

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF “FIND THE DIFFERENCE” GAME ON SPEAKING ABILITY OF THE SECOND YEAR STUDENTS OF SMP BABUSSALAM PEKANBARU

Delviana Anggra Mustikah¹, Atni Prawati², Hadriana³

Email: delvianaanggra@gmail.com, atni_prawati@yahoo.com, ad1208@yahoo.co.id

Contact: 085364017781

*Student of English Study Program
Language and Arts Department
Faculty of Teachers Training and Education
Riau University*

Abstract: *This pre-experimental research aimed to know the effectiveness of “find the difference” game on speaking ability of the second year students of SMP Babussalam Pekanbaru. This research was conducted toward the second year students of SMP Babussalam Pekanbaru from October to November 2015. The researcher used cluster random sampling technique to determine the sample. The sample was class VIII.4 which consisted of 23 students. The data was collected by giving a pre-test and a post-test to students in the form of picture describing. The data was assessed by three raters and analyzed by using SPSS 18. The result of the reserch showed the different score in the pre-test and the post-test was 27.42. The score of the pre-test was 45.62 and the score of the post test increased to 73.04. Moreover, from statistical analysis, it was found out that the t-test 23.320 was bigger than t-table 2.074 at level significance of 0.05. It means that there was a significant effect of “Find the Difference” game on the students’ speaking ability. Therefore, it can be concluded that applying “Find the Difference” game is effective to improve students’ speaking ability.*

Keywords: *“Find the Difference” game, Speaking Ability*

KEEFEKTIFAN PERMAINAN “FIND THE DIFFERENCE” TERHADAP KEMAMPUAN BEBRBICARA SISWA TAHUN KEDUA SMP BABUSSALAM PEKANBARU

Delviana Anggra Mustikah¹, Atni Prawati², Hadriana³

Email: delvianaanggra@gmail.com, atni_prawati@yahoo.com, ad1208@yahoo.co.id

No Hp: 085364017781

Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris
Jurusan Bahasa dan Seni
Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan
Universitas Riau

Abstrak: Penelitian pre-eksperimen ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui keefektifan permainan “Find the Difference” terhadap kemampuan berbicara siswa tahun kedua SMP Babussalam Pekanbaru. Penelitian ini dilaksanakan pada siswa tahun kedua SMP Babussalam Pekanbaru dari bulan Oktober sampai November 2015. Peneliti menggunakan teknik cluster random sampling untuk menentukan sampel. Sampel penelitian ini adalah kelas 8.4 yang berjumlah 23 siswa. Data dikumpulkan dengan memberikan pre-test dan post-test kepada siswa dalam bentuk mendeskripsikan gambar. Data tersebut dinilai oleh 3 orang penilai dan dianalisis menggunakan aplikasi SPSS.18. Hasil dari penelitian ini menunjukkan perbedaan nilai pre-test and post-test adalah 27.42. Nilai pre-test adalah 45.62 dan nilai post-test meningkat menjadi 73.04. Selain itu, untuk analisis statistik ditemukan bahwa t-test 23.320 lebih besar dari t-table 2.074 di level signifikan 5%. Ini bermakna bahwa ada efek yang signifikan dari permainan “Find the Difference” terhadap kemampuan berbicara siswa. Oleh karena itu dapat disimpulkan bahwa menerapkan permainan “Find the Difference” efektif meningkatkan kemampuan berbicara siswa.

Kata Kunci: “*Find the Difference*”, Kemampuan Berbicara

INTRODUCTION

English is one of the languages in the world and becomes the international language that has spoken by millions of people all over the world. English also plays an important role in all aspects of life today such as in medicine, pharmacy, finances, industry, military and also in education. According to 2013 curriculum, there are four skills to be mastered by students namely listening, speaking, reading and writing. Among the four skills, speaking plays an important role because without it, communication cannot take place directly between people. Brown (1994) states that speaking is a skill in producing oral language. It is not only an utterance but also a tool of communication. Harris (1974) also states that speaking is a complex skill requiring the simultaneous use of number in different abilities which often develop in different rates. It is not only involved the messages or the idea but also the knowledge of the sound, structures, vocabulary, and culture of system language.

In Indonesia, students still find the difficulty in speaking. Based on the researcher's observation at SMP Babussalam Pekanbaru, there were a number of factors causing the students not active in using the language. Therefore, it needs to find out an appropriate teaching technique to minimize these problems. One of the factors may come from students, such as the students' lack of vocabulary. It made them tends to keep silent when teacher ask them to speak or invite them to interact in English. The students had low motivation to express their ability in speaking that makes them rather ashamed and not having confidence to speak. Whereas, they tended to use their mother tongue mostly in class.

The other factors may also come from the teacher. Teacher teaches the students traditionally rather than apply any techniques and teaching media. Teachers let the students memorize the vocabulary, instead of using it. If the teacher applies inappropriate teaching technique, the students will not engage with the learning material. It makes the students were not feeling confident enough to express their ideas orally. Besides, the teacher rarely uses ay teaching media in classroom. It makes students less enthusiastic in learning English.

From the problems mentioned earlier, the writer will apply a teaching media to minimize the problems. In this case, one of the teaching media is "Find the Difference" game. This teaching media motivate and give students opportunities to be active in building interaction among them by using English orally. Using games is a good way to improve students' various skills, as Wright, et al (2006) say, "Games can be found to give practice in all the skills, in all the stages of the teaching and learning and for many types of communication". In addition, games may help and encourage many learners to support their interest and work (Wright 2006). Game can increase students' motivation and confidence because they are amusing and interesting.

There are many kinds of games that can be used in teaching English especially speaking. Hadfield (1999) explains two ways in classifying language games. First, she divides the language games into two types: linguistic games and communicative games. Linguistic games focused on accuracy, such as supplying the correct antonym. On the other hand, communicative games focused on successful exchange of information and ideas, such as two people identifying the differences between two pictures which are similar to one another but not exactly alike.

Find the difference game is a kind of game that uses two pictures which are slightly different from each other (Gibbons, 1999 in Salmiati, 2008). In this game, the students will work in pair or group and they will get the different pictures and they must

find the differences between the two pictures. According to Reschny (2004), the goal of find the difference are to ask and answer questions, and give information, thus improving listening and speaking skills, while increasing understanding of the target language. Through find the difference game students must communicate with each other to understand the differences between the pictures. Based on Kayi (2006) in find the difference game the students discuss the activity by finding the similarities or the differences in the picture. This activity will make the students more enjoyable and also make the classroom more interesting.

Based on the explanation above, the writer was interested in conducting a pre experimental research to help students overcome their problems in speaking. In this case the writer applied “find the difference” game for speaking activity of the second year students of SMP Babussalam Pekanbaru. This research was conducted to know the effectiveness of “Find the Difference” game on the speaking ability of the second year students of SMP Babussalam Pekanbaru.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The design of this research is pre-experimental design which is one-group pretest-posttest design applied. According to Gay, Mills, and Airasian (2009), the one-group pretest-posttest design involves a single group that is pretested (O1), exposed to a treatment (X), and then tested again (O2). Therefore, there is no control group in the research. The activity in performing this research can be shown in this schema:

(O1 X O2)

Instrumentation and Analysis

The data used in this research is the data about students’ speaking ability. This kind of data can be categorized as quantitative data. Quantitative data is basically data measured on a numerical scale. In this research, the data was collected from students’ score in pre-test and post-test. The instrument that used in this research was a speaking test in form of picture describing. It was given to the students in both pre-test and post-test. The students needed to make a description about the differences of two pictures based on the color, the position and the things of the pictures. The following are the procedures of collecting the data:

a. Pre-Test

Pre-test was given to the students before the treatment in order to know the base score of the students’ ability. Each student got two pictures which are slightly similar and had to describe the differences between the pictures.

b. Treatment

In the treatment phase, the writer taught the students using “Find the Difference” Game for six times. The writer divided students in pairs. Each pairs got two picture which slightly similar. The students asked some questions about their partner’s picture in order to know the differences of the pictures. The questions were about the things in the picture, the color and the position of the things. After that, the writer called the name of students one by one to describe the differences of their pictures.

c. Post-Test

Post-test held after all treatments conducted. It was also in the form of picture describing. The writer gave the same picture as the pre-test. The students needed to describe the differences of the pictures individually.

The scoring method used was adapted from Harris (1974) with some modification to the description of score. It was modified to make the description of the score more clearly and suitable with the sample's ability. They are pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension. To know the ability of the students, the researcher firstly computed the individual score to find out the real score of the students from the each rater. The formula used as follows:

$$RS = TS/25 \times 100$$

RS= real score of each individual

TS= total score of speaking aspects (P+G+V+F+C)

To find out the average scores of the students in speaking, the following formula was applied.

$$\bar{X} = \Sigma X/N$$

\bar{X} = the students' average score

ΣX = the students' score

N = the number of students

Scoring system and classification of students' score was adapted by Harris (1974) were used to score students' work and classify students' score in pre-test and post-test.

The Classification of Students' Score	
Test Score	Level of Ability
80 - 100	Excellent
60 - 79	Good
50 - 59	Average
0 - 49	Poor

In order to compare the difference results of students' speaking ability in pre test and post test, the t-test technique was used in SPSS 18.0. The researcher discovered the complete results in SPSS including mean, the correlation coefficient, t-test score.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

RESULTS

The result of this research was presented by showing the result of T-test table in comparing the different results of students' speaking ability in pre-test and post-test which was calculated by SPSS 18.0. The data of this research was analyzed by obtaining the score from the three raters. The raters are Khusaini, S.Pd, Yulia, S.Pd and Afrini, S.Pd.

Result of Pre-test

Students' Ability Level in the Pretest

No	Range	Ability Level	Frequency	Percentage %
1.	80 – 100	Excellent	0	0%
2.	60 – 79	Good	0	0%
3.	50 – 59	Average	5	21.74%
4.	0 - 49	Poor	18	78.26%
Total			23	100%

The researcher conducted a pretest to see the entry behavior before “Find the Difference” Game was applied. It was found out that the average score of the students' speaking ability in the pre-test was 45,26. Based on the table, none of the students got ‘excellent’ and ‘good’ level. From the total students, there are 18 students (78.26%) reach ‘poor’ level. The others left, 5 students (21.74%), are in ‘average’ level. Therefore, the result of pre-test was in the ‘poor’ level.

Result of Post-test

Students' Ability Level in the Post-test

No	Range	Ability Level	Frequency	Percentage %
1.	80 – 100	Excellent	4	17.39%
2.	60 – 79	Good	18	78.26%
3.	50 – 59	Average	1	4.35%
4.	0 - 49	Poor	0	0%
Total			23	100%

After the pre-test, the writer gave the treatment then took post-test for the students in speaking test. It was found out that the average score of the students' speaking ability in the post-test was 73.04. Based on the table, there are an improvement on the post-test. From 21.74% students become 4.35% who are categorized in the ‘average’ level. There are 18 students (78.26%) who are in ‘good’ level while 4 students (17.39%) in ‘excellent’ level. Comparing with the pre-test result, overall the result is improved after doing treatment and had a good result.

Result of T-Test Table

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Post-test	73.0404	23	6.61785	1.37992
	Pre-test	45.6200	23	5.56872	1.16116

The table describes about mean score of students' speaking ability, standard deviation and standard error mean. The mean score in pre-test is 45.62. There is an improvement in the post-test, because the mean score in post test increase to 73.04. Thus, the difference of the mean score between pre-test and post test is 27.42. It shows an improvement on students' speaking ability after the treatment. Standard deviation in pre-test is 5.56 and standard error mean is 1.16. Besides, the standard deviation in post-test is 6.61 and standard error mean is 1.37.

Paired Samples Correlations				
		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Post-test & pre-test	23	.584	.003

Paired samples correlation table is explained the correlation coefficient of pre-test and post-test. It presents the correlation coefficient was 0.584. It shows that the correlation between variable x and y is mediocre in order to know the effectiveness of "Find the Difference" Game on students' speaking ability. The probability of (Sig.) 0.003 is smaller than 0.05 also shows a high correlation of "Find the Difference" Game for the students' speaking ability.

Paired Sample Test

Paired Differences						
95% Confidence Interval of the Difference						
		Lower	Upper	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	Post-test – pre-test	24.98193	29.85894	23.320	22	.000

$$\begin{aligned}
 t \text{ table} &= n - 1 (\alpha 5\%) \\
 &= 23 - 1 (\alpha 5\%) \\
 &= 22 (\alpha 5\%) \\
 &= 2,074
 \end{aligned}$$

The table shows that the result of the t-test is 23.320 meanwhile the t-table is 2.074. Because the t-test is bigger than t table, it concludes that there is a significant difference between pre-test and post-test. It means that the alternative hypothesis of this research, "There is a significant effect of "Find the Difference" Game on speaking ability of the second year students of SMP Babussalam Pekanbaru" is accepted and null hypothesis is rejected.

The Difference of Students' Average Score in Each Aspect of Speaking

Students' Average Score in Each Aspect of Speaking				
No	Speaking Aspect	Pre-test	Post-test	Different Score
1	Pronunciation	54.33	84.33	30.00

2	Structure	49.00	86.67	37.67
3	Vocabulary	55.67	84.33	28.66
4	Fluency	46.33	75.67	29.34
5	Comprehension	57.33	88.67	31.34

According to the table, average score of these aspects increase in the post test. There are two aspects that have significant different score in post-test and pre-test, structure and comprehension. Structure increase to 37.67 point which is the average score in pre-test is 49.00 and in post-test is 86.67. While, comprehension increases to 31.34 point which is the average score in pre-test is 57.33 and in post-test is 88.67.

In contrast, the different scores of pronunciation, vocabulary and fluency are lower than structure and comprehension. The different score of pronunciation is 30.00 point. It increased from 54.33 to 84.33. While, vocabulary increases to 28.66 point which is the score in pre-test is 55.67 and in post-test is 84.33. The last is the different score of fluency is 29.34 point. It increased from 46.33 to 75.67. It can be concluded that applying “Find the Difference” Game on for speaking activity give significant different on students’ average score in each aspect of speaking.

DISCUSSION

The result of T-test table and students’ average score in each aspects of speaking showed enhancement of students’ speaking ability after applying “Find the Difference” Game in speaking activity. It also showed that the correlation of using “Find the Difference” Game for the students’ speaking ability was mediocre. It was connected with the research that has been conducted by Salmiati in 2009. Her research also showed that students’ speaking ability increased by applying “Find the Difference” Game. The students’ average score was increased from 50.49 to 70.95. It is because the game trains and gives students opportunity to use language orally.

According to the result, the lowest score of aspects of speaking in pre test and post test was fluency. In this case, students need much time to construct their ideas spontaneously. It made them often do repetition or silence for a second in sharing their ideas. The highest score in pre test and post test was comprehension. The students were easy to comprehend the material and the ideas even they made a mistakes by saying the incorrect sentences.

In addition, the aspects that have significant different in post test are structure and comprehension. The students could comprehend the material and the ideas easily. In learning activities, the writer explains the material to the students by using “Find the Difference” Game. It makes them easy to comprehend and not feel bored with the material. This result was in line with the result of the study that was conducted by Ayu and Murdibjono (2012). They stated that “the games helped the students to understand and comprehend the material easier and games could reduce boredom”. It can be stated that students feel relax when learning English by using games especially “Find the Difference” Game. However, there were strengths and weaknesses points that researcher found during using “Find the Differences” Game for speaking activities.

The strengths were in the following:

1. Through “Find the Difference” Game, students are not afraid to express their ideas and use the language features. The students use the language freely without any pressure. It is because the students and the teacher was not allow to interrupt students’ wrong when they were speaking.

2. Using “Find the Difference” Game in speaking activity encourages students’ interaction in classroom. Students practice to cooperate and to speak with the others in order to get the information of the picture.

3. “Find the Difference” Game is able to make students enjoy the class and feel fun in class. Because they are enjoy and fun, students are easy to understand and comprehend the material.

On other hand, the writer found the weakness when using “Find the Difference” Game, such as:

1. It was quite difficult to find the picture related to the material. So, the writer needed much time to prepare the material.

2. The time for applying this game was quite long. The game needed too much time. Consequently, the writer had to manage the lesson plan and the time properly.

In conducting the research, there were two indicators in the syllabus of English subject such as ‘asking’ and ‘stating’. The indicators were applied by the writer in the teaching and learning process. Meanwhile, the writer did not apply one indicator that is ‘asking’ in the pre-test and post-test. Therefore, the indicator applied was ‘stating’. In pre-test and post-test, the writer asked the students to describe the differences of two pictures based on the things, the color and the position of the things.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMENDATION

After analyzing the data of this research, some conclusion can be drawn. According to the result, it can be seen that there was an improvement of students’ mean score on post-test after taught by using “Find the Difference” Game. It also showed that there was mediocre correlation between “Find the Difference” Game and speaking ability in order to know the effectiveness of “Find the Difference” Game on speaking ability.

Based on the interpretation of students’ average score in each aspect of speaking, all of the aspects are increased. It means that applying “Find the Difference” Game for speaking activity gave significant different on students’ average score in each aspect of speaking. Overall, it was found that the value of t-test was larger than the t-table, the alternative hypothesis was accepted and Null hypothesis was rejected. This research answered the research question that applying “Find the Difference” Game is effective on speaking ability of the second year students of SMP Babussalam Pekanbaru.

According to the conclusions above and some weaknesses, there are several recommendations that useful for teaching speaking through game, especially “Find the Difference” Game. The recommendations are:

1. “Find the Difference” Game is suggested as one of the alternative teaching media that can be used by English teachers because since this teaching media effective to use in teaching speaking and can generated the students’ motivation. This game gives students opportunity to use the language freely without any pressure.

2. In applying “Find the Difference” Game, it is suggested that the teacher have to prepare the lesson plan well in order to covers games so the problem such as material and time management could be reduced as much as possible. Because, the game needs much time.

3. This game is also needed to apply in teaching speaking and/or teaching and learning process, because the students are more active in using the language. They are not feeling bored in teaching and learning process.

4. For the next research, if she/he found any weakness and inappropriateness in this research, some constructive correction is really needed. Therefore, further research will be better.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brown, D. H. (1994). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall Regent.

Gay, L.R. et all, 2009. *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application (Ninth Eds)*. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.

Hadfield, J. 1999. *Intermediate Vocabulary Games*. Harlow, Essex: Longman.

Harris, David., 1974. *Testing English as A Second Language*. Georgetown University. Washington DC.

Kayi, H., 2006. Teaching Speaking: Activities to Promote Speaking in a Second Language. *The Internet TESL Journal*. 12 (11). [http://iteslj.org/Articles/Kayi-Teaching Speaking.html](http://iteslj.org/Articles/Kayi-Teaching%20Speaking.html) (rectrieved on Mar 3, 2015).

Lusi Dyah Ayu and Murdibjono. 2012. The Use of Games in Teaching English at SMAN 2 Pare. Unpublised thesis. State University of Malang. Malang.

Salmiati. 2008. An Application of “Find the Difference” Game in Improving Speaking Ability of the First Year Students of SMAN 1 Pangkalan Kerinci. Unpublised thesis. Teacher’s Training and Education Faculty Riau University. Pekanbaru.

Wright, A., Betteridge, D., and Buckby, M., 2006. *Games for Language Learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.