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**ABSTRACT**

The research aimed at finding out whether or not the use of Show and Tell technique can improve speaking ability of the eleventh grade students of SMKN 5 Makassar and exploring whether or not the use of Show and Tell technique motivates to the eleventh grade students of SMKN 5 Makassar in speaking English.

The research applied quasi experimental design. This research assigned two groups namely experimental group and control group. Each group consisted of 30 students. The sample was chosen by applying cluster random sampling technique. The data of the students’ achievement in speaking were collected through pre-test and post-test. These data were analyzed quantitatively. Besides that, the researcher used questionnaire to find out the students’ motivation toward the use of Show and Tell Technique.

The research result showed that there was an increase on the students’ speaking ability between pretest and posttest in experimental group after the treatment. Then, it is concluded that the use of Show and Tell technique was able to give greater contribution to the students’ speaking ability. The result of the data analysis showed that the posttest was greater than the pretest (71.85˃43.51). Furthermore, the data that were collected from questionnaire showed that the students were motivated to the use of Show and Tell technique in scale of 66.1 which was categorized as motivated.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Speaking is one of the most important and essential skills that must be practiced to communicate orally. By speaking, people are able to know what kinds of situations the world. Being able to speak English is an essential need in learning target language. Nunan (1995) claims that mastering the art of speaking is the single most important aspect of learning a second and foreign language, a success is measured in terms of ability to carry out a conversation in the language. Therefore speaking has to be taught and developed by language teachers in Indonesia.

Most of students are quite difficult to improve speaking ability. Students are compulsory to be attentive of the elements in speaking such as accuracy (pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary) fluency and comprehensibility (Scriverner, 2005). Teaching speaking at Vocational School in Indonesia is one of the main focuses of the English teaching. The principle of teaching English is all the process of teaching should be communicative because the graduates of the students of Vocational school are directed to have life skills for communication to meet the need of job opportunity, besides they can continue their study to the higher level. Considering this importance of speaking skill for students, therefore the English teachers should find out the effort on searching and creating a new model in presenting materials, in order to increase the students’ ability to speak English.

In the preliminary study that the researcher did on February 8, 2017, in the eleventh grade of students in SMKN 5 Makassar, the researcher found some problems in learning English, especially speaking skill. The researcher found that most students made some mistakes in utterances, took too long to compose utterances and some inappropriate word-choice also appeared, the students also encountered some problems in fluency such as the limited range of expressions, unnatural pauses, too much repetitions.

The next problem that the researcher found was that most of the students were not motivated in speaking because they were lack of vocabulary, they were afraid of making mistakes in pronouncing the English words and they were unable to arrange sentences into good order. Based on the problems mentioned, it is important to find an alternative way to improve the students‘ speaking ability. One of the solutions is by selecting an appropriate teaching and learning technique to solve the problems above.

Show and tell is one of the teaching techniques for informative classroom activities: a classroom activity in which each student brings an object to school and tells the others in the classroom about it (Encarta, 2007). The students are free to choose a delivered object. It can be real object such as toy, favorite snack, picture, map, and authentic material which they prefer. Bowen (1985:115) stated that Show and tell technique capitalizes on students’ interest and provides a good opportunity for self-expression. Show and tell is the processes of showing the audience something and telling them about it. Norton (1980:59) says that during a show and tell experience, the child talks about an activity or shows an object that he has bought to school. The children voluntarily take turns talking about their object or activity. So, it makes the students relaxed when they are talking to each other. In talking about the object, the students are expected to emphasize it into two indicators of speaking: asking and giving information, and delivering procedural text monologue.

In a very great amount, show and tell can help the students improve their speaking fluency because they have had previous concepts or background knowledge of what to talk. Show and tell technique provided the students the greater opportunity to gather some informational inputs in order to build a good understanding and communication in performing students’ speaking skill. In relation to the explanation above, the researcher is interested in conducting a research under the title “Using Show and Tell Technique to Improve Speaking Ability of The Eleventh Grade Students of SMKN 5 Makassar”.

Considering about the issues above, the researcher formulates research questions as follows:

1. Can the use of Show and Tell technique improve speaking ability of the eleventh grade students of SMKN 5 Makassar?
2. Are the eleventh grade students of SMKN 5 motivated to speak English using Show and Tell technique?

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**Previous Related Studies**

Previous research about the implementing show and tell technique by using an object as instructional media in the classroom has been done by Pujianti (2003) to prove the effect of using real objects or realia as teaching media. The result shows there was a significant effect of using real objects or realia as teaching media that on the 8th grade students’ vocabulary achievement at SLTPN 4 Gambiran. Similar findings were done by Fatmawati (2010). Based on Fatmawati’s finding, the use of real object or realia enhanced the students’ vocabulary achievement. In the same way, Sufiana (2005), on her findings, also proved that using real object was steadily improving the students’ ability in developing paragraph.

The similarity of their research and present research is the using real objects or realia as teaching media. Then the differences are that those researchers improve students’ vocabulary achievement and paragraph development ability, while this researcher intends to improve speaking ability. However, the use of real media has never been investigated on the vocational school students, especially the real media in which it is given to improve students’ speaking ability. Therefore, based on this rationale the researcher seems to utilize one of the real medias, related to technique, which is called show and tell technique.

**Some Pertinent Ideas**

### Speaking

Speaking is one of the oral skills that play a very essential role in human interaction and communication. When communicate their ideas, minds, and feelings to others, they usually speak.

Clark and Clark (1997) stated that speaking is fundamentally an instrumental act. Speakers talk in order to have some effect on their listeners. They assert things to change their state of knowledge. They ask them questions to get them to provide information. They request things to get them to do things for them. And they promise, bet, warn, and explain to affect them in still other ways..

Nunan (1999) stated that speaking is an interactive process constructing meaning that involves producing, receiving and processing information. Its form and meaning are depending on context in which it occurs, including the participants themselves, their experiences, the physical environment, and the purposes for speaking. It is often spontaneous, open-ended, and evolving. However, speech is not always unpredictable. Speaking requires that learners not only know how to produce specific points of language such as grammar, pronunciation, or vocabulary (“linguistic competence”), but also they understand when, why, and in what ways to produce language (“sociolinguistic competence’)

All of definitions above convey the speaking as a process of building and sharing meaning which are expressed by mouth where there are speakers and listeners.

 **Show and Tell**

Encarta (2007) defines that show and tell is a technique for *informative classroom activity*: a classroom activity for children in which each child brings an object to school and tells the other children about it.

Show and tell is similar with “Realia Strategies”. Realia is a term for any real, concrete object used in the classroom to create connections with vocabulary words, stimulate conversation and build background knowledge. It gives students the opportunity to use all of their sense to learn about a given subject, and is appropriate for any grade or skill level. Teacher can defray costs by collecting on a school wide collections of realia that all can use. When the real object is not available or is impractical, teachers can use models or semi concrete objects such as photographs, illustrations and artwork (Herrel in Deborah, 2003)

**Motivation**

Motivation is commonly thought of as an inner drive, impulse emotion or desire that moves one particular action (Brown, 1987), while Penny (1996) defines motivation as a combination of forces which initiate, direct, and sustain behavior toward a goal. Harmer (1991) also proposes similar definition, that is, motivation is some kind of internal drive that encourage somebody to pursue a course of action. This means that the effort shown by students to achieve a certain goal is the reflection of his motivation toward that goal. If somebody perceive sufficiently attractive goal, he will be strongly motivated to reach that goal**.** The researcher’s aspect that is not less important in learning a language than attitude concludes that motivation goes hand in hand with to reach the target language. These two aspects, motivation and attitude influence the learning success or achievement**.**

**METHOD**

**Design and Sample**

The researcher applied Quasi-Experimental design which aimed to find out to what extent Show and Tell technique improve the speaking of the eleventh grade students of SMKN 5 Makassar in 2016/2017 academic years. This design involved experimental group and control group. Both of groups were given pre-test and post-test. But the experimental group was given treatment by using show and tell technique. The subjects of this research were class XI-KB as experimental group and class XI-GB1 as control group. Each class consisted of 30 students, so the total of the sample was 60 students.

**Instrument and Procedure of Collecting Data**

In this research, the researcher collected the data through speaking test and questionnaire as the research instrument. The researcher came to the class to gave Pre-test in order to know the students’ prior knowledge after that the researcher gave the treatments four times then the post-test was conducted after treatment to find the students’ improvement in speaking skill, The questionnaires were distributed after post-test to the experimental group.

**Data Analysis**

In analyzing data on the students’ speaking ability the researcher used speaking test which was analyzed using the following procedures:1. scoring the students answer of pre-test and post-testby Puskur in Sudarmi (2008).2. classifying the score into the following scale in measuring Accuracy, Fluencyand Comprehensibilityby Heaton (1988) .3.calculating the mean score, and 4.calculating the t-test Valueused SPSS version 22.Questionnaire to measure the students’motivation, The researcher measured the Questionnaire by using Likert Scale.

**RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

**Students’ Speaking Achievement**

1. **Scoring classification of students’ pre-test and post-test**

**Table .1 The frequency and percentage of the students’ speaking accuracy in pre-test and Post-test**



Table 1.illustrates that the aggregate percentage of experimental group was improving after the treatment had been conducted, categorized as very good was 0% in pre-test to 23.33% (7 students) in post-test, categorized as good was 3.33 (1 student) in pre-test to 70% (21students) in post-test, categorized as average was 36.67% (11 students) in pre-test to 6.67% ( 2 students) in post-test, categorized as poor was 60% (18 students) in pre-test to 0% in post-test. While in control group categorized as very good was 0% in pre-test to 10% (3 students) in post-test, categorized as good was 10% (3 students) in pre-test to 33.33% (10 students) in post-test, categorized as average 53.33% (16 students) in pre-test to 56.67% (17 students), categorized as poor was 36.67% ( 11students) in pre-test to 0% in post-test. The score distribution for experimental group and control group on accuracy in post-test showed the difference from pre-test. After the treatment conducted, both of them showed an improvement but in experimental group gave higher improvement than control group.

**Table 2. The frequency and percentage of the students’ speaking fluency in pre-test and Post-test**



Table 2. illustrates that the aggregate percentage of experimental group was improving after the treatment had been conducted, categorized as very good was 0% in pre-test to 23.33% (7 students) in post-test, categorized as good was 3% (1 student) in pre-test to 76.67% (23students) in, categorized as average was 33.33% (10 students) in pre-test to 0% (not any students) in post-test, categorized as poor was 63.33% (19 students) in pre-test to 0% in post-test. While in control group categorized as very good was 0% in pre-test to 6.67% (2 students) in post-test, categorized as good was 0% in pre-test to 46.67% (14 students) in post-test, categorized as average 66.67% (20 students) in pre-test to 46.67% (14 students), categorized as poor was 33.33% ( 10 students) in pre-test to 0% in post-test. The score distribution for experimental group and control group on fluency in post-test showed the difference from pre-test. After the treatment conducted, both of them showed an improvement but the experimental group gave higher improvement than the control group**.**

**Table 3. The frequency and percentage of the students’ speaking Comprehensibility in pre-test and Post-test**



Table 3. illustrates that the aggregate percentage of experimental group was improving after the treatment had been conducted, categorized as very good was 0% in pre-test to 53.33% (16 students) in post-test, categorized as good was 10% (3 students) in pre-test to 46.67% (14students) in post-test, categorized as average was 76.67% (23 students) in pre-test to 0% (not any students) in post-test, categorized as poor was 13.33% (4 students) in pre-test to 0% in post-test. While in control group categorized as very good was 0% in pre-test to 10% (3 students) in post-test, categorized as good was 6.67% (2 students) in pre-test to 33.33% (10 students) in post-test, categorized as average 63.33% (19 students) in pre-test to 56.67% (17 students), categorized as poor was 30% ( 9 students) in pre-test to 0% in post-test. The score distribution for experimental group and control group on comprehensibility in post-test showed the difference from pre-test. After the treatment conducted, both of them showed an improvement but the experimental group gave higher improvement than the control group.

1. **The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Students’ Speaking Accuracy, Fluency and Comprehensibility in Speaking both Pre-test and Post-test.**

The researcher found that the mean score of students’ speaking ability increased in the result of students’ pre-test to post-test. Based on the data below, the mean score of the students’ result of speaking ability for experimental and control group increased after giving treatment. The students’ score based for both experimental and control group showed the improvement, but the experimental group increased significantly than control group. The data of the students’ score are presented in the following table

**Table 4. The Mean Score and the Standard Deviation of the students’ Pre-test and Post-test both Experimental Group (Exp. Group) and Control Group (Con. Group) in regard to Accuracy, Fluency and comprehensibility**.



In the table 4. above, the mean score and standard deviation shows the difference in pre-test and post-test to both of groups. The table indicates that the mean score of the students’ pre-test of the experimental group relating to accuracy was 40.54 and the standard deviation was 9.48 while the mean score of the control group was 45.55 and the standard deviation was 10.66. The mean score of both groups was different after the treatment. The mean score after the treatment was 69.45 for the experimental group and the standard deviation was 8.84 while the mean score of control group was 58.89 and the standard deviation was 11.36. It can be concluded that the mean score of experimental group is higher than control group (69.45˃58.89).

Table 4.also shows that the mean score of the students’ pre-test of the experimental group relating to fluency was 39.99 and the standard deviation was 9.39 while the mean score of control group was 44.44 and the standard deviation was 7.99. The mean score of both group was different after the treatment. The mean score after the treatment was 70.55 for the experimental group and the standard deviation was 7.17 while the mean score of control group was 60.00 and the standard deviation was 10.36. It can be concluded that the mean score of the experimental group is higher than the control group (70.55˃60.00).

The table 4.also shows that the mean score of the students’ pre-test of the experimental group relating to comprehensibility was 49.44 and the standard deviation was 8.17 while the mean score of control group was 46.11 and the standard deviation was 9.47. The mean score of both group was different after the treatment. The mean score after the treatment was 75.55 for the experimental group and the standard deviation was 8.45 while the mean score of control group was 58.89 and the standard deviation was 11.35 It can be concluded that the mean score of the experimental group is higher than the control group (75.55˃58.89).

Test of Significance (t-Test)

The hypothesis is tested by using inferential analysis. In this case, the researcher used t-test (test of significance) for independent sample test, that is, a test to know the significance difference between the result of students’ mean scores in pre-test and post-test in control and experimental group. Assuming that the level of significance (α) = 0.05, the only thing which is needed; the degree of freedom (df) = 58, where N1 + N2 = 56, then the result of t-test is presented in the following table.

**Table 5 The Probability Value of the students speaking Achievement on Experimental and control Group**



Based on the result of the data analysis as summarized in table 5 above on pre-test of control and experimental group, the researcher found that the p-value (0.315) is greater than the level of significance at t-table (0.05) and the degree of freedom 56. It means that H0 was accepted and H1 was rejected. In other words, there was no significant difference between the students’ speaking ability of both group, experimental and control group, before the treatment.

While the data on post-test of control and experimental group shows the probability value was smaller than α (0.00˂ 0.05). It indicates that the alternative hypothesis (H1) was accepted. It means that the use of show and tell technique was able to give significantly greater contribution than conventional technique (using course book). It could be stated that the use of show and tell technique could improve the students’ ability in speaking better.

**The students’ Motivation**

The findings of motivation scale and the students’ interview reveal that the implementation of show and tell technique motivated the students to speak English as shown in the following tables. The percentage of the students’ motivation in experimental group is given in the table 6, and the mean score and the standard deviation are given in the table 7.

**Table 6.the percentage of the students’ motivation in show and tell technique in experimental group**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Interval Score** | **Category** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| 68 – 80 | Strongly Motivated | 9 | 30 |
| 56 – 67 | Motivated | 21 | 70 |
| 44 – 55 | Fairly motivated |  |  |
| 32 – 43 | Unmotivated |  |  |
| 20 – 31 | Strongly Unmotivated |   |   |

The data of the student’ interval score based on motivation scale in the table 6 shows that 9 Students ( 30 %) felt strongly positive,21 Students (70%)felt positive, but none of student felt neutral, negative and strongly negative. In the table below, the researcher presented the mean score and the standard deviation of the students’ motivation in experimental group towards the implementation of show and tell technique.

**Table 7.The Mean Score and the Standard Deviation of the students’ Motivation in Experimental Group**.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|   | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| The Students' Motivation | 66.1 | 3.87 |

The table 7.shows that the mean score of the students’ motivation was 66.1 which was categorized as motivation and the standard deviation was 3.87. The researcher concluded as motivated category. In the other words, the students can be stimulated to speak English through show and tell technique. It is an indication of success degree shown by the students in applying their achievement in real situation.

**CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS**

Based on the findings and discussion on the previous chapter, the researcher concluded that:

The use of show and tell technique in teaching speaking improved the students’ speaking ability. The mean score of the students’ post-test in experimental group was higher than control group. The use of show and tell technique in teaching speaking improved the speaking ability of the students of the eleventh grade students of SMKN 5 Makassar. It was proved by the t-test value that is 0.05 or 0.00<0.05. It means that the use of show and tell technique was able to give significantly greater contribution than conventional method (using course book). It can be stated that the use of show and tell technique could improve the students’ ability in speaking better.

The use of show and tell technique motivated the students in learning English speaking. This led to the conclusion that the eleventh grade students of SMKN5 Makassar were motivated in learning English speaking through show and tell technique. It was proved by students’ mean score on questionnaire 66.1 which categorized as motivated. It means that the students are motivated in learning English speaking through show and tell technique.

Based on the conclusion above, the researcher would like to propose some suggestions as follows: (1) The English teachers could implement show and tell technique in teaching English speaking to the SMK students. The technique offers opportunity to the students to increase creative thinking, they find out themselves word-choice vocabulary from the object they observed, arrange those words into the correct sentences and practice its pronunciation. Therefore students’ speaking accuracy, fluency and comprehensibility can be improved and enhance their motivation in learning English speaking. (2).Further researchers. The researcher also suggested to other researchers can conduct further researcher on teaching technique, particularly show and tell technique for other skill of English since the researcher has some weaknesses, the researcher suggested to others to conduct furthermore research related to this problem to cover the weakness of this research.
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