTING) Implementation for Classroom Use*. [http://hrd.apec.org/index.php/PMI\\_\(PUS-MINUS-INTERESTING\)\\_Implementation\\_for\\_Classroom\\_Use](http://hrd.apec.org/index.php/PMI_(PUS-MINUS-INTERESTING)_Implementation_for_Classroom_Use).

(Retrieved: Sunday, July 7<sup>th</sup> 2013, 11.20 AM)

<sup>24</sup> Wormeli, Rick. Op. Cit. Pp. 124-125

**Table II. 1**

The Example of Plus Minus Interesting Chart:

Plus Minus Interesting Chart Template		
Statement: All cars should be painted yellow.		
Pluses	Minuses	Interesting
Easier to see on the road	Boring	Interesting to see if different shades of yellow arose
Easier to see at night	Difficult to recognize your car	Interesting to see if this were enforceable
No waiting to get the color you wanted	Restriction your freedom to choose	Interesting to see if trim acquired a different color
Easier for manufacturer	The abundance of yellow might tire the eyes	Interesting to see who would support the suggestion

From the chart, we can see that carrying out the process is quite easy. What is not easy is to direct attention deliberately in one direction after another when your prejudices have already been decided for you what you should feel about an idea.

## **B. The Relevant Research**

There are two relevant researches which have relevancy to this research. There are:

1. The Use of PMI to Develop the Students' Critical Thinking through Speaking Activities (An Action Research in Acceleration I of SMP 1 Karanganyar in the Academic Year 2008/2009) by Supartinah in 2009. Her research consists of three cycles, with three meetings in every cycle. There were two types of data in her research; qualitative and quantitative, which were collected by observation, interview, questionnaire, and test. In research finding, she states that PMI can improve the students' vocabulary and pronunciation so that it implied to the improvement of students' speaking ability. Therefore, PMI Technique is very potential to be applied in speaking class.
2. PMI (PLUS-MINUS-INTERESTING) Implementation for Classroom Use by Prof. Ubon Sanpatchayapong in 2013. Her journal in APEC official site states that teachers may implement a PMI Chart in their classroom at any or all levels: Elementary, Intermediate, and Advanced. Therefore, PMI is helping students to assist them when reflecting on language skills and problems; to improve students' grammar; to help students learn how to ask questions; to encourage discussions in English at a classroom forum or conference with the teacher.

The first research above has similarity in technique used in the research. But Supartinah used PMI to enhance students' critical thinking

through speaking activity in classroom action research; meanwhile the writer used PMI in experimental research. The second research proved that PMI can be useful in the classroom at all level, and encourage discussion in English. Both of these research ware focused on the usage of PMI in teaching and learning program.

### C. Operational Concept

A concept is an element that avoids misinterpreting and understanding in a scientific research, as a concept, it is still abstract forms. As mentioned by Syafi'i that all related theoretical frameworks can be operated in the operational concept<sup>25</sup>. In a research plan, the concept has to be interpreted into particular words in order to be easy to measure. It means that operational concept is needed to avoid misinterpreting to the paper content. Actually, there are two variables in this research. They are variable X and Y. Variable X is as independent variable (The Plus Minus Interesting Technique). And Variable Y is dependent variable (Speaking Ability) .

According to wormelli, the procedures of The Plus Minus Interesting Technique (Variable X) are as follows<sup>26</sup>:

1. The teacher asks the students to set up a Plus Minus Interesting chart.
2. The teacher gives students statement to consider about something they have been studying.

---

<sup>25</sup> M. Syafi'i. *From Paragraph to a Research Report: A Writing of English for Academic Purposes*. (Pekanbaru: LBSI, 2007), p. 122

<sup>26</sup> Wormeli, Rick. Op.Cit. p. 124

3. The teacher asks students to record their response to the statement at the top of their Plus Minus Interesting chart.
4. The teacher asks students to share their responses with a partner or small group.

There are also some indicators of conventional technique given to the students in control class such as in the following:

1. The teacher explains about the material.
2. The teacher gives statement to consider about something they have been studying.
3. The teacher asks students to share their responses with a partner or small group.

Then the indicators of Variable Y or speaking ability can be seen as follows”

1. The students are able to use the correct grammar.
2. The students are able to use the proper words.
3. The students are able to express the comprehensible ideas.
4. The students are able to produce speech without filter and pause while sharing the ideas.
5. The students are able to produce acceptable pronunciation.

## **D. Assumption and Hypothesis**

### **1. Assumption**

Before formulating the hypothesis as temporary answer of the problem, the writer would like to present some assumption as follows:

- a. Students' speaking ability is various
- b. The response of students toward the Plus Minus Interesting Technique is various.

### **2. The Hypotheses**

Based on assumption above, the hypothesis for this study can be formulated as follows:

Ha : There is significant effect of using Plus Minus Interesting Technique toward students' speaking ability of the Second Year at Senior High School 2 Pekanbaru.

Ho : There is no significant effect of using Plus Minus Interesting Technique toward students' speaking ability of the Second Year at Senior High School 2 Pekanbaru.

## CHAPTER III

### RESEARCH METHOD

#### A. The Design of the Research

This research used quantitative approach. It was designed to be an Quasi-experimental research. Quasi experiment is a research design having some but not all of the characteristics of a true experiment. The element as frequently missing is random assignment of subjects to the control and experimental condition between two factors which are deliberately appeared by eliminating other irritating factors.<sup>27</sup> It is focused on nonequivalent control group design. Both of the groups take pretest and post test and only experimental group takes the treatment.<sup>28</sup>

Creswell stated that in experimental research; we test an idea (practice or procedure) to determine whether it influences an outcome or dependent variable. Experiment is a way to search a clausal relation between two factors which are deliberately appeared by eliminating other irritating factors.<sup>29</sup> This research aimed at finding if there is a significant effect of using Plus Minus Interesting Technique toward students' speaking ability.

This research consisted of two variables, they were : Independent variable (variable x) that referred to the effect of Plus Minus Interesting Technique and dependent variable (variable y) that referred to speaking

---

<sup>27</sup> ([http://sociologyindex.com/quasi\\_experiment.htm](http://sociologyindex.com/quasi_experiment.htm)) Retrieved on june 19th 2011

<sup>28</sup> Tuckman, W. Bruce. *Conducting Educational Research*. (San Diego: Harcourt Brace College Publisher, 1999), p.141

<sup>29</sup> Suharsimi Arikunto. *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. (Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta, 2006), P.3

ability. In conducting this research, the writer used two classes. The first class was experimental class taught by Plus Minus Interesting Technique. Meanwhile the second one was the control class, as the comparative class, not taught by this technique. And here there were two variables to be the focus of this research.

In working with such intact nonequivalent groups, the nonequivalent control group design show below:

Experimental Group                       $O_1 \text{ --- } X \text{ --- } O_2$

Control Group                               $O_3 \text{ ----- } O_4$

$O_1$  and  $O_3$                       = Pre-test

$O_2$  and  $O_4$                       = Post - test

X    = Treatment by using Plus Minus Interesting Technique

## **B. The Location and the Time of the Research**

The research was conducted from September 12<sup>th</sup> to November 6<sup>th</sup> at the second year students of state senior high school 2 pekanbaru which was located in Nusa Indah Labuhbaru, Pekanbaru.

## **C. The Subject and the Object of the Research**

The subject of this research was the second year students of State Senior High School 2 Pekanbaru. The object of this research was students' speaking ability and Plus Minus Interesting Technique.

#### **D. The Population and Sample of the Research**

The population of this research was the second year students at Senior High School 2 Pekanbaru in 2012-2013 academic year. It had 7 classes which consisted of 4 classes for science department and 3 classes for social department. The number of second year students of State Senior High School 2 Pekanbaru was 180 students.

The population above was large enough to be taken all as the sample of the research. Arikunto states that the amount subject is than less 100, it is better to take all the population and if the amount of the subject is more than 100, it is better to take sample about 10-15% or 20-25% of the population<sup>30</sup>. Based on the limitation of the research, the writer took only two classes of social department after doing clustering sample randomly; XI IPS 1 as an experimental class, and XI IPS 2 as a control class. Those were as the sample of the research by number of the students, 46 ; 23 students for experimental and also 23 students for control class.

#### **E. The Technique of Data Collecting**

In order to get the data that are needed to support this research, the writer used Oral production test to gain the information about speaking ability from the students by giving statements to be considered. The students were asked to consider the statement given by the teacher and discussed in some groups. Then the students were asked to share their ideas based on considering

---

<sup>30</sup> Suharsimi Arikunto. Op. Cit. p. 134

statement to measure their speaking ability. There is reliability and validity to measure the test.

### **1. Reliability**

According to Shohamy, reliability refers to the extent to which the test is consistent in its score, and it gives us an identification of how accurate the test scores are.<sup>31</sup> Henning said that reliability has to do with accuracy of measurement. This kind of accuracy is reflected in the obtaining of similar results when measurement is repeated on different occasion or with different instruments or by different persons.<sup>32</sup>

The concept of reliability stems from the idea, no measurement is perfect. It is reflected in the obtaining how far the test instrument enables to measure the same subject on different occasions that indicate the similar result.

In this result, to know the reliability of the speaking test, the writer used inters rater reliability because the writer has two raters in order to score the students speaking ability.

---

<sup>31</sup> Shohamy, Elana. *Langage Testing for the Second Language Teacher*. (Raana: Te-aviv University, 1985), P. 70

<sup>32</sup> Henning, Grant. *A Guide to Language Testing*. (Cambridge: Newbury House, 1987), p. 73

## 2. Validity

Validity in general refers to the appropriateness of a given test or any of its component parts as a measure of what it is purposed to measure. A test is said to be valid to the extent that measures what is supposed to measure.<sup>33</sup> In this research the writer used content validity to know the validity of the test.

According to Shohamy, content validity is that if a measurement is as the representative of the ideas or appropriate material that will be measured. Content validity examines whether the test is a good representation of the material that need to be tested.<sup>34</sup> Validity and reliability are relation. Based on Hanning stated in another way, it is possible for a test to be reliable without being valid for a specified purpose.

## F. The Technique of Data Analysis

In order to find out whether there is significant effect between students' speaking ability taught by using Plus Minus Interesting Technique and those who were taught by using three phase technique, the data were analyzed statistically. The writer analyzed the data by using independent sample T-Test from SPSS 16.0 Version.

Ho = variance population identical

Ha = variance population non identical

---

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.,p. 89

<sup>34</sup> Elana Shohamy, Op. Cit., p. 74

Ho is accepted if probabilities  $> 0.05$ , there is no significant effect of using Plus Minus Interesting Technique toward students' speaking ability at the second year of State Senior High School 2 Pekanbaru.

Ho is rejected if probabilities  $< 0.05$ , there is significant effect of using Plus Minus Interesting Technique toward students' speaking ability at the second year of Senior High School 2 Pekanbaru.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Hartono. *SPSS 16.0 Analisis Data Statistika dan Penelitian*. (Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 2010), p. 159

## CHAPTER IV

### THE PRESENTATION AND THE DATA ANALYSIS

#### A. The Description of the Data

The aim of the research was to obtain whether there was a significant effect of students' speaking ability taught by using Plus Minus Interesting Technique at the second year of State Senior High School 2 Pekanbaru. The data of this research were taken from the test.

The data were the students' scores of speaking ability improvement from pre-test to post-test scores of both experimental and control classes. Before giving post test, the writer gave pre test to all of the samples in both classes. The speaking result was evaluated by concerning five components: accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. Each component had its scores. In pre test result was found that both classes had no different score significantly. Meaning that, both of their writing ability is homogenous.

The experiment class had been taught by using Plus Minus Interesting Technique, while control class had been taught by using three phase technique. The writer gave pre-test in the first meeting, while post-test was given to students in both classes after treatment was complete during eight meetings and the results of test were evaluated by two raters.

## **B. The Data Presentation**

The data of the research were got from the score of students' pre-test and post test. It was collected through the following procedures:

1. Students were asked to set up the Plus Minus Interesting Technique chart and consider the statement given by the writer on the Plus Minus Interesting chart.
2. It was recorded to evaluate the appropriate speaking skill test indicators of accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.
3. The writer gave it to two raters to measure the students' speaking ability.
4. The writer added the scores from two raters and divided it.

### **1. The Students' Speaking Score on Pre-Test**

#### **a. The Experiment Class Students' Score of Pre-Test of Accent, Grammar, Vocabulary, Fluency, and Comprehension**

Among five components, the highest mean score was comprehension 50 and the lowest mean score was accent 43.91, while the mean score of grammar was 45.22, the mean score of vocabulary was 48.70, and the mean score of fluency was 49.13. So, the total score of pre-test mean score at experimental class was 47.39.

**Table IV. 1**  
**The Frequency Table of Pre-Test Score of Experimental Class**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
valid	40	4	17.4	17.4	17.4
	42	3	13	13	30.4
	46	5	21.7	21.7	52.2
	48	4	17.4	17.4	69.6
	50	1	4.3	4.3	73.9
	52	1	4.3	4.3	78.3
	54	2	8.7	8.7	87
	56	1	4.3	4.3	91.3
	58	2	8.7	8.7	100
	Total	23	100	100	

Based on the table above, there were 4 students who got score 40 (17.4%), 3 students got score 42 (13%), 5 students got score 46 (21.7%), 4 students got score 48 (17.4%), 1 student got score 50 (4.3%), 1 student got score 52 (4.3%), 2 students got score 54 (8.7%), 1 student got score 56 (4.3%), and 2 students got score 58 (8.7%). The highest frequency was in score 46 (5 students).

Then the statistic of this data can be seen as the following table:

**Table IV. 2**  
**statistic**

		Pre-Test of Experimental Class
N	Valid	23
	Missing	0
	Mean	47.39
	Std. Error of Mean	1.202
	Median	46.00
	Mode	46
	Std. Deviation	5.766
	Variance	33.249
	Range	18
	Minimum	40
	Maximum	58
	Sum	1090

Based on the table above, the total number of students was 23 students. The mean score was 47.39; the median was 46 and the standard deviation was 5.766. The highest score was 58 and the lowest score was 40.

**b. The Control Class Students Score of Pre-Test of Accent, Grammar, Vocabulary, Fluency, and Comprehension**

Among five components, which had the highest mean score was vocabulary 49.57 and the lowest mean score was accent 42.17, while the mean score of grammar 44.35, the mean score of fluency 46.62, the mean score of comprehension was 47.39. So, the total of pre-test mean score at control class was 46.

**Table IV. 3**  
**The Frequency Table of Pre-Test Score of Control Class**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
40	3	13.0	13.0	13.0
42	3	13.0	13.0	26.1
44	3	13.0	13.0	39.1
46	6	26.1	26.1	65.2
48	5	21.7	21.7	87.0
50	1	4.3	4.3	91.3
56	1	4.3	4.3	95.7
58	1	4.3	4.3	100.0
Total	23	100.0	100.0	

Based on the table above, there were 3 students who got score 40 (13%), 3 students got score 42 (13%), 6 students got score 46 (26.1%), 5 students got score 48 (21.7%), 1 student got score 50 (4.3%), 1 student got score 56 (4.3%), and 1 student got score 58 (4.3%). The highest frequency was in score 46 (6 students).

Then the statistic of this data can be seen in the following table:

**Table IV. 4**  
**Statistic**

		Pre-Test Control Class
N	Valid	23
	Missing	0
Mean		46.00
Std. Error of Mean		.941
Median		46.00
Mode		46
Std. Deviation		4.513
Variance		20.364
Range		18
Minimum		40
Maximum		58
Sum		1058

Based on the table above, the total number of students was 23 students. The mean score was 46, the median was 46 and the standard deviation was 4.513. The highest score was 58 and the lowest score was 40.

## 2. The Students' Speaking Score on Post-Test

Students' speaking ability in experiment class and Control Class can be seen in the explanation below, these data were analyzed to answer the research and to prove the hypothesis of this research.

### a. The Experimental Class Students Score of Post-test of Accent, Grammar, Vocabulary, Fluency, and Comprehension

Among the five components, which had the highest mean score was vocabulary 61.74 and the lowest mean score was grammar 54.78, while the mean score of accent was 55.22, the mean score of fluency was 55.22, and the mean score of comprehension was 60. So, the total of post-test mean score at experimental class was 57.39.

**Table IV. 5**  
**The Frequency Table of Post-Test Score of Experimental class**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
44	1	4.3	4.3	4.3
46	1	4.3	4.3	8.7
52	1	4.3	4.3	13.0
54	4	17.4	17.4	30.4
56	2	8.7	8.7	39.1
Valid 58	6	26.1	26.1	65.2
60	3	13.0	13.0	78.3
62	3	13.0	13.0	91.3
66	1	4.3	4.3	95.7
70	1	4.3	4.3	100.0
Total	23	100.0	100.0	

Based on the table above, there was 1 student who got score 44 (4.3%), 1 student got score 46 (4.3%), 1 student got score 52 (4.3%), 4 students got 54 (17.4%), 2 students got score 56 (8.7%), 6 students got

score 58 (26.1%), 3 students got 60 (13%), 3 students got 62 (13%), 1 student got score 66 (4.3%), and 1 student got 70 (4.3%). The highest frequency was in score 58 (6 students). Then the statistic data can be seen in the following table:

**Table IV. 6**  
**Statistic**

		postexperiment
N	Valid	23
	Missing	0
Mean		57.39
Std. Error of Mean		1.182
Median		58.00
Mode		58
Std. Deviation		5.671
Variance		32.158
Range		26
Minimum		44
Maximum		70
Sum		1320

Based on the table above, the total number of students was 23 students. The mean score was 57.39, the median score was 58 and standard deviation was 5.671. The highest score was 70 and the lowest score was 44.

**b. The Control Class Students Score of Post-Test of Accent, Grammar, Vocabulary, Fluency, and Comprehension**

Among the five components, the highest mean score was vocabulary 50.43, and the lowest mean score was accent 44.78, while the mean score of grammar was 46.52, the mean score of fluency was 46.09, and the mean score of comprehension was 48.26. So, the total of post-test mean score at control class was 47.22.

**Table IV. 7**  
**The Frequency Table of Post-Test Score of Control Class**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
40	3	13.0	13.0	13.0
42	3	13.0	13.0	26.1
44	3	13.0	13.0	39.1
46	1	4.3	4.3	43.5
48	5	21.7	21.7	65.2
Valid 50	3	13.0	13.0	78.3
52	2	8.7	8.7	87.0
54	1	4.3	4.3	91.3
56	1	4.3	4.3	95.7
58	1	4.3	4.3	100.0
Total	23	100.0	100.0	

Based on the table above, there were 3 students who got score 40 (13%), 3 students who got score 42 (13%), 3 students who got score 44 (13%), 1 student got score 46 (4.3%), 5 students who got score 48 (21.7%), 3 students who got score 50 (13%), 2 students who got score 52 (8.7%), 1 student who got score 54 (4.3%), 2 student who got score 56 (4.3%), and 1 student who got score 58 (4.3%). The highest frequency was

in score 48 (5 students). Then the statistic of this data can be seen in the following table:

**Table IV. 8**  
**Statistics**

		Post-Test of Control Class
N	Valid	23
	Missing	0
Mean		47.22
Std. Error of Mean		1.072
Median		48.00
Mode		48
Std. Deviation		5.143
Variance		26.451
Range		18
Minimum		40
Maximum		58
Sum		1086

Based on the table above, the total number of students was 23 students. The mean score was 47.22, the median score was 48, and the standard deviation was 5.143. The highest score was 58 and the lowest score was 40. Completely, the statistical description of the data can be seen as the following table:

**Table IV. 9**  
**Statistics**

	Pre experiment	Post experiment	Pre control	Post control
N	Valid	23	23	23
	Missing	0	0	0
Mean	47.39	57.39	46.00	47.22
Std. Error of Mean	1.202	1.182	.941	1.072
Median	46.00	58.00	46.00	48.00
Mode	46	58	46	48
Std. Deviation	5.766	5.671	4.513	5.143
Variance	33.249	32.158	20.364	26.451
Range	18	26	18	18
Minimum	40	44	40	40
Maximum	58	70	58	58
Sum	1090	1320	1058	1086

Based on the table above, it showed clearly the differences of mean, median, mode, standard deviation, variance, range, minimum, and maximum score of both experimental and control classes.

### **C. The Data Analysis**

The data analysis presented the statistical result, followed by discussion about the effect of using Plus Minus Interesting Technique toward students' speaking ability at the second year of State Senior High School 2 Pekanbaru.

The data were divided into two classes which were experimental and control scores of pre-test and post-test. The writer used independent sample T-Test from SPSS 16.0 version to analyze the effect of using Plus Minus Interesting Technique toward students' speaking ability at the second year of State Senior High School 2 Pekanbaru.

### **1. The Analysis of Pre-Test of Experimental and Control Class**

The mean score of experimental class was 47.39, while the mean score of control class was 46. It was concluded that students' speaking ability of experimental and control class was relative similar. On the other hand, there was no significant difference between students' speaking ability of experimental and control class. After knowing the basic of students' speaking ability of experimental and control class, the writer measured the improvement of students' speaking ability after giving the treatment by using Plus Minus Interesting Technique at experimental class and by using three phase technique at control class.

### **2. The Analysis Post-Test of Experimental and Control Class**

The mean score of experimental class was 57.39, while the mean score of control class was 47.22. It was concluded that students' speaking ability of experimental and control class had improvement from pre-test score to post-test score. But, post-test score of experimental class was higher than control class. On the other hand, the improvement of experimental class which had

been given treatment by using Plus Minus Interesting Technique was better than the improvement of control class which had been given treatment by using three phase technique.

### 3. The Analysis Speaking Ability Improvement of Experiment Class

**Table IV. 10**  
**The Improvement of Students' Scores**  
**from Pre-Test to Post-Test of Experiment Class**

No.	Student	Pre-test	Post-Test	Score	Percentage
1	S1	52	62	10	19.23
2	S2	46	62	16	34.78
3	S3	48	58	10	20.83
4	S4	40	58	18	45.00
5	S5	46	58	12	26.09
6	S6	46	60	14	30.43
7	S7	50	58	8	16.00
8	S8	40	58	18	45.00
9	S9	54	58	4	7.41
11	S11	40	54	14	35.00
12	S12	48	62	14	29.17
13	S13	58	62	4	6.90
14	S14	40	56	16	40.00
15	S15	46	60	14	30.43
16	S16	56	60	4	7.14
17	S17	54	56	2	3.70
18	S18	48	58	10	20.83
19	S19	42	50	8	19.05
20	S20	48	60	12	25.00
21	S21	46	52	6	13.04
22	S22	42	50	8	19.05
23	S23	42	56	14	33.33
<b>Mean</b>		<b>47.39</b>	<b>57.39</b>	<b>10.43</b>	<b>23.23</b>

The table above described the improvement scores of students' speaking ability before and after giving treatment by using drama at

experimental class. Before giving treatment, the students' speaking mean score of pre-test was 47.39. While after giving the treatment the students' speaking mean score of post-test was 57.39. The mean score of the improvement from pre-test to post-test was 10.43 and the percentage total was 23.23%. So, there is significant improvement of students' speaking ability of experimental class.

Besides, it shows that the lowest pre-test score of experiment class was 40 and the highest pre-test score was 56. While the lowest post test score of experiment class was 50 and the highest post test score was 62. The table above obviously shows the improvement of students' speaking ability of experiment class.

#### 4. The Analysis of Speaking Ability Improvement of Control Class

**Table IV. 11**  
**The Improvement of students' Score**  
**from Pre-Test to Post-Test of Control Class**

No.	Student	Pre-test	Post-Test	Score	Percentage
1	S1	48	50	2	4.17
2	S2	56	58	2	3.57
3	S3	48	52	4	8.33
4	S4	42	42	0	0.00
5	S5	40	40	0	0.00
6	S6	46	56	10	21.74
7	S7	46	46	0	0.00
8	S8	46	56	10	21.74
9	S9	48	50	2	4.17
10	S10	50	54	4	8.00
11	S11	46	44	-2	-4.35
12	S12	58	40	-18	-31.03
13	S13	46	50	4	8.70
14	S14	40	44	4	10.00
15	S15	44	50	6	13.64
16	S16	44	44	0	0.00
17	S17	42	42	0	0.00
18	S18	44	44	0	0.00
19	S19	42	42	0	0.00
20	S20	48	48	0	0.00
21	S21	46	48	2	4.35
22	S22	40	40	0	0.00
23	S23	48	48	0	0.00
<b>Mean</b>		46	<b>47.22</b>	1.30	3.17

The table above described the improvement scores of students' speaking ability before and after giving treatment at control class. Before giving the treatment, the students' speaking mean score of pre-test was 46. While after giving the treatment, the students' speaking mean score of post-test was 47.22. The mean score of improvement from pre-test to post-test was

1.30 and the percentage total of all was 3.17%. So, the students' speaking ability of control class was no significant improvement.

Besides, it shows that the lowest pre-test score of control class was 40 and the highest pre-test score was 58. While the lowest post test score of experiment class was 40 and the highest post test score was 58. The table above obviously shows no significant improvement of students' speaking ability of control class.

## 5. The Analysis of Difference Improvement between Experimental and Control Class

**Table IV. 12**  
**The Difference of Students' Scores of Experiment and Control Class**

No.	Student	Experiment Class	Control Class
1	S1	10	2
2	S2	16	2
3	S3	10	4
4	S4	18	0
5	S5	12	0
6	S6	14	10
7	S7	8	0
8	S8	18	10
9	S9	4	2
10	S10	4	4
11	S11	14	-2
12	S12	14	-18
13	S13	4	4
14	S14	16	4
15	S15	14	6
16	S16	4	0
17	S17	2	0
18	S18	10	0
19	S19	8	0
20	S20	12	0
21	S21	6	2
22	S22	8	0
23	S23	14	0
<b>Mean</b>		<b>10.43</b>	<b>1.30</b>

The table above described the difference improvement of students' speaking ability of experiment and control class seen from the difference of mean score of improvement at experimental class which was 10.43 (23.23%), while control class was 1.30 (3.17%). Based on the percentage, the influence was found for both classes. On the other hand, the percentage of influence of

using Plus Minus Interesting Technique to improve students' speaking ability at experimental class was more significant than control class. It means that the use of Plus Minus Interesting Technique by the teacher in teaching speaking ability was one of the factors which gave influence to improve students' speaking ability.

#### **6. The Analysis Mean and Standard Deviation of Experimental and Control Class**

The writer analyzed mean and standard deviation by using independent sample T-Test from SPSS 16.0 version. The difference of mean and standard deviation between experimental and control class can be seen in the following table:

**Table IV. 13**  
**Mean and Standard Deviation**

	Experiment Class		Control Class	
	Pre-Test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test
Mean	47.39	57.39	46	47.22
Std. Deviation	5.766	5.671	4.513	5.143

From the table above, the mean (M) of pre-test of experimental class was 47.39 and the standard deviation (SD) was 5.766. While the mean (M) of pre-test of control class was 46 and the standard deviation (SD) was 4.513. Meanwhile, the mean (M) of pos-test of experiment class was 57.39 and the

standard deviation (SD) was 5.671. While the mean (M) of post-test of control class was 46 and the standard deviation (SD) was 45.143.

## 7. The Data Analysis of Students' Post-Test Score of Experiment Class

The data of students' post-test scores of experimental class were obtained from the result of their speaking ability. Based on the description of the data, the result was classified into score in the following table:

**Table IV. 14**  
**The Classification of Students Score of Experimental Class**

No.	Category	Score	Frequency	Score
1	Very Good	80 - 100	-	0%
2	Good	66 - 79	2	8.7%
3	Enough	56 - 65	14	60.9%
4	Less	40 - 55	7	30.4%
5	Fall	0 - 39	-	0%

The table above showed the classification of the students' post-test scores of experiment class. There was no frequency in very good category. The category of good was 2 frequencies (8.7%), the category of enough was 14 frequencies (60.9%), the category of less was 7 frequencies (30.4%), and the category of fall was 0%. The table above also showed the highest percentage of experimental class was 60.9%. Then the main score of experimental class was 57.39. So, the majority of experimental class students were classified into enough categories.

## 8. The Data Analysis of Students' Post-Test Scores of Control Class

The data of students' post-test scores of control class were obtained from the result of their speaking ability. Based on the description of the data, the result was classified into score in the following table:

**Table IV. 15**  
**The Classification of Students Score of Control Class**

No.	Category	Score	Frequency	Score
1	Very Good	80 – 100	-	0%
2	Good	66 – 79	-	0%
3	Enough	56 – 65	2	8.7%
4	Less	40 – 55	21	91.3%
5	Fall	0 – 39	-	0%

The table above showed the classification of the students' post-test scores of control class. The category of very good was 0%, the category of good was 0%, the category of enough was 2 frequencies (8.7%), the category of less was 21 frequencies (91.3%), and the category of fall was 0%. The table above also showed the highest percentage of control class was 91.3%. Then the mean score of control class was 47.22. So, the majority of control class students were classified into less categories.

## 9. The Data Analysis of the Difference of Students' Speaking Ability Improvement

**Table IV. 16**  
**Group Statistics**

Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Experiment class	23	10.00	6.688	1.395
Control Class	23	1.22	2.812	.586

The table above showed the students of experimental class were 23 students and the students of control class were 35 students. The mean score of experimental class improvement was 10, while control class was 1.22. The standard deviation of experimental class was 6.688, while control class was 2.812. Then the standard error mean of experimental class was 1.395 and control class was 0.586.

**Table IV. 17**  
**Independent Sample T-test**

		independent Samples Test								
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Score	Equal variances assumed	18.170	.000	5.806	44	.000	8.783	1.513	5.734	11.831
	Equal variances not assumed			5.806	29.541	.000	8.783	1.513	5.691	11.874

From the output SPSS above, Independent Sample T-Test shows Levene's Test to know the similar variance.

Ho = variance population identical.

Ha = variance population identical.

If probabilities  $> 0.05$ , Ho is accepted

If probabilities  $< 0.05$ , Ho is rejected

The output SPSS above answers the hypothesis of this research that Ho is rejected because  $0.00 < 0.05$ , it means that Ha is accepted. In other words, there is a significant effect of students' speaking ability which is taught by using Plus Minus Interesting Technique at the second year of State Senior High School 2 Pekanbaru.

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

#### A. Conclusion

In school based curriculum, it clearly stated that one of the objectives of learning English in Senior High School is developing ability to communicate in English. The students also have some efforts to develop their communicative skill in English. So that, based on this condition, the writer offered one teaching technique of teaching speaking called Plus Minus Interesting Technique.

Based on the application of Plus Minus Interesting Technique as teaching technique, the writer found the effect of using Plus Minus Interesting Technique towards students' speaking ability explained in the chapter IV. Finally, the writer concludes about the effect of using Plus Minus Interesting Technique toward students' speaking ability at the second year of State Senior High School 2 Pekanbaru as follows:

1. The students' speaking ability which was taught without using Plus minus interesting technique is categorized into bad level.
2. The students' speaking ability which was taught by using Plus minus interesting technique is categorized into good level.
3. There is a significant effect of students' speaking ability between the students who were taught and those who were not taught by using Plus Minus Interesting Technique at the second year of senior high school 2 pekanbaru.

## **B. Suggestion**

Based on the conclusion of research above, it is known that using Plus Minus Interesting Technique in teaching speaking can influence students' speaking ability at the second year of State Senior High School 2 Pekanbaru. So, Plus Minus Interesting Technique is one of the best techniques which should be chosen by English Teacher to improve students' speaking ability.

Besides, English Teacher should use many ways to encourage students in speaking English, such as:

1. Teacher should motivate the students to speak English during teaching and learning process.
2. Teacher should construct creative and enjoyable learning for students in order that the students are far away from boredom.
3. Teacher should support the strategies, techniques, or methods by using interesting items and media.
4. Teacher should construct students' awareness about the importance of speaking English for their life.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Suharsimi Arikunto. 2006. *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Arthur Hughes. 2003. *Testing for Language Teacher*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Alderson, Charles. 2004. *Assesing Speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, Gillian and George Yule. 1989. *Teaching the Spoken Language : Approach Based on the Analysis of Conversational English*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, H. Douglas. 2004. *Language Assessment: Principle and Classroom Practice*. San Fransisco: San Fransisco State University.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York : Pearson Longman.
- De Bono, Edward. 1995. *De Bono's Thinking Course*. London: BBC Books.
- Hartono. 2010. *SPSS 16.0 Analisis Data Statistika dan Penelitian*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Kalayo Hasibuan and Muhammad Fauzan Ansyari. 2007. *Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL)*. Pekanbaru: UNRI Press.
- Henning, Grant. 1987. *A Guide to Language Testing*. Cambridge: Newbury House.
- [http://sociologyindex.com/quasi\\_experiment.htm](http://sociologyindex.com/quasi_experiment.htm) Retrieved on june 19th 2011
- I. S. P Nation and J. Newton. 2009. *Teaching ESL/EFL Listening and Speaking*. New York: Routledge.
- Kimtafsirah, Zainal and Yahmawati. 2009. *Teaching Speaking*. Jakarta: Center for Development and Empowerment of Language Teachers and Education Personnel.
- Laughran, John. 2010. *What Expert Teachers Do: Enhancing Professional Knowledge for Classroom Practice*. New South Wales: Allen and Uwin.
- Modul Praktikum Instrumentation. Jurusan Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Keguruan UIN SUSKA Riau, Pekanbaru: Unpublished. 2011

- M. Syafi'i. 2011. *From paragraph to a research report: a writing of English for Academic Purposes*. Pekanbaru: LBSI.
- Nunan, David. 2003. *Practical English Language Teaching*. New York: Mc Graw Hill.
- Shohamy, Elana. 1985. *Language Testing for the Second Language Teacher*. Raanana: Te-aviv University.
- Sanpachayapong, Ubon. 2013. *PMI (PLUS-MINUS-INTERESTING) Implementation For Classroom Use*. (retrieved: Sunday, July 7<sup>th</sup> 2013, 11.20 AM) [http://hrd.apec.org/index.php/PMI \(PLUS-MINUS-INTERESTING Implementation for Classroom Use](http://hrd.apec.org/index.php/PMI_(PLUS-MINUS-INTERESTING_Implementation_for_Classroom_Use)
- Supartinah. 2009. *The Use of PMI to Develop the Students' Critical Thinking through Speaking Activities (An Action Research in Acceleration I of SMP 1 Karanganyar in the Academic Year 2008/2009)*. Surakarta: Unpublished. (retrieved on July, 1<sup>st</sup> 2013) <http://pasca.uns.ac.id/?p=654>
- Ur, Penny. 1996. *A Course in Language Learning: Practice and Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wormeli, Rick. 2005. *Summarization in Any Subject : 50 Techniques to Improve Student Learning*. Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Alexandria.
- W. Tuckman, Bruce. 1999. *Educational Research Fifth Edition*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace College Publisher.
- [www.mindtools.com/pages/article/newTED\\_05.htm](http://www.mindtools.com/pages/article/newTED_05.htm) retrieved on March 30<sup>th</sup> 2011
- Zumakhsin. Yulia Mufarichah. 2007. *Progress : A Contextual Approach to Learning English*. Jakarta: Ganeca Exact