

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the data of the study. It consists of the descriptions of data, hypothesis testing and discussion.

A. The Description of Data

Here the researcher presents the data gotten from the subject of the study. The subjects of the research were 40 students of the first IIS 3 grader of MAN 2 Tulungagung. The purpose of the research was to know the effectiveness of Board Game toward students' speaking proficiency for the first graders at MAN 2 Tulungagung.

The data were gotten from students' score in speaking test before and after being taught by using Board Game. Then, the researcher presented and analysed the data which taken from pre-test and post-test. The pre-test was administered before conducted treatment (Board Game) and post-test was administered after conducted treatment (Board Game) as teaching media in teaching speaking.

Before presenting the students' score in pre-test and post-test, in this part is initiated by presenting the process of treatment applying Board Game.

Treatment was given after the researcher conducted pre-test. The researcher conducted treatment three times. The first treatment was conducted in the classroom on April 22th 2016. The treatment which used here was doing Board Game. Here the researcher told to the students the way they were going to learn that day.

At first the researcher explained what recount is. Then the researcher divided class into eight groups. Each group consisted of five students. The

researcher explained the way how to play board game and explained the questions guidance in board game. Then the students were asked to start the game about telling their favorite famous person toward questions guidance given.

When one of the students play other students may asked the question related to the topic. The researcher went around the class coming to each group checking and gave help as the students needed. While checking the students, the researcher only gave help to the students if it really necessary. The researcher did not correct the students' error in grammar or pronunciation if it can be understood by other students. It was used to make the students able to communicate with other by using their own language and build the students' self-confidence to speak up.

Because the time was limited, the activity at first day treatment was not finish yet. Thus it continued to the following day on April 29th 2016. The activity was continued the first day treatment with the topic my favorite famous person. In the last activity one of the students in each group who can finish the game fast asked to tell their favorite famous person in form of recount in front of the class.

The next day treatment was on May 6th 2016. The activity was still same with the first day treatment. Here the researcher explained about narrative and told to the students fable story about grasshopper and the ants. Then the researcher asked the students play board game about fable. The students enjoyed speaking in English toward board game until the time was over.

The last day treatment was on May 13th 2016. In the last day treatment the researcher told a folktale story to the students. Then the researcher checked the students understanding by giving same question related to the story about lutung

kasarung. After that, the students asked to play board game toward the questions guidance given. Because the day was last treatment, the students more confidence in speaking English and the game finished earlier.

When the game finished the researcher asked one of students to tell lutung kasarung story on board game they did. Then the researcher gave feedback on grammar and pronunciation that she heard during story telling process and the students may gave question if they did not understand or confused related to the whole material given.

Here are the description of students' score in pre-test (before being taught by using Board Game) and post-test (after being taught by using Board Game):

a. Students' score of pre-test

In this part, the researcher presents the students speaking score before being taught by using board game. The description presented in the following table:

Table 4.1 Students' speaking score before being taught by using board game

No.	Name	Pre-test
1	A	2.2
2	B	2.35
3	C	2
4	D	2
5	E	2.65
6	F	2.35
7	G	1.5
8	H	1.8
9	I	2.35
10	J	1.55
11	K	2.55
12	L	2.7
13	M	2.55
14	N	2
15	O	1.7

16	P	2.05
17	Q	2.7
18	R	2.55
19	S	2.7
20	T	2
21	U	2.55
22	V	2.55
23	W	1.55
24	X	1.55
25	Y	2.55
26	Z	1.55
27	AA	2.35
28	AB	2.55
29	AC	2.35
30	AD	2
31	AE	1.5
32	AF	2.35
33	AG	2.55
34	AH	1.55
35	AI	2
36	AJ	2.35
37	AK	2.35
38	AL	2.55
39	AM	2.35
40	AN	2
		$\sum x_i = 87.35$

Base on the Table 4.1 shows 13 students from 40 students got score with the range score 2.5 – 2.9. It means that 27 students cannot pass the test and 13 students can pass the test.

Table 4.2 Qualification

No	Grade	Level	Range of score
1	A	Excellent	3.5 – 4.0
2	B	Very good	3.0 – 3.4
3	C	Good	2.5 – 2.9
4	D	Fair	2.0 – 2.4
5	E	Poor	1.0 – 1.9

Base on the table 4.2 to pass the activity above, at least the students have to gain C (good) with the range score 2.5 – 2.9.

Table 4.3 Descriptive of pre-test statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
VAR00001	40	1.50	2.70	2.1837	.39393
Valid N (listwise)	40				

From the table above showed the minimum score was 1.50 and the maximum score was 2.70. The mean from pre-test was 2.1837.

b. Students' score of post-test

Here, the researcher presents the students speaking score after being taught by using board game. The description presented in the following table:

Table 4.4 Students' speaking score after being taught by using board game

No	Name	Post-test
1	A	3.05
2	B	3.05
3	C	3
4	D	2.7
5	E	3.55
6	F	3.05
7	G	2.7
8	H	3.05
9	I	3
10	J	2.7
11	K	2.7
12	L	3.05
13	M	3.05
14	N	2.55
15	O	2.35
16	P	3
17	Q	3.05
18	R	3.05

19	S	3.05
20	T	2.55
21	U	3.05
22	V	3
23	W	2.7
24	X	2.7
25	Y	3
26	Z	2.55
27	AA	3.05
28	AB	2.9
29	AC	3.05
30	AD	2.7
31	AE	2.7
32	AF	3.05
33	AG	3.05
34	AH	3
35	AI	2.35
36	AJ	3
37	AK	3
38	AL	3.05
39	AM	3.05
40	AN	3.05
		$\sum y = 116.25$

The table 4.4 shows that 2 of the students cannot pass the test, because they got score under the range score 2.5 – 2.9. Both of the students got score 2.35 that indicated they cannot pass the test although they had given treatment.

The table also shows that 38 of the students can pass the test because they got score upper the range score 2.5 – 2.9. It indicated that the students' speaking ability was increased after they were given treatment.

Table 4.5 Descriptive of post-test statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
VAR00002	40	2.35	3.55	2.9062	.23621
Valid N (listwise)	40				

Based on the table above showed the minimum score was 2.35 and the maximum score was 3.55. The mean from post-test was 2.9062.

From the score of pre-test and post-test showed there were differences of data presentation between before taught by using board game and after taught by using board game. The data present that the score after taught by using board game was better than the score before taught by using board game.

c. Identifying T – test

To know whether the significant level is bigger or smaller than T-table the researcher analyzed the data by using SPSS statistics 16.0 and result shows in the following table.

Table 4.6 Paired samples statistics

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	STD. Error Mean
VAR00001	2.1837	40	.39393	.06229
VAR00002	2.9062	40	.23621	.03735

Paired Samples Correlations

	N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1 PRE & POST	40	.627	.000

Paired Samples Test

	Paired Differences					T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Pair VAR00001- VAR00002	-.72250	.30696	.04853	-.82067	-.62433	-14.886	39	.000

By computing of T-test on the table 4.6 above, it can be seen that the t_{count} is 14.886 with df 39. The mean of students' speaking score before getting treatment is 2.1837. After getting treatment, the mean of score is 2.9062. The negative which appear in t_{count} means the mean before treatment is lower than after treatment.

Then the researcher gave interpretation to t_0 . At first, the researcher considered the $df = N - 1$ is 39. The researcher consulted to the score in t-table with the significance level of 0.05. The score of t_{table} is 1.960. By comparing "t" The researcher got the calculation $t_{\text{count}} = 14.886$ and the value of t table was 1.960. It means that t_{count} is higher than $t_{\text{table}} = 14.886 > 1.960$. Because the t_{count} is higher than t_{table} the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted and the null hypothesis is rejected. It means there is different speaking skill score of the first IIS 3 MAN 2 Tulungagung students between before taught by using board game and after taught by using board game.

B. Hypothesis Testing

Based on the statistical calculation using SPSS 16.0, the researcher gives interpretation to significant value. The significant value of the research is 0.000, significance level 0.05 and the t_{table} 1.960 the df: 39 whereas t_{count} 14.886. In conclusion, t_{count} is greater than t_{table} . It means, the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted and the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected. Thus, the alternative hypothesis (H_a) says that board game media is accepted and effective for teaching speaking.

C. Discussion

Based on the data analysis the researcher knows that the t_{count} higher than t_{table} , it means that the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted and the null

hypothesis (H_0) is rejected. Thus there is different students' speaking score of first IIS 3 grader at MAN 2 Tulungagung after and before taught by using Board Game.

Based on the researcher method the teaching and learning process was divided into three steps. The first step was conducted pre-test. In the pretest, the total score was 87.35 with the average score 2.1837. The second step was conducted treatment for the students. The treatment was conducted by giving Board Game which contained questions guidance related to the topic.

The class was divided into groups which consisted of five students to play the game by rolled the dice. The last step was conducted post-test with total score 116.25 and the average score was 2.9062. Based on the research finding, it showed the mean scores seem difference between the two means. the result shows that the post-test was better than the pre-test.

It means that there were any significant different between score of pre-test and post-test. It can conclude that the students get good achievement in mastering speaking after being taught by using board game. The student's mastery on speaking improve significantly, so teaching speaking by using board game is effective to improve student's speaking ability.

Based on the result of the study, Board Game is a kind of game that can be used as a media in teaching speaking. In this case, the students complete task in pairs. They take it in turns to throw a dice and move around the board. When they land on a square they must speak about that topic. The teacher takes notes of errors as the students' progress round the board for general error correction or feedback. The effectiveness of using board game is supported by previous finding

conducted by Mega (2012). She developed a board game for speaking activities for second grader of junior high school students. The result showed that the students were interested in playing the board game for English speaking learning. It also affected the students' speaking mastery. By playing the board game, it improved the students' mastery in English speaking. From the previous finding, it shows that games, especially board games, play important roles for learning English.

By using game, teaching and learning process can be fun and motivate the students to speak up in the speaking class activities. It is supported by Suyanto (2007: 3) states that the students' interest in using media is reasonable because one of the benefits of using media in teaching is to raise the students' interest and motivation in learning English. Paul (2007: 49) states that games play a central role in a child-centered lesson and make it possible for children to fully immerse themselves in learning. Games also help the teachers to create contexts in which the language is useful and meaningful. By learning in groups, students can build the characters of working cooperatively, be self-confident, creative, responsible, honest, and passionate in learning.

Carly (2010:21) stated some advantages of teaching and learning language by using board game such as motivating and challenging, learning a language requires a great deal of effort, Board Game helps students to make sustain the effort of learning, board game provides language practice in the various skills, they encourage students to interact and communicate.