

## ***Implementation of Board Game as a Medium for Increasing Students' Speaking Skills***

Edyson Baroes  
edysonbaroes@jagakarsa.ac.id

Reza Juniar  
rezajuniar@jagakarsa.ac.id

### **Abstract**

The aim of this research is to enhance the speaking abilities of students at Universitas Tama Jagakarsa by utilizing speaking board games. The research employed an Action Research (AR) approach and involved the students of the university as participants. Qualitative analysis was conducted on the main data, consisting of vignettes collected through classroom observation and transcripts obtained from interviews. Additionally, qualitative analysis was performed on supplementary data such as photographs and videos, while quantitative analysis was used to analyze the students' scores using descriptive statistics. The research ensured validity through various means, including democratic validity, outcome validity, process validity, catalytic validity, and dialogic validity. Reliability was ensured through time triangulation and investigator triangulation for qualitative data, and inter-rater reliability for quantitative data. The research encompassed four stages: planning, implementation, observations, and reflections, and was conducted over two cycles. The findings revealed that the use of speaking board games significantly improved the students' speaking skills at Universitas Tama Jagakarsa. The research results indicated improvements in pronunciation, vocabulary, accuracy, and fluency. Implementing speaking board games boosted the students' confidence in speaking English, encouraged their active participation in speaking activities, and provided them with more opportunities to practice speaking. The students were able to engage in conversations using the expressions they had learned during the implementation process in an enjoyable manner.

Keywords: speaking skill, teaching speaking, role-play technique

### **INTRODUCTION**

The belief that language serves as a means of communication drives English facilitators to prioritize teaching students how to effectively communicate in English. Consequently, the learning materials, methods, techniques, and activities should all encourage and support students in utilizing English for communication purposes (Chen Hsieh, *et al*, 2017). The Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach offers a range of communicative activities for English language instruction. However, in practice, traditional teaching models such as reading dialogues or monologues from written transcripts, reciting texts, or completing

written exercises tend to dominate the learning process.

English holds the status of a global language and is included in the curriculum at various levels of education in Indonesia, including elementary, junior high, and senior high schools, to prepare the younger generation for the era of globalization (Spring, 2017). As a global language, English finds extensive use in daily life and modern technologies, such as mobile phones, computers, social media networks, electronic devices, transportation, banking, and even labeling of products like chemicals, medicine, cosmetics, food, and beverages. Furthermore, English proficiency plays a crucial role in the recruitment of new employees, as it

provides broader access to information. Consequently, many students join private English courses because they feel that their English education in formal schools does not adequately prepare them to achieve a higher level of proficiency (Afrin, 2016). Unfortunately, within formal education, the teaching and learning of English often allocate less time to listening and speaking, with a predominant focus on reading and writing. Some facilitators prioritize writing and reading tasks as they create a more controlled and quiet classroom environment, which is perceived to enhance the effectiveness of the teaching and learning process (Wisner & Starzec, 2016). Additionally, formal English examinations often place disproportionate emphasis on reading and writing tests, with speaking tests or oral production tests being rare. Consequently, students may assume that listening and speaking skills are not essential for their studies.

Speaking is a productive language skill encompassing communication performance and other crucial elements such as pronunciation, intonation, grammar, and vocabulary (Derakhshan, *et al.*, 2016). Mastery of speaking is particularly critical in real-life situations, as it forms an integral part of everyday interactions and often serves as the initial impression one makes on others in terms of fluency and comprehensibility. Therefore, facilitators bear the responsibility of preparing students as effectively as possible to speak English confidently in real-life situations.

Considering the aforementioned points, the researcher endeavored to enhance speaking activities in English learning by identifying appropriate and effective techniques for teaching speaking. Specifically, speaking board games were employed as a technique to improve students' speaking skills and enable them to use English for communication purposes. Through classroom observation and interviews with facilitators and students, the researcher identified several problems

in the teaching and learning process at Universitas Tama Jagakarsa.

Firstly, the facilitator provided limited variation in activities, such as games, student projects, speeches, presentations, discussions, and listening activities, which students actually desired. The activities primarily consisted of reading texts from worksheets and answering related questions. The materials were solely selected by the facilitator and derived from textbooks. Additionally, students were often asked to copy or take notes on the materials provided by the facilitator, occasionally repeating English expressions. Secondly, students had limited access to English materials because they heavily relied on materials provided by the facilitator. They did not proactively seek out additional materials to meet their individual learning needs, nor did the facilitator encourage them to explore other sources such as books, newspapers, or the internet. Thirdly, the facilitator devoted little attention to teaching speaking, resulting in minimal opportunities for students to practice speaking. Furthermore, the facilitator focused on materials specifically designed for national examinations, even though English is primarily learned as a means of communication. Consequently, the facilitator failed to adequately address the productive language skill of speaking, which should have involved activities and materials that encouraged and supported students in expressing themselves using appropriate English expressions (Putri, *et al.*, 2017).

Fourthly, when the students were assigned speaking activities, they exhibited reluctance to speak or share their thoughts. Consequently, they required encouragement, support, and prompting from the facilitator to initiate their participation. Additionally, the facilitator failed to provide models for the students to follow during speaking activities, hindering their ability to express their ideas using appropriate language expressions.

Moreover, the facilitator rarely organized activities that actively encouraged and supported students' speaking skills, resulting in limited opportunities for them to engage in spoken communication. Furthermore, during speaking activities, the facilitator frequently interrupted and restricted the students' freedom to express themselves in their own ways.

Although numerous problems related to speaking skills arise in the teaching and learning process, it is impractical to address all of them. Therefore, the researcher narrowed down the focus to the technique of teaching speaking (Shadiev, *et al*, 2017). The researcher believed that by incorporating speaking board games into the teaching and learning process, students' speaking skills would improve. The primary issue addressed by this research is the students' lack of proficiency in speaking, as speaking is a vital skill that students must acquire as part of their language learning journey.

The research aims to address the problem of how to enhance the speaking skills of Universitas Tama Jagakarsa students through the implementation of speaking board games. Based on this problem formulation, the objective of the research is to improve students' speaking abilities by utilizing board games as a teaching tool in speaking classes.

This research holds both practical and theoretical significance. Practically, students can enhance their speaking skills through the use of speaking board games during English instruction. Additionally, facilitators can gain a better understanding of students' needs and identify their deficiencies, particularly in speaking, allowing them to provide appropriate materials, tasks, methods, and techniques to effectively teach their students.

The researcher can employ the techniques and media utilized in this research for future teaching and learning endeavors. Furthermore, the research offers valuable insights to the researcher

regarding factors that must be considered in every teaching and learning process.

For language researchers specifically, they can adapt the techniques and media employed in this research as alternative approaches to teaching students. Additionally, the data collected in this research, such as field notes, can serve as a valuable resource for future considerations in teaching and learning. This research enhances our understanding of the utilization of speaking board games in the teaching and learning process, shedding light on their importance and the application of relevant theories.

## METHOD

Research is an endeavor centered around investigation, comprising two essential elements: the process and the outcome. The process pertains to the exploration of a specific area of inquiry and the manner in which it is conducted, while the outcome encompasses the knowledge generated from the process and the subsequent presentation of findings (Holt, *et al*, 2017). The current study falls under the category of classroom action research, which is designed to assist facilitators in understanding the dynamics of their own classrooms and utilizing that information to make informed decisions for the future.

Classroom action research can adopt various approaches, such as qualitative or quantitative, descriptive or experimental. It comprises four integral components: planning, acting, observing, and reflecting (Martí, 2016). While action research is generally considered qualitative research, the data collected can also take a quantitative form. Furthermore, it is defined as a self-reflective inquiry undertaken by participants within a social or educational context, aimed at enhancing the rationality, justice, and understanding of their own practices and the situations in which those practices occur. Given that this study employs an action research approach, its focus lies primarily on practical significance rather than statistical

significance, and it presents raw data to illustrate the findings.

The research is designed to meticulously plan and determine all the necessary aspects and materials pertinent to qualitative research. In this particular study, the research design employed is classroom action research, which entails a problem-solving strategy that utilizes real actions in the form of innovative development processes to identify and resolve issues. The procedure of classroom action research consists of iterative cycles, which are administered based on the progress achieved. In order to gauge the students' English pronunciation abilities, a diagnostic test was administered as an initial evaluation. This initial observation was conducted to discern the appropriate actions needed to enhance English pronunciation, with a specific focus on reading aloud narrative texts. Within the framework of classroom action research design, four key components are undertaken: planning, action, observing, and reflecting. The second and third components, acting and observing, are closely intertwined in the process.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This study aimed to enhance students' understanding of speaking through the implementation of board games. It utilized a classroom action research approach, involving various activities and a total of 36 student participants. At the onset of the research, the researcher primarily observed the English lesson in the classroom, where the facilitator employed an inductive teaching method.

Initially, the facilitator randomly asked students about their past or present activities in Indonesian. Based on the students' responses, the facilitator proceeded to explain the concept of the simple past tense and emphasized the function of speaking. Throughout the observation, the researcher noted several occurrences within the classroom during

the learning process. It was evident that speaking was perceived as a challenging topic, leading to student confusion and disinterest. Many students appeared bored, displayed a lack of attention towards the facilitator's explanations, and struggled to respond to questions posed by the facilitator.

Based on the above description, it can be concluded that students' engagement and understanding of speaking were notably low during the English lesson. In order to foster enthusiasm and facilitate learning, the researcher introduced board games as a means to enhance students' comprehension of the simple past tense.

Subsequently, the researcher administered a test comprising 10 multiple-choice items to assess students' achievement prior to implementing the intervention. The students were given 15 minutes to complete the test. The purpose of this assessment was to establish a baseline measure of students' performance before implementing any interventions. The test results were then calculated using the formula provided below:

$$\text{Score} = \frac{\sum \text{right answer}}{\sum \text{items}} \times 100$$

Based on the aforementioned findings, the researcher proceeded to calculate the average score of the students. This calculation aimed to assess their comprehension of speaking. Following the test, the researcher planned to incorporate board games into the next activity to generate student interest and enhance the learning process.

### *First Activity*

The initial step involved planning, which took place on Wednesday. Due to the unsatisfactory results of the preliminary test, the researcher and the English facilitator jointly decided to introduce board games. The focus of this intervention was to improve students' understanding of

speaking. Before implementing the board games, the researcher prepared various instructional materials such as lesson plans, observation checklists, board game papers, and student tests.

Subsequently, the implementation phase commenced. The researcher received assistance from a collaborator who acted as the facilitator responsible for guiding students in improving their English pronunciation, particularly in reading aloud narrative texts.

The main stops in the students and learning activated were designed as follows:

*Pre-activity.* The first step involved the facilitator greeting the students and taking attendance. Next, the facilitator captured the students' attention by posing questions about their activities during the previous week. Finally, the facilitator provided an overview of the lesson's objectives.

*While-activity.* The facilitator initially introduced key pronunciation aspects relevant to speaking ability to the students. This was followed by an explanation of techniques for speaking with ease. The facilitator also addressed any difficulties the students encountered in speaking.

*Post-activity.* The facilitator proceeded to reflect on the students' activities and distributed their tests. Subsequently, the facilitator reviewed and assessed the students' work.

The facilitator affixed the board game on the blackboard and divided the class into seven groups, with each group comprising five students. The division of groups was based on their scores from the preliminary test. The facilitator distributed board game papers to each group and explained the game's rules and procedures. Initially, some students had difficulty understanding the procedures, prompting them to seek clarification from the facilitator.

After further explanation from the facilitator, the students grasped the instructions and were ready to play the game. Before starting the board game, the facilitator and students translated the meanings presented on the board game to ensure everyone understood without encountering difficulties. To initiate the game, the facilitator asked the students to "write," and the group that could respond quickly became the first player. In this particular instance, group 6 assumed the role of the first player. Based on observations during the first cycle, it was evident that a greater number of students became actively involved compared to before.

#### *Observing*

The facilitator observed the students' behavior while they played the board game for approximately 30 minutes. The facilitator received assistance from another facilitator during this observation. Following the implementation of the board game intervention, the facilitator administered a multiple-choice test to assess the students' scores. The students were given 10 minutes to complete the test. However, five students did not adhere to the rules and attempted to obtain answers from their peers. To analyze the test results, the facilitator utilized a formula for calculation.

$$Score = \frac{\sum \text{right answer}}{\sum \text{items}} \times 100$$

#### *Reflecting*

Reflection serves as an activity to contemplate the actions taken, evaluate the outcomes achieved, and identify areas that require further attention. The reflection outcomes serve as a guideline for determining subsequent steps until the research objectives are attained. The reflection results can indicate the success or failure of the action, and based on those outcomes, appropriate follow-up actions can be planned. If the reflection reveals

successful outcomes, the cycle concludes. However, if the results are not satisfactory, the next cycle must be planned, incorporating necessary improvements.

### Second Cycle

*First, Planning.* In this particular phase, the facilitator also prepared instructional tools for the teaching and learning process. The facilitator conducted this cycle based on reflections from the previous cycle in collaboration with the English facilitator.

*Second, Implementing.* In the second cycle, the facilitator divided the class into seven groups, which differed from the first cycle. The grouping was based on the test results from the first cycle. During the brainstorming session, the facilitator asked some students about their past activities.

*Third, Observing.* In the second cycle, the students exhibited enthusiasm and happiness. They paid attention to the facilitator's explanations, and a few students from groups 1, 6, and 7 sought clarification on the procedures of playing the board game. The cycle involved 36 students, with one student absent. The facilitator allocated 10 minutes for the students to complete the test. However, some students did not follow instructions and attempted to use dictionaries. The facilitator intervened, prohibiting dictionary use and encouraging students to be honest and rely on their own knowledge. The test results were analyzed using a specific formula for calculation.

$$Score = \frac{\sum \text{right answer}}{\sum \text{items}} \times 100$$

### Reflecting

The facilitator and the English facilitator engaged in discussions regarding the teaching and learning process that had been implemented. They identified weaknesses and formulated strategies for improvement in the next cycle. A reflection was conducted in

preparation for the subsequent cycle. In this cycle, the students still struggled with creating speech in nominal patterns, and some remained passive in responding to answers provided by other groups. Consequently, the facilitator decided to proceed with a third cycle to further assess the students' comprehension of speaking skills.

### The Students' Improvement of Understanding on Simple Past Tense after Being Taught Through The Use of Board Game.

#### Students' Score of The Preliminary test

After conducting test, the researcher gave score. The correct answer got score 1 and wrong answer got 0 score. The maximum score was 10. Then, after finding the result of the students' test score, the researcher analyzed the score by using percentage of scoring as follow:

$$Score = \frac{\sum \text{right answer}}{\sum \text{items}} \times 100$$

Then the researcher used five letters: A, B, C, D and E to classify the grade of students' score level as presented on the tabel below :

Table. 1.1

The test result of pre cycle can be seen in the table below:

NO	Stude nts Code	Sco re	Percent age	Lett er Sco re	Categ ory
1	A-1	6	60 %	C	Fair
2	A-2	4	40 %	D	Less
3	A-3	7	70 %	B	Good
4	A-4	5	50 %	C	Fair
5	A-5	5	50 %	C	Fair
6	A-6	4	40 %	D	Less
7	A-7	5	50 %	C	Fair
8	A-8	8	80 %	B	Good
9	A-9	4	40 %	D	Less
10	A-10	6	60 %	C	Fair
11	A-11	5	50 %	C	Fair
12	A-12	9	90 %	A	Excell ent

13	A-13	8	80 %	B	Good
14	A-14	8	80 %	B	Good
15	A-15	7	70 %	B	Good
16	A-16	8	80 %	B	Good
17	A-17	8	80 %	B	Good
18	A-18	4	40 %	D	Less
19	A-19	6	60 %	C	Fair
20	A-20	5	50 %	C	Fair
21	A-21	6	60 %	C	Fair
22	A-22	5	50 %	C	Fair
23	A-23	6	60 %	C	Fair
24	A-24	5	50 %	C	Fair
25	A-25	7	70 %	B	Good
26	A-26	6	60 %	C	Fair
27	A-27	3	30 %	D	Less
28	A-28	6	60 %	C	Fair
29	A-29	8	80 %	B	Good
30	A-30	6	60 %	C	Fair
31	A-31	5	50 %	C	Less
32	A-32	6	60 %	C	Fair
33	A-33	3	30 %	D	Less
34	A-34	6	60 %	C	Fair
35	A-35	6	60 %	C	Fair
36	A-36	4	40 %	D	Less
Total Score		210			
Mean		5.83			

Then from the result above the researcher calculated the achievement of study used this formula:

$$\text{The average of the student result} = \frac{\text{The total of students score}}{\text{The number of students}} \times 100 \%$$

*Table 1.2*  
*The Category of The Students Score and Their Percentage:*

No	Interval	Freq	Percentage	Category
1	81 – 100	1	2,78 %	Excellent
2	61 – 80	9	25 %	Good
3	41 – 60	19	52,78 %	Fair
4	21 – 40	7	19,44 %	Less
5	0 - 20	-	-	Poor
		36	100 %	

Based on the provided data, it can be observed that 1 or 2.78% of the 36 students achieved an excellent score. Additionally, 9 or 25% of the students received a good score, 19 or 52.78% obtained a fair score,

and 7 or 19.44% received a lower score. To determine the average score of the test results, the researcher calculated the mean using the following formula:

$$M = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$

Explanation:

M = The average of students' score

$\sum x$  = Total students' score was 210.

N = Total of students was 36.

The computation of the average score was follow:

$$\frac{210}{36} = 5.83$$

The calculation result shows that the average of students' test result of preliminary cycle was 5.83. The highest score was 9 and the lowest score was 3.

The results indicate that the average score of students' understanding of speaking was relatively low, with a mean score of 5.83. This score falls below the minimum standard score (KKM) of 6. Following the administration of the test, the researcher intended to incorporate board games in the subsequent activities to generate student interest and enhance the enjoyment of the learning process.

#### 1. Students' Score of The First Cycle

**Table. 2.1**

The test result of first cycle can be seen in the table below:

NO	Students Code	Score	Percentage	Letter Score	Category
1	A-1	10	100 %	A	Excellent
2	A-2	6	60 %	C	Fair
3	A-3	10	100 %	A	Excellent
4	A-4	7	70 %	B	Good
5	A-5	9	90 %	A	Excellent
6	A-6	5	50 %	C	Fair
7	A-7	6	60 %	C	Fair
8	A-8	10	100 %	A	Excellent

9	A-9	5	50 %	C	Fair
10	A-10	6	60 %	C	Fair
11	A-11	6	60 %	C	Fair
12	A-12	10	100 %	A	Excellent
13	A-13	9	90 %	A	Excellent
14	A-14	9	90 %	A	Excellent
15	A-15	9	90 %	A	Excellent
16	A-16	6	60 %	C	Fair
17	A-17	10	100 %	A	Excellent
18	A-18	10	100 %	A	Excellent
19	A-19	9	90 %	A	Excellent
20	A-20	5	50 %	C	Fair
21	A-21	8	80 %	B	Good
22	A-22	9	90 %	A	Excellent
23	A-23	10	100 %	A	Excellent
24	A-24	5	50 %	C	Fair
25	A-25	7	70 %	B	Good
26	A-26	6	60 %	C	Fair
27	A-27	7	70 %	B	Good
28	A-28	7	70 %	B	Good
29	A-29	10	100 %	A	Excellent
30	A-30	7	70 %	B	Good
31	A-31	4	40 %	D	Less
32	A-32	8	80 %	B	Good
33	A-33	7	70 %	B	Good
34	A-34	8	80 %	B	Good
35	A-35	6	60 %	C	Fair
36	A-36	7	70 %	B	Good
Total Score		273			
Mean		7.58			

Then from the result above the researcher calculated the percentage of achievement of study used formula. The result was below:

*Table. 2.2*  
*The Category of The Students Score and Their Percentage:*

No	Interval	Freq	Percentage	Category
1	81 – 100	14	38.89 %	Excellent
2	61 – 80	10	27.78 %	Good
3	41 – 60	11	30.55 %	Fair
4	21 – 40	1	2.78 %	Less

5	0 - 20	-	-	Poor
		36	100 %	

From the data above, it could be seen that 14 or 38.89% of 36 students got excellent mark, 10 or 27.78% students of 36 students got good mark, 11 or 30.55 % of 36 students got fair mark, and 1 or 2.78% of 36 students got less mark. After that, the researcher calculated the mean using the same formula with previous research.

$$M = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$

Explanation:

M = The average of students' score

$\sum X$  = Total students' score was 210.

N = Total of students was 36.

The computation of the average score was follow:

$$\frac{273}{36} = 7.58$$

The researcher's analysis shows that the average of students' test result of the first cycle was 7.58. The highest score was 10 and the lowest score was 4. The average of students test result increased 1.61. It was from 5.97 to be 7.58. Researcher concluded that students' understanding on simple past tense improved.

## 2. Students' Score of The Second Cycle

*Table. 3.1*

*The test result of second cycle can be seen in the table below:*

NO	Students Code	Score	Percentage	Letter Score	Category
1	A-1	8	80 %	B	Good
2	A-2	7	70 %	B	Good
3	A-3	10	100 %	A	Excellent
4	A-4	Absent	Absent	Absent	-
5	A-5	8	80 %	B	Good
6	A-6	5	50 %	C	Fair
7	A-7	5	50 %	C	Fair

8	A-8	10	100 %	A	Excellent
9	A-9	8	80 %	B	Good
10	A-10	5	50 %	C	Fair
11	A-11	6	60 %	C	Fair
12	A-12	10	100 %	A	Excellent
13	A-13	10	100 %	A	Excellent
14	A-14	10	100 %	A	Excellent
15	A-15	9	90 %	A	Excellent
16	A-16	9	90 %	A	Excellent
17	A-17	10	100 %	A	Excellent
18	A-18	8	80 %	B	Good
19	A-19	6	60 %	C	Fair
20	A-20	7	70 %	B	Good
21	A-21	9	90 %	A	Excellent
22	A-22	8	80 %	B	Good
23	A-23	10	100 %	A	Excellent
24	A-24	6	60 %	C	Fair
25	A-25	9	90 %	A	Excellent
26	A-26	8	80 %	B	Good
27	A-27	7	70 %	B	Good
28	A-28	9	90 %	A	Excellent
29	A-29	10	100 %	A	Excellent
30	A-30	9	90 %	A	Excellent
31	A-31	5	50 %	C	Fair
32	A-32	7	70 %	B	Good
33	A-33	7	70 %	B	Good
34	A-34	6	60 %	C	Fair
35	A-35	8	80 %	B	Good
36	A-36	7	70 %	C	Fair
Total Score		276			
Mean		7.88			

Then from the result above the researcher calculated the percentage of achievement of study used the same with previous formula. The result was below:

**Table. 3.2**  
The Category of The Students Score and Their Percentage:

No	Interval	Freq	Percentage	Category
1	81 – 100	14	40 %	Excellent
2	61 – 80	13	37.14 %	Good
3	41 – 60	8	22.86 %	Fair
4	21 – 40	-	-	Less
5	0 - 20	-	-	Poor
		35	100 %	

From the table above, it could be seen that 14 students or 40 % of students from VII got excellent mark, 13 or 37.14 % students got good mark, and 8 or 22.86 % students got fair mark,. From that result, the researcher could calculate the average (mean) of the score as below:

$$M = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$

Explanation:

M = The average of students' score

$\sum X$  = Total students' score was 276.

N = Total of students was 35.

The computation of the average score was follow:

$$\frac{276}{35} = 7.88$$

The average test scores of students improved compared to previous cycles, although there were still a few students who scored close to the minimum standard. Based on the researcher's analysis, the average test result in the third cycle was 7.88, with the highest score being 10 and the lowest score being 6. There was a noticeable improvement from one cycle to the next. The results of this cycle demonstrated successful implementation and were better than the previous cycle, although four students still scored at the minimum level. The researcher concluded that the use of board games adequately addressed the students' difficulties in understanding simple past tense.

*Table. 4.3*  
*The Result of Test from the First Cycle until Third Cycle as Follow:*

No	Students code	Preliminary	Cycle 1	Cycle 2
1	A- 1	6	10	8
2	A- 2	4	6	7
3	A- 3	7	10	10
4	A- 4	5	7	Absent
5	A- 5	5	9	8
6	A- 6	4	5	5
7	A- 7	5	6	5
8	A- 8	8	10	10
9	A- 9	4	5	8
10	A- 10	6	6	5
11	A- 11	5	6	6
12	A- 12	9	10	10
13	A- 13	8	9	10
14	A- 14	8	9	10
15	A- 15	7	9	9
16	A- 16	8	6	9
17	A- 17	8	10	10
18	A- 18	4	10	8
19	A- 19	6	9	6
20	A- 20	5	5	7
21	A- 21	6	8	9
22	A- 22	5	9	8
23	A- 23	6	10	10
24	A- 24	5	5	6
25	A- 25	7	7	9
26	A- 26	6	6	8
27	A- 27	3	7	7
28	A- 28	6	7	9
29	A- 29	8	10	10
30	A- 30	6	7	9
31	A- 31	5	4	5
32	A- 32	6	8	7
33	A- 33	3	7	7
34	A- 34	6	8	6
35	A- 35	6	6	8
36	A- 36	4	7	7
	Mean	5.83	7.58	7.88

Preliminary Research	Cycle I	Cycle II
5.83	7.58	7.88

The presented table displays the average scores of students from the preliminary cycle 1 to cycle 2. It is evident that there was a notable improvement in students' understanding. Various factors contributed to the study's outcomes, with one of the key factors being the use of appropriate teaching aids or media. When the facilitator employed suitable teaching aids or media that aligned with the teaching method, students enjoyed the lessons. The utilization of board games as a teaching medium in the English learning process for Universitas Tama Jagakarsa students demonstrated an enhancement in their understanding of speaking. The use of effective teaching media facilitated students' comprehension of the delivered material. Learning through games proved to be an effective approach in stimulating students' abilities and encouraging their active participation. Board games not only served as an appropriate tool for teaching speaking, but they also stimulated students' cognitive processes and fostered their creativity in constructing sentences.

## CONCLUSION

The implementation of the board game involved several steps. The process began with the teacher dividing the class into seven groups. Each group received a board game paper with nine blank boxes, while the teacher drew a board game grid on the blackboard. The board game grid contained infinitive verbs combined with the names of the months. The teacher selected one infinitive verb from the grid and instructed all groups to change it into its past tense form. The group that successfully and accurately changed the infinitive verb became the first player. They then created a simple past tense sentence using the chosen verb, along with a time signal. During this phase, the teacher provided instructions for the students to include days of the week, months, family

## Discussion

Following the implementation of board games in teaching simple past tense, the researcher collected data that revealed significant improvements in students' understanding of speaking. The use of games during the teaching and learning process sparked enthusiasm among the students, leading to increased engagement and active participation in responding to questions from both their peers and the facilitator. The ability to distinguish between different aspects of speaking was observed throughout each cycle, resulting in the following outcomes of the classroom action research:

members, and personal identities in their sentences. If the answer was correct, the group marked an "O" on their board game paper, but if the answer was wrong, they marked an "X." The turn then passed to the next group, who chose a different infinitive verb from the grid and repeated the process. A group would miss their turn if they couldn't create a sentence following the pattern of the simple past tense or if their answer was incorrect. Each group aimed to create a diagonal, vertical, or horizontal row on their board game paper and block the opposing groups from achieving the same in order to win the game.

Then, The use of board game can improve students' understanding on simple past tense. It can be seen the average score of students as follows:

Preliminary Research	Cycle I	Cycle II
5.83	7.58	7.88

The result above shows that the use of board game can help students solve their difficulties. The test result of the students under this research increased in every cycle.

## REFERENCES

- Afrin, S. (2016). Writing problems of non-English major undergraduate students in Bangladesh: An observation. *Open journal of social sciences*, 4(3), 104-115.
- Chen Hsieh, J. S., Wu, W. C. V., & Marek, M. W. (2017). Using the flipped classroom to enhance EFL learning. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 30(1-2), 1-21.
- Derakhshan, A., Khalili, A. N., & Beheshti, F. (2016). Developing EFL learner's speaking ability, accuracy and fluency. *English Language and Literature Studies*, 6(2), 177-186.
- Holt, N. L., Neely, K. C., Slater, L. G., Camiré, M., Côté, J., Fraser-Thomas, J., ... & Tamminen, K. A. (2017). A grounded theory of positive youth development through sport based on results from a qualitative meta-study. *International review of sport and exercise psychology*, 10(1), 1-49.
- Martí, J. (2016). Measuring in action research: Four ways of integrating quantitative methods in participatory dynamics. *Action Research*, 14(2), 168-183.
- Putri, N. L. P. N. S., Artini, L. P., & Nitiasih, P. K. (2017). Project-based learning activities and EFL students' productive skills in English. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 8(6), 1147-1155.
- Shadiev, R., Hwang, W. Y., & Huang, Y. M. (2017). Review of research on mobile language learning in authentic environments. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 30(3-4), 284-303.
- Spring, J. (2017). *The intersection of cultures: Multicultural education in the United States and the global economy*. Routledge.
- Wisner, B. L., & Starzec, J. J. (2016). The process of personal transformation for adolescents practicing mindfulness skills in an alternative school setting. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 33, 245-257.

Baroes, Juniar, *“Implementation of Board Game as a Medium for Increasing Students' Speaking Skills”*