

APPENDIX

Appendix 1
Research Permit Letter from UIN Syekh Wasil Kediri**KEMENTERIAN AGAMA REPUBLIK INDONESIA**
INSTITUT AGAMA ISLAM NEGERI (IAIN) KEDIRI
FAKULTAS TARBIYAH

Jalan Sunan Ampel No. 7, Kec. Ngronggo, Kota Kediri, Jawa Timur. Kode Pos 64127
Telepon (0354) 889282 | Website: www.iainkediri.ac.id

Nomor : B-5036/In.36/D2/PP.07.01.05/08/2024 Kediri, 30 Agustus 2024
Lamp. : -
Perihal : Permohonan Izin Riset / Penelitian

Kepada
MTS Ihyaul Ulum Canga'an
di Tempat

Assalamualaikum Wr. Wb.

Dengan hormat kami beritahukan bahwa mahasiswa tersebut di bawah ini :

Nama : NATHANIA ADIRATNA MAYAWATI
NIM : 932200119
Semester : 11
Prodi : TADRIS BAHASA INGGRIS

Dalam rangka menyelesaikan studi dan menyusun skripsinya yang perlu melakukan penelitian lapangan. Untuk itu kami memohon agar mahasiswa yang bersangkutan diberi izin dan kesempatan untuk melakukan penelitian di wilayah / lembaga yang menjadi wewenang Bapak / Ibu, dalam bidang-bidang yang terkait dengan judul skripsinya, yaitu :

"The Effectiveness of Tic-Tac-Toe Game in Teaching Speaking at MTS Ihyaul Ulum Canga'an "

Mahasiswa yang melaksanakan riset/penelitian akan berkewajiban mentaati semua peraturan yang berlaku di lembaga/instansi tempat penelitiannya.
Demikian atas perkenan dan kerjasama Bapak/Ibu. kami sampaikan terimakasih.

Wassalamualaikum Wr. Wb.

a.n. Dekan Fakultas Tarbiyah,
Kepala Bagian Tata Usaha



MARHASAN, MM.
NIP. 196706012000031001

Sent To: thanisaas@gmail.com

Response Letter from Mts Ihyaul Ulum Canga'an



روضة التبرية والتعليم احياء العلوم
LEMBAGA PENDIDIKAN MA'ARIF NU
MADRASAH TSANAWIYAH NAHDLATUL ULAMA
IHYAUL ULUM
 TERAKREDITASI A
 NPSN : 20583029 NSM : 121235250099 NIM : B3-064



Alamat : Jl. Pendidikan No. 22 Cangaan Ujungpangkah Gresik 61154 Email : mtsiucangaan@gmail.com Tlp. 085230814288

SURAT KETERANGAN PENELITIAN

Nomor : 11/ B3-064 / A / IX/ 2024

Yang bertanda tangan dibawah ini

Nama : KHOIRUL IHSAN, S.Pd
 Jabatan : Kepala MTs Ihyaul Ulum
 Alamat : Jl. Pendidikan No. 22 Cangaan Ujungpangkah Gresik

Menerangkan Bahwa

Nama : NATHANIA ADIRATNA MAYAWATI
 TTL : Gresik, 25 April 2022
 NTM : 932200119
 Program Study : TADRIS BAHASA INGGRIS
 Semester : 11

Benar-benar melakukan penelitian di MTs Ihyaul Ulum Cangaan Ujungpangkah Gresik, pada tanggal 18 - 23 September 2024, dengan judul *"THE EFFECTIVENESS OF TIC-TAC-TOE GAME IN TEACHING SPEAKING AT MTS IHYAUL ULUM CANGAAN"*

Demikian surat keterangan ini di buat untuk dipergunakan sebagaimana mestinya.

Gresik, 24 September 2024

Kepala MTs Ihyaul Ulum


 KHOIRUL IHSAN, S.Pd

Appendix 2
Speaking Assessment Rubric for Descriptive Text (Animals)

| Criteria | 5 (Excellent) | 4 (Good) | 3 (Average) | 2 (Poor) | 1 (Very Poor) | Score |
|----------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|-------|
| Pronunciation | Clear pronunciation, correct stress and intonation | Minor errors, generally clear | Some errors affect comprehension | Frequent errors, often unclear | Unintelligible pronunciation | |
| Grammar | Correct use of present tense, adjectives | Few minor grammatical errors | Some errors but meaning clear | Many errors affect meaning | Severe grammatical errors | |
| Vocabulary | Rich animal-related vocabulary, descriptive words | Adequate descriptive vocabulary | Limited but acceptable vocabulary | Inadequate descriptive words | Extremely limited vocabulary | |
| Fluency | Speaks fluently, natural pace | Slight hesitation | Moderate hesitation | Frequent pauses, slow speech | Constant hesitation, fragmented | |
| Content | Complete description with all required elements | Good description with most elements | Basic description with some elements | Limited description, missing key elements | Poor or incomplete description | |
| TOTAL SCORE | | | | | | |

Speaking Test:

Raw Score = Sum of all criteria (5-25)

Final Score = (Raw Score ÷ 25) × 100

Appendix 3

Expert Validation Sheet for Research Instruments

EXPERT VALIDATION SHEET FOR RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

Research Title:
THE EFFECTIVENESS OF TIC-TAC-TOE GAME IN TEACHING SPEAKING DESCRIPTIVE TEXT AT MTS IHYAUL ULUM CANGA'AN

Researcher:
NATHANIA ADIRATNA MAYAWATI
NIM: 932200119
English Education Department, UIN Syekh Wasil Kediri

To: English Teacher of MTS Ihyaul Ulum Canga'an

Dear Mr./Mrs. English Teacher,

I am conducting research for my thesis and kindly request your expert validation of my research instruments. Please assess the following materials by checking the appropriate score and providing comments if needed.

Thank you for your valuable assistance.

Sincerely,
Nathania Adiratna Mayawati

VALIDATOR INFORMATION:
Name : FITROTUL AHANI, S.Pd
Position : English Teacher at MTS Ihyaul Ulum Canga'an

Date : 23 September 2024

SPEAKING TEST:

1 = Not Valid | 2 = Less Valid | 3 = Moderately Valid | 4 = Very Valid

A. SPEAKING ASSESSMENT RUBRIC VALIDATION

| No. | Assesment Aspect | Score (1-4) | Comments/Suggestions |
|-----|--|--|--|
| 1 | Clarity of assesment Criteria | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | It's clear enough |
| 2 | Appropriateness for 8th grade students | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | It's appropriate for my students in 8th grade |
| 3 | Coverage of speaking skill components | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | The speaking skill components were good enough |
| 4 | Ease of use in classroom assesment | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | That's easy for the students |

Overall comments about the rubric:

That's good enough I think because the rubric was easy to understand and helped the students for the speaking assessment

B. PRE-TEST & POST-TEST QUESTIONS VALIDATION

| No. | Assessment Aspect | Score (1-4) | Comments/Suggestions |
|-----|--|--|---|
| 1 | Clarity of test instructions | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | the test instructions were clear |
| 2 | Relevance to descriptive text material | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | the test instructions were relevance to the the text |
| 3 | Appropriate topics for students | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | The topics were appropriate for my students |
| 4 | Ability to measure speaking ability | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | it could measure my students speaking ability |

Overall comments about the test questions:

The questions were appropriate enough for my students and could measure their speaking ability.

C. TIC-TAC-TOE GAME PROCEDURE VALIDATION

| No. | Assessment Aspect | Aspect Score | Comments/Suggestions |
|-----|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| 1 | Clarity of game steps | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | Good |
| 2 | Appropriateness for speaking practice | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | it's appropriate for speaking practice |
| 3 | Potential for student engagement | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | My students could involve in the game |
| 4 | Practicality in classroom setting | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | Good setting |

Overall comments about the game procedure:

The game procedure was good. My students involved in the game and they could try to improve their speaking with the game

D. FINAL RECOMMENDATION

Please check ONE option for each instrument:

| Research Instrument | Reccommendation |
|----------------------------|--|
| Speaking Assessment Rubric | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Valid for use <input type="checkbox"/> Needs revision <input type="checkbox"/> Not valid |
| Test Questions | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Valid for use <input type="checkbox"/> Needs revision <input type="checkbox"/> Not valid |
| Game Procedure | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Valid for use <input type="checkbox"/> Needs revision <input type="checkbox"/> Not valid |

Final suggestions for improvement:

Overall was good enough. My students could focus on the game so they were not afraid to speak English. but the researcher should be more cheerful so that the students were more active

Signature of Validator,



Name : FITROTUL ANANI, S.Pd

Position : English Teacher, MTS Ihyaul Ulum Canga'an

Date : 23 September 2024

Appendix 4

Pre-Test And Post-Test Questions (Descriptive Text - Animals)

PRE-TEST INSTRUCTION

Topic: Describing Animals

Instructions:

1. You will choose one animal card randomly.
2. Describe the animal based on the picture.
3. Include: physical appearance, habitat, food, and special characteristics.
4. Speak for about 2 minutes.
5. You will be assessed on your descriptive speaking ability.

Example Animal Choices: Cat, Rabbit, Bird, Fish, Butterfly

POST-TEST INSTRUCTION

Topic: Describing Animals with More Details

Instructions:

1. You will choose one animal card randomly from different animals.
2. Describe the animal in detail.

Include:

- Physical appearance (size, color, body parts)
 - Habitat (where it lives)
 - Food (what it eats)
 - Characteristics (special abilities, behavior)
 - Why you like/dislike this animal
3. Speak for about 2 minutes.
 4. You will be assessed on your descriptive speaking ability.

Example Animal Choices: Elephant, Dolphin, Eagle, Penguin, Tiger

Appendix 5

Classroom Observation Sheet for Descriptive Text Teaching

Observation Date : 21 September 2023

Class : VII A (Experimental Group)

Observer : Nathania Adiratna Mayawati

Topic : Descriptive Text about Animals

| No. | Aspect | Yes | No | Notes |
|-----|---------------------------------------|-----|----|---|
| 1 | Students understand instructions | ✓ | | All students nodded and asked relevant question about game rules |
| 2 | Students use descriptive vocabulary | ✓ | | Used animal adjectives: furry, big, small, colorful, fat, slow |
| 3 | Tic-Tac-Toe game engages students | ✓ | | 18/19 students actively participated, high enthusiasm observed |
| 4 | Students describe animals effectively | ✓ | | Average 3-4 descriptive sentences per turn, good struture |
| 5 | Time management is appropriate | ✓ | | 45-minutes session: 5-min revies, 35-min game, 5-min conclusion |
| 6 | Learning objectives achieved | ✓ | | 16/19 students could describe animals with 4+ characteristics |
| 7 | Students show confidence in speaking | ✓ | | Reduced hesitation, louder voices, more eye contact than pre-test |
| 8 | Teacher provides adequate feedback | ✓ | | Immediate correction on pronnounciation/grammar during game turns |

Observer's Signature:

Nathania Adiratna M

Appendix 6

Photo Documentation of Learning Activities



Photo 1: Students choosing animal cards for description



Photo 2: Tic-Tac-Toe game board with animal vocabulary



Photo 3: Student describing an animal to class



Photo 4: Group discussion about animal characteristics



Photo 5: Classroom during speaking activity

Appendix 7

Raw Data Of Pre-Test And Post-Test Scores

Experimental Class (Class A) - Tic-Tac-Toe Method

Total Students: 19

| Student | Pre-test (Rater 1) | Post-test (Rater 2) | Gain |
|---------|--------------------|---------------------|-------|
| E1 | 60 | 62 | 2 |
| E2 | 61 | 65 | 4 |
| E3 | 63 | 68 | 6 |
| E4 | 64 | 70 | 6 |
| E5 | 65 | 72 | 7 |
| E6 | 65 | 74 | 9 |
| E7 | 66 | 78 | 12 |
| E8 | 68 | 76 | 8 |
| E9 | 69 | 82 | 13 |
| E10 | 70 | 80 | 10 |
| E11 | 70 | 85 | 15 |
| E12 | 72 | 74 | 2 |
| E13 | 73 | 73 | 0 |
| E14 | 73 | 88 | 16 |
| E15 | 74 | 80 | 6 |
| E16 | 75 | 90 | 15 |
| E17 | 76 | 91 | 15 |
| E18 | 78 | 92 | 14 |
| E19 | 79 | 77 | -2 |
| Mean | 69.53 | 77.74 | +8.21 |

Control Class (Class B) - Discussion Method

Total Students: 18

| Student | Pre-test (Rater 1) | Post-test (Rater 2) | Gain |
|---------|--------------------|---------------------|-------|
| C1 | 55 | 58 | 3 |
| C2 | 57 | 62 | 5 |
| C3 | 57 | 62 | 5 |
| C4 | 58 | 63 | 5 |
| C5 | 60 | 65 | 5 |
| C6 | 61 | 66 | 5 |
| C7 | 61 | 65 | 4 |
| C8 | 62 | 64 | 2 |
| C9 | 63 | 66 | 3 |
| C10 | 64 | 67 | 3 |
| C11 | 65 | 66 | 1 |
| C12 | 66 | 68 | 2 |
| C13 | 67 | 69 | 2 |
| C14 | 68 | 70 | 2 |
| C15 | 69 | 70 | 1 |
| C16 | 70 | 72 | 2 |
| C17 | 72 | 75 | 3 |
| C18 | 74 | 78 | 4 |
| Mean | 68.83 | 67.00 | +3.17 |

Appendix 8 SPSS Analysis Output

1. Normality Test Results

| Tests of Normality | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|----|-------------------|--------------|----|------|
| | Class Group | Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a | | | Shapiro-Wilk | | |
| | | Statistic | df | Sig. | Statistic | df | Sig. |
| Pre-test score | Experimental (Class A) | .104 | 19 | .200 [*] | .969 | 19 | .765 |
| | Control (Class B) | .087 | 18 | .200 [*] | .976 | 18 | .904 |
| Post-test score | Experimental (Class A) | .091 | 19 | .200 [*] | .970 | 19 | .782 |
| | Control (Class B) | .137 | 18 | .200 [*] | .971 | 18 | .808 |

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.
a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

2. Homogeneity Test Results

| Tests of Homogeneity of Variances | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|-----|--------|------|
| | | Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
| Pre-test score | Based on Mean | .047 | 1 | 35 | .829 |
| | Based on Median | .035 | 1 | 35 | .852 |
| | Based on Median and with adjusted df | .035 | 1 | 34.969 | .852 |
| | Based on trimmed mean | .047 | 1 | 35 | .829 |
| Post-test score | Based on Mean | 5.958 | 1 | 35 | .020 |
| | Based on Median | 5.714 | 1 | 35 | .022 |
| | Based on Median and with adjusted df | 5.714 | 1 | 30.444 | .023 |
| | Based on trimmed mean | 6.009 | 1 | 35 | .019 |

3. ANCOVA Results

| Source | Type III Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Partial η^2 |
|-----------------|-------------------------|----|-------------|--------|------|------------------|
| Corrected Model | 1645.162 | 2 | 822.581 | 22.366 | .000 | .568 |
| Intercept | 1455.634 | 1 | 1455.634 | 39.581 | .000 | .538 |
| PreTest | 579.603 | 1 | 579.603 | 15.759 | .000 | .317 |
| Group | 901.248 | 1 | 901.248 | 24.507 | .000 | .419 |
| PreTest * Group | 54.192 | 1 | 54.192 | 1.474 | .233 | .042 |
| Error | 1248.865 | 34 | 36.371 | | | |
| Total | 202092.000 | 37 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 2894.027 | 36 | | | | |

Appendix 9

Inter-Rater Reliability Result

1. Reliability Test Results for Descriptive Text Assessment

| | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Statistical Test | : Pearson |
| Value | : 0,995 |
| Number of Items | : 2 (Rater 1 and Rater 2 scores) |

2. PEARSON CORRELATION RESULTS

| Correlation Measure | Value | Interpretation |
|-------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Pearson Correlation (r) | .991 | Very High Agreement |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | Significant at $p < .01$ |
| N | 37 | Total Students |
| | | |
| | | |

3. INTERPRETATION GUIDELINES

| Pearson Correlation (r) | Agreement level |
|-------------------------|---------------------|
| 0.90 – 0.100 | Very High Agreement |
| 0.70 – 0.89 | High Agreement |
| 0.50 – 0.69 | Moderate Agreement |
| 0.30 – 0.49 | Low Agreement |
| 0.00 – 0.29 | Very Low Agreement |

4. CONCLUSION

The Pearson correlation coefficient of $r = .991$ ($p < .01$) indicates very high inter-rater agreement between Rater 1 (pre-test scores) and Rater 2 (post-test scores). This proves that the scoring of students' speaking performance was highly consistent, objective, and trustworthy for this study, despite being conducted by two different raters at different times.

5. RATERS INFORMATION

- **Rater 1** : Nathania Adiratna Mayawati
- **Rater 2** : Fitrotul Anani, S.Pd.

Appendix 10 Researcher's Biography



PERSONAL DATA

Full Name : Nathania Adiratna Mayawati
Student ID : 932200119
Place, Date of Birth : Gresik, 25 April 2002
Gender : Female
Religion : Islam
Nationality : Indonesian
Address : Canga'an UjungPangkah Gresik RT.01 RW.07
Email : Thanthaniaaa5@gmail.com
Phone : 0812-2017-8073

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

1. Elementary School : MI, Ihyaul Ulum Canga'an (Year: 2007-2013)
 2. Junior High School : MTS, Ihyaul Ulum Canga'an (Year: 2013-2016)
 3. Senior High School : MA, Ihyaul Ulum Canga'an (Year:2016-2019)
 4. University : UIN Syekh Wasil Kediri, English Education
 Department (2019)

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

Thesis: "The Effectiveness of Tic-Tac-Toe Game in Teaching Speaking at MTS Ihyaul Ulum Canga'an"

Declaration:

I hereby declare that all information provided above is true and correct.

Kediri, 10 March 2026

(Nathania Adiratna Mayawati)