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Abstract—This research deals with the effect of Ice Breaking Technique in Teaching Speaking. The objective of the study was to find out whether Ice Breaking Technique significantly affect in teaching speaking. The population of the study was the tenth grade students of SMK Dharma Bhakti Siborongborong who were registered in academic year 2018/2019. The data were obtained from 56 students as samples; the researcher took the sample from 224 students of tenth grade as the population. The students were divided into two groups namely experimental group and control group. The experimental group was taught by using Ice Breaking Technique while control group was taught without Ice Breaking Technique. The instrument used in collecting data were speaking test. The data were analyzed by using t-test formula. Having calculated the data it was found that t–test was higher than t-table (7, 70 >2.005) with the degree of freedom (df) 54 (28+28-2) with the t-table is 2.005 and the calculate value was 5.38. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H0) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) was accepted. It can be concluded that Ice Breaking Technique significantly affect in teaching speaking.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Naturally, human already use language to express what he/she wants or needs since he/she was born. Every time language takes big part in human life. Asking for something, telling something, and giving a response are done by language. According to Brown (2000) language is a system of arbitrary conventionalized vocal, written, or gestural symbols that enable members of a given community to communicate intelligibly with one another. Language is also the most frequently used and most developed from the human communication. Speaking is one of communicative learning that helps students to communicate by using English Language. By speaking, student can say everything that they have in their mind. In learning speaking, the students often find some problems. Ice Breaking Technique is an effective technique used in teaching speaking because it is an enjoyable technique and give students a chance to get to know their peers while practicing English in a relaxed setting.

The Problem of the Study
Based on the background written above, the problem of the study is formulated by researcher as the following: Does ice breaking technique significantly affect in teaching speaking?

The Scope of the study
There are nine kinds of ice breaking technique namely: yel-yel, clap hands, body movement, song, games, joke, story, magic, and audio visual. But the researcher focus to ice breaking games.

The Objective of the Study
The objective of the study is: to find out whether ice breaking technique significantly affect in teaching speaking.

The Significances of the Study
Theoretically
The significance of the study theoretically can contribute to improve the quality of English language learning, especially learning to speak English.
Practically
a. For teachers, to add knowledge in teaching English, especially teaching speaking.
b. For students, to improve speaking ability, games, and improve learning outcomes in English subject.
For researcher, can add insight and contribute to the reference material relating to the ability to speak English.

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Teaching means showing or helping someone to learn how to do something, giving instruction, causing to know or understand. Teaching English does not teach the language itself but use of it. Whenever one begins to teach on English course, one makes a choice of what to teach. Dealing with the statement, the language teacher should have preparation in teaching like syllabus, the teaching materials, and lesson planning, so that the aim of teaching can be achieved.

Teaching Speaking

Thornbury (2003:1) says speaking is so much a part of daily life that we take it for granted. The average person produces tens of thousands words a day, although some people like auctioneers or politicians may produce even more than that. So natural and integral is speaking that we forget we once struggle to achieve this ability until, we have to learn how to do it all over again in a foreign language.

According PLPG Rayon 133 (2012:48), there are main reasons for getting students to speak in the classroom. Firstly, speaking activities provide rehearsal opportunities-chances to practice real life speaking in safety of the classroom. Secondly, speaking tasks in which students try to use any or all of the language they know provide feedback for both teacher and students. Everyone can see how well they are doing: both how successful they are, and also what language problems they are experiencing. Finally, the more students have opportunities to activate the various elements of language they have stored in their brains, the more automatic their use of these elements become. As result, students gradually become autonomous language users. This mean that they will able to use words and phrases fluently without very much conscious thought.

Ice Breaking

Term “ice breaking” comes from “break the ice”, which in turn comes from special ships called “ice breaking” that are designed to break up ice in the arctic regions. Just as these ships make it easier for other ships to travel, an ice breaking helps to clear the way for successful exchange of ideas by making the participants more comfortable and engaging them in conversation. Ice breakers are a great way to begin a meeting and can be used to relieve stress and provide needed breaks during intense meetings. Ice breaking help to relax participants thereby allowing them to be more receptive to listening and contributing. Specifically, an icebreaker is an activity designed to help people to get to know each other and usually involves sharing names and other background information.

According to Flanigan (2011), performing ice breaking activities in English class will direct students to the good mood of learning. Also appropriate kind of ice breaking activities will make students sure to get the most from their lesson and also, they will have fun. Ice breaking is a great way to create conducive atmosphere. "Unification" mindset and pattern of action to a single point of attention that can make the condition atmosphere become dynamic and focus. Dynamic because participants can change their own activities to follow a structured pattern that has been directed by the leader. Ice breaking is a fun way to support the objective of presentation (Svendsen, 1996).

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study was conducted by using experimental research and the students were divided into two groups, one group was experimental group and the other one was control group. Experimental group was a group that gave treatment by the researcher, while control group was a group that did not receive treatment from the researcher.

| Table 3.1 |
|-----------|
| **Experimental group** | **Control group** |
| Pre test | Pre test |
| Treatment | Without treatment |
| Post test | Post test |

Population

The population of this research was tenth grade students of SMK Dharma Bhakti Siborongborong. There were seven classes of them. Each class consists of 32 students so the population was 224.

Sample

Sample is a portion of population. Based on Arikunto (2006: 134) “if the subject or population less than 100, it is better for researcher to take all of the population, but if the number of population more than 100, the researcher can take minimal 10% - 15 % or 20 % - 25 %.” In this research, the researcher used simple random sampling through lottery method; it was a process of selecting a sample in such a way that individuals in the defined population have an equal and independent chance of selection to be the sample. The researcher took sample 25% from the population 224 students, they were 56 students. The samples were devided into two groups, one group consisted of 28 students as the experimental group and the other class as the control group consisted of 28 students.
In lottery method, the researcher used selected the sample by the writing number 1 - 56 in pieces of paper and the other papers were empty, they were placed in a box and shaken. Every student took a piece of paper, the student who got the paper which has number it was be sample.

**Instrument for Collecting Data**

Instruments were designed to collect the data. The instrument that was used was speaking test. Data were needed to answer the research problem to examine the hypothesis which had been performed before. The students would be tested by asking them to describe about themselves. The main purpose of the test in this research to know whether the students are able to speak English and how the effect of using ice breaking technique in teaching speaking.

**The Pre-Test**

The experimental group was treated by giving ice breaking technique in speaking. The procedures of the treatment in experimental group were:

1. To begin, the researcher explained each clue in every candy. If the students get:
   a. Blackcurrant candies, they told about their interesting experience.
   b. Strawberry candies, they told about their hobby and like
   c. Lemon candies, they told themselves (i.e. name, address, and family).
   d. Orange candies, they told about their favorite artist or famous people.

2. The researcher asked the every student to take one candy.

3. The researcher gave 5 minutes to do the clue. After students finished to do it the researcher asked the students to take one more candy but the students could not take same candy as before. And the researcher gave 5 minutes to do it, so every student had four times to take candies and every student had four different topics.

4. The researcher asked the students to speak up in front of class, and the topic was chosen by the researcher.

5. The researcher asked the other students to give question.

**The Post-test**

The researcher used criteria to measure data based on Harris (1969:84) that used 1-5 points of rating scale. The speaking class rating is used the range of point 1- 10 or 10-100. The amount of maximum scores gained is 25. It gained from the five elements of speaking. The researcher decided the score that 100 were the highest and 10 was the lowest.

The scale rating scores are drawn as follows:

Table 1: Pronunciation: Pronunciation refers to the ability to produce easily Comprehensible articulation.

| Level  | Criteria                                                                 |
|--------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 25-23  | EXCELLENT Has few trace of foreign accent.                               |
| 22-19  | VERY GOOD Always intelligible, thought one is conscious of a definite accent. |
| 18-16  | GOOD Pronunciation problems necessitate concentrated listening and occasionally lead misunderstanding. |
| 15-13  | POOR Very hard to understand because of pronunciation problems. Must frequently be asked to repeat. |
| 12-9   | VERY POOR Pronunciation problems so serve as to make speech virtually unintelligible. |

Table 2: Grammar is needed for the students to arrange a correct sentence in creating A speaking

| Level  | Criteria                                                                 |
|--------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 25-23  | EXCELLENT Makes view (if any) noticeable errors of grammar or word order. |
| 22-19  | VERY GOOD Occasionally makes grammatical and/ or word-order errors which do not, however, obscure meaning. |
| 18-16  | GOOD Makes frequent errors of grammar and word order which occasionally obscure |
Table 3: Vocabulary means the appropriate diction which is used in Communication

| Level | Criteria |
|-------|----------|
| 20-18 | EXCELLENT |
| 17-14 | VERY GOOD |
| 13-10 | GOOD |
| 9-6   | POOR |
| 5-2   | VERY POOR |

Table 4: Fluency: Fluency refers to the ease and the speed of the flow of the Speech

| Level | Criteria |
|-------|----------|
| 15-14 | EXCELLENT |
| 13-11 | VERY GOOD |
| 10-8  | GOOD |
| 7-5   | POOR |
| 5-2   | VERY POOR |

Table 5: Comprehension is the ability to make the others understand by what we say and deliver.

| Level | Criteria |
|-------|----------|
| 15-14 | EXCELLENT |
| 13-11 | VERY GOOD |
| 10-8  | GOOD |
| 7-5   | POOR |
| 5-2   | VERY POOR |

POOR
Grammar and word-order errors make comprehension difficult. Must often rephrase sentences and/or restrict himself to basic patterns.

VERY POOR
Errors in grammar and word order so severa as to make speech virtually unintelligible.

Table 3: Vocabulary: Vocabulary means the appropriate diction which is used in Communication

| Level | Criteria |
|-------|----------|
| 20-18 | EXCELLENT |
| 17-14 | VERY GOOD |
| 13-10 | GOOD |
| 9-6   | POOR |
| 5-2   | VERY POOR |

Table 4: Fluency: Fluency refers to the ease and the speed of the flow of the Speech

| Level | Criteria |
|-------|----------|
| 15-14 | EXCELLENT |
| 13-11 | VERY GOOD |
| 10-8  | GOOD |
| 7-5   | POOR |
| 5-2   | VERY POOR |

Table 5: Comprehension is the ability to make the others understand by what we say and deliver.

| Level | Criteria |
|-------|----------|
| 15-14 | EXCELLENT |
| 13-11 | VERY GOOD |
| 10-8  | GOOD |
| 7-5   | POOR |
| 5-2   | VERY POOR |

POOR
Grammar and word-order errors make comprehension difficult. Must often rephrase sentences and/or restrict himself to basic patterns.

VERY POOR
Errors in grammar and word order so severa as to make speech virtually unintelligible.
IV. THE DATA, DATA ANALYSIS AND RESEARCH FINDINGS

The data was the result of the pre-test and post-test of both the experimental and control group.

Table 6: The Data of Experimental Group and Control Group

| No | Students’ Name | Experimental | | | Control |
|----|----------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|
|    |                | Pre-test     | Post-test      |                | Pre-test | Post-test |
| 1  | Dafrosa S      | 66           | 76             | Ade S          | 50       | 59        |
| 2  | Irma S         | 50           | 70             | Edward S       | 70       | 80        |
| 3  | Michael P      | 60           | 80             | Frans S        | 60       | 63        |
| 4  | Leon T         | 50           | 73             | Jaya           | 49       | 55        |
| 5  | Nabila M       | 60           | 76             | Andreas M      | 70       | 63        |
| 6  | Jonathan S     | 75           | 93             | Roi            | 60       | 66        |
| 7  | Luhut H        | 66           | 76             | Ivan S         | 64       | 70        |
| 8  | Natanael S     | 70           | 83             | Yohana S       | 50       | 60        |
| 9  | Nicholas N     | 66           | 73             | Juan P         | 70       | 76        |
| 10 | Pukesi H       | 70           | 86             | Ronaldo        | 70       | 73        |
| 11 | Ok Sahdan      | 70           | 83             | Sondang S      | 56       | 63        |
| 12 | Natanael S     | 66           | 76             | Gian H         | 60       | 66        |
| 13 | Yesika S       | 70           | 80             | Ayu            | 70       | 66        |
| 14 | Dini T         | 60           | 76             | David T        | 66       | 73        |
| 15 | Michael S      | 63           | 70             | Erni K         | 65       | 70        |
| 16 | Samuel N       | 70           | 80             | Satria C       | 60       | 76        |
| 17 | Valen H        | 56           | 76             | Manarsar P     | 70       | 80        |
| 18 | Felix S        | 63           | 80             | Oloan K        | 60       | 66        |
| 19 | Rahel S        | 48           | 70             | Anjeli S       | 55       | 53        |
| 20 | Putra S        | 66           | 80             | Johan S        | 56       | 66        |
| 21 | Rivan Jelis    | 73           | 83             | Helena S       | 70       | 73        |
| 22 | Imanuel S      | 70           | 81             | Abel S         | 70       | 72        |
| 23 | Iren S         | 53           | 76             | Indra T        | 59       | 60        |
| 24 | Putra          | 50           | 73             | Joi N          | 83       | 84        |
| 25 | Jou S          | 80           | 96             | Arya P         | 72       | 80        |
| 26 | Elisabet P     | 63           | 80             | Hizkia S       | 70       | 72        |
| 27 | Shindy A       | 66           | 76             | Ramses M       | 60       | 66        |
| 28 | Ryan S         | 70           | 86             | Eswin S        | 70       | 80        |
|    | Total          | 1.790        | 2.208          |                | 1.784    | 1.926     |
|    | Mean           | 63.9         | 78.8           |                | 63.7     | 68.7      |

From the data at table, we can see that in experimental group, the highest and lowest score of the pre-test and post-test were 80, 48 and 96, 70. The mean had been increased from 63, 9 to 78, 8. In the control group the highest and the lowest scores of pre-test and post-test were 83, 49 and 84, 53. The mean had been increased from 63, 7 to 68, and 7.

Based on the data analysis, the researcher found:

a. Ice breaking helped the students feel comfortable together.

b. Ice breaking was necessary for a successful classroom.

c. Ice breaking created a good atmosphere for learning teaching process.

d. The using ice breaking technique had an effect in teaching speaking. The result of analyzing the data, the score of the t-test was higer than t-table (7, 70 > 2,005). It means that t test > t-table where t-table 2.005 and t-test 7, 70, so t-test was higher than t-table.

The Research Finding
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V. CONCLUSION

Having analyzed the data, it was found that ice breaking technique significantly affects in teaching speaking, since the $t$-test $> t$-table ($p = 0.5$) df (54), or $7.70 > 2.005$. It means that null hypothesis (H0) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted.

REFERENCES

[1] Arikunto, S. (2010). *Produser Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*, Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
[2] Arikunto, S. (2011). *Dasar-Dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan*, Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
[3] Brown, H. D. (1980). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*, USA: University of Illinois.
[4] Brown, H. D. (2004). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*, USA: San Francisco State University.
[5] Flanigan, E. (2011). *The importance of ice breaking and warm up activities in English class*.
[6] Harmer, J. (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*, Malaysia: Longman Inc.
[7] Haris, D. P. (1969). *Testing English as a Second Language* New York: Mc. Graw Hill Book Company.
[8] Patel, M. F. (2008). *English Language Teaching*, India: Jaipur.
[9] Penny, Ur. (1991). *Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
[10] Scrinever, J. (2005). *Learning Teaching: A Guidebook for English Language Teacher*, Great Britain: Scotprint.
[11] Said, M. (2010). *80 + Ice Breaker Games Kumpulan Permainan Pengunggah Semangat*, Yogyakarta: Andi.
[12] Thornbury, S. (2003). *How to Teaching Speaking*, USA: Longman Inc.