THE EFFECT OF USING GUESSING GAMES TECHNIQUE TOWARD SPEAKING ABILITY OF THE SECOND YEAR STUDENTS AT ISLAMIC JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL ITTIHADUL MUSLIMIN KOTO GASIB DISTRICT

By

SWARAH

NIM. 10714000062

FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING

STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY SULTAN SYARIF KASIM RIAU

PEKANBARU

1433 H/2012 M

SUPERVISOR APPROVAL

The thesis entitled "*The Effect of Using Guessing Games Technique toward Speaking Ability of the Second Year Students at Islamic Junior High School Ittihadul Muslimin Koto Gasib District*" is written by Swarah, NIM. 10714000062. It is accepted and approved to be examined in the meeting of final examination committee of undergraduate degree at Faculty of Education and Teacher Training of State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau.

Pekanbaru, Rabiul Akhir 12th, 1433 H
March 06th, 2012 M

Approved by

The Chairperson of English
Education Department   Supervisor

Dr. Hj. Zulhidah, M.Pd.   Nuardi, S.Pd. M.Ed.

EXAMINER APPROVAL

The thesis entitled "*The Effect of Using Guessing Games Technique toward Speaking Ability of the Second Year Students at Islamic Junior High School Ittihadul Muslimin Koto Gasib District*" is written by Swarah, NIM. 10714000062. 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 Sya`ban 25, 1433 H/July 12, 2012 M as one of requirements for Undergraduate Degree (S.Pd.) in English Education Department.

Pekanbaru, Sya'ban 25th, 1433 H
July 12th, 2012 M

Examination Committee

Chairperson   Secretary

Dr. Hj. Helmiati, M.Ag.   Dr. Hj. Zulhidah, M.Pd.
Examiner I   Examiner II

Drs. Syafaruddin, M.Pd.   Harum Natasha, M.Pd.

Dean
Faculty of Education and Teacher Training

Dr. Hj. Helmiati, M.Ag.
NIP. 197002221997032001

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Finally, the writer really realizes that there are many weaknesses on the thesis. Therefore, constructive critiques and suggestions are needed in order to improve this thesis.

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

Pekanbaru, June 19th, 2012

The writer

Swarah

NIM. 10714000062

ABSTRAK

Swarah (2012)   **: "Pengaruh Penggunaan Teknik Permainan-Permainan Menebak terhadap Kemampuan Berbicara Siswa Kelas Dua MTS Ittihadul Muslimin Kecamatan Koto Gasib ".**

Guru bahasa Inggris di MTS Ittihadul Muslimin telah menerapkan beberapa teknik dan strategi untuk meningkatkan kemampuan siswa dalam berbicara Bahasa Inggris, seperti guru mengajar siswa dengan memberikan penjelasan tentang materi dan kemudian guru meminta siswa untuk bertanya dan memberikan respon, terkadang guru menggunakan teknik cerita ulang, bermain peran, dan diskusi. Guru telah menerapkan teknik dan strategi yang menarik dan kebanyakan pelajaran berfokus pada kemampuan berbicara. Kenyataanya, para siswa masih tidak bisa berbahasa Inggris pada teks deskriptif.

Penelitian ini telah dilakukan di MTS Ittihadul Muslimin Kecamatan Koto Gasib Kabupaten Siak. Subjek penelitian ini adalah siswa- siswi kelas dua MTS Ittihadul Muslimin, obyek penelitian ini adalah Pengaruh Penggunaan Teknik Permainan- Permainan Menebak Terhadap Kemampuan berbicara Siswa dan tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui apakah ada pengaruh yang signifikan dari Penggunaan Teknik Permainan-Permainan Menebak Terhadap Kemampuan Berbicara Siswa Kelas Dua MTS Ittihadul Muslimin Kecamatan Koto Gasib.

Dalam penelitian ini, penulis menggunakan penelitian Quasi- Eksperimen. Penulis menggunakan desain Nonequivalent Control Group. Dalam penelitian ini penulis melibatkan dua kela dari kelas dua, satu kelas sebagai kelas eksperimen dan yang satu lagi sebagai kelas kontrol. Sebelum diberi perlakuan, baik kelas eksperimen maupun kelas control diberi pre-test dan post-test diberikan setelah perlakuan.

Teknik pengumpulan data yang telah digunakan adalah observasi dan tes. observasi digunakan untuk mengetahui sejauh mana pelaksanaan teknik permainan- permainan menebak di dalam proses pengajaran dan tes digunakan untuk mengetahui kemampuan siswa kelas dua MTS Ittihadul Muslimin berbicara dalam teks deskriptif. Teknik penganalisaan data yang telah digunakan adalah T-test untuk sampel yang tidak berkorelasi dengan menggunakan SPSS 16.0.

Berdasarkan analisis data T-test, t_t (5%) $<t_o>$ t_t (1%) atau 2,00 $<4.144>$ 2,65. Penulis menyimpulkan bahwa ada pengaruh yang signifikan dari Penggunaan Teknik Permainan- Permainan Menebak Terhadap Kemampuan Berbicara Siswa Kelas Dua MTS Ittihadul Muslimin Kecamatan Koto Gasib.

ABSTRACT

Swarah (2012)   **: "The Effect of Using Guessing Games Technique toward Speaking Ability of the Second Year Students at Islamic Junior High School Ittihadul Muslimin Koto Gasib District".**

The English teacher at Islamic Junior High School Ittihadul Muslimin has implemented some techniques and strategies to increase their students' speaking ability, such as the teacher taught students by giving explanation about the materials and then ask the students to question and respond, sometimes the teacher used retelling, role playing, and discussion technique. The teacher has applied an interesting technique and strategy and most lesson focus on speaking practice. In fact, the students are still not able to speak English on descriptive text.

This study was carried out at Islamic Junior High School Ittihadul Muslimin Koto Gasib District. The subject of this research was the second year students at Islamic Junior High School Ittihadul Muslimin, the object of this research was the effect of using Guessing Games Technique toward Students' speaking ability and the main objective of the research was to know the significant effect of Using Guessing Games Technique Toward Speaking Ability of the Second Year Students at Islamic Junior High School Ittihadul Muslimin Koto Gasib District.

In this research, the writer used Quasi-experimental research. The writer use Nonequivalent Control Group design. In this research two class of the second year student was participated, one class as experimental class and the other as control class. Both of experimental and control class were given a pretest before giving treatment and posttest was given after the treatment.

The techniques of collecting data used were the observation and test. The observation was used in order to find out how far the application of guessing games technique in teaching process and the test was used in order to find out the students' speaking ability on descriptive text. The technique of data analysis used was T-test formula for unrelated samples through using SPSS 16.0.

Based on the data analysis of T-test, t_t (5%) $< t_o > t_t$ (1%) or $2.00 < 4.144 > 2.65$. The writer concluded that there is significant effect of Using Guessing Games Technique toward Speaking Ability of the Second Year Students at Islamic Junior High School Ittihadul Muslimin Koto Gasib District.

<div dir="rtl">

ملخّص

سواره (٢٠١٢)   :" تأثير إستعمال تقنية العاب الخمن أما عن قدرة تكلم التلاميذ
صف الثاني في المدرسة الثانوية الإتحاد المسلمين ناحية كوتو
كاسب".

المدرس لغة الإنجليزية في المدرسة الثانوية الإتحاد المسلمين قد ثبت أنواع التقنية والإستراتجية لترقية
قدرة التلاميذ في تكلم لغة الإنجليزية، كلمدرس في تعليم التلاميذ يعطى الشرحا عن مادة الدرس ويطلب
المدرس من تلاميذه سؤالا والإستجابا، أحيانا المدرس يستعمل حكاية الدور والمناقشة. المدرس قد ثبت
التقنية والإستراتجية الجرية بغير وتيرة الواحدة. لكن كثير من التلاميذ لم يستطعوا أن يتكلموا بالجيد في لغة
الإنجليزية ولوكان في نص الوصفي.

قام هذا البحث في المدرسة الثانوية الإتحاد المسلمين ناحية كوتو غاسب مديرية سياك. أما الأفراد
من هذا البحث هو التلاميذ صف الثاني في المدرسة الثانوية الإتحاد المسلمين، وموضوعه الأثار إستعمال
تقنية العاب الخمن أما عن قدرة تكلم التلاميذ، وأما الهدف من هذا البحث فهو ليعرف هل توجد الأثار
ذو معنى من إستعمال تقنية العاب الخمن أما عن قدرة تكلم التلاميذ صف الثاني في المدرسة الثانوية
الإتحاد المسلمين ناحية كوتو غاسب.

في هذا البحث، الجنس البحث الذي إستخدم فهو البحث التجريبي. تستخدم الباحث تصميم
إمتحان الأول في مجتمع الواحد. تستخدم الباحث وحدة الفصلى الذي حول ٣٠ تلميذا. قبل تعطى
المعاملة، تقدم الباحث للتلاميذ إمتحان الأول وتعطى إمتحان الأخر بعد المعاملة.

طريقة جمع البيانات التي تستخدم هي المراقبة والإمتحان. تستخدم المراقبة ليعرف إستعمال تقنية
العاب الخمن في الفصل وتستخدم الإمتحان ليعرف قدرة التلاميذ صف الثاني في المدرسة الثانوية الإتحاد
المسلمين تتكلم في نص الوصفي. أما طريقة تحليل البيانات تستخدم الباحث فهي "الاختبار–T "، هي
ليعرف الفرق الذو معنى بين "قبل الالجي" و "بعدالالجي"

ومن تحليل البيانات،(%٥t_t) >t_o< (%١t_t) او (٢٠٠ >١٤٤ ٤< ٢٦٥).
تستخلص الباحث أن توجد الأثار ذو معنى من إستعمال تقنية العاب الخمن أما عن قدرة تكلم التلاميذ
صف الثاني في المدرسة الثانوية الإتحاد المسلمين ناحية كوتو غاسب

</div>

LIST OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. The Background of the Problem

Speaking is considered as one of the difficulties for most of Indonesian students in learning English as foreign language. According to Brown, for almost six decades now research and practice in English language teaching has identified the four skills; listening, speaking, reading, and writing as of paramount importance[1]. In other words, speaking is one of the basic language skills that become the target activity in language teaching and learning. Based on the curriculum, the purpose of studying English is that the participants are able to achieve the functional level that is communicating by oral and written to solve daily problem[2].

Islamic boarding school Ittihadul Muslimin is one of the Islamic boarding schools in Koto Gasib District. It consists of two educational institutions; they are Islamic junior high school (MTS) Ittihadul Muslimin and Islamic senior high school (MA) Ittihadul muslimin. It is located in Pangkalan Pisang Village, Koto Gasib District, Siak Regency. In Islamic junior high school Ittihadul Muslimin Koto Gasib District, English is taught 2 (two) times a week or

---

[1] H. Douglas Brown. 1994. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. (New Jersey: Prentice Hall Ryents Englewood Cliff), p. 217
[2] Elih Sutisna. 2011. *An Analysis of School Based-English Curriculum (KTSP). [Online]* Available: http://elihsutisnayanto.wordpress.com/2011/02/12/an-analysis-of-school-based-english-curriculum-ktsp/. [April 1st 2011].

160 minutes a week. The curriculum used in teaching and learning process is school-based curriculum.

One of the genres used in the first semester of the second years is descriptive text. Usually, the teacher gives lessons based on the reference book and most of lessons focus on speaking, they have speaking practice in many topics, such as retelling, role playing, and discussion. Moreover, they must speak English full a week in every two weeks. This describes that ideally, the second year students of Islamic junior high school Ittihadul Muslimin are able to speak English, at least for functional level. It is contrary with the writer's observation and teaching experience to the second year student of Islamic junior high school Ittihadul Muslimin, she found that some of the second year students were not able to speak English. Some of the students were not able to express, ask, and answer orally information of descriptive text. As a result, some of the second year students are difficult to achieve passing score standards (KKM). The passing score standards (KKM) of English subject at Islamic Junior High School Ittihadul Muslimin is 60 (sixty). After conducting an observation the researcher found some phenomena as listed below:

1. Some of the students were not able to speak English.

2. Some of the students had lack vocabulary.

3. Some of the students were not able to express orally information of descriptive text by using correct pronunciation, vocabulary, Grammar, good fluency and good comprehension.

4. Some of the students were not able to ask orally information of descriptive text by using correct pronunciation, vocabulary, Grammar, good fluency and good comprehension.

5. Some of the students were not able to answer orally information of descriptive text by using correct pronunciation, vocabulary, Grammar, good fluency and good comprehension.

Language learning is hard work. One must make an effort to understand, to repeat accurately, to adapt and to use newly understood language in conversation and in written composition. Effort is required at every moment and must be maintained over a long period of time. One of the helpful efforts is applying games in learning. Games help and encourage many learners to sustain their interest and work[3]. Games also help the teacher to create contexts in which the language is useful and meaningful. The learners want to take part, and in order to do so must understand what others are saying or have written, and they must speak or write in order to express their own point of view or give information. Games provide one way of helping the learners to experience language rather than merely study it[4]. According to Promadi, among several teaching techniques that can be used by teacher in language teaching are language games[5]. It means that Guessing Games is also kind of techniques, because guessing games is also a language game.

---

[3] Andrew Wright, et.al. 1989. *Games for Language Learning*. (New York: Cambridge University Press), p. 2

[4] *Ibid*.

[5] Promadi. 2008. *Cara Praktis Mengaplikasikan Communicative Language Teaching dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa*. (Pekanbaru: Suska Press), p. 5

Based on the explanation above, one of the games that can be used in teaching speaking is guessing games. There are many reasons a teacher uses guessing games in teaching speaking; everybody knows guessing games. It is not only children who like guessing; adults like guessing too, as shown by many popular TV programs. Games provide one way of helping the learners to experience language rather than merely study it. They give students chance to use English orally, it means that students can practice and develop their ability to speak English. In addition, Games provide fun and relax while remaining very much within the framework of language learning. It is expected for shy or slow learners can be active participants to show their ability and find their confidence in communicating in the foreign language. As the person guessing has a real urge to find out something, guessing games are true communicative situations and as such are very important for foreign language learning[6]. They are generally liked by students of all ages because they combine language practice with fun and excitement.

Based on explanation and the problems experienced by the students above, the writer is interested in conducting a research, entitled by **"The Effect of Using Guessing Games Technique Toward Speaking Ability of The Second Year Students at Islamic Junior High School Ittihadul Muslimin Koto Gasib District"**

---

[6] Friederike Klippel. 1994. *Keep Talking*, (New York: Cambridge University Press), p. 31

B. The Definition of the Term.

The writer uses some specific terms in this study. In order to avoid misunderstanding, the writer provides the definition of all the terms that is used in this study as follows:

1. Effect

Effect is change that somebody or something causes in somebody or something else[7]. It means that in this research effect is an activity that can change caused by something. So, in this research the writer wants to know the effect of using guessing games technique toward speaking ability of the students.

2. Technique

A technique is implementation that which actually takes place in the classroom. It is a particular trick, stratagem, or contrivance used to accomplish an immediate objective[8].

3. Guessing games

Guessing games is one person knows something that another one wants to find out.[9] A guessing game is a game in which the object is to guess some kind of information, such as a word, a phrase, a title, or the location of an object[10].

.

---

[7] Oxford. 2000. *Oxford Learner's Pocket Dictionary, Third Edition.* (New York: Oxford University Press), p. 138

[8] Promadi. *Op. Cit*, p. 2

[9] Friederike Klippel. *Op. Cit*, p. 31

[10] http//:en.wikipedia.orgwikiGuessing game

C. The Problem

1. The Identification of the Problem

Based on the background of the problem, it is very clear that some of the second year students at Islamic Junior high school Ittihadul Muslimin still get some problems in their speaking ability. To make it clearer, it will identify as follows:

a. Some of the students were not able to speak English.

b. Some of the students had lack vocabulary.

c. Some of the students were not able to express orally information of descriptive text by using correct pronunciation, vocabulary, Grammar, good fluency and good comprehension.

d. Some of the students were not able to ask orally information of descriptive text by using correct pronunciation, vocabulary, Grammar, good fluency and good comprehension.

e. Some of the students were not able to answer orally information of descriptive text by using correct pronunciation, vocabulary, Grammar, good fluency and good comprehension.

2. The Limitation of the Problem

Because the problem are quite broad, the writer limits the problem of the research only to some of the students were not able to express orally information of descriptive text by using correct pronunciation, vocabulary, Grammar, good fluency and good comprehension.

3. **The Formulation of the Problem**

Based on the limitation of the problem stated above, the research questions are formulated in the following questions:

a. How is the students' speaking ability that was taught by using guessing games technique?

b. How is the students' speaking ability that was taught without using guessing games technique?

c. Is there any significant difference of using Guessing games technique toward speaking ability of the second year students at Islamic junior high school Ittihadul Muslimin?

E. **The Objective and the Significance of the Research**

1. The Objective of the Study

a. To find out the students' speaking ability that was taught by using guessing games technique.

b. To find out the students' speaking ability that was taught without using guessing games technique.

c. To find out whether there is a significant difference of using guessing games technique toward speaking ability of the second year students at Islamic junior high school Ittihadul Muslimin koto Gasib District.

2. The Significance of the Study

This research is not only interesting to investigate, but also provide many benefits. The significance of this research is as follows;

a. As an alternative techniques for teacher that can be used to improve students' speaking ability.

b. Provide effective, fun, and enjoyable learning for students in improving their speaking ability.

c. Facilitating an effective technique in teaching English especially speaking skill for the head master to improve their successful curriculum.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A. The Theoretical Framework

1.   The Nature of Speaking Ability

The most important aspect of learning the language is mastering speaking. Speaking can be described as the ability of person to express their ideas. Speaking is a language skill through which someone can express ideas or information to the others. In the same way Swan said that speaking is uttering words in formal situation[11]. The intention of speaking course is often that the students should be able to express him self in the target language; to cope with basic interactive skill like exchanging greetings, thanks, and apologies; and to express his need, request information, service, and etc[12].

Speaking ability is the measure of knowing language which involves mechanics (pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary); using the right words in the right order with the correct pronunciation. Function (transaction and interaction); knowing when clarity of message is essential (transaction/information exchange) and when precise understanding is not required (interaction/ relationship building). And social cultural rules and norms (turn-taking, rate of speech, length of pauses between speakers, relative rules of participant); understanding how to take into account who is speaking to whom, in what circumstances, about what,

---

[11] Michael Swan. 2005. *Practical English Usage*. (New York: Oxford University Press), p. 134

[12] Gillian Brown and George Yule. 1983. *Teaching the Spoken Language: Approach Based on the Analysis of Conversational English*. (New York: Cambridge University Press), p. 27

for what reason[13]. Paulston and Brunder said that speaking ability is taken to be the objectives of language teaching: the production of speaker competent to communicate in target language[14].

Brown argued that there are five types of similar categories apply to the kinds of oral production that student are expected to carry out in the classroom. They are imitative, intensive, responsive, interactive, and extensive[15].

a. Imitative

The first type of speaking performance is the ability simply parrot back a word or phrase or possibly a sentence. While, this a purely phonetic level of oral production, or number of prosodic, lexical, and grammatical properties of language maybe included in the criterion performance.

b. Intensive

A second language type of speaking frequently employed in assessment contexts is the production of short stretches of oral language designed to demonstrate competence in narrow band of grammatical, phrasal, lexical, or phonological relationship (such as prosodic element–intonation, stress; rhythm, juncture).The speaker must be aware of semantic properties in order to be able to respond, but interaction with an interlocutor or test administrator is minimal at best.

---

[13] Kalayo Hasibuan & Fauzan Ansyari. 2007. *Teaching English as Foreign Language.* (Pekanbaru: Alaf Riau Graha UNRI *Press*), p. 101

[14] Christiana Bratt Paulston and Mary Newton Brunder. 1976. *Teaching English as a Second Language: Techniques and Procedures.* (Massachusetts: Wintrhrop Publisher Inc), p. 55

[15] Douglass Brown. 2003. *Language Assessment: Principle and Classroom Practice.* (California: Longman), p. 141

c. Responsive

Responsive assessment task include interaction and test comprehension but at the somewhat limited level of very short conversations, standard greetings and small talk ,simple request and comments, and the like.

d. Interactive

The difference between responsive and interactive speaking is in the length and complexity of the interaction, which sometimes include multiple exchanges and or multiple participants. Interaction can take the two forms of transactional language, which has the purpose of exchange specific information or interpersonal exchange, which have the purpose of maintaining social relationships. In interpersonal exchange, oral production can become pragmatically complex with the need to speak in a casual register and use colloquial language, ellipsis, slang, humor, and other sociolinguistics conventions.

e. Extensive (monologue)

Extensive oral production task include speeches, oral presentation, and storytelling during which the opportunity for oral interaction from listener is either high limited (perhaps to nonverbal responses) or ruled out all together.

2. The Components of Speaking Ability

According to Harris as quoted by Mardiansyah, there are five components of speaking ability. They are Pronunciation, Grammar, Vocabulary, Fluency and Comprehension[16].

---

[16] Mardiansyah. 2009. "*The correlation between Student'Vocabulary* Mastery and Their *Speaking abilty at the first Year* of *SMU 1 Kuantan Hilir Kuansing*. (Pekanbaru ;Unpublished), p. 4

a. Pronunciation

Pronunciation is way a in which a language or a particular sound is spoken[17]. Pronunciation is necessary in speaking since it has sounds that express meaning. Then Brown said, pronounciation was a key to gaining full communicative competence. Pronunciation classes consisted of imitation drills, memorization of pattern, minimal pair exercise,and explanations of articulatory phonetics[18].

b. Vocabulary

According to Richards vocabulary is a core component of language proficiency and provides mark of the basis for how well learners speak, listen, and write[19] without an extensive strategy for acquiring new vocabulary, learners often achieves less for their speaking. Then brown said that vocabullary is not as a long and boring list of words, vocabullary is seen in its central role in contextualized, meaningful language. Vocabullary was also the focus of drills, exercise, and memorization efforts[20].

c. Grammar

One of the important aspects that support speaking in English is grammar. Grammar is an essential language instruction to be learned. According to Douglass Brown "Grammar is a system of rules governing the conventional

---

[17] Oxford Learner's Pocket Dictionary. *Op. Cit*, p. 343
[18] H. Douglass Brown. *Op. Cit*, p. 258-259
[19] Jack C. Richards and Willy A. Renandya. 2002. *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*. (New York: Cambridge University Press), p. 255
[20] H. Douglass Brown. *Op. Cit*, p. 365

arrangement and relationship of words in a sentence"[21]. Furthermore as quoted by Douglass Brown, Larsen-Freeman point out that grammar is one of three dimensions of language that is interelated. Grammar gives us the form or the structures of language themselves, but those forms are literaly meeaningless without second dimension, that of meaning/semantic, and third dimension, pragmatics. In other words, grammar tells us how to construct a sentence(word order, verb and noun systems, modifiers, phrases, clauses, etc.). semantic tells us something about the meaning of words and strings of words-or, we should say meaning there may be several. Then pragmatic tells us about which of several meanings to assign given the context of a sentence[22].

d. Fluency

Fluency (also called volubility and loquaciousness) is the property of a person or of a system that delivers information quickly and with expertise. Again Brown point out fluency is the ability of speaker to convey their language by flowing, natural. Fluency may in many communicative language courses be an initial goal in language teaching[23].

e. Comprehension

Comprehension is ability to understand something[24]. Since speaking is an activity of reproducing words orally in which there is a process of exchanging ideas between a speaker and a listener, it is important to have comprehension as the nest component of speaking. If the listener cannot comprehend or understand

---

[21] *Ibid,* p. 347
[22] *Ibid,* p. 348
[23] *Ibid*, p. 254
[24] Oxford Learner's Pocket Dictionary. *Op. Cit*, p. 83

what the speaker says, there must be misunderstanding for what the speaker means. Contemporary theories of comprehension emphasize that it is an active process drawing both on information contained in the message as well as background knowledge, information from the context and from the listener's and speaker's purposes or intentions.

3.   The Factors Influence Speaking Ability

Speaking ability is an important part in language teaching. Without speaking ability, teacher cannot achieve the good proficiency in English. In teaching speaking there are four factors influence speaking ability, they are:

a. Anxiety in Speaking

Anxiety in speaking is one of many factors that influence speaking ability because of anxiety student cannot express their ideas through speaking. According Spielberger as quoted by Brown anxiety ask the subject feeling of tension, apprehension, nervousness, and worry associated with an arousal of the autonomic nervous systems[25]. In the same source, anxiety is associated with feelings uneasiness, frustration, self-doubt, apprehension or worry[26]. It can be concluded that anxiety in speaking even becomes the big barriers for student in speaking.

b. Speaking Environment

Environment of students also become a factor influencing speaking. Environment where student live or grow up can help and enhance the ability in speaking. If students live in environment where they can get opportunity to speak, ideally in a classroom setting they are able to deliver their idea in front of other.

---

[25] H. Douglass Brown. 2007. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching, Fifth Edition.* (San Francisco: Longman), p. 161
[26] *Ibid*

According to Amy Nutt, being in an English speaking environment will improving your English speaking skills by helping you communicate more easily and effectively. When you are constantly hearing and speaking English on a daily basis, you can dramatically improve how you speak and understand the language. You will learn English idioms and slang, pronunciation, and meanings of words and phrases. You will gain more confidence as you listen and learn. Interacting with others will also boost your confidence as you become more comfortable with speaking the language[27].

c. Teaching Strategy

Kalayo said that in the communicative model of language, teaching instructors help their students develop this body of knowledge by providing authentic practice that prepares students for real-life communication situation[28]. To help the student to develops the ability to produce grammatically, correct, logically connected sentence that are appropriate to specific context, and to do using acceptable (that is comprehensible) pronunciation.

d. Media

Media also gives influence toward the developments of someone ability in speaking. According Hamidjojo as quoted by Arsyad, media as mediation is used to convey the ideas and opinions to receiver[29]. It can be concluded that using media takes important role in developing students' speaking ability.

---

[27] Amy Nutt. 2011. An English Speaking Environment Highly Improves English. [Online] Skillshttp://ezinearticles.com/?An-English-Speaking-Environment-Highly-Improves-English-Skills&id=2762535. [July 18th 2012].

[28] Kalayo Hasibuan and Fauzan Ansyari, *Op.Cit*, 101

[29] Azar Arsyad. 2011. *Media Pembelajaran.* (Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada), p. 4

4.   Guessing Games in Teaching Speaking

There is common perception that all learning should be serious and solemn in nature and that if ones are having fun and there is hilarity and laughter, then it is not learning. This is a misconception. It is possible to learn a language as well as enjoy oneself the sometime. One best way of doing this is trough games. Games can be applied in teaching – learning English. This idea is supported by Andrew Wright, Betteridge and Buckby "games help and encourage many learners to sustain their interest and work"[30].

There are many reasons a teacher uses games in teaching speaking; Games provide one way of helping the learners to experience language rather than merely study it, games give students chance to use English orally, it means that students can practice and develop their ability to speak English, and Games provide fun and relax while remaining very much within the framework of language learning. It is expected for shy or slow learners can be active participants to show their ability and find their confidence in communicating in the foreign language.

Among many techniques of guessing in teaching speaking, guessing games can be applied in the teaching of speaking. "Guessing games are true communicative situation and such are very important for foreign language learning"[31]. Guessing games are liked by students all of ages from children until adult, it arouses considerable interest and encourages the learners to communicate because it is combination between language practice with fun and excitement.

---

[30] Andrew Wright, et. al. *Loc. Cit*, p. 2
[31] Klippel. *Op.cit*, p. 31

According to Klippel, variation is vital ingredients of good games. We can try changing the rules of familiar games or doing thing in different order, and we will find that one game idea can be the nucleus of many new games[32]. Klippel proposes several guessing games that are appropriate in teaching speaking, some of them are; Most names, and what's in the box?He states that these games are aiming for speaking skill[33].

    a.   Most Names

Aims   : Skill - Speaking

                     Language - yes/no questions.

Organization   : Individuals

Time   : 15-25 minutes Procedure

Procedure   : *Step1;* without letting the student see it, the teacher fixes a name tag to each student's back.

                     Step2; the students circulate around the room .They have to find out by asking yes/ no question 'who' they are. They are not allowed to ask any person more than three questions. As soon as somebody has found out who he is, he tells the teacher .if he is right he receives a new name tag. The student who has most names tags on his back-and thus has guessed' his' different personalities most quickly in a given time (20 minutes) -is declared the winner,

---

[32] *Ibid,* p. 32
[33] *Ibid,* p. 32-39

Remarks   : Many more names can be added, depending on the students' cultural background and who is in the news at the time.

b. What's in the box?

Aims   : Skill – Speaking.

Language – questions, explaining the *use* of an object without knowing its name

Organization   : Pairs

Preparation   : As many small containers (cigar boxes, matchboxes, tobacco tins, etc) as there are students; one little objects (safety –pins, stamp, pencil-sharpener, etc.) inside each container.

Time   : 10-30 minutes

Procedure   : Each student works with a partner. One student from each pair fetches a box and looks inside without letting his partner see what is in the box. The second student has to guess the object. If you think the students don't know the names of the objects, a piece of paper with the name (and the pronunciation) written on it should also be placed in the box. When the first student is quite sure his partner has guessed the object correctly (by describing its function or appearance) he tells him the name. The second student then fetches a box and lets the other one guess.

In applying guessing games in teaching speaking, make sure that the players know all the words and structures necessary for the games. If you are not sure, a trial run through the game may refresh your students' memories and show whether any revision is needed before you start playing in earnest. A trial run also has the advantage that the rules are demonstrated to the all players. Another element to be considered before playing is the organization of the game, in order to guarantee that as many students as possible are actively participating most of the time. If you are playing a guessing game as a team contest it may be necessary to damp down the very competitive- minded[34].

B. The Relevant research

According to Syafi'i[35], relevant research is required to observe some pervious researchers conducted by other researchers in which they are relevant to our research itself. Below are some researches that were conducted by previous students of English Education Department of State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau relevant to this research:

1. A research that was conducted by Hardi Mulia, the title " The Use of Guessing Word Game Technique in Increasing Students Motivation in Speaking English at the Second Year Students of SMPN 1 Muaralembu". He found that there is a significant difference on the students' motivation in speaking English those who use Guessing word game and those who do not.

2. A research that was conducted by Yunistira Pernanda, the title is "The Effectiveness of Group Work Technique in Increasing Student Ability in

---

[34] *Ibid*. p. 31

[35] M. Syafi'i. S. 2007. *From Paragraph to a Research Report: A Writing of English for Academic Purpose*. (Pekanbaru: Lembaga Bimbingan Belajar Syaf Intensif/ LBSI), p. 122

Speaking English at the Second Year Students of SMPN 1 Muaralembu. She found that Group Work Technique is effective in increasing student ability in speaking English.

C. The Operational Concept

The operational concept is the concepts used in accordance with literature reviewed. In order to avoid misunderstanding in carrying out the research, it is necessary to clarify briefly the variable used in this study. The indicators are clue and strategies applied in the implementation of various methods.

1. The procedures of using guessing games technique as the independent variable, symbolized by "x", the indicators are :

   a. Teacher prepares the lesson material of descriptive text.

   b. Teacher explains the rule, word, and structures of the game.

   c. Teacher asks the students to do the trial of the game.

   d. Teacher revises or re-explains the rule of the game if needed.

   e. Teacher begins the game and observes about the process, whether the game works or not.

   f. Teacher evaluates their learning process.

2. The students' speaking ability as the dependent variable, symbolized by "y". The indicators are :

   Students are able to express orally information of descriptive text by using correct pronunciation, vocabulary, Grammar, good fluency and good comprehension.

D. The Assumption and Hypothesis

1. The Assumption

In this research, researcher assumes that using Guessing games technique in the teaching process is more effective than without using it.

2. The Hypothesis

H_o: There is no significant difference of Using Guessing games technique toward speaking ability of the second year students at Islamic junior high school Ittihadul Muslimin.

H_a: There is a significant difference of Using guessing games technique toward speaking ability of the second year students at Islamic junior high school Ittihadul Muslimin.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. The Research Design

This research is experimental research. According to John W. Cresswell, "experiment is you test an idea (or practice procedure) to determine whether it influences an outcome or dependent variable[36]. The research design is Quasi-Experiment type Nonequivalent Control Group. In conducting this research, the researcher used two classes as experimental class and control class. Both of experimental and control class got a pretest at the beginning, different treatment in the middle and posttest at the end of the research[37]. The posttest results of experimental and control class were compared in order to determine the effect of the treatment.

Table III.1

Research Design

CLASS	PRE- TEST	TREATMENT	POST- TEST
Experimental Class	O_1	X_1	O_2
Control Class	O_1	X_2	O_2

O_1 is test given before giving a treatment. O_2 is test given after giving a treatment. X_1 is treatment that given to experimental class (using guessing games

---

[36] Jhon. W.Cresswell. 2008. *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. (New Jersey: Person Education), p. 299

[37] L. R Gay and Peter Arisian. 2000. *Educational Research Competencies for Analysis and Application 6th edition*. (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc), p. 395

technique). X_2 is treatment that given to control class (without using guessing games technique).

B. The Time and the Location of the Research

The research was conducted at Islamic Junior High School Ittihadul Muslimin Koto Gasib district. It is located in Koto Gasib district, Siak regency. It was conducted on September- Oktober 2011.

C. The Subject of the Research

The subject of this research was the second year students at Islamic junior High school Ittihadul Muslimin.

D. The Object of the Research

The object of this research was the effect of using Guessing games technique toward students' speaking ability.

E. The Population and the Sample

The population of this research was the second year students of Islamic Junior High School Ittihadul Muslimin in academic years 2011-2012. It has 2 classes. The number of the second year students of Islamic Junior high school Ittihadul Muslimin is 60 students.

Table III.2

Student Population

NO	CLASS	POPULATION		
		FEMALE	MALE	TOTAL
1	A	20	10	30
2	B	20	10	30
TOTAL		40	20	60

Because the design of the research was Nonequivalent Control Group design, so the technique sampling used in this research was cluster sampling. According to Gay, cluster sampling randomly select groups, not individual[38]. Then, after doing cluster sampling researcher got class B as experimental class and class A as control class. In class B there were 30 students and in class A also 30 students.

F. The Technique of Collecting Data

1. Observation

According to Suharsimi, observation is an activity that is concerned on some objects by using the five of senses[39]. Observation is the way to get some data, by observing the object of the research. In this research, observation will be used to collect data on the application guessing games technique in teaching process. While the researcher did the treatment, one person (teacher) contributed as observer. He or she followed the treatment process and checked whether the observation list was done or not. The observation list was collected and analyzed in order to consider how far the implementation of the treatment in the classroom.

2. Oral Presentation Test

Oral Presentation Test was used to collect data about students' speaking ability in Descriptive text (express, ask, and answer orally information of descriptive text). Oral presentations Test was divided in two phases:

[38] *Ibid*. p. 129
[39] Suharsimi Arikunto. 2006. *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. (Jakarta Rineka Cipta), p. 156

a. Pre-Test

Pre- Test was used to collect data about students' speaking ability in describing people (Descriptive Text) before applying guessing games technique. In the pre-test section researcher spreads some pictures of people to both of experimental and control class, then let students to choose one of these pictures. Afterward, researcher asked the students to describe picture that they had chosen in approximately 2-3 minutes. While students presented their presentation of describing people, researcher recorded students' performance using audio recorder. These data of audio recorder were analyzed by two raters.

b. Post-Test

Post- Test was used to collect data about students' speaking ability in describing People (Descriptive Text) after being taught by using guessing games technique (experimental class), and after being taught without using guessing games technique (control class). In this section researcher spreads some pictures of certain animation people to both of experimental and control class, then let students to choose one of these pictures. Afterward researcher asked the students to describe picture that they had chosen in approximately 2-3 minutes. While students presented their presentation of describing people, researcher recorded students' performance by using audio recorder. These data audio of students' post-test of experimental class and post-test of control class then were analyzed and compared.

G. The Technique of Data Analysis

According to Hughes, there are some components that should be considered in giving students' speaking ability score: They are accent, grammatical, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension[40]. So, Hughes describes the rating as follows:

1. Accent

Table III. 3

Accent

CATEGORY	REQUIREMENT
6	Native pronunciation, with no trace of "foreign accent.
5	No conspicuous mispronunciations, but would not be taken for a native speaker.
4	Marked "foreign accent" and occasional mispronunciations which is do not interfere with understanding.
3	"Foreign accent" requires concentrated listening, and mispronunciations lead to occasional misunderstanding and apparent errors in grammar or vocabulary.
2	Frequent gross errors and a very heavy accent make understanding difficult, require frequent repetition.
1	Pronunciation frequently unintelligible.

---

[40] Artur Hughes. 1989. *Testing for Language Teachers*. (United Kingdom: Cambridge University), p. 111

2. Grammar

Table III.4

Grammar

CATEGORY	REQUIREMENT
6	No more than two errors during the interview.
5	Few errors, with no patterns of failure.
4	Occasional errors showing imperfect control of some patterns but no weakness that causes misunderstanding.
3	Frequent errors showing some major patterns uncontrolled and causing occasional irritation and misunderstanding.
2	Contrast errors showing control of very few major patterns and frequently preventing communication.
1	Grammar almost entirely inaccurate expert in stock phrases.

3. Fluency

Table III.5

Fluency

CATEGORY	REQUIREMENT
6	Speech on all professional and general topics as effortless and smooth as native speaker's
5	Speech is effortless and smooth, but perceptively non-active in speed and evenness.
4	Speech is occasionally hesitant, with some unevenness caused by rephrasing and grouping for words.
3	Speech is frequently hesitant and jerky; sentences may be left uncompleted.
2	Speech is very slow and uneven expert for short routine sentence.
1	Speech is also halting and fragmentary as to make conversation virtually impossible.

4. Vocabulary

Table III.6

Vocabulary

CATEGORY	REQUIREMENT
6	Vocabulary apparently as accurate and extensive as that of an educative native speaker
5	Professional vocabulary broad and precise; general vocabulary adequate to cope with complex practical problems and varied social situations.
4	Professional vocabulary adequate to discuss special interest: general vocabulary permits discussions of any non-technical subject with some circumlocutions..
3	Choices of words sometime inaccurate, limitation of vocabulary prevent discussion of some common professional and social topics.
2	Vocabulary limited to basic personal and survival areas (time, food, transportation, family, etc)
1	Vocabulary inadequate for event the simplest conversations.

5. Comprehension

Table III.7

Comprehension

CATEGORY	REQUIREMENT
6	Understand everything in both formal and colloquial speech to be expected of an educated native speaker.
5	Understand everything in normal educated conversations except for very colloquial or low-frequency items, or exceptionally rapid or slurred speech.
4	Understanding quite well normal educated speech when engaged in a dialogue, but require the occasional repetitions and rephrasing.
3	Understanding careful, somewhat simplified speech when engaged in dialogue, but may require considerable repetitions and rephrasing.
2	Understands only slow, very simple speech on common social and touristic topics; require constants repetition and rephrasing.
1	Understanding too little for the simple types of conversations.

The Researcher used following form to assess the speaking ability of students;

Table III.8

**Assessment Aspects of Speaking
Monologue Descriptive Text**

NO	ASPECTS ASSESSED	SCORE			
		1	2	3	4
1	Accent				
2	Grammar				
3	Vocabulary				
4	Fluency				
5	Comprehension				
	Total Maximum Score	20			

Explanation of score:

1 = incompetent

2 = competent enough

3 = competent

4 = very competent

Final score = $\dfrac{\text{Total score}}{\text{Maximum score}} \times 100$

So, based on the description above, the classification of the students'
Speaking Ability can be drawn as follows:

Table III.9

Classification of the Students' Score
In Term of the Level Ability

SCORE	CLASSIFICATION
80-100	Excellent
66-79	Good
56-65	Average
40-55	Poor
30-39	Vail

[41].

To analyze the implementation of guessing games technique, the
researcher used formula[42]:

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100\%$$

Where:

P   = Total Percentage

F   = Frequency

N   = Number of cases

---

[41] Suharsimi Arikunto. 2009. *Dasar- dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan*. (Jakarta: Bumi Aksara), p. 245

[42] Anas Sudijono. 2000. *Pengantar Statistik Pendidikan*, (Jakarta: PT Grafindo Persada), p. 40

To classify the percentage of the implementation of guessing games technique can be drawn as follows:

TABLE III.10

The Percentage of Implementation of Guessing Games Technique

SCORE	CLASSIFICATION
81-100%	Very Good
61-80%	Good
41-60%	Enough
21-40%	Less
<21%	Very less

[43].

In order to analyze the students' speaking ability in descriptive text, the researcher used passing score standard of English Lesson in MTs Ittihadul Muslimin (KKM). The passing score for the students' speaking ability of descriptive text is 60. It means for those who get score <60, they do not pass passing score standard (KKM). While, for those who get score 60, they pass passing score standard (KKM).

Then, in order to find out whether there is significant difference between students' speaking ability that was taught by using guessing games technique and that was taught without using guessing games technique, the data were analyzed statistically. In analyzing the data, the writer used score of post-test of control class and post-test of experimental class. The different mean was analyzed by using T-test formula for non related sample through using SPSS 16.0[44].

---

[43] Suharsimi Arikunto. 2009. *Evaluasi Program Pendidikan.* (Jakarta: Bumi Aksara), p. 35

[44] Hartono. 2008. *SPSS 16.0: Analisis Data Statistika dan Penelitian.* (Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar), p. 162- 175

The comparison between t_o and t_t as follows;

The significant level chosen in analyzing the score t_o through using T-test formula is 5% and 1%.

Statistically the hypotheses are:

Ha: $t_o > t_t$

Ho: t_o t_t

Ha is accepted if $t_o > t_t$ or there is significant difference of using guessing games technique toward speaking ability of the second year students of Islamic Junior High School Ittihadul Muslimin Koto Gasib District.

Ho is accepted if t_o t_t or there is no significant difference of using guessing games technique toward speaking ability of the second year students of Islamic Junior High School Ittihadul Muslimin Koto Gasib District.

H. The Validity and the Reliability of the Test

1. The Validity of the Test

Validity refers to appropriateness of a given test or any of its components part as a measure of what it is purposed to measure. A test is said to be valid if it measures what to be measured. There are several type of validity namely; face validity, content validity, external validity, internal validity, and construct

validity[45]. Face validity relates to content validity but assesses informally and/or intuitively whether the instrument appears to measure what it purposed to measure. Content validity considers formally the extent to which a particular instrument measures accurately what it is claimed to measure. A group of expert would normally decide on this, focusing on the instrument's representativeness and comprehensiveness. External validity is of little value unless it has been preceded by adequate address of internal validity concern, which give us confidence in the basic descriptive conclusion drawn from the data themselves. Internal validity is the extent to which the result of the study can be put down to the treatment applied rather than to the design of the study. It also reflects on the degree to which sound conclusion can be drawn about the result of the study. Construct validity describes the extent to which a particular instrument measures accurately construct of interest that have been obtained theoretically.

The writer concluded that this research belongs to the content validity, because the test reflect to what the student have learned the content of the curriculum.

2. The Reliability of the Test

Reliability is a measure of how consistent repeated measurements are when performed under comparable condition[46]. A test is said to be reliable if it can produce stable or consistent scores although the test is administered at

---

[45] Graeme Keith Porte. 2002. *Appraising Research in Second Language Learning: A Practical Approach to Critical Analysis of Quantitative Research*. (Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing), p. 232-233

[46] *Ibid*, p. 243

different time. Reliability is a very important characteristic of a test. A test is not valid unless it is reliable. There are some factors which affect the reliability of a test, namely; the sample performance, the number of items, the administration of the test, the students' motivation and other factors beyond the control of the tester (such as students sickness, etc).

The writer concluded that this research belongs to the inter-rater reliability. According to L.R Gay[47] Inter judge reliabilty can be obtained by having two (more) judges independently score the test and then compare the scores each judge gave to each test takes.The scores of judge 1 can be correlated with the score of judge 2.The higher the correlation,the higher the inter judge reliabilty.For estimating reliability, the independent test scores of two raters were used. This is usually the situation when the test is measuring components speaking ability or writing ability. In this research, the writer used inters raters to measure the reliability of the instrument. The writer used two raters in analyzing the test. They are Mr. Yasir Amri, M. Pd and Miss Kurnia Budiyanti, M. Pd who measured the speaking ability of the students accurately.

---

[47] L.R.Gay and Peter Airasian.2000 *Educational Reseach;Competencies for Analysis and Application.sixth Edition.(*New Jersey:Prenticet -Hall Inc), p. 175

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND THE DATA ANALYSIS

A. The Description of the Data

The data of the research were the score of students' pos- test of control class and post-test of experimental class. The purposes of this research were to find out the significant difference between speaking ability of the students that was taught by using guessing games technique and that was taught without using guessing games technique and to find out the effect of using guessing games technique toward speaking ability of the students. The speaking test is about describing people (descriptive text) and was evaluated by concerning five components: pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension. Each component had its score.

B. The Data Presentation

1. The Data Collection Procedure

The data of this research were gotten by the researcher from pre-test and post-test. The data were collected through the following procedures:

a. The students of control class and experimental class got pre-test: researcher asked them to do oral presentation of describing people (descriptive text) after they got material of descriptive text without using guessing games technique.

b. The students of control class and experimental class got post-test: researcher asked them to do oral presentation of describing people (descriptive text) after they got material of descriptive text without using guessing games technique (Control class) and by guessing games technique (experimental class).

c. The students' speaking was recorded by the writer and saved into CD. Then it was collected to evaluate the appropriate pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension.

d. The researcher used two raters to evaluate the students' record and finally the writer calculated these scores.

2. The Description of the Implementation of Guessing Games Technique

TABLE IV.1

The Recapitulation of the Observation

NO	ITEM OBSERVED	OBSERVATION TIMES						TOTAL			
		1	2	3	4	5	6	Yes	%	No	%
1	Teacher tells to the students about genre that they will use in the lesson.							6	100%	0	0%
2	The teacher prepares lesson materials fit to the genre and suitable for the language level of the students.							6	100%	0	0%
3	The teacher organizes guessing games fit to the lesson materials given.	-						5	83.3%	1	16.7%
4	The teacher do brainstorming							6	100%	0	0%
5	The teacher explains about the significance of learning materials.		-					5	83.3%	1	16.7%

NO	ITEM OBSERVED	OBSERVATION TIMES						TOTAL			
		1	2	3	4	5	6	Yes	%	No	%
6	The teacher conveys lesson material by using guessing games between learning process.	-						5	83.3%	1	16.7%
7	The teacher analyzes whether her guessing games work or not, while she tries to maximize students' feed back.			-				5	83.3%	1	16.7%
8	The teacher together with the students evaluates students' performances.	-			-			4	66.7%	2	33.3%
9	The teacher evaluates students' achievement in mastering lesson materials given.		-					5	83.3%	1	16.7%
TOTAL								47	87.04%	7	12.96%

From the table above, it is found that the researcher did 6 or 100% of the first item of observation. It means that the teacher applied the first item in the category of very good. The Second item of observation, the researchers did 6 or 100%. It means that the teacher applied the second item in the category of very good. From the Third item, the researcher did 5 or 83.3% and no 1 or 16.7%, it means that the teacher has applied in the category of very good. The fourth item of observation, researcher did 6 or 100%, it means that the teacher applied the fourth item in the category of very good, then from the fifth item, the researcher did 5 or 83.3% and no 1 or 16.7%, it means that the teacher applied this item in the category of very good. The sixth item, the researcher did 5 or 83.3% and no 1 or 16.7%, it means that the teacher applied this item in the category of very good.

The seventh item, the researchers did 5 or 83.3% and no 1 or 16.7%, it means that the teacher has applied the item in the category of very good. The eighth item, the researcher did 4 or 66.7% and no 2 or 33.3%, it means the teacher has applied the item in the category of good. And the last item the researcher did 5 or 83.3% and no 1 or 16.7%, it means that the teacher applied this item in the category of very good. Based on the recapitulation of the observation above, it can be concluded that, the implementation of guessing games technique got total 87.04% it means that it is categorized into Very Good.

3. The Description of Students' Pre-test Score of Control Class

Table IV. 2

**The Distribution Frequency of
Students' Pre-Test Score of Control Class**

NO	SCORE	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE (%)
1	50	1	3.3%
2	52.5	8	26.7%
3	55	2	6.7%
4	57.5	9	30%
5	60	4	13.3%
6	62.5	2	6.7%
7	65	2	6.7%
8	67.5	1	3.3%
9	70	1	3.3%
Total		30	100%

Based on the table, it can be seen that 1 students got score 50 (3.3%), 8 students got score 52.5 (26.7%), 2 students got score 55 (6.7%), 9 students got score 57.5 (30%), 4 students got score 60 (13.3%), 2 student got score 62.5 (6.7%), 2 students got score 65(6.7%), 1 student got score 67.5(3.3%), and 1 student got score 70(3.3%). The highest frequency was 9 at score 57.5. The total frequency was 30. Based on the data obtained, there were 20 students who did not

get score   60. It means only 10 students can pass the passing score standard (KKM) stated by Islamic Junior High School Ittihadul Muslimin.

4. The Description of Students' Pre-test Score of Experimental Class

Table IV. 3

The Distribution Frequency of
Students' Pre-Test Score of Experimental Class

NO	SCORE	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE (%)
1	50	5	16.7%
2	52.5	5	16.7%
3	55	4	13.3%
4	57.5	6	20%
5	60	5	16.7%
6	62.5	1	3.3%
7	65	2	6.7%
8	67.5	1	3.3%
9	72.5	1	3.3%
Total		30	100%

Based on the table, it can be seen that 5 students got score 50 (16.7%), 5 students got score 52.5 (16.7%), 4 students got score 55 (13.3%), 6 students got score 57.5 (20%), 5 students got score 60 (16.7%), 1 student got score 62.5 (3.3%), 2 students got score 65(6.7%), 1 student got score 67.5(3.3%), and 1 student got score 72.5(3.3%). The highest frequency was 6 at score 57.5. The total frequency was 30. Based on the data obtained, there were 20 students who did not get score   60. It means only 10 students can pass the passing score standard (KKM) stated by Islamic Junior High School Ittihadul Muslimin.

5. The Description of Students' Post-test Score of Control Class

Table IV. 4

**The Distribution Frequency of
Students' Post-Test Score of Control Class**

NO	SCORE	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE (%)
1	50	2	6.7%
2	52.5	0	0%
3	55	2	6.7%
4	57.5	2	6.7%
5	60	7	23.3%
6	62.5	8	26.7%
7	65	4	13.3%
8	67.5	2	6.7%
9	70	1	3.3%
10	72.5	2	6.7%
	Total	30	100%

Based on the table, it can be seen that 2 student got score 50 (6.7%), 2 student got score 55(3.3%), 2 student got score 57.5 (3.3%), 7 students got score 60 (23.3%), 8 students got score 62.5 (26.7%), 4 students got score 65 (13.3%), 2 students got score 67.5 (26.7%), 1 students got score 70 (3.3%), and 2 students got score 72.5 (6.7%). The highest frequency was 8 at score 62.5. The total frequency was 30. Based on the data obtained, there were 6 students who did not get score   60. It means 24 students can pass the passing score standard (KKM) stated by Islamic Junior High School Ittihadul Muslimin.

6. The Description of Students' Post-test Score of Experimental Class

Table IV. 5

**The Distribution Frequency of
Students' Post-Test Score of Experimental Class**

NO	SCORE	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE (%)
1	55	2	6.7%
2	57.5	1	3.3%
3	60	1	3.3%
4	62.5	2	6.7%
5	65	5	16.7%
6	67.5	3	10%
7	70	8	26.7%
8	72.5	3	10%
9	75	3	10%
10	77.5	2	6.7%
Total		30	100%

Based on the table, it can be seen that 2 student got score 55 (6.7%), 1 student got score 57.5 (3.3%), 1 student got score 60 (3.3%), 2 students got score 62.5 (6.7%), 5 students got score 65 (16.7%), 3 students got score 67.5 (10%), 8 students got score 70 (26.7%), 3 students got score 72.5 (10%), 3 students got score 75 (10%), and 2 students got score 77.5(6.7%). The highest frequency was 8 at score 70. The total frequency was 30. Based on the data obtained, there were 3 students who did not get score 60. It means 27 students can pass the passing score standard (KKM) stated by Islamic Junior High School Ittihadul Muslimin.

C. The Data Analysis

The data analysis presented the statistical result followed by the discussion about the effect of using guessing games technique toward students' speaking ability of the second year at Islamic Junior High School Ittihadul Muslimin Koto Gasib District. The data were divided into two, they were pre-test and post-test.

To analyze the data in the chapter III, the mean score (M) and the standard deviation (SD) were analyzed by using formula trough SPSS 16.0 Version.

1. **The Data Analysis of Students' Pre-Test Score of Control Class**

The data of students' pre-test score of control class were obtained from the result of their speaking ability. The data can be described as follows:

Table IV. 6

Students' Pre-Test Score of Control Class

NO	SCORE (X)	FREQUENCY (f)	PASSING SCORE STANDARD
1	50	1	Failed
2	52.5	8	Failed
3	55	2	Failed
4	57.5	9	Failed
5	60	4	Pass
6	62.5	2	Pass
7	65	2	Pass
8	67.5	1	Pass
9	70	1	Pass
Total		f= 30	

Based on the data obtained, 20 students could not pass the passing score standard (KKM), or the score obtained < 60 while 10 Students could pass the passing score standard (KKM), or the score obtained 60. The percentage of students which could not pass the graduated standard as follows:

$\frac{20}{30}$ x 100 = 66.7%

The percentage of students which could pass the graduated standard as follows:

$\frac{10}{30}$ x 100 = 33.3%

So, mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) can be obtained statistically by using SPSS 16.0 as follows;

Table IV. 7

**Mean and Standard Deviation of
Pre-Test Score of Control Class**

	TECHNIQUE	N	MEAN	STD. DEVIATION	STD. ERROR MEAN
Score	1 (Conventional)	30	57.6667	4.95381	.90444

From the table above, the distance between mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) is too far. In other words, the score obtained are normal. From mean score 57.67, it is concluded that Students' speaking ability of control class on pre-test is categorized into Average level.

2. The Data Analysis of Students' Pre-Test Score of Experimental Class

The data of students' pre-test score of experimental class were obtained from the result of their speaking ability. The data can be described as follows:

Table IV. 8

Students' Pre-Test Score of Experimental Class

NO	SCORE (Y)	FREQUENCY(f)	PASSING SCORE STANDARD
1	50	5	Failed
2	52.5	5	Failed
3	55	4	Failed
4	57.5	6	Failed
5	60	5	Pass
6	62.5	1	Pass
7	65	2	Pass
8	67.5	1	Pass
10	72.5	1	Pass
Total		30	

Based on the data obtained, 20 students could not pass the passing score standard (KKM). The percentage of students which could not pass the passing score standard as follows:

$\frac{20}{30}$ x100 = 66.7%

Students who could pass the passing score standard were 10. The percentage of students which could pass the passing score standard as follows:

$\frac{10}{30}$ x100 = 33.3%

So, mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) can be obtained statistically by using SPSS 16.0 as follows;

Table IV. 9

**Mean and Standard Deviation of
Pre-Test Score of Experimental Class**

	TECHNIQUE	N	MEAN	STD. DEVIATION	STD. ERROR MEAN
Score	2 (Conventional)	30	57.0000	5.62476	1.02694

From the table above, the distance between mean (M) and Standard Deviation (SD) is too far. In other words, the score obtained are normal. From mean score 57, it is concluded that Students speaking ability of experimental class on pre-test is categorized into Average level.

3. The Data Analysis of Students' Post-Test Score of Control Class

The data of students' post-test score of control class were obtained from the result of their speaking ability. The data can be described as follows:

Table IV. 10

Students' Post-Test Score of Control Class

NO	SCORE (X)	FREQUENCY (f)	PASSING SCORE STANDARD
1	50	2	Failed
2	52.5	0	Failed
3	55	2	Failed
4	57.5	2	Failed
5	60	7	Pass
6	62.5	8	Pass
7	65	4	Pass
8	67.5	2	Pass
9	70	1	Pass
10	72.5	2	Pass
Total		f= 30	

Based on the data obtained, 6 students could not pass the passing score standard (KKM), or the score obtained < 60 while 24 Students could pass the passing score standard (KKM), or the score obtained   60. The percentage of students which could not pass the graduated standard as follows:

$$\frac{6}{30} \times 100 = 20\%$$

The percentage of students which could pass the graduated standard as follows:

$$\frac{24}{30} \times 100 = 80\%$$

So, mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) can be obtained statistically by using SPSS 16.0 as follows;

Table IV. 11

**Mean and Standard Deviation of
Post-Test Score of Control Class**

TECHNIQUE		N	MEAN	STD. DEVIATION	STD. ERROR MEAN
Score	1 (Conventional)	30	61.8333	5.37127	.98066

From the table above, the distance between mean (M) and Standard Deviation (SD) is too far. In other words, the score obtained are normal. From mean score 61.83, it is concluded that Students' speaking ability that was taught without using guessing games technique is categorized into Average level.

4. The Data Analysis of Students' Post-Test Score of Experimental Class

The data of students' post-test score of experimental class were obtained from the result of their speaking ability. The data can be described as follows:

Table IV. 12

Students' Post-Test Score of Experimental Class

NO	SCORE (Y)	FREQUENCY(f)	PASSING SCORE STANDARD
1	55	2	Failed
2	57.5	1	Failed
3	60	1	Pass
4	62.5	2	Pass
5	65	5	Pass
6	67.5	3	Pass
7	70	8	Pass
8	72.5	3	Pass
9	75	3	Pass
10	77.5	2	Pass
	Total	30	

Based on the data obtained, 3 students could not pass the passing score standard (KKM). The percentage of students which could not pass the passing score standard as follows:

$$\frac{3}{30} \times 100 = 10\%$$

The percentage of students which could pass the passing score standard as follows:

$$\frac{27}{30} \times 100 = 90\%$$

So, mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) can be obtained statistically by using SPSS 16.0 as follows;

Table IV.13

**Mean and Standard Deviation of
Post-Test Score of Experimental Class**

	TECHNIQUE	N	MEAN	STD. DEVIATION	STD. ERROR MEAN
Score	2 (Guessing Games)	30	67.9167	5.98429	1.09258

From the table above, the distance between mean (M) and Standard Deviation (SD) is too far. In other words, the score obtained are normal. From mean score 67.92, it is concluded that Students speaking ability that was taught by using guessing games is categorized into Good level.

5. **The Data Analysis of T-test**

In analyzing the data, the researcher used students' score of post-test both of control and experimental class. The calculation of student score trough using SPSS 16.0 was done by concerning following steps[48];

a. Open program/Application SPSS 16.0

b. Open new file (New > Data)

c. Enter the data of student score both of control and experimental class base on its group in the certain variable.

d. Choose menu *Analyze,* then click *Compare Means* and choose *Independent- Samples T Test.*

e. After click *Independent- Samples T Test*.

---

[48] Hartono. 2008. *SPSS 16.0: Analisis Data Statistika dan Penelitian.* (Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar), p. 148- 157

In column *Test Variable*(s): enter student score, then in column *Grouping Variable*: enter technique, and then click *Devine Group* type group one with number 1 and group two with number 2. Then click "OK" and wait a moment until output SPSS 16.0 appears. Then the analysis as below:

Table IV.14

Group Statistic

	TECHNIQUE	N	MEAN	STD. DEVIATION	STD. ERROR MEAN
Score	1(Conventional)	30	61.8333	5.37127	.98066
	2(Guessing Games)	30	67.9167	5.98429	1.09258

From output Group Statistic it can be seen that the total number of each class is 30, mean score of students' speaking ability that was taught without using guessing games technique is 61.83 and it concluded in the category of average level, mean score of students' speaking ability that was taught by using guessing games technique is 67.92 and it concluded in the category of good level, the standard deviation of students' speaking ability that was taught without using guessing games technique is 5.37 and that was taught by using guessing games technique is 5.98, and the standard error mean of students' speaking ability that was taught without using guessing games technique is 0.98 and that was taught by using guessing games technique is 1.09.

Table IV.15

Independent- Samples T 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	.748	.391	-4.144	58	.000	-6.08333	1.46813	-9.02212	-3.14455
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.144	57.336	.000	-6.08333	1.46813	-9.02284	-3.14382

From output *Independent Samples Test*, displayed *Levene's Test* for equality of variance. Based on analysis of levene's test, probability of the test is 0.391. The value of probability 0.391 > 0.05 and can be concluded that variance population is identical[49]. So, the orientation in taking further analysis is base on numbers in *Equal Variance Assumed* row.

In the table it can be seen that t_o is -4.144. T_o can be negative or positive, but negative is also the same to the positive one. It mean that there is difference degree as big as 4.144[50]. Then df 58, mean difference -6.08, standard error difference 1.47, the difference lower level achievement -9.02 and upper level achievement -3.14. Then, t_o (t observation) was compared to t_t (t table). T_t with df= 58 in significant 5%= 2.00 and in significant 1% = 2.65.

---

[49] *Ibid*, p. 157
[50] Hartono. Op. Cit, p. 146

Finally researcher found that t_t 5% $< t_o > t_t$ 1% or 2.00 $<$ 4.144$>$ 2.65. In other word H_o is rejected and H_a is accepted. The conclusion, there is significant effect of using guessing games technique toward speaking ability of the second year students at Islamic Junior High School Ittihadul Muslimin.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion

Based on the explanations in the chapter IV, finally the research about the effect of using guessing games technique toward speaking ability of the second year students at Islamic Junior High School Ittihadun Muslimin Koto Gasib District can be concluded as follows:

1. Mean score of students' speaking ability that was taught by using guessing games technique before giving the treatment is 57.00, and after giving the treatment is 67.92. The mean score on post-test shows that the Students' speaking ability that was taught by using guessing games technique is rise 10.92 and categorized into Good level.

2. Mean score of students' speaking ability that was taught without using guessing games technique before giving the treatment is 57.67, and after giving the treatment is 61.83. The mean score on post-test shows that the Students' speaking ability that was taught without using guessing games technique is rise 4.16 and categorized into Average level.

3. After calculating T-test formula for non related sample through using SPSS 16.0, researcher got value t_o= 4.144 and can be described; t_t (sig 5%) < t_o > t_t (sig 1%) or 2.00 <4.144> 2.65. So H_o is rejected and H_a is accepted.

The conclusion, using guessing games technique in teaching English is more effective than without using guessing games technique.

B. Suggestion

1. For the Teacher

Based on the conclusion of the research above, it is known that using guessing games technique in teaching speaking can affect the speaking ability of students. So that, guessing games technique is one of choices that can be used by teacher of English in order to increase students' speaking ability. Teacher of English should know how to teach speaking by using guessing games technique. Besides that, teacher should use many ways to encourage the students' speaking as in the following list:

   a. Teacher trains students to speak English during teaching process.

   b. Teachers can encourage students' awareness about the importance of speaking ability for their life.

   c. Teachers should construct creative and enjoyable learning for students.

   d. Teacher should support their technique by using interesting media.

2. For the Student

   a. Students should actively involve in the learning process to enjoy the benefit of teaching process by using guessing games technique.

   b. Students should aware about the importance of mastering speaking ability for their life.

   c. Students should practice their English as often as possible.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

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

_____. 2009. *Dasar- dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan.* Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

_____. 2009. *Evaluasi Program Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Nutt, Amy. 2011. An English Speaking Environment Highly Improves English. [Online] Skillshttp://ezinearticles.com/?An-English-Speaking-Environment-Highly-Improves-English-Skills&id=2762535. [July 18th 2012].

Arsyad, Azar. 2011. *Media Pembelajaran.* Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.

Brown, H. Douglas. 1994. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Ryents Englewood Cliff.

_____. 2007. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching, Fifth Edition*. San Francisco: Longman.

_____. 2003. *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practice*. New York: Pearson Education.

Brown, Gillian and George Yule. 1983. *Teaching the Spoken Language : Approach Based on the Analysis of Conversational English*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Creswell, John.W. 2008. *Educational Research*. Canada: Pearson Educational international.

C. Richards, Jack & Willy A. Renandya. 2002. *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Elih Sutisna. 2011. *An Analysis of School Based-English Curriculum (KTSP)*. [online] Available: http://elihsutisnayanto.wordpress.com/2011/02/12/an-analysis-of-school-based-english-curriculum-ktsp/. [April 1st 2011].

Gay, L. R and Peter Arisian. 2000. *Educational Research Competencies for Analysis and Application 6th Edition*. New Jersey: prentice-Hall Inc.

Hartono. 2008. *Statistik untuk Penelitian*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

_____. 2008. *SPSS 16.0: Analisis Data Statistika dan Penelitian*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Hasibuan, Kalayo & Fauzan Ansyari. 2007. *Teaching English as Foreign Language*. Pekanbaru: Alaf Riau Graha UNRI Press.

Hughes, Artur. 1989. *Testing for Language Teachers*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Http//:en.wikipedia.orgwikiGuessing game

Keith Porte, Graeme. 2002. *Appraising Research In Second Language Learning: A Practical Approach to Critical Analysis of Quantitative Research*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing.

Klippel, Friederike. 1994. *Keep Talking*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Oxford. 2000. *Oxford Learner's Pocket Dictionary, Third Edition.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Paulston, Christiana Bratt and Mary Newton Brunder. 1976. *Teaching English as a Second Language: Techniques and Procedures*. Massachusetts: Wintrhrop Publisher Inc.

Promadi. 2008. *Cara Praktis Mengaplikasikan Communicative Language Teaching dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa*. Pekanbaru: Suska Press.

Sudijono, Anas. 2000. *Pengantar Statistik Pendidikan*. Jakarta: PT. Grafindo Persada.

Swan, Michael. 2005. *Practical English Usage*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Syafi'I .S, M. 2007. *From Paragraph to a Research Report: A writing of English for Academic Purpose*. Pekanbaru: Lembaga Bimbingan Belajar Syaf Intensif/ LBSI.

Wright, Andrew. Et al. 1989. *Games for Language Learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.