Journal Language League ISSN: 2338-2546
Vol/Num: XIV/2, March,2024-September, 2024
Indeks Open Journal System/Google Scholar

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF GUESSING GAME STRATEGY ON STUDENTS WRITING DESCRIPTIVE TEXT

[1]Mailani, [2]Dian Anggraini Harahap, [3]Paisal Manurung
[1,2,3] English Education Study Program, The Faculty of Teacher Training's and Education, Universitas Asahan
Email: mailanimey24@gmail.com[1]
diananggrainiharahap123@gmail.com[2],[3]paisalmanurung@gmail.com

Abstract
This study aims to determine the significant effect of using guessing games on students in writing descriptive texts for grade X SMK Muhammadiyah 5 Kisaran in the 2022/2023 academic year. The population of this study were students of class X AP SMK Muhammadiyah 5 Kisaran which consisted of 3 classes. This study uses a quantitative approach with a quasi-experimental research design. Subjects in this study were divided into two groups, namely the experimental group and the control group. The research sample chose X AP-2 as the experimental group and X AP-1 as the control group. The experimental group in X AP-2 consisted of 30 students, while the control group in X AP-1 consisted of 30 students. So that the total sample size for this study was 60 students. Based on the results of data analysis, the average value of the experimental class was 45 in the pre-test and 79 in the post-test. While the average value of the control class was 37 on the pre-test and 75 on the post-test. The results obtained are tcount> ttable, namely tcount = 3.898 and ttable = 1.701, so 3.898 > 1.701. Significance 0.000 <0.05. Thus (Ho) is rejected and (Ha) is accepted. That is, there is a significant difference in the value of student learning outcomes between classes that apply the guessing game method and those that do not apply the guessing game method. So, the guessing game method is effective and significant on the ability to write descriptive text by the students.

Key Word: *Guessing Game, Writing, Descriptive Text*

Introduction

Students was studying the English language, in particular, must be aware of and able to comprehend a number of key concepts(Muwafi & Taufiqurrochman, 2023). Specifically, hearing, speaking, reading, and writing are the four abilities used in English communication. Writing is regarded as one of the key abilities for English First Learning by learners when studying English, particularly in academic settings where students must comprehend and manage all of the complexities of writing(Pinangkaan et al., 2023).

The effectiveness of a guessing game strategy in teaching students to write descriptive texts can be significant, particularly in engaging students and enhancing their creative thinking(Ana, 2018). Here's a breakdown of how this strategy can influence students' writing skills(Mukramah et al., 2023). Guessing games require students to be active participants, which increases their engagement in the learning process(Bosch-Rosa & Meissner, 2020). The interactive nature of guessing games makes the learning process more enjoyable, reducing anxiety and encouraging students to express themselves more freely. Through guessing games, students learn new vocabulary in context, which can enhance their ability to describe objects, people, or scenes more vividly (Hasanah et al., 2022).

The need to provide and interpret clues in guessing games fosters creativity, helping students think outside the box when describing something in writing.

Guessing games provide prompts that can kickstart the writing process, helping students overcome the blank page syndrome. The strategy encourages students to focus on specific details to make their descriptions clearer and more precise(Hedberg, 2021). Guessing games often involve group work, which can enhance communication skills and allow students to learn from each other's descriptive techniques. Working in groups gives students the chance to give and receive feedback on their descriptive abilities, which can lead to improvements in their writing(Hwang et al., 2023). Guessing games require students to make inferences, a critical thinking skill that is beneficial in both understanding and constructing descriptive texts. Meanwhile, analyzing clues to make guesses helps students develop their analytical skills, which are essential in organizing and structuring their writing(Wahyuni & Yulianti, 2021). The guessing game strategy can be aligned with real-life scenarios where students describe objects, people, or scenes, making the writing task more relevant and practical. Repeated practice through different guessing games allows students to refine their descriptive writing skills over time.

Writing is one of the main ways that people communicate with one another to express what they are thinking and feeling(Siregar & Dongoran, 2020). Like talking, writing is an unnatural act. Speaking requires less effort than writing does. Writing requires a challenging effort to extract and manage the ideas from the researcher's mind and pour them into written form successfully so that it will be readable (Ross, 2018). A descriptive writing is one that thoroughly explains a person or item. Highlighting and describing a particular person, place, or item is its aim (Maru et al., 2020). In-depth information about particular people, objects, and places is provided in a descriptive paragraph. Consequently, a text is anything that describes a person, object, or location.

The teacher must be able to select and develop an appropriate method of presenting material in order to increase the students' interest and motivation in understanding and producing it (United et al., 2012). If the students are taught about descriptive text based on the book, it is not enjoyable. In order to make the teaching and learning process interesting for the students, the teacher needs a creative idea. Technology now plays a significant part in people's daily lives. It has a variety of applications, including communication, entertainment, and education(Bernardes, 2020). The student can provide a variety of online materials by using technology. Some materials, like Guessing Game, can be incorporated into a traditional English lesson.

A guessing game is an activity in which individuals or groups interact with the goal of prescribing objectives (Michelsen, 2015). Students can collaborate with their peers by playing guessing games and exchanging ideas. It may be inferred that the guessing game has an impact not only on students' cognitive abilities, but also on their emotional

well-being because it helps them become more social.

Method

At SMK Muhammadiyah 5 Kisaran, Grade X students served as the participants of this study. In the province of Sumatera Utara, Jl. Madong Lubis No. 8, Kelurahan Selawan, Kec. Kota Kisaran Timur-Asahan, is where this school is situated. The study is a quantitative type of investigation. that time they using Guessing Game to function as an independent variable to the implementation(Mukramah et al., 2023). in order to compare the outcomes within the treatment group and the control group, the method of study that the research chose to use is a quasi-experimental design. The study creates two classes: the experimental class, designated as X AP-2, and the control class, designated as X AP-1, which was used as the sample.

Result and Discussion

Table 4.1The Students' Writting Ability Score Pre Test and Post Test in Experimental Class

NO	Inisial Name	Pre Test Experimental	Post Test Experimental
1	A	50	80
2	ARZ	45	80
3	APA	50	75
4	AT	50	80
5	AS	50	75
6	CN	40	75
7	DF	35	80
8	DA	50	75
9	EM	55	85
10	FF	40	75
11	FR	50	85
12	HR	50	75
13	HA	40	80
14	KS	40	70
15	MW	40	75
16	NW	55	85
17	NMN	35	70
18	RA	45	75
19	RF	55	85
20	SFS	45	85
21	SR	40	85
22	TW	40	80
23	WA	40	80
24	HCL	45	80
25	SR	40	85
26	SBR	50	80
27	MS	40	80
28	MP	55	80
29	N	45	85
30	NP	50	90

Table 4.2 Descriptive Statisctics Students' Writtng Skill Score in Experimental Class

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation

	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic
PretestControl	30	35	55	45.50	1.108	6.067
PosttestControl	30	70	90	79.67	.895	4.901
Valid N (listwise)	30					

Based on Table 4.1 and 4.2 above showed the quantity respondents (N) in the experimental class as many as 30 respondents. From these 30 respondents, it was can be seen that the smallest (minimum) value for pretest is 35 and 70 for the minimum score for final test. And the largest (maximum) value in pretest is 55 and for posttest is 90. The mean of students' score in pre-test was 45.50 and after giving treatment by using peer response, it was increased 34, 17% until the score mean was being 79,67 in post test.The posttest scores are higher than the pretest value, indicating that using peer response models has a significant effect on Writing Ability of Class Experiment.

Table 4.3 The Students' Writting Skill Score Pre Test and Post Test in Control Class

NO	Inisial Name	Pre Test Experimental	Post Test Experimental
1	AF	40	80
2	AW	35	75
3	AM	40	70
4	ANA	35	75
5	DA	40	80
6	DA	45	85
7	DM	40	75
8	DNA	35	75
9	DAD	45	70
10	ENS	50	80
11	EZ	35	70
12	IM	30	70
13	IF	35	75
14	MAP	40	75
15	MTA	50	70
16	NH	30	75
17	NF	30	70
18	NM	40	80
19	SH	40	75
20	SH	30	75
21	SRH	35	75
22	TD	30	70
23	WWD	30	75
24	HS	30	75
25	RD	35	70
26	TSA	50	80
27	N	30	85
28	NS	30	75
29	NI	50	70
30	N	50	75

Table 4.4Descriptive Statistics Students' Writting Skill Score in Control Class

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation

	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic
PretestControl	30	30	50	37.83	1.306	7.154
PosttestControl	30	70	85	75.00	.795	4.355
Valid N (listwise)	30					

From table 4.3 and 4.4 above it can be seen that the number of respondents (N) in the control class is 30 respondents. Of these 30 respondents was can be seen that the smallest (minimum) value for control class pretest was 30 and 70 for the minimum score on the posttest. Biggest (maximum) score in pretest is 50 and for posttest is 85. The average value of 30 respondents for the pretest is 37.83 while the posttest about 75,00. This shows that student scores increased between pretest and posttest, though not significantly. However, when the experimental and control classes were compared, there was a significant difference in the posttest average score, with the experimental class score of 79,67 and the control class only getting a score of 75.00.

Tabel 4. 5 Validity and Reability of the PreTest Experiment

Correlations

		Q1	Q2	Q3	TOTAL
Q1	Pearson Correlation	1	.721**	-.304	.518**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.102	.003
	N	30	30	30	30
Q2	Pearson Correlation	.721**	1	-.357	.530**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.053	.003
	N	30	30	30	30
Q3	Pearson Correlation	-.304	-.357	1	.566**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.102	.053		.001
	N	30	30	30	30
TOTAL	Pearson Correlation	.518**	.530**	.566**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.003	.001	
	N	30	30	30	30

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.581	4

Based on the table above or testing the validity of the items, all items tested are valid because the Pearson correlation (r_{hitung}) of each item is greater than the r_{table}. The value of r_{table} with a sample of 30 with df = n-2 (30-2=28 $r_{table=}$ 0.462, meaning that if r_{hitung}> 0.462 then the item is considered valid. However, if r_{hitung}<0.344 then the item is considered invalid.

The output above showed the value of the alpha coefficient, which is 0.58, the instrument is declared to have high reliability. This device has high reliability. If the alpha value is > 0.58, this means it is reliable enough. .

Table 4.6 Validity and Reability of the Post Test Experiment Class

Correlations

	Q1	Q2	Q3	TOTAL

	Pearson Correlation	1	.106	-.042	.522**
Q1	Sig. (2-tailed)		.578	.827	.003
	N	30	30	30	30
	Pearson Correlation	.106	1	.044	.558**
Q2	Sig. (2-tailed)	.578		.818	.001
	N	30	30	30	30
	Pearson Correlation	-.042	.044	1	.688**
Q3	Sig. (2-tailed)	.827	.818		.000
	N	30	30	30	30
	Pearson Correlation	.522**	.558**	.688**	1
TOTAL	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.001	.000	
	N	30	30	30	30

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.683	4

Based on the table above or testing the validity of the items, all items tested are valid because the Pearson correlation (r_{hitung}) of each item is greater than the r_{table}. The value of r_{table} with a sample of 30 with df = n-2 (30-2=28 $r_{table=}$ 0.462, meaning that if r_{hitung}> 0.462 then the item is considered valid.

The output above shows the value of the alpha coefficient, which is 0.68, this device has high reliability. If the alpha value is greater than 0.6, this means it is reliable enough.

Tabel 4.7 Validity and Reability of the Pre Test Control Class

Correlations

		Q1	Q2	Q3	TOTAL
	Pearson Correlation	1	.335	-.023	.537**
Q1	Sig. (2-tailed)		.070	.905	.002
	N	30	30	30	30
	Pearson Correlation	.335	1	-.049	.559**
Q2	Sig. (2-tailed)	.070		.797	.001
	N	30	30	30	30
	Pearson Correlation	-.023	-.049	1	.710**
Q3	Sig. (2-tailed)	.905	.797		.000
	N	30	30	30	30
	Pearson Correlation	.537**	.559**	.710**	1
TOTAL	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.001	.000	
	N	30	30	30	30

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.692	4

Based on the table above or testing the validity of the items, all items tested are valid because the Pearson correlation (r_{hitung}) of each item is greater than the r_{table}. The value of r_{table} with a sample of 30 with df = n-2 (30-2=28 $r_{table=}$ 0.462, meaning that if

r_{hitung}> 0.462 then the item is considered valid. However, if r_{hitung}<0.344 then the item is considered invalid.

The output above shows an alpha factor value of 0.69. The equipment is rated fairly reliable.

Tabel 4.8 Validity and Reability of the Post Test Control Class

Correlations

		Q1	Q2	Q3	TOTAL
Q1	Pearson Correlation	1	-.042	-.044	.460*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.825	.817	.011
	N	30	30	30	30
Q2	Pearson Correlation	-.042	1	.037	.546**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.825		.845	.002
	N	30	30	30	30
Q3	Pearson Correlation	-.044	.037	1	.653**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.817	.845		.000
	N	30	30	30	30
TOTAL	Pearson Correlation	.460*	.546**	.653**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.011	.002	.000	
	N	30	30	30	30

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.651	4

Based on the table above or testing the validity of the items, all items tested are valid because the Pearson correlation (r_{hitung}) of each item is greater than the r_{table}. The value of r_{table} with a sample of 30 with df = n-2 (30-2=28 $r_{table=}$ 0.462, meaning that if r_{hitung}> 0.462 then the item is considered valid.

The output above shows the value of the alpha factor (0.65). The equipment is rated fairly reliable.

The Hypothesis Testing

The Hypothesis testing is the basic criteria for drawing the mathematical predictions about situation. It is basically concentrates particular result about a particular situation.

In carrying out this test there are several provisions that must be used as guidelines, 'if t_{hitung}> t_{table} or Sig. < 0.05 then Ho is rejected and Ha accepted. And then, if t_{hitung}< t_{table} or Sig. > 0.05 then Ho is accepted and Ha is Rejected. In this research, researchers used a sample of 30 people. Then the value of degrees of freedom (dk) = n-2 = 30-2 = 28 and error rate of 5% for the sig. 2-tailed test, it can be seen that the value of t_{table} = 1,701 results of calculating the hypothesis test using the SPSS version 20.

Table 4.9 Hypothesis 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
Writting_Posttest	Equal variances assumed	,959	,331	3,898	58	,000	4,667	1,197	2,270	7,063
	Equal variances not assumed			3,898	57.208	,000	4,667	1.197	2,270	7,064

Based on the table under t_{hitung} =3,898. So, $t_{hitung} > t_{tabel}$ or 3,898> 1,701 and Sig. 0,000 < 0,05 Ho is rejected and Ha accepted the hypotesis there is Sig.

Discussion

Research Finding is a measurement that the hypothesis' resting state allows for. The control group's and experimental group's means were different. The experimental group's post-test mean was greater than that of the control group. Whether the hypothesis is correct or not, each test entails making one or more predictions about what ought to occur. The gathering and examination of observational or experimental data is necessary to determine whether or not predictions are fulfilled.

This study compared the writing abilities of students in the experimental class and the control class using class X English learning materials on descriptive texts to ascertain The Effect of Peer Response Strategy on Students' Writing Ability. Class X Ap 2 and class X Ap 1 served as the experimental and control groups, respectively. the differences in how the experimental class and control class were treated with regard to learning strategies.

After doing statistical analysis with the t-test calculated using the SPSS version 20 program, the results obtained are $t_{hitung} > t_{table}$, namely t_{hitung} = 3.898 and t_{table} = 1,701, then 3,898> 1,701. The significance 0,000 <0.05. With Thus Ho is rejected. This means, there is a significant difference in the value of the results student learning between classes that apply the Peer Response Stategy and those that do not apply the Peer Response Stategy. So, the Peer Response Stategy is effective and significant on the writing ability english narrative text.

Conclusion

The guessing game strategy can be highly effective in improving students' ability to write descriptive texts by making the learning process interactive, enhancing vocabulary and descriptive skills, and fostering critical thinking. The strategy also promotes collaboration and engagement, which are key factors in effective learning. A quantitative study was used in this study and

a cluster random sampling technique was used for sampling. The sample consists of his AP-1 class in his SMK Muhammadiyah 5 Kisaran and his X name in his AP-2 class for the 2022/2023 academic year. In this study, pretests, treatments, and follow-up tests were used for data collection. Essay texts are tools for data collection. From the results obtained, we can see that Thitung > ttable, i.e. Thitung = 3.898 and ttable = 1.701, and 3.898 > 1.701. Significance 0.000 <0.05. So rejects (Ho) and accepts (Ha). Guessing game methods have been found to have a significant impact on students' descriptive writing.

References

Ana, I. K. T. A. (2018). Teaching English Vocabulary for Young Learners through Electronic Guessing Game. *Journal of Psychology and Instructions*, *2*(1). https://doi.org/10.23887/jpai.v2i1.13738

Bernardes, Â. D. C. (2020). Education for Sustainable Development Review. *EccoS – Revista Científica*, *54*. https://doi.org/10.5585/eccos.n54.16138

Bosch-Rosa, C., & Meissner, T. (2020). The one player guessing game: a diagnosis on the relationship between equilibrium play, beliefs, and best responses. *Experimental Economics*, *23*(4). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10683-020-09642-2

Hasanah, R., Eviyuliwati, I., & Deviyanti, M. (2022). The Effect of Guessing Game on Students' Vocabulary Knowledge. *SIBATIK JOURNAL: Jurnal Ilmiah Bidang Sosial, Ekonomi, Budaya, Teknologi, Dan Pendidikan*, *1*(2). https://doi.org/10.54443/sibatik.v1i2.12

Hedberg, P. H. (2021). One step ahead in the game: Predicting negotiation outcomes with guessing-games measures. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, *34*(5). https://doi.org/10.1002/bdm.2237

Hwang, W. Y., Manabe, K., & Huang, T. H. (2023). Collaborative guessing game for EFL learning with kinesthetic recognition. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, *48*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2023.101297

Maru, M. G., Nur, S., & Lengkoan, F. (2020). Applying video for writing descriptive text in senior high school in the covid-19 pandemic transition. *International Journal of Language Education*, *4*(3). https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v4i3.14901

Michelsen, G. (2015). Policy, Politics and Polity in Higher Education for Sustainable Development. In *Routledge Handbook of Higher Education for Sustainable Development*.

https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315852249-5

Mukramah, C., Mustafa, F., & Sari, D. F. (2023). The Effect of Picture and Text Prompts on Idea Formulation and Organization of Descriptive Text. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, *7*(2).

Muwafi, M. R., & Taufiqurrochman, R. (2023). The Effectiveness of Using Android-Based Picture Guessing Game in Improving Arabic Vocabulary. *Kitaba*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.18860/kitaba.v1i1.21169

Pinangkaan, V. F. L., Maru, M. G., & Wongkar, Y. H. (2023). The Use of Guessing Game in Improving Students' Speaking Skill at SMP Negeri 3 Tondano. *SoCul: International Journal of Research in Social Cultural Issues*, *2*(2). https://doi.org/10.53682/soculijrccsscli.v2i2.6797

Ross, R. S. (2018). Nationalism, Geopolitics and Naval Expansionism From the Nineteenth Century to the Rise of China. *Naval War College Review*, *71*(4).

Siregar, R., & Dongoran, N. (2020). Students' Ability in Writing Descriptive Text. *English Journal for Teaching and Learning*, *08*(01).

United, T., Educational, N., & Secretariat, T. (2012). United Nations and Cultural Organization. In *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Globalization*.

Wahyuni, S., & Yulianti, F. (2021). The Use of Guessing Game to Improve Students' Speaking Skill. *IJJE (Indonesian Journal Of English Eduation)*, *8*(2).