# THE EFFECT OF USING A GUESSING GAME
# ON STUDENTS' SPEAKING ABILITY
# AT SMP KERTANEGARA MALANG

Marcilia Dorotea Uba[1]Ike Dian Puspita Sari[2]

E-mail : apriliyamarcilia@gmail.com , ikedianps@gmail.com

| Informasi Artikel | ABSTRACT |
|---|---|
| | Speaking is one of the English skills that must be mastered by English learners. There are so many ways to hone students' speaking ability at eighth grade students in SMP Kertanegara Malang in the academic year 2021/2022. One of that ways is using guessing game while speaking class. This research is aimed to know and to find out if the use of guessing game gives effect or not on students' speaking ability at eighth grade students of SMP Kertanegara Malang in the academic year 2021/2022. The researcher used quantitative-experimental research, which the researcher used two classes for studied, the experimental class and the control class. The use of guessing game only given to the experimental class, and the control class taught without any methods or any treatment. From the research study, the researcher was able to find the difference between the experimental class and the control class. It is known from the average score of presenting data that has been calculated in SPSS version 20 that the experimental class score has increased from 66,50 in the pre-test to 83,38 in the post-test because after being given the guessing game treatment. While the pre-test value of the control class was 64,75 and the post-test value was 80,25 because the researcher did not do any treatment to it. The T-score obtained from the post-test results between the experimental class and the control class is 0,66485922888. This shows that the t-score is > 0,05. From the data presented, it can be concluded that there is an effect of using guessing games on students' speaking ability in eighth grade students of SMP Kertanegara Malang in the 2021/2022 academic year.<br><br>**Keywords**: Guessing Game, Students' Speaking Ability,Quantitative |
| **Penerbit** | ABSTRAK |

**IKIP Budi Utomo**

Berbicara merupakan salah satu keterampilan bahasa Inggris yang harus dikuasai oleh pembelajar bahasa Inggris. Ada banyak cara untuk mengasah kemampuan berbicara siswa pada siswa kelas VIII SMP Kertanegara Malang tahun ajaran 2021/2022. Salah satunya adalah dengan menggunakan permainan tebak-tebakan saat kelas berbicara. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui dan mengetahui apakah penggunaan permainan tebak-tebakan berpengaruh atau tidak terhadap kemampuan berbicara siswa pada siswa kelas VIII SMP Kertanegara Malang tahun ajaran 2021/2022. Peneliti menggunakan penelitian kuantitatif-eksperimental, dimana peneliti menggunakan dua kelas untuk diteliti, yaitu kelas eksperimen dan kelas kontrol. Penggunaan permainan tebak-tebakan hanya diberikan pada kelas eksperimen, dan kelas kontrol diajarkan tanpa metode atau perlakuan apapun. Dari hasil penelitian, peneliti dapat mengetahui perbedaan antara kelas eksperimen dan kelas kontrol. Diketahui dari rata-rata skor penyajian data yang telah dihitung dalam SPSS versi 20 bahwa skor kelas eksperimen mengalami peningkatan dari 66,50 pada pre-test menjadi 83,38 pada post-test karena setelah diberikan permainan tebak-tebakan. perlakuan. Sedangkan nilai pre-test kelas kontrol 64,75 dan nilai post-test 80,25 karena peneliti tidak melakukan perlakuan apapun terhadapnya. T-score yang diperoleh dari hasil post-test antara kelas eksperimen dan kelas kontrol adalah 0,66485922888. Hal ini menunjukkan bahwa t-score > 0,05. Dari data yang disajikan, dapat disimpulkan bahwa ada pengaruh penggunaan permainan tebak-tebakan terhadap kemampuan berbicara siswa pada siswa kelas delapan SMP Kertanegara Malang tahun ajaran 2021/2022.

Kata Kunci: Game Menebak, Kemampuan Berbicara Siswa, Kuantitatif.

## INTRODUCTION

English is one of the international languages used by many people in the world, English for Indonesia is the first foreign language learned in school. Because of its importance, English has become a compulsory subject in schools starting from junior high school to university. Based on the curriculum (2013), one of the objectives of learning English is to develop communication competence in spoken and written form to achieve a level of functional literacy. In order to communicate well, adequate vocabulary is needed, one of which is learning English based on the curriculum, the 2013 curriculum. According to Webster (2013), guessing games are games in which participants compete individually or in teams to identify something that is not indicated (as in a riddle or guesswork). Several theories in the thesis say that guessing games are very helpful for students in learning to speak English.

## RESEARCH METHOD

### Research Design

This research used the quantitative research method. This research is focused on conducting trials or experiments using guessing

games on students' speaking abilities in SMP Kertanegara Malang academic year 2021/2022. The researcher used 2 classes a control class and an experimental class. Which is the experimental class will get a guessing game trial while the control class does not.

## Population and Sample

1. Population ,According to Arikunto (2002), the population is the whole object of the study. The population of this research is students in the 8th grade in SMP Kertanegra Malang academic year 2021/2022. It consists of one class and is divided into two groups of 16 students.

2. Sample, Arikunto (2017) stated that the sample is a part or representative of the population studied. There are various kinds of sampling techniques to determine the sample that will be used in research. Sampling techniques basically can be grouped into two types, namely probability sampling and non-probability sampling. Probability sampling is a sampling technique that provides equal opportunity or opportunity for each element (member) of the population to be chosen as a sample member. Non-probability sampling is a technique that does not provide equal opportunity or opportunity for each element or member of the population to be selected as a sample. The researcher used non probability sampling, especially purposive sampling. As the case in this research, the researcher only examined or tested in one classes in grade 8 classes, and it will be used as the experimental class and control class.

## Research Instrument and Data Collection Method

According to Tukiran and Hidayati (2011), there are several types of instruments in quantitative research, including questionnaires, observations, documentary studies, and tests. The researcher used a speaking test for the instrument of this research. Speaking tests are generally used to assess and measure students learning outcomes in speaking English, particularly cognitive learning outcomes regarding mastery of subject matter by educational and teaching objectives. The researcher used pre-test and post-test to measure the students' speaking ability. In assessing students' speaking ability, the researcher used a scoring rubric that was adapted from J. Heaton (2004) and Douglass Brown (2004). They were as follows:

| Aspect | Score | Criteria |
|---|---|---|
| Comprehensibility/content | 5 | The students describe the generic structure of descriptive paragraphs, stating the physical appearance and characteristics of a person described. The listener is very familiar with the contents of descriptive paragraph that he/she conveys. And successfully describe with a minimum of 5 sentences. |
| | 4 | The students describe someone by mentioning the generic structure of the text that contains person'physical appearance and person's characteristic. Most of what was said by the students is still easy to follow and easy to understand. But, there are some words are still confusing to understand. |
| | 3 | The listener can understand a lot of what was said by the students, the students describe people by mentioning what the teacher has told. But the listener cannot understand many of the speaker's more long sentences. |
| | 2 | Only small bits (usually short sentences and phrases) can be understood – and then with considerable effort by someone to the speaker. |
| | 1 | Hardly anything of what is said can be understood. Even when the listener makes a great effort or interrupts, the speaker is unable to clarify anything he/she seems to have said. He/she did not describe someone well, because he/she cannot mention at least 5 sentences in a paragraph. |
| Fluency | 5 | He/she has to make an effort of times to search words. Nevertheless, smooth delivery on the whole and only a few unnatural pauses. |
| | 4 | Although he/she has to make an effort and search for words, there are not too many unnatural pauses. Fairly smooth delivery mostly. Sometimes the words are fragmented, but succeed in conveying the general meaning. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | 3 | He/she has to make an effort for much of the time. Often has to search for the desired meaning. Rather halting delivery and fragmentary. |
| | 2 | Long pauses while he/she searches for the desired meaning. Frequently fragmentary in delivering the words and sometimes halting in delivering the words. Almost gives up making the effort at times. |
| | 1 | Full of long and unnatural pauses. Very halting and fragmentary in delivering the words. At times gives up making the effort. |
| **Pronunciation** | 5 | Pronunciation is slightly influenced by the mother tongue. A few minor errors in pronunciation but most utterances are correct. |
| | 4 | Pronunciation is still moderately influenced by the mother tongue but no serious phonological errors. A few errors in pronunciation but only one or two major errors causing confusion. |
| | 3 | Pronunciation is influenced by the mother tongue but only a few serious phonological errors. There are several pronunciation errors, some of which cause confusion. |
| | 2 | Pronunciation seriously influenced by the mother tongue with errors causing a breakdown in communication. And so many 'basic' pronunciation errors. |
| | 1 | Serious pronunciation errors as well. No evidence of having mastered any of the language skills and areas practiced in the course. |
| **Grammar** | 5 | Equivalent to that of a native speaker. Errors in grammar are quietly rare. |
| | 4 | Able to use the language accurately. Very few grammatical errors. |
| | 3 | Control of grammar is good. Able to speak the language with a good grammar. |
| | 2 | The students can speak English but does not have thorough or confident control of the grammar. |

*Marcilia Dorotea Uba - The Effect Of Using A Guessing Game On Students' Speaking Ability at SMP Kertanegara Malang*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | 1 | Errors in grammar are frequent, but listener can still understand what the students are saying about. |
| **Vocabulary** | 5 | The students speak using a variety of vocabulary and not monotonous because he/she has breadth of vocabulary. |
| | 4 | The students speak using the vocabulary he/she already has and so rarely does he/she speaks with memorize the vocabulary he/she has. |
| | 3 | Able to speak the language with vocabulary. Vocabulary is broad enough that he rarely to grope for a word. |
| | 2 | The students have sufficient vocabulary to express their selves simply. |
| | 1 | The students speak using simple vocabulary and very monotonous because he/she takes from the example given by the teacher |

**Data Analysis Technique**

In analyzing the data of this research study, the researcher used a quantitative technique by calculating data using the statistic technique. This method is done to find out if the data obtained is significant. Then, the researcher was able to determine that the use of a guessing game influences students' speaking ability.

1. Determining Experimental Class and Control Class through average score test of class 8 at "SMP" Kertanegara Malang

2. Validity Test

3. Reliability Test / Try out test

**RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

**The Description Of Data**

In this section, the researcher discusses the description of the results of his research on the speaking ability of 8th grade students of SMP Kertanegara Malang. Researchers conducted research in one class, namely grade 8th which consisted of 16 students. Then the researcher divided into two groups (A and B) as an experimental class and a control class, each class consisting of 8 students. In that class, the researcher gave a speaking test in the form of pre-test and post-test. There are differences in treatment in the two classes studied by the researchers, the researchers conducted a pre-test on the experimental class before being given treatment or before being taught by using guessing games and giving a post-test after the class was given treatment. In addition, the researchers conducted a pre-test in the control class before being taught descriptive paragraph material and after that the researchers conducted a post-test.

The researcher assessed the students' speaking ability using an oral assessment rubric that adapted from the Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices of Douglass Brown and the Writing English Language of J. Heaton. The researcher used inter-rater in assessing the students' speaking ability and used video recording to assist the researcher in the lack of assessment. In assessing students' speaking ability, there must be a tolerance value, the tolerance value in this study is 5. Thus researchers can assess easily.

**Data Analysis**

Because the data were taken from two classes, namely the experimental class and the control class. Data analysis was conducted to determine the comparison between the two classes used as research, namely the experimental class and the control class. The experimental class was taught using treatment or guessing games, while the control class was not taught. Comparison of values seen from

the data obtained through the pre-test and post-test. The researcher provides a table listing the pre-test and post-test scores for the experimental class and the control class, as follows:

**The Data of the 2 classes studied**

| No | Experimental Class | | Control Class | |
|----|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| | Pre-Test | Post Test | Pre Test | Post Test |
| 1 | 76 | 92 | 65 | 72 |
| 2 | 72 | 88 | 76 | 88 |
| 3 | 52 | 60 | 72 | 74 |
| 4 | 76 | 92 | 52 | 76 |
| 5 | 68 | 92 | 65 | 88 |
| 6 | 72 | 75 | 60 | 80 |
| 7 | 56 | 80 | 56 | 88 |
| 8 | 60 | 88 | 72 | 76 |

From the results of research conducted for 1 month in class 8A as the Experiment Class and 8B as the Control Class at SMP Kertanegara Malang in the 2021/2022 academic year, the researchers analyzed the data above using SPSS version 20. And the results are as follows:

**Descriptive Analysis**

The researcher used SPSS version 20 to calculate the data. By combining the two pre-test and post-test data in the experimental class and control class.

**The Display Data description output**

**Descriptive Statistics**

| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|----|---|---------|---------|-------|----------------|
| Pre-Test Experimental | 8 | 52 | 76 | 66.50 | 9.304 |
| Post Test Experimental | 8 | 60 | 92 | 83.38 | 11.300 |
| Pre-Test Control | 8 | 52 | 76 | 64.75 | 8.396 |
| Post Test Control | 8 | 72 | 88 | 80.25 | 6.798 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 8 | | | | |

Double-click

The data shown above is the data from the analysis results descriptive statistics, including: minimum score, maximum score, average, and standard deviation. By looking at the data above, we can find out the average score or the average score of pre-test and post-

test in the experimental class and control class. Post-test experimental class experienced a significant difference from the results of the previous pre-test. These results can be interpreted that there is an influence or influence on the use of guessing games on the speaking ability of students at SMP Kertanegara Malang in the 2021/2022 academic year.

## Normality Test

The second step to analyze the data is to perform a normality test. Normality The test in this study was conducted to meet the absolute requirements before statistical analysis. At this stage there are two ways to test for normality, namely using Kolmogrov-Smirnov or Shapiro-Wilk or we can also use both. However, the researcher has chosen the Kolmogrov-Smirnov method as the normality test in this researcher. And the result is:

### The Normality Data output

**Tests of Normality**

| Class | | Kolmogorov-Smirnov<sup>a</sup> | | | Shapiro-Wilk | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Statistic | df | Sig. | Statistic | df | Sig. |
| Students' Speaking Ability | Pre-Test Experimental Class | .223 | 8 | .200* | .886 | 8 | .216 |
| | Post-Test Experimental Class | .284 | 8 | .057 | .806 | 8 | .033 |
| | Pre-Test Control Class | .181 | 8 | .200* | .953 | 8 | .739 |
| | Post-Test Control Class | .248 | 8 | .160 | .835 | 8 | .067 |

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

The normality test above is only focused on the significance value of Kolmogrov-Smirnov. In the Kolmogrov Smirnov normality test, it can be seen that the data is normally distributed, because the significance value is > 0,05. All Kolmogrov Smirnov significance values are more than > 0,05. Therefore, the absolute requirements have been met and the researcher can analyze the data obtained by using the Paired Sample T-test.

## Paired Sample T-Test

Paired sample t-test or the test of the average difference of two pairs of samples is used to test the difference in the mean for two independent (independent) paired samples. Paired sample t-test can be done if the data are normally distributed. This is because the results of the normality test above show that the data is normally distributed, the results of paired

The sample t-test of the experimental class and the control class are:

### The output data of Paired Sample T-test

**Paired Samples Test**

| | | Paired Differences | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | |
| | | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | Lower | Upper | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| Pair 1 | Pre-Test Experimental - Post Test Experimental | -16.875 | 8.442 | 2.985 | -23.933 | -9.817 | -5.654 | 7 | .001 |
| Pair 2 | Pre-Test Control - Post Test Control | -15.500 | 10.823 | 3.827 | -24.548 | -6.452 | -4.051 | 7 | .005 |

Paired sample t-test was conducted to find out the difference the mean of the two paired samples. Based on the output above, the result from the table Sig (2-tailed) for pair 1 is 0,001 < 0,05 and pair 2 is 0,005 < 0,05. So it can be concluded that there are differences in the value of students' speaking ability in the experimental class.

## Homogeneity Test

In this section, a homogeneity test is carried out to see if post-test data in the experimental class and control class is homogeneous or heterogeneous. This is because homogeneous data is one of the requirements for conducting an independent sample t-test. The results are as follows:

**Test of Homogeneity of Variance**

| | | Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students' Speaking Ability | Based on Mean | 1.495 | 1 | 14 | .242 |
| | Based on Median | .282 | 1 | 14 | .604 |
| | Based on Median and with adjusted df | .282 | 1 | 9.260 | .608 |
| | Based on trimmed mean | 1.171 | 1 | 14 | .297 |

Based on the output data above, it is known that the significance (sig.) is 0,242 > 0,05. So it can be concluded that the post-test data of the experimental class and the control class are homogeneous. Therefore, one of the requirements of the independent sample t-test has been fulfilled.

## Independent Sample T-Test

Independent sample t-test was conducted to determine whether the two sample groups had a significant difference in mean or not. Independent sample t-test was conducted by testing the post-test data for the experimental class and the control class.

**The output data of Independent Sample T-test**

**Independent Samples Test**

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | Lower | Upper |
| Students' Speaking Ability | Equal variances assumed | 1.495 | .242 | .670 | 14 | .514 | 3.125 | 4.662 | -6.875 | 13.125 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | .670 | 11.480 | .516 | 3.125 | 4.662 | -7.085 | 13.335 |

Based on the data above, the significance of sig. (2-tailed) in the post test experimental class was 0,514 > 0,05. While the control class post test is 0,516 > 0,05. Thus, there is a difference in the average post-test data in the experimental class and the control class. To identify the t-test based on the data presented on the independent t-test. Since the researchers conducted research on different variants, the formula used was as follows:

$$T = \frac{X_1 - X_2}{\sqrt{\frac{S1^2}{n1} + \frac{S2^2}{n2}}}$$

$$= \frac{83-80}{\sqrt{\frac{11,300}{8} + \frac{6,798}{8}}}$$

$$= \frac{3}{\sqrt{1,4125 + 0,84975}}$$

$$= \frac{3}{\sqrt{2,26225}}$$

$$= \frac{3}{1,99457768665}$$

$$= 0,66485922888$$

## Hypotheses Testing

a. If the T-score is greater than the T-table, the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted and the null hypothesis (H0) is rejected. That means there is an effect the use of guessing games on students' speaking ability at SMP Kertanegara Malang in the 2021/2022 academic year. So, the use of guessing games on students' speaking ability is effective for 8th graders.

b. If the T-score is smaller than the t-table, the null hypothesis (H0) is accepted and alternative hypothesis (Ha) is rejected. It means there is no effect the use of guessing games on students' speaking ability at SMP Kertanegara Malang in the 2021/2022 academic year. So, the use of guessing games on students' speaking ability is effective for 8th graders. Based on the data presented above, the t-score is 0,66485922888 and which shows the t-score is higher than the significant level (5%). Because determination of the level of significance adjusted to the level of risk faced in drawing conclusions. For example, if a doctor wants to know the efficacy of a drug that has a side effect on death, then a value must be determined. However, unlike research conducted by a teacher in testing the effectiveness of a teaching method, he simply chooses (a) a value of 25%. Therefore, the use of guessing games is effective in students' speaking ability.

## Discussion

This study aims to determine how the effect of the use of guessing game on students' speaking ability in grade 8 students at SMP Kertanegara Malang in the 2021/2022 academic year. Data collection The technique used by the researcher is a test, more precisely speaking test. The speaking test was conducted in the experimental class and the control class in each class with eight students. In the experimental class, the researcher conducted a pre-test and posttest

to compare the speaking scores achieved by students before and after treatment (guessing game). For the control class, the researcher only taught the material about descriptive paragraphs as usual without any treatment or any method. From the data in the data analysis, it can be seen that the average pretest score in the experimental class before being taught using guessing games is 66,50 with a minimum score of 52 students and a maximum score students is 76. This means that the average data is still low. After the researcher teaches the material using guessing games, the data analysis is obtained from the post-test with an average score of 83,38. Minimum score achieved by students in the post-test is 60 and the maximum value is 92. From the results of the data in the previous chapter it shows that guessing games are very effective and become an alternative way to teach speaking class. Therefore, as cited in hypothesis testing, the alternative hypothesis (Ha) accepted and the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected. So, guessing game isn't it only makes students happy in the learning process, but also makes students happy speaking ability increases.

## CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION
### Conclusion
Based on the results of the research studies that have been discussed in data analysis, hypothesis testing and discussion in the previous chapter, it can be concluded that there is a significant effect of using guessing games on students' speaking skills at SMP Kertanegara

Malang in the academic year 2021/2022. The average value of the previous pre-test results in the experimental class was 66,50 and the control class showed 64,70. However, after the researchers carried out treatment with the guessing method in the experimental class, the average score of the post-test results in the experimental class increased from 66,50 to 83,38 , while the results of the post-test control class showed that the average score control class is 80,25. From the previous statement, it means that there is a difference in scores between the experimental class after being treated using guessing games and the control class which was not given any treatment. The higher the scores of the experimental class students on the post-test, their speaking ability also increased. This can be seen from the post-test that researchers have done. The researchers considered that the students' fluency and accuracy had greatly improved along with the application of guessing games to the treatment. Therefore, the use of guessing games has an effect on students' speaking ability.

### Suggestion

Because there is an effect of using guessing games on students' speaking skills at SMP Kertanegara Malang in the 2021/2022 academic year, the researcher will give some suggestions to teachers, students and further researchers, as follows:
- **To the English teacher**

The researcher suggests English teachers to use games in the teaching and learning process, especially guessing games for the speaking class. This is because guessing games not only make students enthusiastic in class, but also improve their speaking skills.

- **To the students**

The students must follow and participate in the teaching and learning process when the teacher uses guessing games in speaking class. By participating and attending classes, students can improve their speaking skills as well as improve them.

- **For the next researcher**

The researcher suggests for further research with the same topic to use the results of this study as a source and information. Because, it allows future researchers to get some important information about guessing games on students' speaking ability.

## REFERENCES

Arikunto, S. 2002. *Prosedur Pendekatan Suatu Penelitian Praktek.* Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Brewster and Ellis. 2004. *The Primary English Teacher's Guide.* England: Penguin English.

Brown, Douglass. 2004. *Language Assesment Principles and Clasroom Practice.* New York: Pearson Education.

Burns, Christine. 2012. *Teaching Speaking: A Holistic Approach.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Byrne, D. 2006. *Languange Learning in the Classroom: Teaching Oral English.* Hongkong : Longman.

Fulcher, G. 2003. *Testing Second Language. Britain: Pearson Education Limited.* Heaton, J. 2004. *Writing English Language Tests.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Heinle. 2010. *An Introduction to Language: Ninth Edition.* Boston: Thomson Corporation.

Herhyanto, Nar. 2017. *Statistika Pendidikan.*Tangerang: Universitas Terbuka. Hornby, A.S. 1999. *Oxford Advance Learner's Dictionary of Current Language.* Oxford: Oxford Unity Press.

Klippel, F. 2012. *Keep Talking: Communicative Fluency Activities for Language Teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marsland, Bruce. 2009. *Lessons From Nothing.* Cambridge: University Press. Nasution, S. 2007. *Metode Research (Penelitian Ilmiah).* Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Nurastuti, W. 2007.*Metodologi Penelitian.* Yogyakarta: Penerbit Ardana Media.

Purwanto. 2008. *Metodologi Penelitian Kuantitatif.*Yogyakarta :Pustaka Pelajar.

Rahmawati, Dwi. 2016. *The Effectiveness of Using Guessing Game Technique Toward The Eight Grade Students' Speaking Skill at MTs Negeri  Bandung.*Published Thesis.IAIN Tulungagung.

Saptono, Dimas. 2018. *The Effect of Using Picture-Guessing Game Toward The Ninth Grade Students' Speaking Ability of SMPN 3 Kediri In Acaddemic Year 2017/2018.*Published Thesis.Universitas Nusantara PGRI Kediri.

Sugiyono. 2014. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D.* Bandung: Alfabeta.

Taniredja, T & Mustafidah, H. 2012.*Penelitian Kuantitaif (Sebuah Pengantar).* Bandung: Alfabeta.

Tarigan, Henry Guntur.1997.*Pengajaran Analisis Berbahasa.*Bandung :Angkasa.

Tim Penyusun Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Ilmu Keguruan IAIN Jember. 2019. *Pedoman Penulisan Karya Ilmiah.*Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Ilmu Keguruan IAIN Jember: Jember.

Thornbury,S. 2007. *How to Teach Speaking.* London: Longman Press.

Wahyuni, S. &Yulianti, F. 2016.*The Use of Guessing Game to Improve Student's Speaking Skill.*STKIP Bina Bangsa Getsempena.

Wright, A., Batteridge, D., & Bucky, M. 2005.*Games For Language Learning :Third Edition.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Zulaikha, Z &Asari, S. 2018. *The Effect of Using Interactive Guessing Game Technique on Fluency Student's Speaking Skill.*Published Thesis. Universitas of Muhammadiyah Gresik