

# THE APPLICATION OF GAMES IN DEVELOPING STUDENTS' SPEAKING SKILL IN EFL CLASSROOM

## ABSTRACT

This research was aimed at developing students speaking skill in EFL classroom through the application of games. The research was designed in the form of Classroom Action Research. It was conducted in two cycles and six meetings. Each cycle consisted of plan, implementation, observation and Reflection. The researcher employed observation checklist, field notes, questionnaire, and test to collect the data. The main criterion of success of this research was that the students' scores on speaking test should achieve the score of 70; and it must be achieved by 75% of the total number of students. The second criterion was that the teacher's classroom performance should meet "Success" category. The results of the first speaking test showed that from 24 students in class TBI-1 FTIK IAIN Palu, there were 15 students got the scores of 70 or higher. It was equal to 62.5 %. In cycle 2, the total number of students who got the scores of 70 or higher was 21. It was equal to 87.5 %. The result of this research indicated that the application of games was effective to develop the students' speaking skills.

*Keywords: Developing, Speaking Skill, and Games*

## INTRODUCTION

Speaking is very important to learn. Mastering the speaking skill is one of someone's dreams in learning English. It is one way of finding information through oral communication. One who knows English well can easily communicate with other people all over the world, apply for a job, spread news, work social relation, or transact business.

Speaking skill must be prioritized. All languages are spoken before they are written. The written language derives from the spoken one. So, language learners should focus on the speaking skill especially in teaching English in university level. The teacher has to consider and select appropriate technique to be applied in the teaching to develop speaking skill. It is believed that games can be applied to help students to understand English material.

Based on the opinion above, the researcher will apply games in doing the research. The games can always be used to practice specific language items in an enjoyable and motivating way. Therefore, the researcher is interested to carry out the research about developing students' speaking skill. In enabling students to speak English well, a teacher applies technique particularly games.

Based on the background above, the research is focused on the problems that are usually faced by a teacher in teaching speaking. Although methods and techniques of teaching English have been improved, some of students' English skill especially speaking is still low. Based on the researcher's experiences in teaching English, speaking is sometimes ignored by a teacher, as the result students cannot speak English well; they cannot share their opinions, feelings, and desires to their friends or teacher. It is difficult to invite students to speak; they just keep silent when their teacher asks some questions. Lack of vocabulary and low motivation are their main constraints in learning English especially speaking skill. The objective of this research is directed to develop English speaking skill of students through games and also to know how far the influence of games in developing the students' English speaking skill.

## METHOD

The researcher conducted classroom action research by involving directly herself from the beginning to the end of the study. Since it is an action research, it consists of planning, acting, observing, and reflecting. Kemmis and McTaggart (1988) state, "action research starts

with small cycles of planning, acting, observing, and reflecting which can help to define issues, ideas, and assumptions more clearly so that those involved can define more powerful questions from themselves as their work progresses". This research was conducted in the third semester students of TBI-1 FTIK IAIN Palu 2019/2020 academic year. The class consists of 24 students with various ability, gender, and learning style. Data collection is a process of gathering information in a disciplined and systematic way about a puzzle or a researchable question (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998). This stresses on collecting information and data as evidences in answering the research question. In order to obtain accurate and reliable data, the researcher carried out a field research by employing some instruments, i.e. observation checklist, field notes, questionnaire, and test.

## **RESEARCH RESULTS**

### **Cycle 1**

#### **1. Planning**

Lesson plan contained time allocation, standard competence, and basic competence, indicator for students' achievement in speaking class, objectives, teaching materials, teaching method, teaching procedures used by the researcher, teaching resources, and evaluation. After all the above item have been prepared and put them together in a lesson plan format, the researcher and her collaborator were ready to implement it in the teaching of speaking skill to the students.

#### **2. The Implementation of Planning**

##### **a. Meeting 1**

To begin the class, the researcher and her collaborator came into the classroom and the students spontaneously greeted them, both the researcher and her collaborator replied the greeting. When the researcher and her collaborator entered into the classroom, without firstly taking a seat, she re-greeted the students and the students replied the greeting chorally. Meanwhile, the collaborator directly stepped to the corner of the class and to look for an unoccupied chair to sit on.

The researcher then continued asking some opening questions to the students. For example, how are you this morning students? and students answer chorally, fine. Ok. Students let me ask you some questions and guessed what your researcher would provide you to do this morning. After the students could guess what the researcher asked to them she would write the topic on the white board. Then, she asked some preliminary questions to students to answer orally in order to direct them to the content of the lesson and explored students' prior knowledge about the topic that the class would be discussed. Then, the researcher instructed the students about what the class was going to have in the phase, such as, ok everybody, the next class activity was that you were going to pay attention to what I was to do. Have your focus to my presentation; I was going to describe you about the material by using game. You needed to remember the sequence and the way I describe how to use game, because the next turn was yours to speak in front of the classroom by using game.

What an essential finding through interactive between researcher and students was that most of the students were enthusiastically responding to researcher's questions. They competed to get a turn to be pointed answering the questions. They required the researcher to continue questioning before coming to the core classroom activity; although this activity consumed much time.

When the researcher had simple oral interaction with students, the collaborator was seriously paid attention to class interaction between the researcher and students. She sometimes noted down on provided paper about the students' response to the researcher questions. She also sometimes walked around the class and asked some less attentive students to join the class.

The researcher solicited students' attention by clapping her hand and asked students to be with her explanation. She informed the students about the next class activity in which the

students should experience in it. After providing students with simple explanation about class activity, she asked confirmation questions in order to know whether or not the students have understood what they were going to do. Moreover, since the students have asked clarification questions before completing classroom task, they got clear explanation about what they were going to do; and this situation had put them into enjoyable atmosphere without being interfered by confusion on how to complete the given task.

After administering instruction to the students and having some simple questions to the students, the researcher wrote down instructional objective on the white board in which the class should achieve through the meeting. The researcher explained each of the instructional objectives to direct the students to the end target of the lesson to be achieved. The explanation was mostly given in English to accustomed students to this way of teaching. The students were attentively listening to the researcher explanation. To check students' understanding however, after giving the explanation, the researcher asked confirmation questions. In fact, it was found that most of students did not understand about what they were going to achieve from teaching learning process of that day.

Before coming to While-Activity, in order to direct students to the topic they were going to study at the first meeting, the researcher administered probing questions. Probing questions were intended to dig up students' prior knowledge about the topic and to lead the students to the more specific theme of that day to learn. Besides, probing question was also valuable to warm up students' spirit to learn before they were involved into the more complicated classroom task in which they could not avoid it. It was also intended to be trigger for students to recall about what they have known about the topic that could help them to do classroom conversation.

While-Activity is usually called core activity. In this phase, the researcher provided the students with conversation format and they did a presentation related to the topic previously discussed in probing questions phase. Before distributing text and discussion format to the students, the researcher delivered some instructions related to the classroom task that the students were going to complete. The researcher asked to students to choose one topic that they wanted to explain in front of the class. A student chose one topic related to job, and then he/she described about someone occupation after that other students guess what is the man/woman's job, when other students had finished to guess the game, the researcher gave opportunity to other students to act in front of the class same with the students before, but if no one of students did not guess the game the researcher try to support the other students to find other ways to guess what the speaker's puzzle or game.

In order to gain true data about students' discussion activity, the collaborator controlled the students' discussion activity by using observation checklist to assess students' participation in the learning process. Meanwhile, the researcher was seriously directed students on classroom task and jotted down important information from students' activity on provided paper (field notes).

Post-Activity was the last teaching session conducted by the researcher and students in the classroom. In this phase, the researcher did three main activities. Those three activities were: (1) provided the students with reinforcement; (2) flashed back to the previous classroom activity; and (3) provided the students with homework.

#### **b. Meeting 2**

In this meeting the theme of the lesson was still with the previous meeting. It was aimed to make the students were interested and joyful to join English class, especially speaking skill. As the first meeting, the researcher delivered some questions to elevate students understanding about the topic that we were going to talk. The researcher should give much opportunity to the students to express their idea. After that the researcher gave a model how to practice speaking skill using game.

When the students have been getting the topic, the researcher asked students to comment the topic by using their own words. After that, the researcher asked them to practice their speaking using game. After all students have already presented their topic, the researcher gave instructions to the students to employ the individual presentation. While his or her friend was speaking, another one remained giving a chance to ask question or guess to him or to her under guided by the researcher. At the end of the class the researcher reminded and encouraged the students to prepare their selves to study hard and do more practice by using games.

### **c. Meeting 3**

In the third meeting the researcher still continued the activity to assign her students to present their task, one of students came in front of the class, and describe about something related to occupation and the other students guess whatever the speaker said. It was because of the time allocation in the second meeting was not enough to accommodate all students' game presentation individually.

In the pre-activity, the researcher greeted the class and checked their attendance list. She reminded the students that there were some students who have not presented yet their game in the last meeting (the second meeting). So, their turn to present the game based on the topic that they have got from the researcher.

In the while-activity, the researcher's activity was focused on evaluating students' learning progress after being treated through the implementation of game in the first and the second meeting. The researcher continued assessing individual speaking performance. She asked the students to prepare their game as they did in the second meeting.

All students finally could present their game presentation in this meeting. In the post-activity, the researcher expressed her surprise that most of the students have made much progress in speaking skills when presenting the game in English although some of them were still low in fluency and accuracy. The researcher also discussed the factors causing their low achievement in the aspects of fluency and accuracy with class. She also told the students that their speaking progress indicator was based on the minimal standard of mastery that is 70,00. The researcher finally ended the meeting that day and left the class.

## **3. Observation**

### **Meeting 1**

Based on the observation, most of the students were very enthusiastic to join the learning activities. The class becomes more cheerful when the researcher explained the material through games and told them about what people occupation in the games. Surprisingly, there were four students who correctly guess the occupation or job. Then, the researcher together with the students commented or said something about the job by using simple sentences, for instance; *what is his/her job....., his/her job is....., she/he wears ....* and so on. The students began to know what was going to do with the topics.

Some of students often asked the researcher how to start a monologue. The researcher then gave some examples that are commonly used to start the monologue, for instance; *Good morning guys, thanks for the time given to me. Okay, I want to tell you about someone's occupation. Listen to me....This people always help the patients.... She/he wears uniform... who is she/he?.*

In whilst activity, all students were busy compiling words related to the topic that they want to explain in front of the class. Some students often asked the researcher to check the sentences they have made. Most students were not yet skillful to express one idea in two kinds of sentences patterns such as Active and Passive voice. The teacher then checked students' sentences and helped the students to make some improvement. When the students had finished arranging their sentences, the researcher asked them to present their task in front of the class. The students was practiced their speaking skill by using game one by one, when one students

performed their speech, other students guessed what the speaker said and also asked some questions related to the speaker explained.

According to data obtained from field-notes, there were some students wanted to present the game individually in front of the class. The researcher in this cases assigned students to present the game in monologue. According to the notes, there were ten students who presented the game in (monologue) individually.

### **Meeting 2**

According to data obtained from the observation sheet, most of the students were enthusiastic to join the speaking class. The students also prepared some sentences used in the game from home as assigned. The researcher then collected their task for the need of correction their sentences and then gave them back to owners.

The researcher asked students did the task as they did in the meeting 1. The students were asked to compile as many words as possible about the game they had. The students were facilitated to do it (compiling words). The students were also encouraged by the researcher to help each other to put the words they have compiled to become sentences of a game.

As it has been previously planned that this second meeting was focused on assessing students' presentation, the researcher still also gave necessary guidance for the students who needed it. According to the field-notes there were sixteen students who presented their games in monologue. Because of the limited time the rest of ten students' presentation was continued in meeting 3.

The researcher reminded the students who have not presented their games to be well prepared for their oral presentation in the next meeting. She also asked them to consider about their friends' presentation especially pronunciation, gestures, grammar, and expression used in opening and closing of an oral presentation. The teacher greeted the students and closed the meeting.

### **Meeting 3**

According to the observation, the students in this meeting appeared well-prepared then it was in meeting 2. It means they have prepared and trained themselves at home to present their game based on the own words. However, the researcher still reminded students to present their games by using appropriate opening expression, answering friends' questions if any, and close the presentation properly. The students were also asked to use eye-contact and gestures to support expression of meanings.

The students were invited to present their games in front of the class. The students who presented the game individually appeared with high self-confidence although they sometimes made mispronunciation and made frequent repetition to make the meanings clearer.

The researcher observed each presentation carefully and together with the class gave applause to each presentation. The researcher used the rest of time to discuss the difficulties the students had when creating and presenting the game. According to the notes, most students stated that their difficulty was in presenting the game. They felt embarrassed to appear in front of the class individually. The ideas in her/his mind may go away if too many eyes staring at her or him.

### **Learning Achievement**

The learning achievement that was that was referred in action research was students' progress in presenting game orally based on the topic. Researcher assessed the students' speaking performance when presenting game individually. The researcher recorded the students' oral performance to maintain the authentic data from the field.

Based on the data, there are 15 or 62.5% students whose achievement in speaking skills has met the criteria of success 70.00. The mean score of their obtained scores was  $\geq 70.00$  (based on the Minimum Mastery Standard). This mean score in three aspects namely accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility are equal with "good". On the other hand, the percentage of the

students who obtain the scores of  $\leq 70.00$  is bigger. It is 37.5% or 9 students. According to the scoring system, the mean score of  $\leq 70.00$  is equal with “poor”.

Based on the data, it can be seen that there are eight students who obtained scores higher than the minimal predetermined criteria 70.00 (71.33, and 72. According to the observation those always pay a serious attention to the teacher’s explanation. They bravely tried to present their speaking tasks. In other words, they have higher self confidence in presenting the game especially quiz than other students.

#### 4. Reflection

Based on the students’ learning achievement in cycle 1 and the data obtained from observation sheets and field notes, the researcher and her collaborator made a reflection. The result of reflection is presented in the following table.

**Table 1 The Result of Reflection in Cycle 1**

Number	Researcher’s Activities	Students’ Activities
1.	Researcher did not give students an appropriate reinforcement about the model how make a game based on the topic.	a. Most of students found it difficult to construct sentences based on the topic because the researcher did not show them an appropriate model.
2.	According to the observation most students did not understand about the instructions given by the researcher. The researcher gave the instruction too fast and unclearly to most of the students.	b. Most students could not create sentences to present the game well because the researcher gave the instruction too fast and unclearly. Therefore, the students very often asked the researcher to repeat the instructions and it should be in Bahasa Indonesia.
3.	The researcher should provide key words, because key words may help the students to develop their ideas.	c. The students got difficulty to start saying something about the game because there were not any words that make them easy to make or arrange the sentences.

### Cycle 2

#### 1. Planning

Based on the reflection above the researcher revised her teaching plan as the following. The researcher kept assigning students to work in pairs but she did not assigned them to provide game from home. The researcher herself provided the game and prepared some key words in order to make the students easy to arrange the sentences. The teacher trained students to construct the words the students compiled into sentences. She also changed her pairing procedure where a smarter student was paired with the lower one if the game was presented in pairs.

The researcher gave the instruction both in English and Bahasa Indonesia. The researcher also gave a model of how to present the game orally in each meeting. She also asked one or two talkative students to become the model presenting the game based on the topic. The researcher gave oral drills to train students to pronounce some expression that are commonly used as the opening expression.

#### 2. Implementation

##### Meeting 1

In pre-activity the researcher greeted her students and checked their attendance list. She gave some questions about occupation or job by asking students to mention kinds of occupations. She also asked students whether or not they like game. To this activity most of students participated actively giving their opinions.

In the whilst-activity, the researcher asked students to sit in pairs as they did in the previous meeting. The researcher gave the topics to each pairs. She also wrote the topic on the

white board. The researcher started modeling the game based on the topic on the white board. She presented the game slowly. She presented game especially to pronounce the opening and closing expression slowly and clearly. She also gave example to maintain eye contact, to use gesture to help delivering meanings. The writer explained someone's occupation, for instance; *Hello students, ...today I want to explain someone's occupation, pay close attention to me... Listen to me... "I always drop some people wherever they go, after I drop them, they give me some money, sometimes I wear uniform and sometimes I do not wear it... Who am I?.*

The researcher asked one smart talkative students to produce a game based on the topic on white board. This student could present well. The researcher then gave other different topics. She assigned the pairs to develop game based on the topic. The researcher helped students in each pair to brainstorm as many words as possible. She also helped the students to construct the words or phrases into sentences to become story in a game.

Based on the field notes, there were ten students who presented their story in a game individually in this meeting. The researcher asked individual first to present their story in a game and then assigned them. She observed each presentation and recorded the oral language production. The researcher asked the other students to pay attention to their friends' oral presentation and if possible they could give some questions. The researcher gave applause to each oral presentation together with the class.

The researcher gave a short comment to students' oral presentation and she mentioned the good points of each student's speaking performance. She also mentioned the students' mistakes and showed how it should be at the end of this meeting the researcher asked her student to be ready for the next meeting with the same activities.

## **Meeting 2**

In meeting 2 the learning activities were still the same with the ones in the meeting 1, but emphasis was on assigning students to produce the sentences trough game. In pre-activity, she greeted the students and checked their attendance. The researcher attracted students' attention and interest to speaking activity by asking some oral questions about someone occupation or job. She then asked the students to sit in pairs again as they did in the previous meeting. She still managed the learning in pairs in order they could share their ideas and help each other making it easier for them developed the ideas from the topics.

In the whilst-activity, the researcher gave them topic to each pair. She asked the pairs to discuss and create sentences become a game. She guided the students to answer the questions from each topic by using WH question, for example; *"who is she/he?...what is her/his job?..."* and so on. She asked each pair to answer the question above. The next task the students did was to construct sentences become a story in a game. They could also add more ideas to each topic if necessary. The researcher asked the students to choose one of some occupations which have been prepared by the researcher and then the students arranged some sentences related to the topic they have been chose. After that, the researcher asked them to present their task in front of the class. The researcher guided them how to open and close conversation, and also how to describe someone's occupation in front of the class, when one student presented their task other students try to guess someone's occupation which has been told by their friend, and the researcher guide the students how to make question to his/her friend.

In the post-activity, the researcher assigned students to present the game. The game could be presented individually. The researcher observed their presentation and recorded it. There were ten students presented the game in this meeting. Because of the limited time available, the researcher continued the other six students' presentation in meeting 3 as she planned before.

## **Meeting 3**

The researcher opened her class by greeting her students and checking the attendance list. The researcher asked to the students if they were ready to continue the speaking class that day. She then reminded the students about the game. The class suddenly became cheerful and

live. Some students told their teacher that there were some students who have not got yet the turn to present the game.

In whilst-activity, the researcher asked the students to sit in pairs as they did in the second meeting. She continued the activity to assign the students to provide the game. There were six students who have not got opportunity or turn to present the game in last meeting because of the limited time available. So, the researcher's activity was still focused on encouraging the students to employ the speaking skills in presenting the game. She assessed the students' learning progress based on the speaking performance and speaking data recorded through a camera.

The teacher gave 15 minutes for the individual to prepare their game presentation. The students were assigned to help the students who have not got the turn to present the game in the previous meeting. The researcher moved around the students to check their learning activity and reminding the students to employ "questioning" trick as they did in the last meeting. The researcher then assigned students to present their game. She observed the presentation while recording it.

The sixth students could complete their game presentation in this meeting. All of them present their game in form of monologue. They presented it individually. The researcher and the students then discussed about the factors causing the difficulties in developing a game. Before ending the class the researcher asked the students to fill questionnaire and the closed the meeting.

### **3. Observation**

#### **Meeting 1**

Based on the observation most of the students began to understand the way to present the game. Their self-confidence (especially the shamed students) increased when the researcher asked an extrovert talkative student to become a model in front of the class. The class became more cheerful when the researcher showed students the topic how to play the game and told them about what the people' occupation.

The students actively participated in pair discussion to prepare the game. They began to know what was going to do with the topic and some of the pairs even began to discuss how to produce sentence became a game.

There were some students who asked whether they could ask some questions while during their friends presentation or not. The researcher said that they could give some questions and gave the examples asking someone to repeat his/her question if it was not clear, for example; *excuse me! I am not with you. I can't hear your voice, I am sorry!...* and so on.

All the pair members were actively involved in their pair learning such as discussing the ideas about the topic, finding out some words/phrases related to the topic from dictionary and constructing sentences based on the words/phrases. Some of the students often asked the researcher to check the sentences they made.

According to data obtained from field notes, most of the students preferred to present a game in front of the class. Most of students present it individually. The researcher in this case allowed the students to present the game individually (monologue). In the first meeting there were ten students or 41. 6% who presented the game individually.

#### **Meeting 2**

According to data obtained from the observation sheet, most of the students actively participated in completing the speaking tasks such as employing the "questioning" trick to develop ideas based on the topic. They shared the ideas to each other within the pairs members. The smarter student helped his/her friend to construct the ideas of the game and even there



were some students practiced presenting the game in the form of monologue before being assigned to present it in front of the class.

The researcher kept encouraging students to create the game and presented it perfectly. As it has been previously planned that this second meeting was focused on assessing students' presentation but the researcher still also gave necessary guidance for any students which needed it. According to field notes there were ten students or 41.6% who presented their task individually in this meeting. Because of the limited time available the rest of six students' game presentation would be continued in meeting 3.

The researcher reminded the students who have not presented their tasks to be well prepared for their oral presentation in the next meeting. She also asked them to consider about their friends' presentation especially pronunciation, gestures, grammar, and expression used in opening and closing of an oral presentation. The researcher greeted the students and closed the meeting.

### Meeting 3

According to the observation the students in this meeting appeared more familiar with than it was in meeting 2. It means they have prepared and trained themselves at home to present a game based on their own words. However, the researcher still reminded students to present their game by using an appropriate opening expression, answering friends' question if any, and close the story properly. The students were also asked to use eye-contact and gestures to support expression of meanings.

Based on the data obtained from the field, there were six students or 25% who presented their tasks individually (monologues). According to the notes, there were five students who rose up their hands when the researcher asked them about who were ready to present their task.

### Learning Achievement

The researcher assessed the students' speaking performance when presenting game individually. The researcher recorded the students' oral performance to maintain the authentic data from the field.

According to the data, there were 21 students or 87.5% of the total students whose learning achievement met criterion of success. The mean score of their obtained scores in the assessed speaking skill is  $\geq 70.00$ . It means that the 21 students (87.5%) have made development in the aspects of accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility when presenting the game. Nevertheless, there were also some students whose mean score of their obtained scores did not meet the minimal mastery standard  $\leq 70.00$ . The number of these students was 3 or 12.5%. The mean score of their obtained scores in the three aspects of oral assessed speaking skills was  $\leq 70.00$ . According to the scoring system this mean score is classified "poor".

### The Result of Questionnaire

There six questions or statements that were requested students to give respond to. The students were asked to fill the questionnaire right after the meeting 3 of the cycle 2 was ended. The result is tabulated as the following table.

**Table 2 The Result of Questionnaire from the Students**

Number	Question	Answer	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Apakah anda merasa senang belajar bahasa Inggris khususnya speaking?	Ya	21	87.5%
		Tidak	3	12.5%

2.	Belajar speaking dengan permainan (Game) dengan teman lebih mudah dari pada belajar speaking sendiri	Ya	22	91.6%
		Tidak	2	8.3%
3.	Apakah dosen bahasa Inggris anda sering menerapkan permainan (game) dalam mengajarkan speaking?	Ya	18	75%
		Tidak	6	25%
4.	Bagaimanakah anda Mengekspresikan gagasan/ide dalam bahasa Inggris	Mudah	10	41.6%
		Sulit	5	20.8%
		Sangat sulit	9	37.5%
5.	Bagaimana anda menanggapi pesan, gagasan/ide yang disampaikan oleh teman?	Mudah	13	54.2%
		Sulit	4	16.6%
		Sangat sulit	7	21.2%
6.	Kesulitan apa yang anda hadapi dalam belajar speaking?	Vocabulary	10	41.6%
		Structure	6	25%
		Pronunciation	8	33.4%

The analyses deal with the result of student's response toward questionnaire indicate the improvement on students' participation in classroom activities and students' mastery to particular language components. By confronting between the students' response and students' speaking skill improvement, it can be interpreted that there was a significant relationship among them.

The first item, there were twenty one (87.5%) students who were interested in studying English; particularly in speaking skill. There were three (12.5%) students who responded that the less interested in. The second item, there were twenty two (91.6%) students who "state study speaking through game with their friends is easier rather than study with their selves. Conversely, there were two (8.3%) students who state "they did not study speaking through game with their friends. The third item; the number of students who state that their English teacher usually employs game in teaching speaking was eighteen (75%); the rest of the students or six students (25%) state that the teacher rarely employed game to teaching speaking.

The fourth item, there were ten (41.6%) students respond that it is easy for them to express idea and opinion. Meanwhile, there were five students (20.8%) who suppose that it is difficult for them to express idea and opinion and there were nine students (37.5%) state that it is very difficult for them to express idea and opinion. The fifth item, the students variously state the response toward the questions. There were thirteen (54.2%) students state that it is easy for them to respond the message or idea suggested by their friends. There were four (16.6%) students who considered that it is difficult, and there were seven (21.2%) students who view that it is really difficult for them to respond the message or idea suggested by their friends.

The sixth item there were ten (41.6%) students who find it is difficult to speak English since they have problem with vocabulary stock. The rest of students; six (25%) students state that they are in difficulty to speak English because of the structure and there were eight (33.4%) students who state that pronunciation was a big problem for them to speak English.

Having gained information from the result questionnaire, and on the basis of reflection done in the first and second meeting, the researcher and her collaborator decided to chance the planning and to introduce new material related to students' vocabulary improvement. So, the third meeting that was firstly emphasized on introducing new material that was aimed at improving students' vocabulary to support them in speaking class. The new material was expected to enrich the students with sufficient stock of vocabulary in order to enable them to interact orally in speaking class.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **1. Teaching Speaking through Game**

Based on the findings of this research, it was found that the appropriate strategy of using game required a particular procedure. First, the researcher must show a model before command the students to present the task by using game. The researcher must also encourage the students to brainstorm their ideas related to the topic. It is aimed at helping students to gather as many as their ideas about the topic. This activity is called brainstorming in which the topic is introduced by the teacher and the students call out ideas associated with the topic. According to data obtained in the field, the students felt confident to answer the questions based on the topic, because there is no wrong or right judgment in this activity. The teacher should accept all students' answers and writes it on the board. Then the teacher explains what she wants the student to do.

The second, the teacher asks the students to sit in pairs. The teacher should provide the model of producing a game before assigning them to take their turn. The third, the instructions about how to do the speaking task must be clear in order to avoid them from misunderstanding. Even the instruction should be also given in Indonesian language if the students still seem confuse or do not get the ideas. The questions are related to the topic and aimed to help students in constructing their sentences into a game.

During the teaching and learning process, the students are sitting in pairs to work together. The pairs learning enable them to help each other, share their ideas and it is easier for the researcher to manage the class and control their activities. While they are working in pairs, the students are always controlled and guided by the researcher in constructing their sentences into a game. At the last meeting of each cycle the students present their games individually because the teacher wants to assess and evaluate their progress and development in speaking specially in presenting their task based on the topic in front of class.

In the implementation of the game in the cycle 1, the students paid attention to the instruction given by the researcher, but some of them did not give a quick respond and only keep silent. That is caused by the lack of vocabulary and they do not have enough self-confidence to express their ideas in spoken language. Actually they know to guess the story but they do not know how to construct the words into sentences. In cycle 2, the students paid more attention to the researcher; most of them give a quick respond and ask the researcher some question if they do not understand when the researcher explained the topic. The students brave to speak or guess their friend's explanation because they have more vocabulary and also they have known to construct simple sentences. When they faced some difficulties to construct sentences, they asked to the researcher orally.

## **2. The Development of Students' Speaking Skill**

The application of game as teaching technique is effective to develop the students' speaking skills. The game containing someone occupation or job is helpful to develop students' skills in presenting the game orally. The number of students who have made progress in speaking skill in terms of their accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility when presenting the game increased from cycle to cycle.

In accordance with the preliminary study that the students got difficulties in expressing their ideas in spoken language, but the application of game as the teaching technique could develop the students' disability in speaking skill. The difficulties that were caused by their low level mastery in grammar, vocabularies, and pronunciation could be gradually minimized. Consequently, their oral performance in the three aspects of accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility was also gradually developed.

In the cycle 1, some of the students have made the development in speaking skill but the number or simply the classical percentage did not yet met the criteria of success 75%. Based on the result of reflection, there were three main activities did both researcher and students. From the researcher; she did not give students an appropriate reinforcement about the model how to make a game based on the topic, the instructions given by the researcher too fast and

unclearly and the researcher should provide key words. From the students; they found it difficult to construct sentences based on the topic because the researcher did not show them an appropriate model, most of students could not create sentences to present the game well because the researcher gave the instruction too fast and unclearly, and the students got difficulty to start saying something about the game because there were not any words that make them easy to make or arrange the sentences. Therefore, the researcher continued her action into cycle 2 by learning from the obtained data in the reflection. She revised her teaching plan and implemented it in the cycle 2.

In cycle 2, most of the students' speaking skill became better and categorized as good. Their willingness to try presenting the game was also better than it was in the cycle 1. Therefore, they could present the game based on the topic and guided by the answers of a series of questions. They presented the game with a high self-confidence although they often make few mistakes in accuracy and fluency. They could construct the sentences became a game more quickly and they competed to present it in front of the class without feeling nervous or be afraid of making mistakes anymore. As the result, most of the students obtained the mean scores 70.00 or greater that it and the classical percentage was 87.5%.

The development can also be recognized from the students' self-confidence. In this case, the researcher supported them to speak in front of their friends by giving them more chances and exercises in order to make them feel free to talk. Besides, the researcher talked to students to pay attention more to their friends when he/she speaks in front of the class if any mistaken no one laugh. Therefore, they have been already brave to present the game in front of the class although there were still many mistaken in grammar and pronunciation. The mistakes made the listeners full concentration to understand what he/she said. Before presenting their game in front of the class the researcher asked the students to collect their draft and make a necessary correction to minimize the mistakes. Then, the researcher showed students the mistakes they made so that the students could learn more and improve their speaking skill with fewer mistakes anymore.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

Based on the data that have been presented in chapter IV the researcher can draw some conclusions; firstly; the implementation of game as the technique in teaching speaking skills is effective to help the third semester students of TBI-1 FTIK IAIN Palu to develop their speaking skills. The students would be able to present the game orally in front of the class based on the topic. It was supported by the increasing number of students who obtain the mean score that meet the criteria of success  $\geq 70.00$ . In cycle 1, there were 15 students or 62.5% who obtained the mean score  $\geq 70.00$ . In cycle 2, the number of students who obtained the mean score  $\geq 70.00$  is 21 students or 87.5%. The percentage of the classical achievement is 87.5%. It is greater than the target of 75%. Secondly; the implementation of game in teaching speaking skill to the grade seven students is also effective to develop students' self confidence in presenting oral story in front of the class. They presented the story with a high self-confidence although they often made few mistakes in accuracy and fluency. They could construct the sentences more quickly and they competed to present it in front of the class without feeling nervous or being afraid of making mistakes anymore. It was because there was no any judgment whose game was right or wrong. The judgment was only given to the aspects of accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility. Thirdly; In relation to the factors caused students' disability to express their ideas orally, the implementation of game can also be helpful to develop the students' speaking skill. Fourthly; game would be effective to develop speaking skills if they are followed by key words/phrases and the instruction is in two languages (English and Indonesia).

## REFERENCES

- Artini. 1998. *Is Speaking Easier than Writing? Exploring the Complexity of Spoken Language*. Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan, 5 (Supplementary edition), 38-48.
- Bailey, K.M. 2005. *New Ways in Teaching Speaking*. Mc Grow Hill, Boston.
- Bogdan, C.R. and Biklen, K.S. 1998. *Qualitative Research in Education. An Introduction to Theory and Method*. Allyn and Bacon, Boston.
- Harmer, Jeremy. 2001. *How to Teach English*. Pearson Longman. Malaysia.
- Lang, Helmut R. 2006. *Models, Strategies, and Methods for Effective Teaching*. Pearson Education Inc, United States of America.
- Luciana and Aruan. 2005. *A Discourse-Based Approach*. Paper Presented at LIA International Conference, Jakarta.
- Luciana. 2005. Developing Learner Oral Communication: Intercultural perspective. In J. A. Foley (Ed.), *New Dimensions in the Teaching of Oral Communication* (pp. 20-32). SEAMEO Regional Language Centre, Singapore.
- Kemmis and McTaggart. 1988. *The Action Research Planner*. Deakin University, Victoria.
- McMillan, J.H. and Schumacher, S. 1993. *Research in Education. A Conceptual Introduction*. Harper Collins Publisher, Virginia.
- Parrott, Martin. 2002. *Task for Language Teachers*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, Jack C. 2001. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Second Edition. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Shumin, K. 2002. Factors to Consider: Developing Adult EFL Students Speaking Abilities. J. C. Richards, and W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in Language Teaching* (pp. 204-211). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sugiono, 2007. *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan*. Alfabeta, Bandung.
- Wright, Andrew. 2014. *Games for Language Learning*. New Addition. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.