



The Effect of Using “Board Games on the Students’ Speaking Skill (A Quasi Experimental Study at the Tenth Grade of SMA Muhammadiyah 4 Bengkulu in 2016/2017 A.Y)

Lussy Erviona

English Education Study Program, Department of Language and Art

Universitas Bengkulu

lussyerviona02@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aimed to find out whether board games have a positive effect on students' speaking skill. It was a quasi experimental research. The population included the tenth graders of SMA Muhammadiyah 4 Bengkulu City from which two classes (X 1 and X 3) were selected as the research sample. The instruments consisted of a speaking test (with 10 questions). The result was that board games could give positive effect on the students' speaking skill between the pretest and the post-test score. It was proved by the Sig value in the experimental class which was smaller than 0.05 (0.000 < 0.05; paired sample t-test) and the mean score improvement in the experimental class which was 30.03. Therefore, board games had a positive effect on the students' speaking skill. It was suggested that *current or future researchers* conduct studies on the effect of using board games on students' speaking skill in different locations in Bengkulu city or in a regency of Bengkulu or in improving the students' speaking skill by using board games. They also should investigate the effect of using board games in another skill of English (listening, speaking, or writing) at the same school or at different locations in Bengkulu. Furthermore, they should investigate the students' response about the use of board games in learning English not only in speaking skill but also in other skills of English.

Keywords: Board Games, Speaking Skill.

Introduction

Speaking is one of the English skills that students must have. In order to be able to speak, students sometimes found difficulties or problems. The students of SMP Negeri 8 Bengkulu, especially those from class seven, also have problems in speaking. The researcher has interviewed one of the English teachers at the school (Ms. Wijo Rini, S.Pd) informally on May 11, 2016. In the interview she said that the teacher often depended very much on English textbooks. She seldom created her own teaching materials related to certain topics. Thus sometimes she found the classroom activities especially when she taught speaking skills uninteresting or boring.

Games are activities with rules, a goal, and element of fun (Hadfield, 2005 in Azzahroh, 2015). By using games, the students can use this international language during speaking activities (Azzahroh, 2015). Moreover, using games can help and encourage students' interest and work in order to have more practice in English instruction, and help the teacher to create contexts in which the language is useful and meaningful. (Wright et al, 1994:1) in Nirmawati, 2015). Additionally, it is motivating and challenging for the students and that they will not feel bored of learning because it can break the ice – the usual routine of the language class (Kim, 1995:35 in Nirmawati, 2015).

There are so many games that can be applied in the teaching and learning activities in the classroom especially in speaking skills such as board games, tic tac toe, guessing games, and so on. However, in this research, the researcher is interested in board games. Monopoly, Snakes and Ladders, and Ludo are the examples (Provenzo, 1981:2 in Nirmawati, 2015).

A board game is a game that can be played by using a dice. The dice is thrown when students play it and the students can step forward to dice. It involves counters or pieces moved or placed on a pre-marked surface or "board" according to a set of rules. It can be based on pure strategy, chance (e.g., rolling dice) or a mixture of the two, and usually have a goal to achieve (Azzahroh, 2015). Board games have been used to teach children basic fact and information about the world in which they live (Provenzo, 1981:2 in Nirmawati, 2015).

There are some advantages of using board games in a language classroom. Using board games can equip students' ability to communicate in the target language (Nirmawati, 2015:32). It is an effective, low-anxiety, and fun way to learn and practice communication skills (Chang and Cogswell, 2008 in Nirmawati, 2015: 32). Besides, it can stimulate communication exchange between and among students and provide context and situation for real communication (Hadfield, 1990: iv in Nirmawati, 2015:33). Furthermore, using these attractive and interesting games as English teaching and learning media can increase students' curiosity and creativity (Azzahroh, 2015). Due to the students' problems in speaking skill above, there are some gaps that the researcher would like to fulfill. The advantages of using the games encourage the researcher to prove whether or not this kind of games can give positive effect on the students' speaking skill.

Research Methodology

The design of this research was a quasi experiment. According to Sadish et.al (2002) and White & Sabarwal (2014), a quasi-experimental design is like experimental designs because it tests causal hypotheses. Besides, it lacks random assignment, identifies a comparison group that is as similar as possible to the treatment group in terms of baseline (pre-intervention) characteristics. Moreover, Leedy & Ormrod (2010) in Levy and Ellis (2011) explain,

The quasi-experiment, also known as 'field-experiment' or 'in-situ experiment', is a type of experimental design in which the researcher has limited leverage and control over the selection of study participants. Specifically, in quasi-experiments, the researcher does not have the ability to randomly assign the participants and/or ensure that the sample selected is as homogeneous as desirable. Additionally, in numerous investigations, including those conducted in information systems research, randomization may not be feasible, leaving the researcher with pre-assigned group assignments. Accordingly, the ability to fully control all the study variables and to the implication of the treatment on the study group(s) maybe limited. Nevertheless, quasi-experiments still provide fruitful information for the advancement of research.

There will be two variables used in this research, namely independent (board games) and dependent (speaking skill). Furthermore, two groups are used, they are experimental group – with the treatment (by using board games), and control group – with conventional method. Before giving the treatment, a

pre-test for each group will be given in order to see the level of students' qualifications. After the treatment, a post-test will be given to both groups in order to know the students' speaking skill.

Experimental Group Y1 \longrightarrow X1 \longrightarrow Y2

Control Group Y1 \longrightarrow X0 \longrightarrow Y2

Note : Y1 : Pre-Test

Y2 : Post-Test

X1 : Treatment

X0 : No-treatment

Finding and Discussion

Finding

The result showed that the instrument was reliable. It was proved by the reliability coefficient which was found, that was 0.99. it meant that the instrument had very high reliability (Sugiyono, 2010).

Normality Test Results

Pre-Test

The normality test in this research used *Kolmogorov-Smirnov* method was SPSS v.17 for windows with criteria $\alpha = 0.05$. it means that based on the calculation, the significance value of normality pre-test score in the experimental class was 0.200. It meant that the data were normally distributed because 0.200 was bigger than 0.05 ($0.200 > 0.05$). Moreover, the significance value of pre-test score in the control class was 0.069. It also meant that the data were normally distributed because 0.069 was bigger than 0.05 ($0.069 > 0.05$). Therefore, the distribution of the data in the pretest was normal. See table 4.1 for more detail.

Table 4.1 . The Normality Test Result in the Pre-Test

Aspect	Class	Sig-value	Meaning
Pre-Test	Control	0.069	The data were normal.
	Experiment	0.200	The data were normal.

Post-test

Based on the calculation, the significance value of normality of the post-test score in both the experimental class and the control class was 0.200. It meant that the data were normally distributed because 0.200 was bigger than 0.05 ($0.200 > 0.05$). Therefore, the distribution of the post test data was normal. See table 4.2 for more detail.

Table 4.2. The Normality Test Result in the Post-Test

Aspect	Class	Sig-value	Meaning
Whole/Overall	Control	0.200	The data were normal.
	Experiment	0.200	The data were normal.

Homogeneity Test Results

Pre-test

Based on the calculation of normality, the researcher obtained that the result or the data of the pre-test in both experimental and control class had been distributed normally. The next step of the calculation was finding out the pre-test and the post-test homogeneity of the data by using SPSS V.17 for windows.

The calculation showed that the significance value of the pre-test homogeneity between experimental and control class was 0.526. It meant that the data were homogenous because 0.526 was bigger than 0.05 ($0.526 > 0.05$). Therefore, the data processing could be continued to the hypothesis testing. See table 4.3 for more detail.

Table 4.3. The Homogeneity Test Result in the Pre-Test

Aspect	Sig-value	Meaning
Homogeneity on Pre-Test	0.526	The data were homogenous

Post-test

Based on the calculation of normality, the researcher obtained that the result or the data of the pre-test in both experimental and control class had been distributed normally. The next step of the calculation was finding out the pre-test and the post-test homogeneity of the data by using SPSS V.17 for windows.

The calculation showed that the significance value of the pre-test homogeneity between experimental and control class was 0.717. It meant that the data were homogenous because 0.717 was bigger than 0.05 ($0.717 > 0.05$). Therefore, the data processing could be continued to the hypothesis testing. See table 4.4 for more detail.

Table 4.4. The Homogeneity Test Result in the Post-Test

Aspect	Sig-value	Meaning
Homogeneity on Post-Test	0.717	The data were homogenous

Results of Hypothesis Testing

Before conducting the hypothesis testing, the following hypothesis is reviewed:

H_0 = There is a positive effect on the students' speaking skill between the pre and post-test score.

H_1 = There is no positive effect on the students' speaking skill between the pre and post-test score.

Regarding the hypothesis above, paired sample T-test was used instead of independent sample t-test. Based on the result, the sig-value of the hypothesis testing both in the control class and in the experimental class was 0.000. It was smaller than 0.05 ($0.000 < 0.05$). It meant that there was significant difference for the students' initial ability in speaking skill between the pre-test score and the post-test score.

However, to know how much effect they were different each other was known from the difference in the mean score in each class. In the control class, the improvement or the difference in mean score was 20.39. Meanwhile, in the experimental class, the improvement or the mean score

difference after using board games was 30.03. It meant that even though in the two classes there was significant difference in the students speaking skill in the pre-test and in the post-test, after seeing the mean score difference in each class, the experimental class obtained higher. Therefore, the answer of the hypothesis was that there was positive effect on the students' speaking skill between the pre-test and the post-test score in the experimental class. See table 4.5 for more detail.

Table 4.5. The Hypothesis Testing and the Mean-Score Result

Class	Mean Score		Improvement	Sig Value (Independent T-Test)		Paired Sample T-Test
	Pre-Test	Post-Test		Pre-Test	Post-Test	Pre-Post
Control	53.29	71.86	20.39	0.051 > 0.05 (There is no sig difference between experimental class and control class)	0.000 < 0.05 (There is sig difference between experimental class and control class)	0.000 < 0.05 (there is sig difference between pre-test and post-test)
Experiment	53.79	83.82	30.03			0.000 < 0.05 (there is sig difference between pre-test and post-test)

Discussion

Based on the result of the test, the researcher did hypothesis testing. Hypothesis testing was conducted after passing the normality and the homogeneity test. And it became the basis for the researcher to answer the research question.

Before discussing the answer of the research question, the hypothesis could be reviewed:

H_0 = There is a positive effect on the students' speaking skill between the pre and post-test score.

H_1 = There is no positive effect on the students' speaking skill between the pre and post-test score.

Concerning the hypothesis result, the Sig-value of the hypothesis testing was smaller than 0.05 ($0.000 < 0.05$). It meant that there was significant difference for the students' speaking skill between the pre-test score and the post-test score (paired sample t-test; $\alpha=0.05$).

Moreover, the result was supported by the mean score for each class in which in the control class, the mean score of the pre-test was 53.29 and the mean score of the post-test was 71.86 (with the improvement was 20.39). Meanwhile, in the experimental class, the mean score of the pre-test was 53.79 and the mean score of the post-test was 83.82 (with the improvement was 30.03). Therefore, it

strengthened the result of the hypothesis testing that there was positive effect on the experimental class students' speaking skill between the pre-test score and the post-test score.

During the implementation of board games, the students did not have any difficulties due to the fact that the game was just like a *snake and ladder* game that they used to play when they were kids. They used pictures of tourist objects or famous historical landmarks in the board games to be described orally. And by using their dice, they took turn describing tourist objects or famous historical landmarks based on the picture they had got after they roll their dice. And the student who firstly reached the finish line was the winner.

Furthermore, the students became more competitive each other. It is because they wanted to show their best. They wanted to be the winner in the game. It was supported by Treher (2011) that board games are threatening, playful, and competitive games in order to focus on content and reinforce and apply learning.

They tried to maximize their effort to speak in English even though they did not know the correct grammar. What was important for them was that they spoke up. They felt confident in speaking English when using the games. Even for students who were previously shy or inactive in speaking English, this game finally made them speak. As Langran & Purcell.1994. p.12-14 in Sigurðardóttir (2010) said that games are good for shy and low confident students. In this case, shy and low confident students can get an opportunity to speak in front of fewer audiences instead of in front of the whole class.

Therefore, this game could make the students interact and communicate with their friends. It could also help the students solve their problems by asking their friends some words they did not know in English. Furthermore, it could build their competitive soul to be the winner of the game. They will try to maximize their effort to speak in English even though they did not know the correct grammar. The point was that they speak. Moreover, the game built positive atmosphere among the students as well as their confidence.

This research, however, was different from the others in terms of subject, time, material, and instrument. In term of subject, the researcher investigated the effect of board games with different population and sample. In this research, the researcher had conducted her study on the tenth grade of SMA Muhammadiyah 4 Bengkulu. And in term of time, the researcher had conducted her research in the second semester of 2016/2017 academic year. One of the materials offered by the curriculum in this semester was about descriptive texts. Therefore, different population and sample, different time, different materials made the instrument also be different from other studies.

The finding of this study supported the findings of other studies. Rahmawati (2012) found that the use of board games in combination with applying various media in the presentation, using songs, using classroom English, and conducting listening activities was able to improve students' speaking skills. The students also enthusiastically joined the teaching and learning activities. Moreover, Nirmawati

(2015) found that there was improvement of the students' speaking skills in some aspects, such as pronunciation, vocabulary, accuracy and fluency. Furthermore, Azzahroh (2015) also found that board game is effective in improving the students' speaking skill. And it is effective to be applied in teaching speaking skill in senior high school.

Conclusion and Suggestion

Conclusion

The conclusion of this study showed that board games gave positive effect on the students speaking skill in which there was any change on the students' behavior of speaking. It could improve the students' speaking skill. The students' speaking skill became better when it was compared between pre-test score and post-test score. It was also proved by the Sig value in the experimental class which was smaller than 0.05 ($0.000 < 0.05$; paired sample t-test) and the mean score improvement in the experimental class which was 30.03 which mean so.

Suggestions

Based on the conclusion above, the researcher suggests not only current or future researchers, but also English teachers, students, and readers. For current or future researchers, it is better for them to conduct the same study on the effect of using board games on students' speaking skill in different location in Bengkulu city or in a regency of Bengkulu or to conduct a study in improving the students' speaking skill by using board games. Moreover, they also should investigate the effect of using board games in another skill of English (listening, speaking, or writing) at the same school or at different location in Bengkulu.

REFERENCES

Azzahroh, R.A. 2015. *The Effectiveness of Using Board Games towards Students' Speaking Skill (A Quasi Experimental Study at the Tenth Grade Students of SMAN 1 Parung)*. Jakarta.

Couzin, M. 2012. *Benefits of Board Games*. Retrieved from <http://www.yourneighborhoodtoystore.org/play-together.asp?i=89> on June 16, 2016 at 3.22 A.M

Daymut, J. A. (2009). *Helpful strategies for teaching children how to play board games*. Super Duper Publications – Super Duper Handy Handouts! Number 237.

Ferbasari, L. 2005. *The Effect of the Jigsaw Technique toward Students' Reading Comprehension Achievement at SMA Negeri 3 Kota Bengkulu 2004/2005 Academic Year*. Bengkulu: Universitas Bengkulu.

Nirmawati, L.A. 2015. *Improving Students' Speaking Skills through Speaking Board Games of Grade VIII of SMP N 13 Yogyakarta in the Academic Year of 2013/2014*. Yogyakarta: Yogyakarta State University.