

**THE EFFECT OF USING SIMULATION STRATEGY TOWARD
STUDENTS' SPEAKING SKILL AT THE SECOND YEAR OF
MTs NURUL ISLAM KABUPATEN
KUANTAN SINGINGI**



By

NORA ANZELLITA

NIM. 10514000361

**FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING
STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF SULTAN SYARIF KASIM RIAU
PEKANBARU
1433 H/2012 M**

**THE EFFECT OF USING SIMULATION STRATEGY TOWARD
STUDENTS' SPEAKING SKILL AT THE SECOND YEAR OF
MTs NURUL ISLAM KABUPATEN
KUANTAN SINGINGI**

Thesis

Submitted to Fulfil One of Requirements
for Undergraduate Degree in English Education



By

NORA ANZELLITA

NIM. 10514000361

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH EDUCATION
FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING
STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF SULTAN SYARIF KASIM RIAU
PEKANBARU
1433 H/2012 M**

SUPERVISOR APPROVAL

The thesis entitled “*The Effect of Using Simulation Strategy Toward Students’ Speaking Skill at the Second Year of MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi*”, written by Nora Anzellita NIM. 10514000361 is accepted and approved to be examined by the examination committee of undergraduate degree at Faculty of Education and Teacher Training of State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau.

Pekanbaru, 10 Shafar, 1433 H

January 5, 2012 M

Approved by

The Chairperson of English
Education Department

Supervisor

Dr. Hj. Zulhidah, M.Pd.

Drs. H. Muliardi, M.Pd.

EXAMINER APPROVAL

The thesis entitled “*The Effect of Using Simulation Strategy Toward Students’ Speaking Skill at the Second Year of MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi*”, is written by Nora Anzellita NIM. 10514000361. It has been approved and examined by the final examination committee of undergraduate degree at Faculty of Education and Teacher Training of State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau on Robiul Awal 8, 1433 H/ February 2, 2012 M as one of requirements for Undergraduate Degree (S.Pd.) in English Education.

Pekanbaru, Robiul Awal 08, 1433 H

February 01, 2012 M

Examination Committee

Chairperson

Secretary

Prof. Dr. H. Salfen Hasri, M.Pd.

Dr. Hj. Zulhidah, M.Pd.

Examiner I

Examiner II

Drs. M. Syafi’i S, M.Pd.

Nuardi S.Pd.,M.Ed.

Dean

Faculty Education and Teacher Training

Dr. Hj. Helmiati, M.Ag.

NIP. 197002221997032001

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

الله الرحمن الرحيم

By the name of Allah Almighty, the Lord of the world, who has been giving the writer His guidance, mercy, blessing, and health to complete this academic requirement. Shalawat and salam forever to a noble character, the prophet Muhammad SAW who has brought the human beings from the darkness to the lightness and from the bad character to the good one.

This project paper is intended to complete a partial requirement for the award of undergraduate degree in English Education Department of Education and Teacher Training Faculty of State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau. The title of this project paper is “The Effect of Using Simulation Strategy toward Students’ Speaking Skill at the Second Year of MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi”.

The writer realizes that there are many weaknesses on this project paper. Therefore, constructions and suggestions are needed very much to improve this project paper. A lot of thanks to who have given moral and material supports to the writer. Thus, the writer expresses her gratitude and sincere thanks to:

1. Prof. Dr. H. M. Nazir, the Rector of State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau for his kindness and encouragement.
2. Dr. Hj. Helmiati, M.Ag, the Dean of Education and Teacher Training Faculty for her kindness and encouragement.
3. Dr. Hj. Zulhidah, M.Pd, as the Chairperson and Dedi Wahyudi, M.Pd as the secretary of English Education Department for their kindness and encouragement.
4. Drs. H. Muliardi, M.Pd as the writer’s supervisor for his invaluable assistance, guidance, encouragement, persistence, helpful and valuable suggestions and advice that has encouraged and motivated the writer to complete this project paper.
5. All lecturers who have given knowledge, information of this project paper, contributions and supports during the courses.

6. The head master of MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi Drs. Syafri, MM, and also all of the teacher, especially for English teacher, Pendra Gusnadi, S.Pd who has helped the writer in the process of collecting data,
7. My beloved mother, Nurbaida who have given meaningful and useful supports, both material and spiritual. Thanks a lot for your praying. You are my hero and angel in my life. I love you forever.
8. My beloved sister and brother, Iin Terlina, Candriadi, Umi Kalsum, Nuraisayatul Hasanah and also my big family specially my uncle Sabaruddin, Mardianis and family for their support and praying. I love you.
9. My beloved family in Pekanbaru, Drs. H. Fairus Taher M.Ag and Dra. H. Nurias, Dr. Achmad Hidir M.Si and Neneng Riskiyani who have given meaningful and supports. Nurhasni S.Ag, Syartunis, Syafrianto etc thanks a lot for your support.
10. My beloved “Ginjar Wahyu Pambudi” and his family. Thanks for your help and support.
11. My best friends, Okmi, Lidia, Mpit, Bedri, Siti for their kindness and motivations.

Finally, this thesis is still far from perfect. Therefore, constructive comments, critiques, suggestions will be appreciated very much.

“May Allah Almighty bless you, bless me, and bless us”

امين يا ربّ العالمين

Pekanbaru, 05 January 2012

The Writer,

Nora Anzellita

NIM. 10514000361

ABSTRAK

Nora Anzellita (2012) : Dampak Penggunaan Strategi Simulasi terhadap Kemampuan Berbicara Siswa pada Kelas Dua di MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi

Penelitian ini adalah penelitian eksperimen. Hal ini dicari untuk mengetahui dampak penggunaan simulasi terhadap kemampuan berbicara siswa pada kelas dua di MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi dan faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi strategi simulasi tersebut terhadap kemampuan berbicara siswa pada kelas dua di MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi. Subjek pada penelitian ini adalah siswa kelas dua di MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi. Siswa kelas dua di MTs itu terdiri dari empat kelas (120 siswa). Penulis mengambil kelas VIII2 dan VIII4 (60 siswa) sebagai sampel dari penelitian tersebut. Cara untuk memilih sampel ini adalah dengan tehnik acak.

Instrumen yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah lembar observasi dan tes. Lembar observasi digunakan untuk mengetahui faktor yang mempengaruhi strategi simulasi terhadap kemampuan penggunaan bahasa Inggris di dalam kelas yang diikuti oleh para siswa dan tes digunakan untuk mengetahui data tentang kemampuan siswa. Dalam menganalisa data, penulis menggunakan statistik t-tes. Rumusnya adalah :

$$t = \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\sum x^2 + \sum y^2}{N_x + N_y - 2}\right) \left(\frac{1}{N_x} + \frac{1}{N_y}\right)}}$$

Akhirnya, berdasarkan penemuan penulis, nilai t-tes adalah 4.072 kemudian nilai tersebut diperiksa ke t-table dengan df=60 ditemukan adanya peningkatan 5% = 1.671. Akhirnya, karena nilai t-test lebih tinggi dari t-table (4.072 > 1.671). Itu artinya H_0 ditolak dan H_a diterima. Kata lainnya, strategi simulasi dapat meningkatkan kemampuan berbicara siswa kelas dua di MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi. Adapun faktor yang mempengaruhi kemampuan berbicara siswa dengan menggunakan strategi simulasi adalah siswa-siswa tersebut menggunakan kosakata yang tepat dalam strategi simulasi. Para siswa dapat mengungkapkan ide-ide mereka dengan lancar dan berusaha sebagai pembicara yang asli dan para siswa mampu menyatakan gagasan mereka dengan baik dengan mengungkapkannya melalui ucapan yang dapat dimengerti di dalam strategi simulasi.

LIST OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| SUPERVISOR APPROVAL | |
| EXAMINER APPROVAL | |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENT | i |
| ABSTRACT..... | iii |
| LIST OF CONTENTS | iv |
| LIST OF TABLES | vii |
| LIST OF APPENDICES..... | viii |
| CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION | |
| A. Background | 1 |
| B. Definition of the Terms | 4 |
| C. Problems | 5 |
| 1. Identification of the Problem..... | 5 |
| 2. Limitation of the Problem | 5 |
| 3. Formulation of the Problem | 6 |
| D. Reason of Choosing the Title | 6 |
| E. Objective and Significance of the Research..... | 7 |
| 1. The Objective of the Research | 7 |
| 2. The Significance of the Research..... | 7 |
| CHAPTER II THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK | |
| A. Simulation Strategy | 8 |
| 1. The Nature of Simulation Strategy..... | 8 |
| 2. The Advantages of Simulation Strategy..... | 10 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 3. The Procedures of Using Simulation Strategy | 13 |
| B. Speaking Skill..... | 16 |
| 1. The Nature of Speaking Skill | 16 |
| 2. The Components of Speaking Skill..... | 16 |
| 3. Factors that Influences Speaking Skill | 17 |
| 4. Measuring of Students' Speaking Skill | 19 |
| C. The Relevant Research | 20 |
| D. Operational Concept..... | 21 |
| E. Assumption and Hypothesis | 23 |

CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

| | |
|--|----|
| A. Research Design | 25 |
| B. Location and Time of the Research..... | 25 |
| C. Subject and Object of the Research..... | 26 |
| D. Population and Sample | 26 |
| E. Technique of the Data Collection..... | 27 |
| F. Technique of the Data Analysis | 29 |

CHAPTER IV DATA PRESENTATION AND DATA ANALYSIS

| | |
|--|----|
| A. Data Presentation..... | 33 |
| 1. Description of the Research Variable..... | 33 |
| 2. Data Presentation..... | 33 |
| B. The Data Analysis | 45 |
| C. The Interpretation of the Data | 50 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| D. The Factors Influence the Students' Speaking Skill Using Simulation | |
| Strategy | 50 |
| CHAPTER V CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION | |
| A. Conclusion..... | 54 |
| B. Suggestions..... | 55 |
| 1. Suggestion for the Teacher..... | 55 |
| 2. Suggestion for the Students..... | 56 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 57 |
| APPENDICES | 59 |

LIST OF TABLE

| | | Page |
|--------------|--|------|
| Table III.1 | Research Design..... | 25 |
| Table III.2 | The Population of the Research | 26 |
| Table III.3 | The Sample the Research..... | 27 |
| Table III.4 | The Components of Assessing Speaking Skills..... | 28 |
| Table IV.1 | Recapitulation of Students' Speaking Skill Score in Pre-Test of Experiment Class | 33 |
| Table IV.2 | Students' Speaking Skill Score in All Aspects in Pre-test of Experiment Class | 35 |
| Table IV.3 | Recapitulation of Students' Speaking Skill Score in Pre-Test of Control Class | 36 |
| Table IV.4 | Students' Speaking Skill Score in All Aspects in Pre-test of Control Class | 37 |
| Table IV.5 | The Percentage of Writer's Activity | 38 |
| Table IV.6 | Recapitulation of Students' Speaking Skill Score in Post-Test of Experiment Class | 40 |
| Table IV.7 | Students' Speaking Skill Score in All Aspects in Post-test of Experiment Class | 42 |
| Table IV.8 | Recapitulation of Students' Speaking Skill Score in Post-Test of Control Class | 43 |
| Table IV.9 | Students' Speaking Skill Score in All Aspects in Post-test of Control Class | 44 |
| Table IV. 10 | Calculated Table of Control and Experiment Class..... | 45 |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background

Speaking is an important skill because one of the keys in English communication is speaking ability. Indonesian has to be able to master English as an international language. By mastering speaking skill, they can carry out conversation with others, give ideas and change the information with people are able to know the situation that happens in the world.

In speaking class, the students should be taught how to speak. The components of English speaking skill that should be given and studied in English speaking class are pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, fluency, accuracy and comprehension. Speaking is the most important skill, because it is one of abilities to carry out conversation on the language. Speaking is an interactive process of constructing meaning, receiving, and processing information.

Based on Education Unit Level Curriculum, there are two kinds of competences that must be achieved by students; they are standard competence and basic competence. For the standard competence, students are required to express meaning and short simple monologue in a form of descriptive and procedure to interact with surroundings. For the basic competence, students must be able to respond to those interpersonal and transactional conversations such as greeting recognized and unrecognized people, self introduction and introducing somebody else, giving command or prohibition, asking and giving information, expressing

thank you, asking for apology, expressing politeness, asking and giving services, asking and giving goods, asking and giving fact, asking and giving opinions, expressing like and dislike, asking for clarification, and responding interpersonally.¹

In reaching the basic competences of speaking skill: responding interpersonal and transactional conversations such as greeting recognized and unrecognized people, self introduction and introducing somebody else, giving command or prohibition, asking and giving information, expressing thank you, asking for apology, expressing politeness, asking and giving services, asking and giving goods, asking and giving fact, asking and giving opinions, expressing like and dislike, asking for clarification, and responding interpersonally, the teacher applied appropriate and strategy that can increase students' speaking skill. Based on writer's observation at the second year students' of MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi, the teacher used discussion. By using discussion, the teacher hopes that the students' speaking skill will be good. In fact, there are some problems of students' speaking skill and the students are low in speaking skill. These problems can be seen from the symptoms below:

1. Some of students cannot express conversations in transactional (to get things done),
2. Some of the students are not able to express surprises,
3. Some of the students are not able to express warning,

¹Depdiknas, *Standard Kompetensi and Kompetensi Dasar Tingkat SMP/MTs*, (Pekanbaru: Dikpora, 2006).

4. Some of the students are not able to ask for suggestions and permission,
5. Some of the students are not able to express feelings; relief, pain, pleasure, asking for opinions,
6. Some of the students are not able to express satisfactions and dissatisfactions.

Based on the problems above, the writer tries to apply new method in solving the students' problem that is Simulations Strategy. Simulations Strategy is very similar to role-play but what makes simulations different from role-plays is that it is more detail than role-plays. In simulations, students can bring items to the class to create a realistic environment. For instance, if a student is acting as a singer, she brings a microphone to sing and so on. Simulation strategy has many advantages. First, since it is entertaining, it motivates the students. Second, it increases the self-confidence of hesitant students, because in role-play and simulation activities, they will have a different role and do not have to speak for themselves, which means they do not have to take the same responsibility.²

From the explanation above, the writer is interested in carrying out a research with a title: "The Effect of Using Simulation Strategy toward Students' Speaking Skill at the Second Year of MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi".

²Harmer, Jeremy, *The Practice of English Language Teaching*, (London: Longman, 1984).

B. Definition of the Terms

In order to avoid misunderstanding and misinterpretation in this research, the researcher narrates some definitions of the key terms. They are as follows:

1. Effect means the influence that something has on the way a person thinks or behaves or on the way that something works or develops.³ In this research, the effect means the influence of simulation in increasing students' speaking skill at the second year of MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi.
2. Simulation means the imitation of some real thing, state of affairs, or process. The act of simulating something generally entails representing certain key characteristics or behaviours of a selected physical or abstract system.⁴ In this research, simulation strategy is used to make a conversation among the students.
3. Speaking comes from word "speak" it means to talk somebody else about something to have a conversation with somebody.⁵ In this research, speaking means the students' ability in applying English speaking skill.

³Hornby, AS, *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (Sixth Edition)*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 666.

⁴Nana Sudjana, *Dasar-dasar Proses Belajar Mengajar*, (Bandung: Sinar Baru Algensindo, 2009), p. 89.

⁵Hornby, AS, *Op. Cit.*, p. 20.

C. Problems

1. Identification of the Problems

From the above background, it can be identified some problems dealing with the second year of MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi. The identification of the problems is as following questions:

- a. Why some students can not express the meaning in transactional (to get things done)?
- b. Why some students not able to express surprises?
- c. Why some students not able to express warning?
- d. Why some students not able to ask for suggestions and permission?
- e. Why some students not able to express feelings; relief, pain, pleasure, asking for opinions?
- f. Why some students not able to express satisfactions and dissatisfactions?

2. Limitation of the Problem

In this research, it is necessary to limit the problems. The problem is focused on the effect of using simulation strategy toward students' speaking skill at the second year of MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi.

3. The Formulation of the Problem

The problem of this research can be formulated in the following questions:

- a. Is there any significant effect of using simulation strategy toward students' speaking skill at the second year of MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi?
- b. What are the factors that influence the use of simulation strategy toward students' speaking skill at the second year of MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi?

D. Reasons for Choosing the Title

The writer is interested in carrying out this research because of the some reasons as following:

1. The topic is relevant to the writer as one of the students of the English Education Department.
2. The topic has not been investigated yet by other students of English Department of UIN SUSKA Riau.
3. The topic is very important to be discussed because the topic discusses about speaking skill that it is very important in learning English.
4. To know the use of simulation strategy in increasing students' speaking skill.

E. Objective and Significance of the Research

1. The Objective of the Research

- a. To find out whether any significant effect of using simulation strategy toward students' speaking skill at the second year of MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi.
- b. To find out the factors that influence the use of simulation strategy toward students' speaking skill at the second year of MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi

2. The Significance of the Research

By doing the research, the writer hopes that it can:

- a. Enlarge writers' knowledge about the real teaching process
- b. Fulfil one of the requirements of S.1 degree of English education department of education and teachers and training faculty of UIN SUSKA Riau.
- c. Give information to the teacher about simulation strategy in teaching speaking skill
- d. Increase the students' speaking ability using simulation strategy.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A. Simulation Strategy

1. The Nature of Simulation Strategy

Simulation is the imitation of some real thing, state of affairs, or process. The act of simulating something generally entails representing certain key characteristics or behaviours of a selected physical or abstract system.¹

Simulation is used in many contexts, such as simulation of technology for performance optimization, safety engineering, testing, training, education, and video games. Training simulators include flight simulators for training aircraft pilots in order to provide them with a lifelike experience. Simulation is also used for scientific modelling of natural systems or human systems in order to gain insight into their functioning.

Simulation can be used to show the eventual real effects of alternative conditions and courses of action. Simulation is also used when the real system cannot be engaged, because it may not be accessible, or it may be dangerous or unacceptable to engage, or it is being designed but not yet built, or it may simply not exist.

Key issues in simulation include acquisition of valid source information about the relevant selection of key characteristics and behaviours, the use of simplifying approximations and assumptions within the simulation, and

¹Nana Sudjana, *Dasar-dasar Proses Belajar Mengajar*, (Bandung: Sinar Baru Algensindo, 2009), p. 89.

fidelity and validity of the simulation outcomes.²

Simulation is an extremely valuable method for second language learning. It encourages thinking and creativity, lets students develop and practice new language and behavioural skills in a relatively no threatening setting, and can create the motivation and involvement necessary for learning to occur. This paper will examine this technique in detail. There is little consensus on the terms used in the role playing and simulation literature. Just a few of the terms which are used, often interchangeably, are "simulation," "game," "role-play," "simulation-game," "role- play simulation," and "role-playing game" There seems to be some agreements, however, that simulation is a broader concept than role playing. for example, views simulations as complex, lengthy and relatively inflexible, but role playing as quite simple, brief and flexible. Simulations simulate real life situations, while in role playing the participant is representing and experiencing some characters type known in everyday life. Simulations always include an element of role play.

Simulation clearly promotes effective interpersonal relations and social transactions among participants. In order for a simulation to occur the participants must accept the duties and responsibilities of their roles and functions, and do the best they can in the situation in which they find themselves. To fulfil their role responsibilities, students must relate to others in the simulation, utilizing effective

²South, Robert, *Simulation*, from: (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Simulation>, rewrite on 24 May 2011).

social skills.³

2. The Advantages of Simulation Strategy

One of the primary advantages of simulators is that they are able to provide users with practical feedback when designing real world systems. This allows the designer to determine the correctness and efficiency of a design before the system is actually constructed. Consequently, the user may explore the merits of alternative designs without actually physically building the systems. By investigating the effects of specific design decisions during the design phase rather than the construction phase, the overall cost of building the system diminishes significantly. As an example, consider the design and fabrication of integrated circuits. During the design phase, the designer is presented by a myriad of decisions regarding such things as the placement of components and the routing of the connecting wires. It would be very costly to actually fabricate all of the potential designs as a means of evaluating their respective performance. Through the use of a simulator, however, the user may investigate the relative superiority of each design without actually fabricating the circuits themselves. By mimicking the behaviour of the designs, the circuit simulator is able to provide the designer with information pertaining to the correctness and efficiency of alternate designs. After carefully weighing the ramifications of each design, the best circuit may then be fabricated.

³Hayriye, Kayi, *Teaching Speaking: Activities to Promote Speaking in a Second Language*, from: (<http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Kayi-teachingSpeaking.html>.accessed, rewrite on 2006).

Another benefit of simulators is that they permit system designers to study a problem at several different levels of abstraction. By approaching a system at a higher level of abstraction, the designer is better able to understand the behaviours and interactions of all the high-level components within the system and is therefore better equipped to counteract the complexity of the overall system. This complexity may simply overwhelm the designer if the problem had been approached from a lower level. As the designer better understands the operation of the higher-level components through the use of the simulator, the lower level components may then be designed and subsequently simulated for verification and performance evaluation. The entire system may be built based upon this "top-down" technique. This approach is often referred to as *hierarchical decomposition* and is essential in any design tool and simulator that deals with the construction of complex systems. For example, with respect to circuits, it is often useful to think of a microprocessor in terms of its registers, arithmetic logic units, multiplexers and control units. A simulator that permits the construction, interconnection and subsequent simulation of these higher level entities is much more useful than a simulator which only lets the designer build and connects simple logic gates. Working at a higher level abstraction also facilitates *rapid prototyping* in which preliminary systems are designed quickly for the purpose of studying the feasibility and practicality of the high-level design.

Thirdly, simulators can be used as an effective means for teaching or demonstrating concepts to students. This is particularly true of simulators that make intelligent use of computer graphics and animation. Such simulators

dynamically show the behaviour and relationship of all the simulated system's components, thereby providing the user with a meaningful understanding of the system's nature. Consider again, for example, a circuit simulator. By showing the paths taken by signals as inputs are consumed by components and outputs are produced over their respective fan out, the student can actually see what is happening within the circuit and is therefore left with a better understanding for the dynamics of the circuit. Such a simulator should also permit students to speed up, slow down, stop or even reverse a simulation as a means of aiding understanding. This is particularly true when simulating circuits which contain feedback loops or other operations which are not immediately intuitive upon an initial investigation.

During the presentation of the design and implementation of the simulator in this report, it will be shown how the above positive attributes have been or can be incorporated both in the simulator engine and its user interface.⁴

In addition benefits of simulation are as follows:

1. Accelerate knowledge transfer through learning by doing in a risk-free environment
2. Provide participants with realistic and relevant contexts in which to test and develop their understanding, knowledge and competence
3. Practice inherent in simulations, enhances transfer of knowledge to on-the-job performance
4. Enable participants to develop and internalize knowledge by applying

⁴Craig, Donald, *Advantages of Simulation*, from: (<http://web.cs.mun.ca/~donald/msc/node6.html> on 2010).

new skills in a risk-free environment

5. Provide real time feedback allowing participants to assess their current situation, analyse options for moving forward and measure results of past decisions and actions
6. Be interactive, dynamic, engaging and fun through design elements such as graphics, video, audio, storytelling, grounded learning and recognizable environments
7. Provide a flexible user driven experience that lifts motivation.⁵

3. The Procedures of Using Simulation Strategy

a. Phase One: Orientation

- 1) Explain to your students what simulations are about and for. (If you mention some common games they play which are simulations, they might start thinking about what real life complex situations the games model, and might learn something about them.)
- 2) Describe the particular simulation.
- 3) Ensure the students to understand the purpose of the simulation.
- 4) Outline the rules for the students. I put the rules on an overhead, and leave the overhead on during the simulation. You could also write the rules on bristle board, and hang this in a conspicuous place during the activity.

⁵CEG and SMG Australasia Alliance, *Simulation Training*, from: (http://www.competitiveedgegroup.com.au/html/simulation_training.html, 2010).

5) Assign roles to the students.

b. Phase Two: The Simulation

- 1) The students participate in the game, playing their roles as assigned. You are the coach and referee. You should stay uninvolved, except when you notice that you can facilitate the educational opportunities the simulation presents.
- 2) While your students are playing, you could make anecdotal records, or fill in checklists.

c. Phase Three: Debrief

For every teaching strategy involving a debrief, I will suggest a different method. There are a number of ways in which debriefs can be done. Please mix and match the different forms of debriefs you use.

- 1) Put the students into small groups.
- 2) Choose three or four learning objectives for the simulation. Write up these learning objectives as questions for discussion. One question should be about how the students think the simulation is like the real thing and how it is not like the real thing. Give each small group of students one question to discuss.
- 3) Tell the students how much time they have to discuss the questions.
- 4) Five minutes before the time is up, visit each group with a card

which has written on it: Five minutes until presentation. “Choose a speaker and write a summary of your discussion for the speaker to present to the class.”

- 5) An alternative to the above method would be to put groups who have discussed different question together to discuss their different questions and answers. This way, each group has an opportunity to discuss at least two of the questions.
- 6) If you use this second method, you could have students write answers to the questions in a learning log instead of having them present to the class.⁶

Examples of Simulations:

To illustrate the complexity of scientists at work constructing knowledge, have small groups of students assemble different parts of a jig saw puzzle. To illustrate the variety of factors involved in animal survival, there are many simulations available in the Project Wild Activity Book. For example, one involves bears preparing for winter. The teacher drops a number of food cards around the area where the students will be playing. Some bears are given handicaps. For example, one bear is blind, so is blindfolded. One is lame, so must never run - only walk. Some bears have young, so must collect twice as much food as others. At the end of the game, tally up how many food points each bear has collected. The blind and lame bears are unlikely to have as many points as the healthy ones, but they might. Etc.

⁶Nana Sudjana, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 90-91.

B. Speaking Skill

1. The Nature of Speaking Skill

Speaking skill is the process of building and sharing meaning by verbal and non-verbal symbols. Speaking ability is a crucial part of foreign language learning and teaching. However, today's world requires the goal of teaching speaking ability should improve students' communicative skills because students can express themselves and learn how to use a language.

According to Moris in Novia state that speaking ability is a tool to communicate naturally between society to express opinion and as a social behaviour form. Speaking skill is also ability to arrange sentences because communications happened by using sentences to present difference of various behaviours from different society.⁷

From the Moris's opinion speaking ability is dialogue because speaking ability involves two or more speakers and can be subdivided into those exchanges that promote social relationships (interpersonal) and those for which the purpose is to convey propositional or factual information (transactional).

2. The Components of Speaking Skill

According to Kalayo and Ansyari state that the languages learners need to recognize that speaking ability involves three are of knowledge:⁸

⁷Novia, T, *Strategy to Improve Students' Ability in Speaking*, (Padang: UNP Padang, 2002).

⁸Kalayo Hasibuan and M. Fauzan Ansyari, *Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL)*, (Riau: UIN SUSKA Riau, 2007), p. 113.

- a. Mechanics (pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary). The language learner should use the correct words in the right order with the correct pronunciation.
- b. Functions (transaction and interaction). The language learner should know when clarity of message is essential (transaction/information exchange) and when precise understanding is not required (interaction/relationship building).
- c. Social and culture rules and norms (turn-taking, rate of speech, length of pauses between speakers, relative roles of participants). The language learner should understand how to take into account who is speaking to whom, in what circumstances, about what, and for what reason.

3. Factors that Influence Speaking Skill

According to Brown, there are some cases in speaking skill,⁹ they are:

- a. Clustering

Fluent speech is phrasal, not word by word. Learners can organize their output both cognitively and physically (in breath groups) through such clustering.

⁹Brown, H. Douglas, *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*, (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents, 2001), p. 256.

b. Redundancy

The speaker has an opportunity to make meaning clearer through the redundancy of language. Learner can capitalize on this feature of spoken language.

c. Reduced Forms

Contraction, elisions, reduced vowels, etc, all from special problem teaching spoken English.

d. Performance Variables

One of the advantages of spoken language is that the process of thinking as you speak allows you to manifest a certain number of performance hesitations, pauses, back tracking, and correction.

e. Colloquial Language

Acquaint the words, idioms and phrases of colloquial language and get practice in producing these forms.

f. Rate of Delivery

Achieve an acceptable speed along with other attributes of fluency.

g. Stress, Rhythm, and Intonation

The stress-timed rhythm of spoken English and its intonation patterns convey important messages.

h. Interaction

Learning to produce waves of language in a vacuum-without interlocutors-would rob speaking skill of its richest component: the creativity of conversational negotiation.

4. Measuring of Students' Speaking Skill

There are five aspects that are generally recognized in analyzing speaking skill such as pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension.

a. Pronunciation.

Pronunciation includes the segmental features of vowels, consonants, stress, and intonation patterns. Pronunciation is the ways of certain sounds are produced. In communication process, one needs to pronounce and to produce the words uttered clearly and correctly in order to miscommunication.¹⁰

b. Grammar

Grammar remains us how to make the use of words: that is to say, it teaches us how to make the use of them in proper manner, to be to choose the words which ought to be placed. We must be acquainted with certain principles and rules constitute what is collect grammar.¹¹

c. Vocabulary

Vocabulary is one of word include in language, have many words that must be mastered by a person speaking or writing something. Vocabulary is the acquisition of an adequate, vocabulary as essential for successful second language use, because without an extensive vocabulary we will be unable to use the structures and the function that we have learned fir comprehensible communication. It means that

¹⁰Richard, Jack C, *et al.*, *Language Teaching Applied Linguistics*, (Malaysia,VVP, 1999), p. 297.

¹¹Nunan, David, *Language Teaching Methodology a Text Book For Teacher*, (New York: Pieties Hall, 1991), p. 296.

vocabulary mastery is one of the important components in communication.¹²

d. Fluency

According to Brown, fluency is probably best achieved by allowing the air stream of speech to follow then as some of this speech spill over beyond comprehensibility.¹³

e. Comprehension

In brief speaking requires that not only know how to produce specific points of language includes grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary, and fluency, but also to understand the when, why, and in what ways to produce the language.

C. The Relevant Research

To avoid the same title used in the research, the writer shows the relevant research. The first was done by Sumiati. After doing the research, she found that the students' speaking ability was categorized less. It can be proved by the average percentage was 53, 65%. While to find out the contribution of group work activity toward the students' speaking ability the null hypothesis was accepted. It can be seen r_{table} is higher than r_{ch} whether r observed is 0, 22 while r table is at 5% significant level is 0, 288 and at 1% significant level is 0, 372.¹⁴

¹²Nunan, David, *Ibid.*, p. 117.

¹³Brown, H. Douglas, *Op. Cit.*, p. 254.

¹⁴Sumiati, The Contribution of Group Work Activity toward the Students' Speaking Ability at the Second Year of Madrasah Aliyah Hidayatul Mubtadiin Bandar Sungai, (Pekanbaru: UIN SUSKA Riau, Unpublished Thesis, 2006).

The second research was done by Zulkifli. After analyzing and giving interpretation, he found that, the score of F-test was 16.15 then it was consulted to F-table with $df = 38$ found that at significant level $5\% = 4.10$ and at $1\% = 7.35$. Finally, $F\text{-test} = 16.15$ was higher than F-table. Therefore, it can be interpreted that there was significant contribution of group work participation strategy toward speaking skill at the second year students of SMAN 1 Bunut Pelalawan.¹⁵

D. Operational Concept

The operational concept is the concept that give explanation about theoretical framework in order to avoid misunderstanding and misinterpretation toward the research. There are two variables used in this research, they are variable X and variable Y. The using of simulation strategy is as Variable X that gives the effect on students' speaking skill as variable Y. The indicators that will be compared are about students' speaking ability before and after being taught by using simulation strategy. The indicators are as follow:

1. Variable X (teaching procedures in using simulation strategy)

- a. **Phase One: Orientation**

- 1) Teacher eexplains to the students what simulations are about and for
 - 2) Teacher describes the particular simulation
 - 3) Teacher ensures the students understand the purpose of the simulation.

¹⁵Zulkifli, Contribution of Group Work Participation toward the Speaking Skill of the Second Year Students at SMAN 1 Bunut Pelalawan, (Pekanbaru: UIN SUSKA Riau, Unpublished Thesis, 2011).

- 4) Teacher outlines the rules for the students.
- 5) Teacher assigns roles to the students.

b. Phase Two: The Simulation

- 1) Teacher asks the students to participate in the game, playing their roles as assigned.
- 2) Teacher make anecdotal records, or fill in checklists while the students are playing

c. Phase Three: Debrief

- 1) Teacher put the students into small groups.
- 2) Teacher chooses three or four learning objectives for the simulation and then the teacher writes up these learning objectives as questions for discussion.
- 3) Teacher tells the students how much time they have to discuss the questions.
- 4) Teacher visits each group and chooses a speaker and asks the speaker to present to the class.
- 5) Teacher puts groups in different question together to discuss their different questions and answers.
- 6) Teacher asks students to write answers to the questions in a learning log instead of having them present to the class.

2. Variable Y (students' speaking skill)

- a. The students articulate English with correct pronunciation in simulation strategy
- b. The students use appropriate vocabularies in simulation strategy
- c. The students can use rules and certain principle in sentences in proper manner in simulation strategy
- d. The students can express their ideas with fluency and effortless as a native speaker in simulation strategy
- e. The students can express their ideas with best achieved by allowing the air stream of speech to follow then as some of this speech spill over beyond comprehensibility in simulation strategy.

E. Assumption and Hypothesis

1. The Assumption

Before constructing the hypothesis, the writer would like to offer assumption that by using simulation strategy can improve students' speaking skill at the second year of MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi.

2. The Hypothesis

Based on the assumptions above the writer formulates two hypotheses as follows:

Ho: There is no significant effect of using simulation strategy toward students' speaking skill at the second year of MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi.

Ha: There is significant effect of using simulation strategy toward students' speaking skill at the second year of MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Research Design

The design of this research was a quasi experimental research of pre-test and post-test design. This design requires at least two groups (experimental and controlled class). It is administrated a pre-test and treatment. It is post-tested at the end of the study. Post-test scores are compared to determine the effectiveness of the treatment.¹ This research consists of two variables; the independent variable symbolized by “X” that is the use of simulation strategy and the dependent one as “Y” which refers to students’ speaking skill. In brief, the research can be designed by following table:

Table III.1
Research Design

| Class | Pre-test | Treatment | Post-test |
|------------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| Control | X_1 | - | X_2 |
| Experiment | Y_1 | T | Y_2 |

B. Location and Time of the Research

The research was conducted at the second year of MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi. This research was conducted in September until November 2011.

¹Gay, L.R and Peter Airasian, *Educational Research Competencies for Analysis and Application*, (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall. Inc, 2000), p. 392.

C. Subject and Object of the Research

The subject of this research was the second year of MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi, while the object of this research was the students' speaking skill through simulation strategy.

D. Population and Sample

1. Population of the Research

The population of this research was all the second year students of MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi with the total population was 120 students. It consisted of four classes and every class consisted of 30 students. Furthermore, the total of population can be seen from the table below:

Table III.2
The Population the Research²

| No | Class | The Number of the Students | | Total Population |
|--------------|--------|----------------------------|-----------|------------------|
| | | Male | Female | |
| 1 | VIII 1 | 14 | 16 | 30 |
| 2 | VIII 2 | 15 | 15 | 30 |
| 3 | VIII 3 | 16 | 14 | 30 |
| 4 | VIII 4 | 15 | 15 | 30 |
| Total | | 60 | 60 | 120 |

2. Sample of the Research

From the population of the research, it can be seen that it was very wide, the writer used cluster technique in choosing sample in this research. According to

²Source: *Document of MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi 2011/2012 Academic Year.*

Sugiyono, the cluster technique is used to take sample if the object that will be researched is very wide. To decide which of the population that will be taken as sample, the sample is taken based on the population that specified.³

Based on the explanation above, the writer wrote in a piece of paper one as an experimental in lotteries form and every chairman get that paper. The class that got experiment class, writer supposed that was as a sample class. Finally it was found that class VIII 2 as a sample of this research with the number of students was 30 students. Furthermore, the total of sample can be seen from the table below:

Table III.3
The Sample the Research

| No | Class | The Number of the Students | | Total Sample | Sample |
|--------------|--------|----------------------------|--------|--------------|---------------------------|
| | | Male | Female | | |
| 1 | VIII 2 | 15 | 15 | 30 | Experimental Class |
| 2 | VIII 4 | 15 | 15 | 30 | Control Class |
| Total | | 30 | 30 | 60 | |

E. Technique of the Data Collection

The writer used two kinds of instrument in this research, they are observation and test.

1. The observation sheet was used to know both, the writer activity in teaching speaking using simulation strategy and the factors that influence the students' speaking using simulation strategy. To get data

³Sugiyono, Prof. Dr, *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan*, (Bandung: Alfabeta, 2008), p. 121.

the writer was helped by English teacher at the second year of MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi.

2. Test was used to find out whether there was or no significant effect of using simulation strategy to increase students speaking ability. The kind of test was oral by using record. The test consisted of pre test and pos test. The test was done by giving students some topics and then the students were ordered to make a simulation. The writer used the following rating sheet from to analyze students' speaking ability. According to Haris, to measure the students' speaking skill can be used by the following aspects: ⁴

Table III.4
The Component of Assessing Speaking Skills

| Aspects | Score | Requirement |
|----------------------|-------|---|
| Pronunciation | 5 | Have a view traces of foreign accent |
| | 4 | Always Intelligible, though one conscious of a define |
| | 3 | Accent problems necessitate concentrate listening and occasionally lead to miss understanding |
| | 2 | Very hard to understanding because of pronunciation problem. Muss frequently be asked to repeat |
| | 1 | Pronunciation problems so several as to make speech virtually unintelligible |
| Grammar | 5 | Makes few (if any) noticeable error of grammar or word order |
| | 4 | Occasionally makes grammatical and/or word-order error, which do not. However, obscure meaning |
| | 3 | Make frequently errors of grammar and word order which occasionally obscure meaning |
| | 2 | Grammar and word order errors make comprehension difficult, must often rephrase sentence and or restrict him to basic pattern |

⁴Haris. D.P, *Testing English as a Second Language*, (New York: Mc Graw Book Company, 1974). p. 79.

| | | |
|----------------------|---|---|
| | 1 | Errors and grammar and word order so severe as to make speech virtually unintelligible |
| Fluency | 5 | Speech as fluency and effortless as that of a native speaker. |
| | 4 | Speed of speech seems to be slightly affected by language problem. |
| | 3 | Speed and fluency rather strongly affected by language problem. |
| | 2 | Usually hesitant, often only silence by language limitation. |
| | 1 | Speech is also halting and fragmentary as to make conversation virtually |
| Vocabulary | 5 | Use of vocabulary idiom is virtually that of a native speaker. |
| | 4 | Sometimes uses inappropriate terms and/or must rephrase ideas because of lexical inadequacies. |
| | 3 | Frequently uses wrong words, compensation somewhat limited because of inadequate vocabulary |
| | 2 | Misuse of words and very limited vocabulary make comprehension quite difficult |
| | 1 | Vocabulary limitation as extreme as to make comprehension vitally impossible |
| Comprehension | 5 | Appears to understand very well without difficulty. |
| | 4 | Understand nearly everything at normal speech although occasionally repetition may be necessary. |
| | 3 | Understanding most of what is said at slower than normal speech with repetition. |
| | 2 | Has great difficulty following what is said. Can comprehend only social conversation, spoken slowly and with frequent repetition. |
| | 1 | Cannot be said to understand even simple conversational English |

F. The Techniques of Data Analysis

1. Percentage

In analyzing the observation data and to find out the researcher's progress in teaching by using sensory images strategy, the following formula can be used:

$$\text{Percentage} = \frac{F}{N} \times 100\%$$

Where:

M = Individual Score

F = Number of Correct Answer

N = Number of Items.⁵

After that to know the classification of observation can be used classification score as below:

76 – 100 % = Effective

56 – 75 % = Less

40 – 55 % = Low⁶

2. T-Test

In analyzing data, the researcher used score of pre-test and post-test of the students. According to Arikunto, the process to analyze the scores was using statistical analysis t_{test} , variance, and homogeneity should be found first. Homogeneity test was used to find out whether the two classes have homogenous variance or not.⁷ The process to analyze the data as follows:

1. Find out the means score of control (M_x) and experiment class (M_y).

The formula as follow:

⁵Haris, D.P, *Ibid.*, p. 79.

⁶Suharsimi Arikunto, *Prosedur Penelitian (Suatu Pendekatan Praktek)*, (Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 1998) , p. 246.

⁷Suharsimi Arikunto, *Ibid.* p. 306.

$$M_x = \frac{\sum x}{N} \text{ and } M_y = \frac{\sum y}{N}$$

- Where: M_x = Mean score of control class
 M_y = Mean score of experiment class
 x = Difference score of control class
 y = Difference score of experiment class
 N = Number of students

2. Find out the variance of control class ($\sum x^2$) and experiment class ($\sum y^2$). The formula as follow:

$$\sum x^2 = \sum x^2 - \frac{(\sum x)^2}{N} \text{ and } \sum y^2 = \sum y^2 - \frac{(\sum y)^2}{N}$$

- Where: x^2 = Variance of control class
 y^2 = Variance of experiment class
 x = Difference score of control class
 y = Difference score of experiment class
 N = Number of students

3. Find out homogeneity test. The formula as follows:

$$f_{\text{calculated}} = \frac{\text{the greater variance}}{\text{the lesser variance}}$$

4. Find out t-test statistic. The formula as follow:

$$t = \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\sum x^2 + \sum y^2}{N_x + N_y - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{N_x} + \frac{1}{N_y}\right)}}$$

Where: t = The t-test statistic
 M_x = Mean score of control class
 M_y = Mean score of experiment class
 x^2 = Variance of control class
 y^2 = Variance of experiment class
 N = Number of students. ⁸

⁸ Suharsimi Arikunto, *Ibid.*, p. 311.

CHAPTER IV

DATA PRESENTATION AND DATA ANALYSIS

A. Data Presentation

1. The Description of the Research Variable

This research consisted of two variables; they were variable X, which referred to the use of simulation strategy, and variable Y was students' speaking skill at the second year of MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi. Therefore, X was an independent variable and Y was a dependent variable.

2. Data Presentation

a. Pre-Test of Experiment Class

Table IV.1
Recapitulation of Students' Speaking Skill Score
in Pre-Test of Experiment Class

| Sample | Score | | |
|------------|---------|----------|-------------|
| | Rater I | Rater II | Final Score |
| Student 01 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Student 02 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Student 03 | 14 | 13 | 13.5 |
| Student 04 | 13 | 10 | 11.5 |
| Student 05 | 13 | 11 | 12 |
| Student 06 | 13 | 11 | 12 |
| Student 07 | 12 | 11 | 11.5 |
| Student 08 | 12 | 13 | 12.5 |
| Student 09 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Student 10 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| Student 11 | 10 | 10 | 10 |

| | | | |
|--------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Student 12 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| Student 13 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Student 14 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Student 15 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Student 16 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| Student 17 | 13 | 13 | 13 |
| Student 18 | 13 | 13 | 13 |
| Student 19 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Student 20 | 12 | 13 | 12.5 |
| Student 21 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| Student 22 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Student 23 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| Student 24 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Student 25 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Student 26 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Student 27 | 10 | 11 | 10.5 |
| Student 28 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Student 29 | 14 | 11 | 12.5 |
| Student 30 | 14 | 11 | 12.5 |
| Total | 350 | 338 | 344 |
| Means Score | 11.67 | 11.27 | 11.47 |

Based on the table IV.1, it can be seen that the total of students' speaking skill at Rater I was 350 with means score was 11.67 and Rater II was 338 with means score was 11.27. Furthermore, final score of students' speaking skill in pre-test of experimental class was 344 with means score was 11.47. In addition, to know the students' speaking skill score in all aspects can be seen in the following table:

Table IV.2
Students' Speaking Skill Score in All Aspects in Pre-test
of Experiment Class

| No | Speaking Aspects | Rater I | | Rater II | |
|----|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | Total Score | Means score | Total Score | Means score |
| 1 | Grammar | 66 | 2.20 | 64 | 2.13 |
| 2 | Vocabulary | 74 | 2.47 | 68 | 2.27 |
| 3 | Pronunciation | 60 | 2.00 | 64 | 2.13 |
| 4 | Fluency | 73 | 2.43 | 71 | 2.37 |
| 5 | Comprehension | 77 | 2.57 | 71 | 2.37 |

Based on the table IV.2, it can be seen that the total score of students' speaking skill in pre-test can be explained that at Rater I, the total score of grammar aspect was 66 with means score was 2.20, vocabulary was 74 with means score was 2.47, pronunciation was 60 with means score was 2.00, fluency was 73 with means score was 2.43 and comprehension was 77 with means score 2.57. While at Rater II, the total score of grammar aspect was 64 with means score was 2.13, vocabulary was 68 with means score was 2.27, pronunciation was 64 with means score was 2.13, fluency was 71 with means score was 2.37 and comprehension was 71 with means score 2.37.

b. Pre-Test of Control Class

Table IV.3
Recapitulation of Students' Speaking Skill Score
in Pre-Test of Control Class

| Sample | Score | | |
|------------|---------|----------|-------------|
| | Rater I | Rater II | Final Score |
| Student 01 | 13 | 10 | 11.5 |
| Student 02 | 12 | 10 | 11 |
| Student 03 | 14 | 10 | 12 |
| Student 04 | 10 | 11 | 10.5 |
| Student 05 | 10 | 13 | 11.5 |
| Student 06 | 14 | 13 | 13.5 |
| Student 07 | 10 | 12 | 11 |
| Student 08 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Student 09 | 13 | 12 | 12.5 |
| Student 10 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| Student 11 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Student 12 | 12 | 11 | 11.5 |
| Student 13 | 13 | 14 | 13.5 |
| Student 14 | 11 | 12 | 11.5 |
| Student 15 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Student 16 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| Student 17 | 13 | 13 | 13 |
| Student 18 | 13 | 13 | 13 |
| Student 19 | 13 | 12 | 12.5 |
| Student 20 | 13 | 12 | 12.5 |
| Student 21 | 12 | 11 | 11.5 |
| Student 22 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Student 23 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| Student 24 | 13 | 12 | 12.5 |

| | | | |
|--------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Student 25 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Student 26 | 11 | 10 | 10.5 |
| Student 27 | 14 | 10 | 12 |
| Student 28 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Student 29 | 14 | 12 | 13 |
| Student 30 | 10 | 11 | 10.5 |
| Total | 353 | 339 | 346 |
| Means score | 11.77 | 11.30 | 11.53 |

Based on the table IV.3, it can be seen that the total score of students' speaking skill at Rater I was 353 with means score was 11.77 and Rater II was 339 with means score was 11.30. Furthermore, final score of students' speaking skill in pre-test of control class was 346 with means score was 11.53. In addition, to know the students' speaking skill score in all aspects can be seen in the following table:

Table IV.4
Students' Speaking Skill Score in All Aspects in Pre-test
of Control Class

| No | Speaking Aspects | Rater I | | Rater II | |
|----|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | Total Score | Means score | Total Score | Means score |
| 1 | Grammar | 71 | 2.37 | 63 | 2.10 |
| 2 | Vocabulary | 71 | 2.37 | 72 | 2.40 |
| 3 | Pronunciation | 64 | 2.13 | 60 | 2.00 |
| 4 | Fluency | 71 | 2.37 | 71 | 2.37 |
| 5 | Comprehension | 76 | 2.53 | 73 | 2.43 |

Based on the table IV.4, it can be seen that the total score of students' speaking skill in pre-test can be explained that at Rater I, the total score of

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | to participate in the game, playing their roles as assigned | | | | | | | | |
| | 2) Teacher make anecdotal records, or fill in checklists while the students are playing | - | - | - | - | | | | |
| 3. | Phase Three: Debrief | | | | | | | | |
| | 1) Teacher puts the students into small groups | | | | | | | | |
| | 2) Teacher chooses three or four learning objectives for the simulation and then the teacher writes up these learning objectives as questions for discussion | | | | | | | | |
| | 3) Teacher tells the students how much time they have to discuss the questions. | | | | | | | | |
| | 4) Teacher visits each group and chooses a speaker and asks the speaker to present to the class | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | 5) Teacher puts groups in different question together to discuss their different questions and answers | - | - | - | | | | | |
| | 6) Teacher has students write answers to the questions in a learning log instead of having them present to the class | - | - | - | | | | | |
| | Total | 7 | 8 | 8 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| | Mean | 0.54 | 0.62 | 0.62 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| | Percentage | 54 | 62 | 62 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |

$$\text{Means: } \frac{\sum \text{observationscore}}{\text{writer'sactivity}} = \frac{7}{13} = 0.54$$

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{\sum \text{observationscore}}{\text{writer'sactivity}} \times 100\% = \frac{7}{13} \times 100 = 54\%$$

Based on the table IV.5, the writer had completed all of aspects that had been observed. Every aspect had some improvement from observation I until observation VIII. In observation I, the total writer's activity was 5 (63%), in observation II was 5 (63%), in observation III was 6 (75%), in observation IV was 7 (88%), in observation V was 8 (100%), in observation VI was 8 (100%), in observation VII was 8 (100%), and in observation VIII is 8 (100%). This result showed that the writer could use dialogue technique in teaching speaking well.

d. Post-Test of Experimental Class

Table IV.6
Recapitulation of Students' Speaking Skill Score
in Post-Test of Experimental Class

| Sample | Score | | |
|------------|---------|----------|-------------|
| | Rater I | Rater II | Final Score |
| Student 01 | 13 | 15 | 14 |
| Student 02 | 13 | 14 | 13.5 |
| Student 03 | 19 | 15 | 17 |
| Student 04 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Student 05 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Student 06 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Student 07 | 13 | 16 | 14.5 |
| Student 08 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Student 09 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Student 10 | 19 | 16 | 17.5 |
| Student 11 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Student 12 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Student 13 | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| Student 14 | 18 | 18 | 18 |

| | | | |
|--------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Student 15 | 16 | 16 | 16 |
| Student 16 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Student 17 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Student 18 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Student 19 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Student 20 | 15 | 17 | 16 |
| Student 21 | 16 | 16 | 16 |
| Student 22 | 16 | 16 | 16 |
| Student 23 | 16 | 16 | 16 |
| Student 24 | 16 | 18 | 17 |
| Student 25 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Student 26 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Student 27 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Student 28 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Student 29 | 19 | 17 | 18 |
| Student 30 | 19 | 17 | 18 |
| Total | 468 | 467 | 467,5 |
| Means score | 15.60 | 15.57 | 15.58 |

Based on the table IV.6, it can be seen that the total of students' speaking skill at Rater I was 468 with means score was 15.60 and Rater II was 467 with means score was 15.57. Furthermore, final score of students' speaking skill in post-test of experimental class was 467.5 with means score was 15.58. In addition, to know the students' speaking skill score in all aspects can be seen in the following table:

Table IV.7
Students' Speaking Skill Score in All Aspects in Post-test
of Experimental Class

| No | Speaking Aspects | Rater I | | Rater II | |
|----|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | Total Score | Means Score | Total Score | Means score |
| 1 | Grammar | 92 | 3.07 | 93 | 3.10 |
| 2 | Vocabulary | 97 | 3.23 | 95 | 3.17 |
| 3 | Pronunciation | 85 | 2.84 | 89 | 2.97 |
| 4 | Fluency | 96 | 3.20 | 95 | 3.17 |
| 5 | Comprehension | 98 | 3.27 | 95 | 3.17 |

Based on the table IV.7, it can be seen that the total score of students' speaking skill in post-test of experimental class can be explained that at Rater I, the total score of grammar aspect was 92 with means score was 3.07, vocabulary was 97 with means score was 3.23, pronunciation was 85 with means score was 2.84, fluency was 96 with means score was 3.20 and comprehension was 98 with means score 3.27. While at Rater II, the total score of grammar aspect was 93 with means score was 3.10, vocabulary was 95 with means score was 3.17, pronunciation was 89 with means score was 2.97, fluency was 95 with means score was 3.17 and comprehension was 95 with means score 3.17.

e. Post-Test of Control Class

Table IV.8
Recapitulation of Students' Speaking Skill Score
in Post-Test of Control Class

| Sample | Score | | |
|------------|---------|----------|-------------|
| | Rater I | Rater II | Final Score |
| Student 01 | 13 | 15 | 14 |
| Student 02 | 13 | 14 | 13.5 |
| Student 03 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Student 04 | 11 | 13 | 12 |
| Student 05 | 13 | 14 | 13.5 |
| Student 06 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Student 07 | 13 | 13 | 13 |
| Student 08 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Student 09 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Student 10 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Student 11 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Student 12 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Student 13 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Student 14 | 14 | 15 | 14.5 |
| Student 15 | 13 | 13 | 13 |
| Student 16 | 14 | 15 | 14.5 |
| Student 17 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Student 18 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Student 19 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Student 20 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Student 21 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Student 22 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Student 23 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Student 24 | 10 | 12 | 11 |
| Student 25 | 15 | 15 | 15 |

| | | | |
|--------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Student 26 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Student 27 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Student 28 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Student 29 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Student 30 | 10 | 15 | 12.5 |
| Total | 418 | 433 | 425.5 |
| Means score | 13.93 | 14.43 | 14.18 |

Based on the table IV.8, it can be seen that the total of students' speaking skill at Rater I was 418 with means score was 13.93 and Rater II was 433 with means score was 14.43. Furthermore, final score of students' speaking skill in post-test of control class was 425.5 with means score was 14.18. In addition, to know the students' speaking skill score in all aspects can be seen in the following table:

Table IV.9
Students' Speaking Skill Score in All Aspects in Pre-test of Control Class

| No | Speaking Aspects | Rater I | | Rater II | |
|----|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | Total Score | Means Score | Total Score | Means score |
| 1 | Grammar | 82 | 2.73 | 87 | 2.90 |
| 2 | Vocabulary | 86 | 2.87 | 88 | 2.93 |
| 3 | Pronunciation | 77 | 2.57 | 83 | 2.77 |
| 4 | Fluency | 85 | 2.83 | 86 | 2.87 |
| 5 | Comprehension | 88 | 2.93 | 89 | 2.97 |

Based on the table IV.9, it can be seen that the total score of students' speaking skill in post-test of controlled class can be explained that at Rater I, the

total score of grammar aspect was 82 with means score was 2.73 vocabulary was 86 with means score was 2.87, pronunciation was 77 with means score was 2.57, fluency was 85 with means score was 2.83 and comprehension was 88 with means score 2.93. While at Rater II, the total score of grammar aspect was 87 with means score was 2.90, vocabulary was 88 with means score was 2.93, pronunciation was 83 with means score was 2.77, fluency was 86 with means score was 2.87 and comprehension was 89 with means score 2.97.

B. The Data Analysis

Table IV.10
Calculated Table of Controlled and Experimental Class

| Controlled Class | | | | Experimental Class | | | |
|------------------|----------------|----------------|------------|--------------------|----------------|----------------|------------|
| Student | Pre-test | Post-test | Difference | Student | Pre-test | Post-test | Difference |
| | X ₁ | X ₂ | x | | Y ₁ | Y ₂ | y |
| 01 | 11.5 | 14 | 2.5 | 01 | 10 | 14 | 4 |
| 02 | 11 | 13.5 | 2.5 | 02 | 10 | 13.5 | 3.5 |
| 03 | 12 | 14 | 2 | 03 | 13.5 | 17 | 3.5 |
| 04 | 10.5 | 12 | 1.5 | 04 | 11.5 | 15 | 3.5 |
| 05 | 11.5 | 13.5 | 2 | 05 | 12 | 15 | 3 |
| 06 | 13.5 | 15 | 1.5 | 06 | 12 | 15 | 3 |
| 07 | 11 | 13 | 2 | 07 | 11.5 | 14.5 | 3 |
| 08 | 12 | 15 | 3 | 08 | 12.5 | 15 | 2.5 |
| 09 | 12.5 | 14 | 1.5 | 09 | 12 | 14 | 2 |
| 10 | 11 | 14 | 3 | 10 | 11 | 17.5 | 6.5 |
| 11 | 10 | 15 | 5 | 11 | 10 | 15 | 5 |
| 12 | 11.5 | 15 | 3.5 | 12 | 11 | 15 | 4 |
| 13 | 13.5 | 15 | 1.5 | 13 | 14 | 18 | 4 |
| 14 | 11.5 | 14.5 | 3 | 14 | 12 | 18 | 6 |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| 15 | 10 | 13 | 3 | 15 | 10 | 16 | 6 |
| 16 | 11 | 14.5 | 3.5 | 16 | 11 | 14 | 3 |
| 17 | 13 | 14 | 1 | 17 | 13 | 14 | 1 |
| 18 | 13 | 15 | 2 | 18 | 13 | 15 | 2 |
| 19 | 12.5 | 15 | 2.5 | 19 | 12 | 15 | 3 |
| 20 | 12.5 | 15 | 2.5 | 20 | 12.5 | 16 | 3.5 |
| 21 | 11.5 | 14 | 2.5 | 21 | 11 | 16 | 5 |
| 22 | 10 | 15 | 5 | 22 | 10 | 16 | 6 |
| 23 | 11 | 15 | 4 | 23 | 11 | 16 | 5 |
| 24 | 12.5 | 11 | -1.5 | 24 | 12 | 17 | 5 |
| 25 | 10 | 15 | 5 | 25 | 10 | 15 | 5 |
| 26 | 10.5 | 15 | 4.5 | 26 | 10 | 15 | 5 |
| 27 | 12 | 15 | 3 | 27 | 10.5 | 15 | 4.5 |
| 28 | 10 | 15 | 5 | 28 | 10 | 15 | 5 |
| 29 | 13 | 14 | 1 | 29 | 12.5 | 18 | 5.5 |
| 30 | 10.5 | 12.5 | 2 | 30 | 12.5 | 18 | 5.5 |
| $\sum N$ =30 | $\sum X_1$ =346 | $\sum X_2$ =425.5 | $\sum x$ =79.5 | $\sum N$ =30 | $\sum Y_1$ =344 | $\sum Y_2$ =467.5 | $\sum y$ =123.5 |

Based on the table 10, it can be found that $\sum N=30$, $\sum X_1=346$, $\sum X_2=425.5$, $\sum x=79.5$, $\sum Y_1=344$, $\sum Y_2=467.5$, and $\sum y=123.5$.

Furthermore, find out the means score of control (M_x) and means score of experiment class (M_y).

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

$$= \frac{79.5}{30}$$

$$M_x = 2.65$$

$$M_y = \frac{\sum y}{N}$$

$$= \frac{123.5}{30}$$

$$M_y = 4.12$$

Then, finding the variance of control class $(\sum x^2)$ and the variance of experiment class $(\sum y^2)$ are as follows:

$$\sum x^2 = \sum x^2 - \frac{(\sum x)^2}{N}$$

$$= 270.25 - \frac{79.5^2}{30}$$

$$= 270.25 - \frac{6320.25}{30}$$

$$= 270.25 - 210.68$$

$$\sum x^2 = 59.58$$

$$\sum y^2 = \sum y^2 - \frac{(\sum y)^2}{N}$$

$$= 563.25 - \frac{123.5^2}{30}$$

$$= 563.25 - \frac{15252.25}{30}$$

$$= 563.25 - 508.41$$

$$\sum y^2 = 54.84$$

Based on the calculation above, it was found that the means of control class was 2.65 and the variance was 59.58. While the means of experiment class was 4.12 and the variance was 54.84.

Based on the finding above, there was difference between the experimental class and control class in term of means, and variance. In order to find out the variance homogeneity of both classes, F value can be calculated in the following:

$$f_{\text{calculated}} = \frac{\text{thegreatervariance}}{\text{thelesservariance}}$$

$$= \frac{59.58}{54.84}$$

$$f_{\text{calculated}} = 1.086$$

The value of $f_{\text{calculated}}$ was compared with the value of f_{table} with dk denominator (30-1=29) and dk counter (30-1=29). Based on the dk dominator 5% is 1.85 and dk counter 1% is 2.41. From the explanation, it was found that $f_{\text{calculated}}$ is lower than f_{table} (1.086 < 1.85 < 2.41). Thereby, it can be said that both of groups' variance are homogenous.

Then find out t-test statistic.

$$t = \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\sum x^2 + \sum y^2}{N_x + N_y - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{N_x} + \frac{1}{N_y}\right)}}$$

$$= \frac{2.65 - 4.12}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{59.58 + 54.84}{30 + 30 - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{30} + \frac{1}{30}\right)}}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{-1.47}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{114.42}{58}\right)\left(\frac{2}{30}\right)}} \\
&= \frac{-1.47}{\sqrt{\frac{228.84}{1740}}} \\
&= \frac{-1.47}{\sqrt{0.13}} \\
&= \frac{-1.47}{0.361} \\
t &= 4.072
\end{aligned}$$

Based on the data analysis, it can be described that $t_{calculated}$ was 4.072 then to prove whether there is a significant or not, $t_{calculated}$ is turned to $t_{distribution}$ level in alpha decision level (α) 0,05 and with the degree freedom 58 ($df = N_1 + N_2 - 2 = 30 + 30 - 2 = 58$). In the degree freedom of 58 was not found in the $t_{distribution}$ so the writer took the nearest degree freedom that was 60. In the degree freedom of 60 was found that $t_{distribution}$ at 5% was 1.671. It can be concluded that $t_{calculated} > t_{distribution}$ ($4.072 > 1.671$). It means that H_a is accepted and H_o is rejected. In short, there is a significant effect of using simulation strategy toward students' speaking skill at the second year of MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi.

C. The Interpretation of the Data

Based on the data analysis, the researcher toward that the total means score of students' ability in speaking skill of experiment class was 4.12 and control class was 2.65. Based on the calculation of both experimental and control class in the hypothesis testing, it was found that the value of $t_{calculated}$ was higher than $t_{distribution}$ ($4.072 > 1.671$) in alpha decision level (α) 0,05 with the degree freedom ($d.f.$ 60). Consequently, the null hypothesis was rejected. In short, there is significant effect of using simulation strategy toward students' speaking skill at the second year of MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi.

D. The Factors Influence the Students' Speaking Skill Using Simulation Strategy

Table IV.11
The Factors Influences Students' Spealing Skill
in Teaching and Learning Process
Using Simulation Strategy

| No | Studnets' Activity | Observation | | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|-------------|----|-----|----|----|----|-----|------|-------|-------|
| | | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII | Total | % |
| 1 | The students articulate English with correct pronunciation in simulation strategy | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 22 | 22 | 23 | 23 | 170 | 70.83 |
| 2 | The students use appropriate vocabularies in simulation strategy | 22 | 22 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 188 | 78.33 |
| 3 | The students can use rules and certain principle | 21 | 21 | 21 | 22 | 22 | 23 | 25 | 25 | 180 | 75.00 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|--------------|
| | in sentences in proper manner in simulation strategy | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | The students can express their ideas with fluency and effortless as a native speaker in simulation strategy | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 23 | 23 | 25 | 25 | 184 | 76.67 |
| 5 | The students can express their ideas with best achieved by allowing the air stream of speech to follow then as some of this speech spill over beyond comprehensibility in simulation strategy. | 22 | 22 | 23 | 23 | 25 | 25 | 26 | 26 | 192 | 80.00 |
| Total | | 107 | 107 | 109 | 110 | 115 | 118 | 124 | 124 | 914 | 76.17 |
| Percentage | | 71.33 | 71.33 | 72.67 | 73.33 | 76.67 | 78.67 | 82.67 | 82.67 | | |

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{\sum \text{observationscore}}{\text{writer'sactivity}} \times 100\% = \frac{107}{150} \times 100 = 71.33\%$$

Based on the table IV.11, it can be known that the factors that influence the students' speaking skill using simulation strategy are as follows:

1. The students articulate English with correct pronunciation in simulation strategy after observing for eight times, the total score was 170 with percentage was 70.83%.

2. The students use appropriate vocabularies in simulation strategy after observing for eight times, the total score was 188 with percentage was 78.33%.
3. The students can use rules and certain principle in sentences in proper manner in simulation strategy after observing for eight times, the total score was 180 with percentage was 75.00%.
4. The students can express their ideas with fluency and effortless as a native speaker in simulation strategy after observing for eight times, the total score was 184 with percentage was 76.67%.
5. The students can express their ideas with best achieved by allowing the air stream of speech to follow then as some of this speech spill over beyond comprehensibility in simulation strategy after observing for eight times, the total score was 192 with percentage was 80.00%.

Based on the findings above, it can be known that the most factors that influence the students' speaking skill using simulation strategy are as follows:

1. The students used appropriate vocabularies in simulation strategy after observing for eight times, the total score was 188 with percentage was 78.33%.
2. The students can express their ideas with fluency and effortless as a native speaker in simulation strategy after observing for eight times, the total score was 184 with percentage was 76.67%.

3. The students can express their ideas with best achieved by allowing the air stream of speech to follow then as some of this speech spill over beyond comprehensibility in simulation strategy after observing for eight times, the total score was 192 with percentage was 80.00%.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

In this chapter, the researcher would like to draw some conclusions from what have been discussed in the preceding chapters, and to recommend some suggestions concerning with students' speaking skill of the second year at MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi by using simulation strategy.

A. Conclusion

Research findings about using simulation strategy show that there was significant difference between students who were taught conventional and who were taught by simulation strategy one. The research finding can be concluded as follow:

1. In the first formulation of the problem, is there any significant effect of using simulation strategy toward students' speaking skill at the second year of MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi? It can be answered that there is significant effect of using simulation strategy toward students' speaking skill at the second year of MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi. This statement can be seen from the result of t-test is 4.072 higher than $t_{distribution}$ (4.072 > 1.671) in alpha decision level (α) 0,05 with the degree freedom (*d.f.* 60). It means that H_0 is rejected and the H_a is accepted. In other word, simulation strategy can improve the students' English speaking skill at at the second year of MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi.

2. In the second formulation, what are the factors do influence the use of simulation strategy toward students' speaking skill at the second year of MTs Nurul Islam Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi? It can be answered that the most of the factors that influence the students' speaking skill using simulation strategy are 1) The students use appropriate vocabularies in simulation strategy after observing for eight times, the total score was 188 with percentage was 78.33%, 2) The students can express their ideas with fluency and effortless as a native speaker in simulation strategy after observing for eight times, the total score was 184 with percentage was 76.67%, and 3) The students can express their ideas with best achieved by allowing the air stream of speech to follow then as some of this speech spill over beyond comprehensibility in simulation strategy after observing for eight times, the total score was 192 with percentage was 80.00%.

B. Suggestions

1. Suggestion for the Teacher

The researcher hopes English teacher is able to choose the effective strategy to increase students' speaking skill. Related to the result of the research, the researcher offers some suggestions as follow:

- a. Simulated strategy can give the students chance to apply their skill in speaking. Therefore, the students are able to show their ideas or

opinions in speaking. It is suggested that English teacher can adopt and apply this strategy in order to improve the students' speaking skill.

- b. Simulation provides participants with realistic and relevant contexts in which to test and develop their understanding, knowledge and competence. It is suggested that English teacher can adopt and apply this strategy in order to improve the students' speaking skill.

2. Suggestions for the Students

- a. The students should participate in simulation to improve their speaking.
- b. The students should articulate English with correct pronunciation in simulation.
- c. The students should use appropriate vocabularies in simulation.
- d. The students should use rules and certain principle in sentences in proper manner in simulation.
- e. The students should express their ideas with fluency and effortless as a native speaker in simulation.
- f. The students should express their ideas with best achieved by allowing the air stream of speech to follow then as some of this speech spill over beyond comprehensibility in simulation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brown, H. Douglas, 2001, *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy, Second Edition*, New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- CEG and SMG Australasia Alliance, *Simulation Training*, from: CEG in association with BTS is a licensed provider of Strategic Management Group, Inc® (SMG) simulation products in http://www.competitiveedgegroup.com.au/html/simulation_training.html
- Craig, Donald, *Advantages of Simulation*, from: <http://web.cs.mun.ca/~donald/msc/node6.html>, rewrite on 2010.
- Depdiknas, 2006, *Standard Kompetensi and Kompetensi Dasar Tingkat SMP/MTs*, Pekanbaru: Dikpora.
- Gay, L.R and Peter Airasian, 2000, *Educational Research Competencies for Analysis and Application*, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall. Inc.
- Harmer, J. 1984, *The Practice of English Language Teaching*, London: Longman.
- Haris. D.P. 1974, *Testing English as a Second Language*, New York: Mc Graw Book Company.
- Hayriye, Kayi, *Teaching Speaking: Activities to Promote Speaking in a Second Language*, from: <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Kayi-teachingSpeaking.html>.accessed, rewrite on 2006.
- Hornby, AS, 2000, *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (Sixth Edition)*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nana Sudjana, 2009, *Dasar-dasar Proses Belajar Mengajar*, Bandung: Sinar Baru Algensindo.
- Novia, T, 2002, *Strategy to Improve Students' Ability in Speaking*, Padang: UNP Padang.
- Nunan, David, 1991, *Language Teaching Methodology a Text Book for Teacher*, New York: Pieties Hall.
- South, Robert, *Simulation*, from: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Simulation>, rewrite on 24 May 2011.

Richard, Jack C, *et al.*, 1999, *Language Teaching Applied Linguistics*, Malaysia, VVP.

Sugiyono, Prof. Dr, 2008, *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan*, Bandung: Alfabeta.

Suharsimi Arikunto, 2006, *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*, Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brown, H. Douglas. 2001. *Teaching by Principles; an Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy, Second Edition*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc
- CEG and SMG Australasia Alliance. *Simulation Training*. From: CEG in association with BTS is a licensed provider of Strategic Management Group, Inc® (SMG) simulation products in http://www.competitiveedgegroup.com.au/html/simulation_training.html
- Craig, Donald, *Advantages of Simulation*, From; <http://web.cs.mun.ca/~donald/msc/node6.html>, rewrite on 2010.
- Depdiknas., 2006, *Standard Kompetensi and Kompetensi Dasar Tingkat SMP/MTs*. Pekanbaru: Dikpora.
- Gay, L.R and Peter Airasian, 2000. *Educational Research*, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall. Inc.
- Harmer, J. 1984, *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. London: Longman.
- Haris. D.P. 1974, *Testing English as a Second Language*. New York: Mc Graw Book Company.
- Hayriye Kayi,' *Teaching Speaking: Activities to Promote Speaking in a Second Language,*' *The Internet TESL Journal*, (Online), Vol. XII, No. 11, November 2006, <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Kayi-teachingSpeaking.html>. accessed, rewrite on 2006.
- Hornby, AS, 2000, *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (Sixth Edition)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nana Sudjana, 2009, *Dasar-dasar Proses Belajar Mengajar*, Bandung: Sinar Baru Algensindo.
- Novia, T. 2002, *Strategy to Improve Students' Ability in Speaking*. Padang: UNP Padang.
- Nunan, David. 1991, *Language Teaching Methodology a Text Book For Teacher*, New York: Pieties Hall.
- South, Robert, *Simulation*, From: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Simulation>, rewrite on 24 May 2011.

Richard, Jack C, et. al., 1999, *Language Teaching Applied Linguistics*.
Malaysia, VVP.

Sugiyono, Prof. Dr. 2008, *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Suharsimi Arikunto. 1997, *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*.
Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.