

DEVELOPING STUDENTS' SPEAKING SKILL THROUGH BOARD GAME AT SMPN 1 TOLITOLI

Ismail Yunus H.,¹ Mawardin M. Said and Sudarkam R. Mertosono²

ismanaicha@gmail.com

¹*The student of Postgraduate Program Tadulako University*

²*The Lecturers of Postgraduate Program Tadulako University*

Abstrak

Tujuan Penelitian ini adalah untuk penerapan permainan papan dalam mengajarkan keterampilan berbicara. Metode Penelitian ini menggunakan quasi experimental dengan rancangan non-equivalent kelas kontrol. Ada 56 siswa yang menjadi sampel pada kelas experiment dan kelas kontrol. Pengambilan data di ambil dari Pretest dan Posttest. Data yang teridentifikasi bahwa nilai rata rata siswa di kelas experiment 78.03 lebih tinggi dibandingkan dengan kelas kontrol yang mana nilai rata rata hanya 6.12. Dalam melakukan analisis data dengan menggunakan rumus t -test. Perhitungan hasil data $t_{count}(t_c)$ adalah 6.12 lebih tinggi di dibandingkan dengan hasil data $t_{table}(t_t)$ yang hanya 1.998. Dari hasil yang teridentifikasi bahwa ada pengembangan yang signifikan dalam mengajarkan permainan papan untuk meningkatkan keterampilan siswa dalam berbicara. Hal ini menyatakan bahwa mengajarkan keterampilan berbicara siswa dengan menggunakan permainan papan efektif. sehingga permainan papan dapat mengembangkan keterampilan siswa dalam berbicara.

Kata kunci: *Mengembangkan, Keterampilan Berbicara, Permainan Papan*

Language has an important role in human life. By using it the people will express their ideas, emotion, and desires, and it is used as a medium to interact with one another. to fulfil their daily need. English has been the most important language in global communication. The people all over the world speak the language when they meet one another in every international meeting, workshop, or conference. All countries in the world have set the language as one of the compulsory subject studied at school.

Teaching and learning will be successful if they are supported by some factors such as the method that is used in teaching English, teaching facilitation, interesting media, and condition of school environment.

I decided to concentrate on communicative competence in speaking which is helpful for students to develop their speaking skill By using board game. To make the students have strong interest in teaching and learning process especially in learning

speaking, the teacher should take the best approach, method, and strategies. In this case, I used board game as method in teaching learning processes.

Game can be defined as something or an instrument that is used to attract students' motivation to follow the teaching and learning process because board game can make the students more focused in learning. They do not feel that they are forced to learn. They also enable learners to acquire new experiences within a foreign language which are not always possible during a typical lesson. English has been taught to the students since they were in junior high in grade VII school, even some of them have been learning English since elementary school. Now they are in grade VIII junior high school. They should already be able to speak English yet. This problem can be solved by answering the following research question: *How can speaking skill be developed through Board Game?*. This research needs to be specified. So, I limit my

research by using board game in grade VIII of SMP NEGERI 1 TOLITOLI. focuses on appropriacy and fluency in the process of dialogue. The students are expected to explore the class enthusiasm and practice their speaking as frequently as possible. In using the technique, I use asking question and answering question.

Review of Related Literature

Speaking is expressing our idea, thought and feeling by uttering words to others. According to Brown (1994 : 48), speaking is an interactive process of constructing its form and meaning are involves producing and receiving and processing information. It's form and meaning are depending on the context in which it occurs, including the participants themselves, their collective experience, the physical environment and the purpose for speaking. It is often spontaneous, and evolving. However, Philips (1982: 17) proposes "speaking as method by which work is done on day to day basis". Speaking is particularly useful when you want to get something stated and you need something instruction or others.

Consequently learners often evaluate their success in language learning as well as the effectiveness of their English course based on how much they feel they have improved in their spoken language proficiency. Cameron (2001: 40) argues that speaking is the active use of language to express meanings so that other people can make sense of them. Moreover, it is recognized as an interactive, social and contextualized communicative event. Speaking requires learners to be possession of knowledge about how to produce not only linguistically connect but also pragmatically appropriate utterances.

A large percentage of the world's language learners study English in order to develop proficiency in speaking because is one of the most important skills in language

learning besides listening, writing, and reading. Speaking belongs to performance rather than competence since the speaker is required to practice in actual situation (Richards and Renandya, 2002: 201). Regarding as one of the productive skills, the teaching of speaking skill should also be taken into account due to the large number of learners who want to study English in order to be able to use English for communicative purpose.

Element of Speaking Skill

There are some elements of speaking that should be mastered by the students. According to Heaton (1988: 100), there are some components of speaking that should be mastered by the students, some of which are described in following subchapters.

Fluency is one of the aspects of English determining whether the speaker who uses the language is competent or not. Fluency means being able to communicate ideas, feeling, and expression without having to stop and to think too much about what to say. Knight (1992) argue that fluency is about speed of talking, no hesitation while speaking, and no hesitation before speaking. Lackman (2010: 3) expresses that fluency requires students to focus on meaning in communication without immediate concern for accuracy (errors can be corrected afterwards)

Accuracy is the aspect of speaking skill which describes the correct use of structure and pronunciation. A good pronunciation makes the listener gets easier to comprehend the speaker's attention. Lackman (2010: 3) argues "students need to be able to pronounce words and structures correctly in order to be understood." Accuracy also not only focuses on the correct use of grammar, but also the correct use of vocabulary, and other language components. It is quite difficult to speak accurately because the speaker must concentrate on the language

patterns and rules. This is one of the problems faced by the learners generally.

Speaking appropriacy means that when the speaker speaks there must be an exact correlation between what he or she is talking about. Harmer (1994) states that when we teach English we need to be sure that our student can be understood when they speak. Lackman (2010: 3) points out that activity of appropriacy stress on what the purpose of language is appropriate. Correlation of word to word indefinitely important in this phase because the listener gets understanding and responds to what has been said if the content of speech is appropriate.

Principles of Board Game.

To develop the speaking skill we need a method to be used. One of them is a game and the definition of the game is an activity that you do to have some fun. According to Hornby (1995: 486), a board game can be defined as something or an instrument that is used to attract students' motivation to follow the teaching and learning process because a board game can make the students more focused in learning, because they do not feel that they are forced to learn. Buckby (1994: 82) expresses that the usefulness of board games are to attract the students to learn English because it is fun and makes them want to have an experiment, discover and interact with their environment.

Teachers should also motivate the students regularly to create a good environment in the classroom. Rivers (1981: 188) states "Teacher persuade themselves that if they speak the new language exclusively in the classroom they are encouraged to use the language to make students imitate the way the teacher speak" in other words, students are expected to understand how to use the language properly. Meanwhile, the teacher needs to give more. There are several steps in this game, namely:

- a. This game can be played by 2-4 players. All players should use English to speak
- b. Decide with other players who will get the turn to roll the dice then put the counters at the star.
- c. If the students stop on the blue block, they have to take a blue card. The instruction written in the card tells what you have to do.
- d. Students stop on the red block, she or he has to take a red card. The card shows the information that you have to ask to other players.
- e. The player who reaches the finish first will be the winner. Once if the player becomes the winner, other player can continue the game to be the next winner.

Design of the Research

In this research, I employed a quasi-experimental non-equivalent control group design. The sample of this research I used two classes, one class for experimental class and the other class as control class. The pretest and posttest had been done to both classes.

The population of this research were the VIII students of SMP NEGERI 1 TOLITOLI. Best (1981: 8) states "a population is a group of individuals that had one more characteristic in common area of interest in the research". There were seven classes for each grade. So, there were 21 classes and the total number of population are 760 students.

Sample of the research was a representative group from the population to serve as the respondents. I had already seen that due to two factors, time and accessibility, it was always possible or practical to apply a measure from a smaller group or subject of population under study. Sample was the smaller of accessible population (Latief, 2013: 181). I took two classes of the VIII grade students of SMP NEGERI 1 Tolitoli as the sample. They were VIII A as the

experimental class, which class consists of 33 students, and VIII C as control class, which class consists 32 students. The sample of this research had been taken purposively. I used it because the classes selected base on their knowledge.

Research instrument was a tool designed to measure the variables, characteristics, or information of interest. A research should have at least one instrument used to collect data. The instruments that used in this research were test and non test. The test consists of two kinds: pretest and posttest, while the non test includes an observation sheet.

According to the scale of scoring system from the table 3.3, the highest scoring in each aspect are 6 for the components of speaking. So, the maximum score was 6. To analyze students' individual score, I applied the following formula proposed by Sugiyono (2013: 123);

$$\Sigma = \frac{x}{N} \times 100$$

Where:

- Σ = Individual Score
- x = Obtained Score
- n = Maximum Score

After getting the individual score from the pretest the data then was collected in a table. In addition, the data was counted to find the mean score from each class. The mean or average was the sum of all the values in a distribution divided by the number of cases. The mean score both in experimental and control class was counted by the following formula proposed by Sugiyono (2013: 54).

$$\bar{x}_1 = \frac{\Sigma x_1}{n_1}$$

$$\bar{x}_2 = \frac{\Sigma x_2}{n_2}$$

Where:

- \bar{x}_1 = Mean scores in experimental class
- \bar{x}_2 = Mean scores in control class

Σx_1 = Sum of scores in experimental class

Σx_2 = Sum of scores in control class

n_1 = Number of scores in experimental class

n_2 = Number of scores in control group

Then, I computed the sum of squared deviation by employing formulas adapted from Sugiyono (2013) as follows:

$$SS_1 = \Sigma X_1^2 - \frac{(\Sigma X_1)^2}{n_1}$$

$$SS_2 = \Sigma X_2^2 - \frac{(\Sigma X_2)^2}{n_2}$$

Where:

- SS1 = sum of squares deviation in experimental class
- SS2 = sum of squares deviation in control class
- ΣX_1^2 = sum of squared scores in control class
- ΣX_2^2 = sum of squared scores in experimental class

Finally, in order to know the significant difference between the experimental group and control group, the formula below was used. This formula helped to determine the development of students' speaking skill. I computed the t-counted by using the following t-counted formula adapted from Sugiyono (2013):

$$t = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{SS_1 + SS_2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}\right) \left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}\right)}}$$

Where:

- $SS_1 = \Sigma X_1^2 - \frac{(\Sigma X_1)^2}{n_1}$
- $SS_2 = \Sigma X_2^2 - \frac{(\Sigma X_2)^2}{n_2}$

Where:

- SS1 = sum of squares in experimental class
- SS2 = sum of squares in control class

$\sum X_1^2$ = sum of squared scores in control class
 $\sum X_2^2$ = sum of squared scores in experimental class

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

The observation checklist in experimental class and control class showed that the result was similar. It indicates that there were some activities that the teacher did not conduct well. Some activities were missed by the teacher's attention, such as in the while-activity the teacher did not present the material clearly, and the students were not actively involved in the activity of asking question. In the postactivities the teacher was not activated the students participation well in building conversation with their classmates so that the students were not active in speaking activities. Finally, based on my consideration, the main problem was the two classes handled by one English teacher and using same techniques. That was why the students of experimental class and control class were not really active in the teaching and learning process.

Result of the Pretest

The pretest was administered to both experimental and control class. It was purposed at finding the students' ability in speaking. I presented the data taken from the pretest and posttest of both experimental and control class.

The processes of giving the pretest in the experimental class, first I gave the students some of motivation to make them were not afraid and shy, thus when they answered the question from me, They felt enjoy to express their idea. Second I asked them one by one base on the pretest question that I made. When I gave them the question most of the students have low of speaking, because they were less of vocabulary and expression in English style, so they are difficult to express their idea but one of them

can speak fluency and appropriacy. The third I closed the meeting after I asked all the students from two aspect namely fluency and appropriacy. .the highest score in pretest of the experimental class is 83 and the lowest one is 33. It means that the students' achievement in speaking test in the pretest of experimental class was poor. All the students did not perform well in their speaking test. The students still hesitate to share their ideas. They rather gave up and stop answering the questions than tried to remember it. They had long and unnatural pauses, fragmentary delivery, and little bit limited range of expression. So, To determine the mean score of the experimental class, I applied the following formula:

$$\bar{X}_1 = \frac{\sum X_1}{n_1} = \frac{1841}{33}$$

$$= 55.79$$

So, the mean score of pretest for experimental class is 55.79

The processes of giving the pretest in the control class, first I met to the real teacher of English in class C that to be the control class to discuss about giving the pretest for students. I just gave the pretest to the teacher, so processes of giving pretest to the control class I didn't intervene. Second after the teacher gave the pretest, I asked the result of the pretest. When I checked the result of pretest in control class, the result was almost same with experimental class, so the problem of the students in control class were less of vocabulary and expression in English style, so they are difficult to express their idea. The finding above shows that all the students of control class were in category of poor. They were afraid to present their speaking test. Some of the students spoke slowly and unclear pronunciation. The students of control class were unconfident to deliver their ideas in speaking. They had full of long and unnatural pauses as well, very halting and fragmentary delivery, even more they

were very limited range of expression. So, based on their performance that the highest score was 83 while the lowest one is 33. I then calculated the mean score of this class:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{X}_1 &= \frac{\sum X_1}{n_1} \\ &= \frac{1840}{32} = 57.5\end{aligned}$$

So, the mean score of pretest for the control class is 57.5. Based on the result of pretest for both classes where mean score of experimental class got 55.79 and the control class is 57.5. These results indicate that the students' ability in expressing ideas were still very low.

Result of Posttest

Talking the processes of giving the posttest in the experimental class, the method was still same with the pretest but different of result. In result of posttest there were significant result from the pretest to the posttest in experimental class why, because before giving posttest, I gave the students the treatment. First I gave the students some of motivation to make them were not afraid and shy when they answered the question from me, They felt enjoy to express their idea. Second I asked them one by one base on the posttest question that I made. Most of the students was successful in posttest and several of them were no successful but they could be increasing their vocabulary and expression in English style.

Based on the posttest score of experimental class, It was found from the Table 4.5 above that the highest score is 100 and the lowest one is 58. It means that, after conducting the treatment, the students were active in speaking activities. They were good enough at delivering their ideas, made an effort at time to search for words, and smooth delivery. There were not too many unnatural pauses, occasionally fragmentary but succeeds in conveying the general meaning and also fair range of expression. So, related to the achievement that there are 23 students

who got very good category and in classification of successful and 10 were in category of poor. The result of the posttest score is totally different with the previous test. Thus, the formulation of the mean score is as follow:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{X}_2 &= \frac{\sum X_2}{n_2} \\ &= \frac{2575}{33} \\ &= 78.03\end{aligned}$$

So, the mean score of posttest experimental class is 78.03. It indicates that the experimental class has progress of mean score from 55.79 in the pretest to 78.03 in the posttest

The processes of giving the posttest in the control class was same also with the pretest, first I met to the real teacher of English in class C that to be the control class to discuss about giving the posttest for students. I just gave the posttest to the teacher, so processes of giving posttest to the control class I didn't intervene too. Second after the teacher gave the posttest, I asked the result of the posttest. When I identified the result of posttest in control class, there were significant result from the pretest to the posttest in control class, in this case happen because of the teacher English in class C gave the other treatment that different with my treatment which I applied to the students in experimental class.

Based on the table 4.6. I computed the mean score from posttest of control class as follow:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{X}_2 &= \frac{\sum X_2}{n_2} \\ &= \frac{1972}{32} \\ &= 61.63\end{aligned}$$

So, the mean score of control class posttest is 61.63. The calculation above indicates that the mean score of control class also increase from 57.5 in the pretest and 61.63 in the posttest, But it is not significantly changed like in the experimental class. In the posttest

of the control class, there are only some students achieved the criteria of success, and the rest are failed. It was caused by some factors such as less of confident, preparation, practice. The students still hesitate to deliver their ideas, had long pauses while they were searching for the desired meaning, and even sometimes they still almost gave up in making the effort at times. Thus, related to their performance in the posttest, it can be measured that almost all the students are still low in speaking activities.

The Result of Treatment

First meeting the topics is Asking for/giving/denying information. Second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth meeting they are same method with the first meeting during the processes of giving the treatment to the students. For the different are topics and condition every meeting. The result of treatment all the students are happy, fun and they can develop their knowledge after playing board game.

I started the lesson by greeting and saying a pray when the students had done to pray I checked their attendance to know who is absent in this meeting. Before introduce the topic what they are going to learn today? I explained first to them, how to answer the question that I gave to them last time (pretest). I gave them some of motivation to improve their spirit, so they were fun during study English with me and giving question also related with the topic that I discussed in class room, as warming up their knowledge. Most of the students pay attention and listening me but some of them not. Finishing of doing that I wrote the expression of the topics and giving them chance to write the expression. When they did that, I asked them to listening and repeat after me to read this expression and the end I asked them to read alone the expression and the result is good, thus they can conceive the expression after I translated that. Then I

asked to the students to made the group for playing the board game. I divided 10 groups every groups there were 3 and 4 students.

During the processes of playing board game the students were happy and fun, so the class is noisily. I went to the group one by one for Monitoring the students activity it was enjoy time. After playing it, I asked them to make the dialogue base on the expression and the result of that the students can speak fluent no only that but also appropriacy. The end of meeting I gave them motivation again and I took the conclusion of what they are learning today, one of them directly speak to explain what he learn. I end the lesson by saying a pray.

After getting t-test result, then it would be consulted to the critical score of t_{table} to check whether the difference is significant or not. It was found that $t_{count} = 6.12$. Furthermore, t_{count} score was compared with t_{table} score with $df = n_1 + n_2 - 2 = 33 + 32 - 2 = 63$ on the standard of significant 0.05, so it was found that $t_{table} = 1.998$. Because of $t_{count} = 6.12 > t_{table} = 1.998$, so it could be concluded that " $H_1 =$ There was positive significant difference between teaching speaking using board game and without using board game" was **accepted** and $H_0 =$ "There was no positive significant difference between teaching using board game and without board game" was **rejected**. It was proved that experimental class was better than control class after getting treatment.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Conclusion

Speaking skill can be developed through board game by the following procedure: During the students followed the processes of teaching learning in the class they were happy because they were playing the game. The rule of the board game can developed their speaking skill, why? because student's fault they got the punishment for answer the question base on the expression.

The last they make the dialogue with their group. When they practice their speaking skill, they were enjoy and fun to interaction each other using of speaking English, so can speaking skill be developed through board game. Based on the analysis of pretest result, there is one students of the experimental class get high score. The highest score is achieved only 83. and the lowest one is 33. It indicates that most of the students still get difficulties in speaking skill. While in the posttest of experimental class, it is found that many students make significant progress. There are some students get higher than 83. The highest score is 100 and the lowest is 58. It proves that after employing board game, the students have progress in speaking skill. This is also confirmed by the value of t-counted (6.12) that is higher than the t-table (1.998). By applying 0.005 level of significance with degree of freedom (df) 5.

Suggestion

Students should be able to provide many dictionary in the library, so the students didn't go out to borrow the dictionary in the other class and focus to increase their vocabulary that can make them to developed their speaking skill. Teacher should be able to motivate and inspiring the students to practice their speaking skill through the competition of speech and story telling when they had done the final examination. for the fund of activity from BOS, but the teacher must discuss first with the head master, so the students are easy to develop their speaking skill. The researcher can use the result of this study to be reference and also technique/media to teach English. The study also gives insights to the researcher in teaching and learning process.

REFERENCES

Best, J.W. 1981. *Research in Education*. Englewood, Butler University,

- Emeritus. Clift, New Jersey. Allyn & Bacon.
- Brown, H. Douglas. 1994. *Teaching by principles: an interactive approach to language pedagogy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents
- Buckby, Michael. 1994. *Games for Language Learning*. Australia: Cambridge University Pres.
- Cameron, Deborah. 2001. *Working with Spoken Discourse*. Oxford: SAGE Publications, Ltd.
- Harmer, J. 1994. *The practice of English Teaching. New edition*. New York. Longman Publishing.
- Heaton, T.B 1988. *Writing English Language Test*. Hongkong: longnam Grup
- Knight 1992. *Assessing Speaking Skill: a workshop for teacher development*. EFL Journal Volume 46/3 July 1992. Oxford University Press 1992
- Lackman, K. 2010. *Teaching Sub-Skill: Activities for Improving Speaking*. Ken Lackman and Associates: Educational Consultant.
- Latief, M. A. 2013. *An Introduction of Research Methods on Language Learning*. Malang: Universitas Negeri Malang
- Philips, M. 1982. *Dialogue and the Human Image, Beyond Humanistic Psychology*. Snewbury Park, CA. Sage Publication.
- Richards, J. C. and Renandya, W.A. Eds.. 2002, *Methodology in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rivers, W. M. 1981. *Teaching Foreign Language Skill (2nd)*. Chicago: University of Chichago Press.
- Sugiyono. 2013. *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif*. Bandung Alfabeta