**CHAPTER I**

**INTRODUCTION**

1. **The Background of Study**

As a foreign language, English is taught as a compulsory subject at junior high schools in Indonesia. The aim of English teaching and learning process is to enable students to comprehend and produce English. Language is an important part of how humans communicate with each other. It is no small thing. Through language, we learn how to “mean things” and how to share all of those meanings with others.[[1]](#footnote-1) English is very important to be mastered because it has many relationship with various aspects of life owned by human being in Indonesia. It is considered as the first foreign language and taught formally from elementary school up to the university level.

In addition, people must have good speaking skill in order to produce words, express, state and deliver their thought, ideas and feeling even exchange information and convey meaning by using utterances in the form of communication. Not all speakers have benefit of such immediate listener feedback. This will often be in response to the feedback they are getting from their listeners who will show through a varietty of gestures, expressions and interuptions that they do understand and inface to face interaction the speaker can use a whole range of facial expressions, gestures and general body language to help the message.[[2]](#footnote-2)

As a language learners who had learned English intensively, the students should be able to interact orally each other through English. But in fact, most of students in SMPI Al-Mubarok Tigaraksa did not perform English in their language conversation. They would rather to use Indonesia language than English as a medium of communication, it because of the method in teaching English that is used by English teacher in classroom is not suitable, there is no innovation in teaching English, which the teacher used traditional method that made English atmosphere in classroom seems monotone.

Media of ludo game is an alternative that can be used by teachers as a means of educating students in the ability to speak. In the ludo games, there will be a lot of communication. The communication is unconsciously thrown by the students because it is lulled in a fun game. Media of ludo game is a method and material that can be integrated with other basic skills, namely speaking, writing, reading and listening skills. Through the media of this method in the process of learning the ability of children more effectively stimulated when teacher do a kind of test on the students to tell about the games then learn to speak, pouring experience in a ludo games with the style of the child’s own language.

Based on the observation that the researcher conducted while doing the learning process in SMPI Al-Mubarok Tigaraksa, what makes speaking very difficult to build in the classroom is the activities conducted in the classroom also do not give students chances to speak. This is because of the lack of interesting media when the first teaching about speaking and the speaking activities done by the students are commonly dialog practices, which are not interesting and challenging. The students only have to memorize the dialog their selves. There is not real communication in the activity, so the ultimate goal of learning English is not reached.

The strategies applied by the teacher at SMPI Al-Mubarok Tigaraksa do not seem to be effective since they do not give much contribution in developing the students speaking mastery and motivate the students to learn and to speak English. Moreover, it has made the students feel bored and under pressure. By this condition, the class won’t run effectively and the students still and always believe that English is difficult.

Based on the explanation of the problem above, the researcher conducted a study entiled ”The Effectiveness of Ludo Games in Students Speaking Skills”. This research is to assist English teachers to improve the students Eglish speaking skills and help the students achieve the goal of learning English.

Other than that, most of experts agree that learning a language its a hard process, therefore facilitating students’ with kind of activity which can bring some joyful feeling such as game is very important. Another reason for using Ludo games as a teaching media is the interesting and playfullness feeling that was brought by game. Moreover, there is no doubt that most of teenangers love game, therefore the writer tries to engage students’ attention, involvement, and cooperativeness during learning process in order to provide a great amount of communicative practice and target language exposure into learning activity for improving students’ speaking skill.

1. **The Statement of the Problems**

In this research, the research limits the problem only on **The Effectiveness of Ludo Games in Students’ Speaking Skills.** This research focuses on the second grade of SMPI Al-Mubarok Tigaraksa.

To make this research focus, the writer would like to formulate this research in following questions:

1. How is the student’s speaking skill at the second grade students of SMPI Al-Mubarok Tigaraksa?
2. How is the effectiveness of using ludo games in teaching speaking at the second grade students of SMPI Al-Mubarok Tigaraksa?
3. **The Objectives of the Research**
4. To know how is the student’s speaking skill at the second grade students of SMPI Al-Mubarok Tigaraksa.
5. To know the effectiveness of using ludo games in teaching speaking at the second grade students of SMPI Al-Mubarok Tigaraksa.
6. **Limitation Problems**

Based the backgroud of the study, therefore the researcher takes the scope of the study is limited to in applying Ludo Games strategy to improve students speaking skills, the researcher focused in speaking skills to the second grade of SMPI Al-Mubarok Tigaraksa.

1. **Significance of the Study**

The finding of this research is expected to give valuable contribution to the researcher, another researcher, teachers, students and school itself:

1. To the researcher

To develop the researcher’s knowledge on the development of various techniques implemented in teaching English to the Junior High School students and to develop another research. The other researchers can develop the research based on the result and use it as one of references to study in their research.

1. To another researcher

To give a brief knowledge to another researcher to conduct the similar research in another school with another research subject and the result of this research can be useful starting point to conduct the next research.

1. To the teachers

To enrich the teacher’s knowledge on the use of various techniques or strategies in teaching speaking, so the class will not run in boring atmosphere and the students amd the students will enjoy learning English. The various strategies that are comfortable feeling during the class activities.

1. To the students

It is also beneficial for the students to find meaningful strategy to overcome their problems not only the effect using ludo game in teaching speaking. They were not suitable in learning process, the students will be highly motivated by various strategies and techniques applied to the classroom.

1. To the school

It will be beneficial for school in giving beneficial comtribution of the improvement of the quality of the educational in the school. Therefore, if the school has a good quality of course the society will trust and believe it and they will be motivated to register their children to the school.

1. **Hypothesis**

In this research study, the writer assumes that the alternative hypothesis of research as follow :

(Ha) : Ludo games media is effective to improve students’ speaking skill at second grade of SMPI Al-Mubarok Tigaraksa.

(Ho) : Ludo games media is not effective to improve students’ speaking skill at second grade of SMPI Al-Mubarok Tigaraksa.

1. **Previous of the Study**

In this research, the writer summarizes some relevant previous studies from a paper, a thesis and a journal that :

1. Iriani Indri Hapsari wrote in her paper that entiled *“*Efektifitas Ludo Words Game (LWG) terhadap Peningkatan Kosa Kata Bahasa Inggris pada Anak Studi Kasus Kelas IV SD Muhammadiyah 4 Pucang*”* The process of her research following conclusions; Ludo words game effective game to increase the number of English vocabulary for elementary school students of Muhammadiyyah 4 Pucang Surabaya. Ludo words game can increase the number of English vocabulary in SD Muhammadiyah 4 Pucang Surabaya with F = 2.582 and P = 0,019 after matching on some control variabels. Ludo word game is a game that can be used as a method of learning English children are done while playing so that children feel happy in doing so. High number of English owned vocabulary influenced by Age, IQ, parent education, income, parent job, English course and English follow up activity.

In addition to the above things that support the significance of this study is the subject of research aged 9-11 included in school age. This age is a golden age for a child to learn a second language other than mother tongue including learning English so that a child taught English vocabulary at this age will be easier to remember vocabulary. This is seen in the experimental group that experienced an increase in the number of English vocabulary after being given a method of learning English vocabulary with the game of LWG. School age is also the age of play so that at this age the child enjoys learning while playing as seen in the joyful attitude of the children observed by researchers and from the opinion of the research subjects on this LWG game.[[3]](#footnote-3)

1. Sugiwati wrote on her paper that entiled *“Metode Bermain Ular Tangga Untuk Meningkatkan Perkembangan Kognitif Kelompok A di TK. Ria Baruk Utara VIII/35 Rungkut – Surabaya”* based on the result of her research and discussion of cycles I and II on playing snake ladder in children group A RIA TK Surabaya can be concluded that by snake play method of teacher activity have improvement of learning in group A in kindergarten RIA, with method of playing snake ladder of child activity have increase. Learning in group A in RIA kindergarten and by snake ladder play method can improve cognitive development of group A in RIA TK. So the purpose of learning activities can be achieved optimally.

Based on previous study above, Playing a game is a media to make happy not only for adult but also for children. Especially for children, because they are in the best age. Thus, we must give a basic capital for every child to explore their cognitive development for example: spelling the numbers or the names of equipment. So that, they need to improve their cognitive by using children’s cognitive. So, they can develop and train their effort to remember all about it.[[4]](#footnote-4)

1. Intan Alfi wrote on her thesis (2015), entiled “*Improving the Students Speaking Skills Through Communicative Games for the Grade VIII Students of MTsN Ngemplak”*. She conclude that was carried out in two cycles. Each cycle consisted of three meetings. Cycle 1 was implemented on March 30, 31 and April 20, 2015, while cycle 2 was implemented on April 21-28, 2015. It was done due to some problems existing in cycle 1, so there were eight actions to be implemented in cycle 2. The scores also showed that students’ speaking skills were improved as the scores of post-test were bigger than those of pre-test. Classroom observation when the actions were implemented and interviews done with the students and the English teacher after the implementation of cycle 1 and cycle 2 proved that the actions were successful in improving students’ speaking skills as being expected. There were some changes found. The changes were shown in the English teaching and learning processes, the students’ behavior toward the English teaching and learning processes and their speaking skills, and the English teacher’s ways of thinking.

In this paper, we can concluded that the tudents’ vocabularies and pronunciation skills were improved as they always did pronunciation drills and vocabulary practices every meeting. It was shown when they practiced dialogs and played communicative games. The use of classroom English in the classroom increased students’ vocabularies as well. New words and expressions increased since everyday they heard English. They understood what the researcher meant, even they could respond using English. Their English production slowly showed improvement. Although they still made mispronunciation and used Bahasa Indonesia, they used English more often than before the actions were implemented.[[5]](#footnote-5)

1. The Organization of Writing

The paper is systematically divided into five chapters. This following is short description about each chapter:

Chapter I is introduction that consists of background of study, limitation of the problem, statement od problem, the purpose of study, significance of study, hypothesis, previous study, and the organization of the writing.

Chapter II is theoretical review. They are the definition of speaking, the purpose of speaking, the problem with speaking activities, teaching speaking, the definition of ludo, the rules of ludo games, and definition of game.

Chapter III is methodology of the rresearch that consist research method, place and time, population and sample, the technique data collecting, the technique of scoring system, and the technique data analysis.

Chapter IV is the result of the research that consists of description of data, analyzing of the data research, and interpretation data.

Chapter V is closing that consists of conclusion and suggestion.
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**CHAPTER II**

**THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

1. **Speaking**

Speaking skill is one of basic language skills that has important role rather than other skills gue its significant and its use for communication. To know how important speaking is, it needs to know what the definition of speaking, the purpose of speaking, the problem with speaking activity, teaching speaking and assessing scoring component speaking. Itwill be discussed in following point.

1. **The Definition of Speaking**

Speaking is the more natural way to communicate. Without speaking, people must remain in almost total isolation from any kind of society. For most people, the ability to speak a language is the most basic means of human.

There are four skill that must be mastered by students, which are listening, speaking, reading, and writing. according to Jeremy Harmer, the four skill are divided into types. Receptive skill is a term used for reading and listening, skills where meaning is extracted from the discourse. Productive skill is the term for speaking and writing, skill where students actuallt have to produce language themeselves.[[6]](#footnote-6)
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Speaking is a very important skill. As human being, we need to socialize with one another. One way to socialize is to communicate. There are some ways to communicate. One of the ways of communication which used most frequently in human’s daily life is speaking. we can communicate our feelinga, ideas, or just information we have to others directly by speaking. Thus without an ability to speak well we cannot tell others clearly what ideas we have in mind, what information we have or even what is our opinion toward something.

Lynne Cameron defines “speaking is the active use of language to express meaning so that other people can make sense of them”.[[7]](#footnote-7) Don Byrne states that, “oral communication (or speaking) is a two way process between speaker and listener and involves the productive skill of speaking and the receptive skill understanding”.[[8]](#footnote-8) It means speaking is power to communicate, act to communicate or way to communicate to an audiebce. According to Lesley Brown said “speaking is the action of speak; speech, talk; conversation, discourse; the delivery of speeches; speech making; an instance of speech or talk; a discourse, a discussion, things spoken, saying, statements, words, the faculty or power of speech”.[[9]](#footnote-9)

Tarigan explain about speaking. He said that “Berbicara adalah kemampuan mengucapkan bunyi-bunyi artikulasi atau kata-kata untuk mengekspresikan, menyatakan serta menyampaikan pikiran, gagasan dan perasaan”.[[10]](#footnote-10) In other word, speaking is obtained and learned in early. Because, its communicative activity to produce some words or sentence to express the feelings, ideas, wish, etc. Then it’s delivered to listener for achieving information. As human beings, especially social creature we need to express our thoughts, opinion, or feelings in order to be accepted in social life. So tha, it is important that you say is conveyed in the most effective way. How you say something can be important as what you say in getting meaning process.

Based on the defintion above, we can say that speaking is a communication process transfering message to other people with articulation sounds in the form of utterance. Speaking is a complex skill that involves abilities of how to pronounce or execute fluently meaningful words, phrases and sentences in the right order based on rules govern system.

1. **The Purpose of Speaking**

Speaking is important to tell about something or it needs for other things. We can do speaking in every time. Speaking activities can do in many kinds, such as in the family, in the school and in our environment. Speaking also need when we want to apply a job, conversation with someone else, tell and describe about something. But when we speak in learning speak a foreign language requires more than knowing its grammatical and semantics rules.

Speaking is a skill that enables us to product utterances and product information. The other hand, speaking is saying something not only to another people but also to herself.

Tarigan said that the main purposes of speaking is to communicate.[[11]](#footnote-11)

The present writer agree with theory above, because without good ability in speaking we can not communicate well. So, the main purpose of speaking is to communicate appropriately, and the writer suggests speaking ability by using media of ludo games.

Futhermore, he said that basically, speaking has three general purposes :

1. To inform
2. To entertain
3. To persuade[[12]](#footnote-12)

That three general purposes of speaking are very important because the essential of speaking is to give an information to other people. As we know that the purpose of speaking is to communicate with people. So, with communication we can convey our ideas, we can inform news, we can entertain people and persuade people effectively. So, the listeners can understand well.

1. **Problem with Speaking Activity**

Classrom activities can develop learner’s ability to express themselves throught speech. It is part an important component of a language course. Of course, in the learning process there are some problems with speaking activities, namely:

1. Inhibition

Unlike reading, writing, and listening activities, speaking requires some degree of real time exposure to an audience. Learners are often inhibited about trying to say things in foreign language in the classroom: worried about making mistakes, fearful or critism or losing face, orsimply shy of the attention that their speech attracts.

1. Nothing to say

Even if they are not inhibited, you often hear learners complain that they canot think of anything to say: they have no motive to express thenselves beyond the guilty feeling that they should be speaking.

1. Low or uneven participation

Only one participant can talk each one will have obly very little talking time. This problem is compounded by the tendency of some learners to dominate. While by others speak very little or not at all.

1. Mother tongue use

In classes where all, or a number of the learners share the same mother tongue, they may tend to use it, because it is easier, because it feels unnatural to speak to one another in a foreign language, and because they feel less ‘exposed’ if they are speaking then mother tongue. If they are talking in small group it can be quite difficult to get some classes particularly the less disciplined or motivated ones to keep target language.[[13]](#footnote-13)

Basically, although theory above is often happen to students but in this term the writer attempt to minimize the problems of speaking above. So, in this research the writer uses ludo games as media of learning. The present writer provides ludo games as a popular game now which is contain fun and easy in clues statements, this can make the students motivated to speak and clue statements can make students think of anything to say.

1. **Teaching Speaking**

After talking about the definition, the purpose, and the problem with speaking activity this paper will discuss about teaching speaking which includes principles in teaching second language, principles of designing speaking techniques, problems in speaking, types of classroom speaking performance, types of classroom speaking performance, and the importance of teaching speaking. Teaching speaking to ESL learners is to:

1. Produce the English speech sounds and sound patterns.
2. Use word and sentences stress, intonation patterns and the rhythm of the second language.
3. Select appropriate words and sentences according to the proper social setting, audience, situation and subject matter.
4. Organize their thoughts in a meaningful and logical sequence.
5. Use language as a means of expressing values and judgments.
6. Use the language quickly and confidently with few unnatural pauses, which are called as fluency.[[14]](#footnote-14)
7. **Assessing scoring component of speaking**

According to Arthur Huges there are five component to measure score speaking they are :[[15]](#footnote-15)

|  |
| --- |
| Proficiency Descriptions |
| Accent 1. Pronunciation frequently unintelligible
2. Frequent gross errors and a very heavy accent make understanding difficult, require frequent repetitions
3. “foreign accent” requires concentrated listening, and mispronunciations lead to occasional misunderstanding and apparent errors in grammar or vocabulary.
4. Marked “ foreign accent ” and occasional mispronunciations which do not interfere with understanding.
5. No conspicuous mispronunciations, but would not be taken for a native speaker.
6. Native pronunciations, with no trace of “foreign accent”.
 |
| Grammar1. Grammar almost entirely inaccurate except in stock phrase.
2. Content errors showing control of very few major patterns and frequently preventing communication.
3. Frequent errors showing some major patterns uncontrolled and causing occasional irritations and misunderstanding.
4. Occasional errors showing imperfect control of same patterns but no weakness that causes misunderstanding.
5. Few errors, with patterns of failure.
6. No more than two errors during the interview.
 |
| Vocabulary 1. Vocabulary inadequate for even the simplest conversation.
2. Vocabulary limited for basic personal and survival areas (time, food, transportation, family, etc.)
3. Choice of word sometimes inaccurate , limitations of vocabulary prevent discussion of some common professional and social topics.
4. Professional vocabulary permits adequate to discuss special interest; general discussions vocabulary permits discussion of any non-technical subject with some circumlocutions.
5. Professional vocabulary broad and precise; general vocabulary adequate to cope with complex practical problems and varied social situations.
6. Vocabulary apparently as accurate and extensive as that of an educated native speaker.
 |
| **Fluency**1. Speech is so halting and fragmentary that conversation is virtually impossible.
2. Speech is very slow and uneven except for short or routine sentences.
3. Speech is frequently hesitant and jerky; sentences may be left uncompleted.
4. Speech is occasionally hesitant, with some unevenness caused by rephrasing and groping for words.
5. Speech is effortless and smooth, but perceptively non-native in speech and evenness.
6. Speech on all professional and general topics as effortless and smooth as a native speaker’s
 |
| **Comprehension**1. Understands too little for the simplest type of conversation.
2. Understands only slow, very simple speech on common social and touristic topics; require constant repetition and rephrasing.
3. Understands careful, somewhat simplified speech when engaged in a dialogue, but may require considerable repetition and rephrasing.
4. Understands require quit well normal educated speech when engaged in a dialogue, but requires occasional repetition or rephrasing.
5. Understand everything in normal educated conversation except for very colloquial or low-frequency item, or exceptionally rapid or slurred speech.
6. Understand everything in both formal and colloquial speech to be except of an educated native speaker.
 |

|  |
| --- |
| WEIGHTING TABLE |
| Accent | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | SCORE |
| Grammar | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 |  |
| Vocabulary | 6 | 12 | 18 | 24 | 30 | 36 |  |
| Fluency | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 24 |  |
| Comprehension | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 12 |  |
|  | 4 | 8 | 12 | 15 | 19 | 23 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |

1. **Definition of Game**

Most of people love to play games because of the joyful and the interesting feeling which provided by games. In Games for Language Learning, game defines as an exciting and joyful activity which sometimes challenges its players to play and to interact with other peoples.[[16]](#footnote-16) Points out the definition of game stated above can be summed up that in spite of exciting and joyful sensation provided by game, it is also more emphasizes on the challenging aspect rather than competitive aspect in its activity because in competition students against each other and the strongest party considers as a winner and the wrest party considers as a looser thus the gap between the winner and the looser can decries the looser participation during this activity. In contrast, a challenging activity will inspire the participants to do their best without worrying too much of being not good (looser) in doing this activity.

Game is “an activity with rule, a goal and an element of fun.”[[17]](#footnote-17) From that statement can be concluded that game is an entertaining activity which can make learning process full of happiness. When teaching a new language in the class teachers need to include some points such as a few grammatical point, grammatical exercises, or text reading and when those learning points being taught in monotonous technique learners will feel bored; therefore to avoid this problem teachers can initiate to use game as their teaching technique.

1. **Ludo**

To increase the speaking skill we need method to be used. One of them is game. Therefore, ludo game can defined as something or an instrument that is used to attract students motivation to follow the teaching and learning process beacause ludo game can make the students more focus in learning process, because they do not feel that tehy are forced to learn. They also enable learners to acquire new experiences within a foreign language which are not always possible during a typical lesson. The ludo game can be method that will give many advantages for teachers and students either.[[18]](#footnote-18)

1. **Definition of Ludo**

Ludo is a racing game with dice and board for three or four players. This game is team activity designed to encourage students to ask and answer common questions.[[19]](#footnote-19)

An interesting series of games enjoyed by young and old all of which are very clearly described in the following rules of play, with the exception of backgammon the rules for which will be found in a separate booklet.[[20]](#footnote-20)

Based on definition above ludo game is a game that uses a board and inside there are pictures and usually also colorful as green, blue, red, and yellow. Ludo game can be played by some person maximum of 4 person or less than 4 person but this game cannot be played individually. In this game is not easy but there are obstacles that need to be passed, for example the pawn hit by our opponent’s the pawn it will return again to the initial box or start again.

1. **The rules of Ludo Game**
2. Place your counters on the starting position (the outer triangles marked A, B, C and D). The object of the game is to go around the board to the finishing position (the inner triangles marked A, B, C and D). the first player to do this is the winner.
3. Go around the board in the direction shown by the arrow in your starting triangle and do not cross any thick lines.
4. Take turns to throw the dice and move. To move, check the dice next to the board to find out which sound is indicated by the number on the dice.

Then move around the board to the first word containing that sound. If the other players agree that you have moved your counter to a word which does not contain the sound that you are looking for, put your counter back where it was and miss a turn.

1. When there are no more words on the board which contain the sound that you are looking for, move directly to the finishing position.
2. If another player lands on the square where you counter is, miss a turn.[[21]](#footnote-21)

Media of ludo game is an alternative that can be used by teachers as a means of educating students in the ability to speak. In the ludo games, there will be a lot of communicating on. The communication is unconsciously thrown by the students because it is lulled in a fun game. Media of ludo game is a method and material that can be integrated with other basic skills, namely speaking, writing, reading and listening skills. Through the media of this method in the process of learning the ability of children more effectively stimulated when teacher do a kind of test on the students to tell about the games then learn to speak, pouring experience in a ludo games with the style of the child’s own language.

**CHAPTER III**

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The purpose of this chapter is to explain about the methodology of research that consist of the research method, the place and time of research, population and sample, the research instrument, the technique of data collection, technique of analyzing data, and research procedure.

1. **Method of the Research**

Method of the research is a quantitative method. According to Creswell that quantitative research is testing objective theories by examining the relationship among variables by using research instruments that produce data with analyzed by statistics.[[22]](#footnote-22) It means the variable of the research can be measured and analyzed to see the effect among variables. In this research there are two variables, variable X and variable Y. The ludo game as (X) variable while speaking skill as (Y) variable.

Moreover, in this research uses experimental research the researcher choose an experimental research because this research using treatment by the purpose to search the effect of certain treatment on others with controlled conditions.[[23]](#footnote-23) Then, the researcher wants to know the effect of ludo on student speaking skill. In addition, this research using Quasi Experimental by using the pre-test and post-test design by taking one of class as an experimental class which given pre-test, the treatment by ludo games and given post-test to measure the treatment is influence or not. And the researcher take second class as a control class, the class is given pre-test, treatment without ludo games and post-test.
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1. **The Place and Time of Research**

This research will take place at SMP Islam Al-Mubarok Tigaraksa Islamic Boarding School at Jl. Syeikh Mubarok, Kp. Kalapadua, Ds. Pete, Kec. Tigaraksa, Kab. Tangerang-Banten 15720.

1. **Population and Sample**
2. Population

A population is a set (or collection) of all elements processing or more attributes of interest.[[24]](#footnote-24) The population of this research is the second grade of SMP Islam Al-Mubarok Tangerang-Banten which consist of 48 students. A sample is collecting data with small amount of population that tested at the research.[[25]](#footnote-25) In this research, has choosen second grade as sampling.

1. Sample

Sample is a part or representative of population being researched. It is called sample research. Sample is subject individual or cases from within a population.

The research divided them two groups, 24 students of class A and 24 student of class B as control class. In the experimental class the research using ludo game to know the effectiveness of students speaking skills using media of ludo game and in control class the researcher not use ludo game.

1. **The Research Instrument**
2. **Observation**

Before doing the research, the researcher does the observation directly to the school which become the place of this research and the population who becomes the object of this research. The researcher uses observation to identify the condition of students in the class and investigate their problem and difficulties in study. The purpose of this observation is to get information about teaching learning of students in English subject.

1. **Lesson Plan**

Lesson plan is used for treatment process. The purpose is to make systematical learning process. This lesson plan is attached.

1. **Scoring Sheet**

Scoring sheet is used to make the researcher know about the ability of students in speaking. After giving test to the students the researcher has measured and score the result of them by the purpose to analyze the test that was given by researcher. Based on FSI Proficiency Ratings (as cited in Higgs & Clifford, 1982)[[26]](#footnote-26) the scoring sheet as follow:

The rating sheet of speaking test

Name : ………………

Class : ………………

Table 3.1

**The Criteria of Students’ Score**

**Conversational English Proficiency Weighting Table**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Proficiency Description**  | **->** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **Total** |
| Grammar |  | 6 | 12 | 18 | 24 | 30 | 36 |  |
| Vocabulary |  | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 24 |  |
| Fluency |  | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 12 |  |
| Comprehension  |  | 4 | 8 | 12 | 15 | 19 | 23 |  |
| Total |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Letter**  | **Score** | **Description** |
| A | 83 – 99 | Very Good |
| B | 63 – 82 | Good |
| C | 43 – 62 | Enough |
| D | 26 – 42 | Less |
| E  | 16 – 25 | Low |

1. **Tape Recorder**

Recording was used to record the students’ voice when they speak during the test. The researcher used a tape recorder like hand phone. The purpose this recording is to analyzing the scoring rubric of speaking.

1. **The Technique of Data Collecting**

The collecting of data is a systematic procedure and standard obtain the necessary data. For collecting the data in this research, the researcher uses test (pre-test and post-test) and documentation.

1. **Pre-test**

Before applying the ludo game in experimental class, the researcher gives the pre-test to experiment and control class in the first meeting to know the initial students’ speaking skill.

1. **Post-test**

Both experiment and control class have the post-test after giving the treatment for experimental class. It is used to measure the effect of ludo game in students’ speaking skill.

1. **Documentation**

Documentation was collecting data to see a report that is available. This method is taken some pictures, record video and audio.

Both the test are assessed by two raters ; by the researcher herself and the English teacher. It is doing to keep the validity and reliability.

1. **The Technique of Analysis Data**

The technique of analysis data in this research uses t-test. According to Anis Sudijono t-test is used for testing the null hypothesis of the mean differences of two samples.[[27]](#footnote-27) Because the quasi experiment use pre-test and post-test then the researcher uses this test to measure the final test between experiment class and control class.

The steps for statistic analyze that are[[28]](#footnote-28) :

1. Determining mean of variable X1 with formula :

$$M\_{1= \frac{\sum\_{}^{}X\_{1}}{N\_{1}}}$$

1. Determining mean of variable x2 with formula :

$$M\_{2= \frac{\sum\_{}^{}X\_{2}}{N\_{2}}}$$

1. Determining derivation score variable x1 with formula :

$$x\_{1= X\_{1- M\_{1}}}$$

1. Determining derivation score variable x2 with formula :

$$x\_{2= X\_{2- M\_{2}}}$$

After collecting the data from pre-test and post-test, the researcher analyze it by using statistic calculation of t-test by using fisher formula with significance degree 5% and 1%. The formula is as follow :

$$t= \frac{M\_{1}-M\_{2}}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\sum\_{}^{}x\_{1}^{2}+\sum\_{}^{}x\_{2}^{2}}{N\_{1}+N\_{2}-2}\right) \left(\frac{N\_{1}+N\_{2}}{N\_{1}.N\_{2}}\right)}}$$

Notes :

$M\_{1}$ = Mean score of the experiment class

$M\_{2}$ = Mean score of the control class

$\sum\_{}^{}x\_{1}^{2}$ = Sum of square deviation score in experiment class

$\sum\_{}^{}x\_{2}^{2}$ = Sum of square deviation score in control class

$N\_{1}$ = Number of students of experiment class

$N\_{2}$ = Number of students of control class

$2$ = Constant number

df = Degree of Freedom (df = $N\_{1}+N\_{2}-2$)

1. **Research Procedure**

In general, the procedure of this research can be described as follows :

1. Observation the English teaching activity.
2. Provide pre-test of the experimental class and control class.
3. Provide treatment to the experimental class using ludo game and control class without ludo game as follow :
4. **Experimental Class**
5. Preparation
6. Preparing the lesson plan
7. Preparing the material
8. Preparing the ludo game for students’ speaking
9. Implementation
10. Teacher explain the material
11. Teacher gives the example
12. Teacher guide students to make group and discuss the material and give them the ludo game
13. Teacher asks the students to have conversation in accordance with the statement in ludo game.
14. **Controlled Class**
15. Preparation
16. Preparing the lesson plan
17. Preparing the material
18. Implementation
19. Teacher explain the material
20. Teacher gives the example
21. Teacher ask the students to make a conversation in groups
22. Teacher ask the students to speak in front of class
23. Provide post-test of the experimental class and control class.
24. Analyzing the data from pre-test and post-test
25. Drawing the interpretation based on the result of test and making conclusion.

**CHAPTER IV**

**RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

1. **Description of Data**

In this chapter the writer would like to present the description of data obtained. As the writer explained in the previous chapter that the populations in this research were 167 students of second grade in SMPI Al-Mubarok Tigaraksa. The writer took 64 students at second grade of SMPI Al-Mubarok Tigaraksa the sample in this study divided into two classes. They are 24 students from class VIII-A as the experiment class and 24 students from class VIII-B as the control class.

In this research, the writer did an analyze of quantitative data. The data is obtained by giving test to the experimental class and control class. The test divided two types are pre-test and post-test. Pre-test was given before treatment and post-test was given after treatment. On the test, students should make a dialogue in groups according the statements by the writer and perform the dialogue in front of class.

The writer identified some result to find out the effect of ludo games in students’ speaking skill. They are the score of students before treatment, the score students after treatment and the differences between pre-test and post-test score of students.
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The writer describes the data in experimental and control class as below:

1. **Result of Pre-test and Post-test score of experimental class**

The result of Pre-test that conducted in experimental and control class is obtained before treatment is given to both class to know the students’ capability in speaking skill. The score of pre-test in experimental class will be describing in the following table:

***Table 4.1***

***The students' score of pre-test at the experimental class***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NO** | **RESPONDENT** | **CRITERIA** | **SCORE** |
| **A** | **G** | **V** | **F** | **C** |
| **1** | **A F Z** | **2** | **18** | **16** | **8** | **15** | **59** |
| **2** | **A S** | **2** | **24** | **16** | **8** | **19** | **69** |
| **3** | **D R S A** | **2** | **24** | **16** | **10** | **19** | **71** |
| **4** | **D A S** | **1** | **18** | **16** | **8** | **15** | **58** |
| **5** | **E F U** | **2** | **18** | **16** | **8** | **19** | **63** |
| **6** | **F D** | **2** | **18** | **16** | **8** | **12** | **56** |
| **7** | **G S P** | **2** | **24** | **16** | **8** | **15** | **65** |
| **8** | **H** | **2** | **18** | **16** | **8** | **12** | **56** |
| **9** | **L D A** | **2** | **24** | **16** | **10** | **15** | **67** |
| **10** | **L A** | **1** | **18** | **16** | **8** | **15** | **58** |
| **11** | **M S** | **2** | **24** | **16** | **10** | **15** | **67** |
| **12** | **M D R** | **2** | **18** | **16** | **10** | **15** | **61** |
| **13** | **N N** | **1** | **18** | **16** | **8** | **12** | **55** |
| **14** | **N R J** | **2** | **18** | **16** | **8** | **15** | **59** |
| **15** | **P A M** | **2** | **24** | **16** | **8** | **19** | **69** |
| **16** | **R A** | **1** | **18** | **16** | **8** | **15** | **58** |
| **17** | **S F** | **2** | **24** | **16** | **8** | **19** | **69** |
| **18** | **S R** | **2** | **24** | **16** | **8** | **15** | **65** |
| **19** | **S F N** | **2** | **18** | **16** | **8** | **19** | **63** |
| **20** | **S M** | **2** | **18** | **12** | **8** | **15** | **55** |
| **21** | **S R M** | **2** | **18** | **16** | **8** | **19** | **63** |
| **22** | **T S L** | **2** | **18** | **16** | **8** | **19** | **63** |
| **23** | **Y S** | **2** | **18** | **12** | **6** | **15** | **53** |
| **24** | **Z N** | **2** | **24** | **16** | **8** | **19** | **69** |
| **N= 24** | **TOTAL** | **∑X = 1491** |
| **AVERAGE** | **M =  62,12** |

Note:

A. : Accent

G. : Grammar

V. : Vocabulary

F. : Fluency

C. : Comprehension

Determine mean of pre-test experimental class by formula

*M*2 = $\frac{\sum\_{}^{}X\_{2}}{N\_{1}}$

*M*2 : Mean of pre-test

∑ : Total Score

N1 : Number of sample (Experimental class)

*M*2 = $\frac{\sum\_{}^{}X\_{2}}{N\_{1}}$

*M*2 =$\frac{1491}{24}$

*M*2= 62,12 (It means the mean of post-test in the experimental class is 62,12)

The table above shows us about the students’ pre-test score of experimental class based on criteria in speaking skill. Evident from the scores obtained, such as the lowest score was 53 and the highest is 71. In this case, the pre-test of the experimental class has not reached KKM.

While the result of post-test in experimental class got better score. The result of post-test in experimental class described by table below:

***Table 4.2***

***The students’ score of post-test at the experimental class***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NO** | **RESPONDENT** | **CRITERIA** | **SCORE** |
| **A** | **G** | **V** | **F** | **C** |
| **1** | **AFZ** | **3** | **24** | **20** | **10** | **23** | **80** |
| **2** | **AS** | **2** | **24** | **20** | **10** | **19** | **75** |
| **3** | **DRSA** | **3** | **30** | **24** | **8** | **23** | **88** |
| **4** | **D A S** | **2** | **24** | **20** | **8** | **19** | **73** |
| **5** | **E F U** | **2** | **24** | **20** | **8** | **19** | **76** |
| **6** | **F D** | **2** | **24** | **20** | **8** | **19** | **73** |
| **7** | **G S P** | **2** | **24** | **16** | **8** | **19** | **69** |
| **8** | **H** | **2** | **24** | **16** | **6** | **19** | **67** |
| **9** | **L D A** | **2** | **24** | **24** | **10** | **19** | **79** |
| **10** | **L A** | **2** | **24** | **16** | **6** | **15** | **63** |
| **11** | **M S** | **3** | **24** | **20** | **10** | **19** | **76** |
| **12** | **M D R** | **3** | **24** | **20** | **10** | **19** | **75** |
| **13** | **N N** | **2** | **24** | **16** | **8** | **19** | **69** |
| **14** | **N R J** | **2** | **24** | **20** | **8** | **19** | **73** |
| **15** | **P A M** | **3** | **30** | **24** | **10** | **23** | **90** |
| **16** | **R A** | **2** | **24** | **16** | **8** | **19** | **69** |
| **17** | **S F** | **2** | **24** | **20** | **8** | **19** | **73** |
| **18** | **S R** | **2** | **24** | **20** | **10** | **19** | **75** |
| **19** | **S F N** | **2** | **24** | **24** | **10** | **19** | **79** |
| **20** | **S M** | **2** | **24** | **24** | **10** | **19** | **79** |
| **21** | **S R M** | **3** | **24** | **24** | **8** | **23** | **82** |
| **22** | **T S L** | **2** | **24** | **20** | **10** | **19** | **75** |
| **23** | **Y S** | **2** | **24** | **16** | **8** | **19** | **69** |
| **24** | **Z N** | **3** | **30** | **24** | **10** | **23** | **90** |
| **N= 24** | **TOTAL** | **∑X = 1817** |
| **AVERAGE** | **M = 75,70** |

Note:

A. : Accent

G. : Grammar

V. : Vocabulary

F. : Fluency

C. : Comprehension

Determine mean of post-test experimental class by formula

*M*2 = $\frac{\sum\_{}^{}X\_{2}}{N\_{1}}$

*M*2 : Mean of post-test

∑ : Total Score

N1 : Number of sample (Experimental class)

*M*2 = $\frac{\sum\_{}^{}X\_{2}}{N\_{1}}$

*M*2 =$\frac{1817}{24}$

*M*2= 75,70 (It means the mean of post-test in the experimental class is 75,70)

The table above shows us about the students’ post-test score of experimental class based on criteria in speaking skill. The data shows that the lowest score of post-test is 63 and the highest score is 90 and the average score of post -test is 75,70. There are some students who achieve KKM (is 75) namely 75, 76, 79, 80, 82, 88 and 90. It shows that the post-test scores of experimental class increased and there are significant after treatment in the experimental class.

The writer describe the students’ improvement score of the pre-test and post-test in the experimental class through table and graphic as follows:

***Table 4.3***

***The difference score between pre-test and post-test***

***at experimental class***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NO** | **RESPONDENT** | **Pre-test** (X1) | **Post-test** (X2) |
| **1** | **A F Z** | **59** | **80** |
| **2** | **A S** | **69** | **75** |
| **3** | **D R S A** | **71** | **88** |
| **4** | **D A S** | **58** | **73** |
| **5** | **E F U** | **63** | **76** |
| **6** | **F D** | **56** | **73** |
| **7** | **G S P** | **65** | **69** |
| **8** | **H** | **56** | **67** |
| **9** | **L D A** | **67** | **79** |
| **10** | **L A** | **58** | **63** |
| **11** | **M S** | **67** | **76** |
| **12** | **M D R** | **61** | **75** |
| **13** | **N N** | **55** | **69** |
| **14** | **N R J** | **59** | **73** |
| **15** | **P A M** | **69** | **90** |
| **16** | **R A** | **58** | **69** |
| **17** | **S F** | **69** | **73** |
| **18** | **S R** | **65** | **75** |
| **19** | **S F N** | **63** | **79** |
| **20** | **S M** | **55** | **79** |
| **21** | **S R M** | **63** | **82** |
| **22** | **T S L** | **63** | **75** |
| **23** | **Y S** | **53** | **69** |
| **24** | **Z N** | **69** | **90** |
| **25** | **WH** |  |  |
| **N = 25** | **TOTAL** | **∑X = 1491** | **∑X = 1817** |
| **AVERAGE** | **M = 62,12** | **M = 75,70** |

Based on the explanation above, it shows that there are significant improvements of the results in experimental class. It can be seen from the average score of posttest is higher than pre-test, namely 75,70 > 62,12. From the table above, the students speaking skill improved after using ludo game in the learning process.

Graphic 4.1

The scores of the pre-test and posttest of experimental class

From the graphic above, shows the comparison between the scores of pre-test and post-test in experimental class. There are significant improvement after treatment in experimental class, it shows that the score of post-test is better than the score of pre-test commonly.

1. **Result of Pre-test and Post-test score of control class**

The writer describes the result of pre-test in the control class by the table as follow:

***Table 4.4***

***The students' score of pre-test in the control class***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NO** | **RESPONDENT** | **CRITERIA** | **SCORE** |
| **A** | **G** | **V** | **F** | **C** |
| **1** | **A** | **2** | **18** | **12** | **8** | **19** | **59** |
| **2** | **AF** | **2** | **24** | **20** | **8** | **15** | **69** |
| **3** | **AKI** | **2** | **18** | **12** | **6** | **15** | **53** |
| **4** | **AW** | **2** | **18** | **12** | **8** | **15** | **55** |
| **5** | **DSK** | **1** | **18** | **12** | **6** | **19** | **56** |
| **6** | **EA** | **2** | **24** | **16** | **6** | **15** | **53** |
| **7** | **FADM** | **2** | **18** | **12** | **8** | **12** | **52** |
| **8** | **FAR** | **2** | **18** | **12** | **6** | **15** | **53** |
| **9** | **GA** | **2** | **18** | **12** | **8** | **15** | **55** |
| **10** | **IF** | **1** | **18** | **12** | **6** | **12** | **49** |
| **11** | **MPR** | **2** | **24** | **16** | **8** | **19** | **69** |
| **12** | **MHM** | **2** | **18** | **12** | **6** | **15** | **53** |
| **13** | **MUN** | **1** | **18** | **12** | **6** | **15** | **52** |
| **14** | **MIM** | **1** | **18** | **12** | **6** | **19** | **56** |
| **15** | **MD** | **1** | **18** | **12** | **6** | **15** | **52** |
| **16** | **MY** | **1** | **18** | **12** | **6** | **12** | **52** |
| **17** | **PP** | **2** | **18** | **12** | **6** | **19** | **57** |
| **18** | **PAM** | **2** | **18** | **16** | **8** | **15** | **59** |
| **19** | **RFA** | **2** | **18** | **12** | **6** | **15** | **53** |
| **20** | **RM** | **2** | **24** | **12** | **6** | **19** | **63** |
| **21** | **SQA** | **2** | **18** | **12** | **6** | **12** | **50** |
| **22** | **SM** | **2** | **18** | **12** | **8** | **15** | **55** |
| **23** | **TSL** | **2** | **18** | **12** | **6** | **15** | **53** |
| **24** | **T** | **2** | **18** | **12** | **6** | **15** | **53** |
| **N= 24** | **TOTAL** | **∑X =1331** |
| **AVERAGE** | **M = 55,45** |

Note:

A. : Accent

G. : Grammar

V. : Vocabulary

F. : Fluency

C. : Comprehension

Determine mean of pre-test control class by formula

*M*1 = $\frac{\sum\_{}^{}Y\_{1}}{N\_{2}}$

*M*1 : Mean of pre-test

∑ : Total Score

N2 : Number of sample (Control class)

*M*1 = $\frac{\sum\_{}^{}Y\_{1}}{N\_{2}}$

*M*1 =$\frac{1331}{24}$

*M*1 = 55,45 (It means the mean of pre-test in the control class is 55,45)

The table above shows us about the students’ pre-test score of control class based on criteria in speaking skill. Evident from the scores obtained, such as the lowest score was 49 and the highest is 69. In this case, the pre-test of the control class has not reached KKM.

While the result of post-test in control class got better score. The result of post-test in control class described by table below:

***Table 4.5***

***The students' score of post-test in the control class***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NO** | **RESPONDENT** | **CRITERIA** | **SCORE** |
| **A** | **G** | **V** | **F** | **C** |
| **1** | **A** | **2** | **18** | **20** | **8** | **15** | **63** |
| **2** | **AF** | **3** | **24** | **16** | **10** | **19** | **72** |
| **3** | **AKI** | **2** | **18** | **16** | **8** | **15** | **59** |
| **4** | **AW** | **2** | **18** | **20** | **8** | **15** | **63** |
| **5** | **DSK** | **2** | **18** | **16** | **8** | **15** | **59** |
| **6** | **EA** | **2** | **18** | **16** | **8** | **15** | **59** |
| **7** | **FADM** | **2** | **24** | **20** | **8** | **15** | **69** |
| **8** | **FAR** | **2** | **18** | **16** | **8** | **15** | **59** |
| **9** | **GA** | **2** | **18** | **20** | **8** | **15** | **63** |
| **10** | **IF** | **2** | **18** | **16** | **6** | **15** | **57** |
| **11** | **MPR** | **3** | **30** | **24** | **10** | **15** | **82** |
| **12** | **MHM** | **3** | **18** | **20** | **8** | **19** | **68** |
| **13** | **MUN** | **2** | **18** | **20** | **8** | **19** | **63** |
| **14** | **MIM** | **2** | **18** | **16** | **8** | **19** | **67** |
| **15** | **MD** | **2** | **24** | **20** | **10** | **19** | **75** |
| **16** | **MY** | **2** | **18** | **16** | **8** | **15** | **59** |
| **17** | **PP** | **2** | **18** | **20** | **8** | **15** | **63** |
| **18** | **PAM** | **2** | **18** | **20** | **8** | **15** | **63** |
| **19** | **RFA** | **2** | **18** | **20** | **8** | **15** | **63** |
| **20** | **RM** | **3** | **18** | **24** | **10** | **19** | **74** |
| **21** | **SQA** | **2** | **18** | **16** | **10** | **15** | **61** |
| **22** | **SM** | **2** | **18** | **24** | **10** | **19** | **73** |
| **23** | **TSL** | **2** | **18** | **20** | **10** | **19** | **69** |
| **24** | **T** | **2** | **24** | **24** | **10** | **15** | **75** |
| **N= 24** | **TOTAL** | **∑X = 1578** |
| **AVERAGE** | **M= 65,75** |

Note:

A. : Accent

G. : Grammar

V. : Vocabulary

F. : Fluency

C. : Comprehension

Determine mean of post-test control class by formula

*M*2 = $\frac{\sum\_{}^{}Y\_{2}}{N\_{2}}$

*M*2 : Mean of post-test

∑ : Total Score

N2 : Number of sample (Control class)

*M*2 = $\frac{\sum\_{}^{}X\_{2}}{N\_{2}}$

*M*2 =$\frac{1578}{24}$

*M*2 = 65,75 (It means the mean of post-test in the control class is 65,75)

The table above shows us about the students’ post-test score of control class based on criteria in speaking skill. The data shows that the lowest score of post-test is 57 and the highest score is 82 and the average score of post -test is 65,58. There are some students who achieve KKM (is 75) namely 75 and 82. It shows that the post-test scores of control class increased.

Based on the explanation above, the writer concluded that the result of the control class is no significant improvement. It can be seen from the average scores of pre-test and post-test. It caused the control class did not use ludo game in the learning process.

***Table 4.6***

***The difference score between pre-test and post-test at the control class***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NO** | **RESPONDENT** | **Pre-test** (X1) | **Post-test** (X2) |
| **1** | **A** | **59** | **63** |
| **2** | **AF** | **69** | **72** |
| **3** | **AKI** | **53** | **59** |
| **4** | **AW** | **55** | **63** |
| **5** | **DSK** | **56** | **59** |
| **6** | **EA** | **53** | **59** |
| **7** | **FADM** | **52** | **69** |
| **8** | **FAR** | **53** | **59** |
| **9** | **GA** | **55** | **63** |
| **10** | **IF** | **49** | **57** |
| **11** | **MPR** | **69** | **82** |
| **12** | **MHM** | **53** | **68** |
| **13** | **MUN** | **52** | **63** |
| **14** | **MIM** | **56** | **67** |
| **15** | **MD** | **52** | **75** |
| **16** | **MY** | **52** | **59** |
| **17** | **PP** | **57** | **63** |
| **18** | **PAM** | **59** | **63** |
| **19** | **RFA** | **53** | **63** |
| **20** | **RM** | **63** | **74** |
| **21** | **SQA** | **50** | **61** |
| **22** | **SM** | **55** | **73** |
| **23** | **TSL** | **53** | **69** |
| **24** | **T** | **53** | **75** |
| **N = 24** | **TOTAL** | **∑X = 1331** | **∑X = 1578** |
| **AVERAGE** | **M = 55,45** | **M = 65,75** |

Based on the explanation above, the writer concluded that the result of the control class is no significant improvement. It can be seen from the average scores of pre-test and post-test. It caused the control class did not use ludo games in the learning process.

Graphic 4.2

The scores of the pre-test and post test of control classs

From the graphic above, shows the comparison between the scores of pre-test and post-test in control class. There are no significant improvement in control class, it shows that post-test score is not far from pre-test.

1. **The score of Post-test in experimental class and control class**

The students’ post-test score of control class could be shown on table 6 as follows:

Table 4.7

Post-test Result of Experimental Class and Control Class

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| NO | Post TestExperimental Class (X2) | Post TestControl Class (Y2) |
|  | **80** | **63** |
|  | **75** | **72** |
|  | **88** | **59** |
|  | **73** | **63** |
|  | **76** | **59** |
|  | **73** | **59** |
|  | **69** | **69** |
|  | **67** | **59** |
|  | **79** | **63** |
|  | **63** | **57** |
|  | **76** | **82** |
|  | **75** | **68** |
|  | **69** | **63** |
|  | **73** | **67** |
|  | **90** | **75** |
|  | **69** | **59** |
|  | **73** | **63** |
|  | **75** | **63** |
|  | **79** | **63** |
|  | **79** | **74** |
|  | **82** | **61** |
|  | **75** | **73** |
|  | **69** | **69** |
|  | **90** | **75** |
|  | **∑**X2 **=** 1817 | **∑**Y2 **=** 1578 |
|  | M = 75,70 | M = 65,75 |

From the table above, it can be seen the average score of post-test in experimental class and control class. The lowest score of experimental class is 63 and the highest score is 90. While in the control class the lowest score is 57 and the highest score is 82. It shows that there are many improvements between experimental class that using ludo games and control class that using conventional method.

1. **Analysis of The Data**
2. **Experimental Class**

The writer analysis the data by comparing students’ score in pre-test and post-test in the experimental class. The students’ improvement score caused the writer used ludo games in teaching speaking. If seen from the students’ improvement score, it means that a used ludo game was success in improving students’ speaking. The writer describes the students’ improvement score of pre-test and post-test at the experimental class by the table below:

|  |
| --- |
| ***Table 4.8******The difference score between pre-test and post-test result of experimental class*** |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Respondent** | **Pre-Test** ($X\_{1}$) | **Post-Test** ($X\_{2})$ | **Differences**( $X\_{2}-X\_{1})$ |
| **1** | A F Z | **59** | **80** | **21** |
| **2** | A S | **69** | **75** | **6** |
| **3** | D R S A | **71** | **88** | **17** |
| **4** | D A S | **58** | **73** | **15** |
| **5** | E F U | **63** | **76** | **13** |
| **6** | F D | **56** | **73** | **17** |
| **7** | G S P | **65** | **69** | **4** |
| **8** | H | **56** | **67** | **11** |
| **9** | L D A | **67** | **79** | **12** |
| **10** | L A | **58** | **63** | **5** |
| **11** | M S | **67** | **76** | **9** |
| **12** | M D R | **61** | **75** | **14** |
| **13** | N N | **55** | **69** | **14** |
| **14** | N R J | **59** | **73** | **14** |
| **15** | P A M | **69** | **90** | **21** |
| **16** | R A | **58** | **69** | **11** |
| **17** | S F | **69** | **73** | **4** |
| **18** | S R | **65** | **75** | **10** |
| **19** | S F N | **63** | **79** | **16** |
| **20** | S M | **55** | **79** | **24** |
| **21** | S R M | **63** | **82** | **19** |
| **22** | T S L | **63** | **75** | **12** |
| **23** | Y S | **53** | **69** | **16** |
| **24** | Z N | **69** | **90** | **21** |
| **N = 24** | **TOTAL** | **∑X = 1331** | **∑X = 1578** | **∑X =326** |
| **AVERAGE** | **M = 55,45** | **M = 65,75** | **M = 13,58** |

Table 4.7 above showed that the difference score between pre-test and post-test at the experimental class. The difference score was the result from the post-test scores reduced pre-test score. There was significant difference score between pre-test and post-test at the experimental class by the highest score was 24 and the lowest was 4.

1. **Control Class**

The writer analysis the data by comparing students’ score in pre-test and post-test at the control class. This result describes by the table below:

***Table 4.9***

 ***The difference score between Pre-test and Post-test result of control class***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NO** | **Respondent** | **Pre-Test** ($X\_{1}$) | **Post-Test** ($X\_{2})$ | **Difference**( $X\_{2}-X\_{1})$ |
| **1** | **A** | **59** | **63** | **4** |
| **2** | **AF** | **69** | **72** | **3** |
| **3** | **AKI** | **53** | **59** | **6** |
| **4** | **AW** | **55** | **63** | **8** |
| **5** | **DSK** | **56** | **59** | **3** |
| **6** | **EA** | **53** | **59** | **6** |
| **7** | **FADM** | **52** | **69** | **17** |
| **8** | **FAR** | **53** | **59** | **6** |
| **9** | **GA** | **55** | **63** | **8** |
| **10** | **IF** | **49** | **57** | **8** |
| **11** | **MPR** | **69** | **82** | **13** |
| **12** | **MHM** | **53** | **68** | **15** |
| **13** | **MUN** | **52** | **63** | **11** |
| **14** | **MIM** | **56** | **67** | **11** |
| **15** | **MD** | **52** | **75** | **23** |
| **16** | **MY** | **52** | **59** | **7** |
| **17** | **PP** | **57** | **63** | **6** |
| **18** | **PAM** | **59** | **63** | **4** |
| **19** | **RFA** | **53** | **63** | **10** |
| **20** | **RM** | **63** | **74** | **11** |
| **21** | **SQA** | **50** | **61** | **11** |
| **22** | **SM** | **55** | **73** | **18** |
| **23** | **TSL** | **53** | **69** | **16** |
| **24** | **T**  | **53** | **75** | **22** |
| **N = 24** | **TOTAL** | **∑X = 1331** | **∑X = 1578** | **∑X =247** |
| **AVERAGE** | **M = 55,45** | **M = 65,75** | **M = 10,29** |

Table 4.8 above showed that the difference score between pre-test and post-test at the control class. The difference score was the result from the post-test scores reduced pre-test score. There was significant difference score between pre-test and post-test at the control class by the highest score was 23 and the lowest was 4.

After collecting data, the writer analyzed using t-test with formula:

$$tO= \frac{M\_{1}-M\_{2}}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\sum\_{}^{}x\_{1}^{2}+\sum\_{}^{}x\_{2}^{2}}{N\_{1}+N\_{2}-2}\right)\left(\frac{N\_{1}+N\_{2}}{N\_{1}.N\_{2}}\right)}}$$

Where:

*t*0 = The value of t observation

$M\_{1}$ = Mean score of the experiment class ($X\_{1}$)

$M\_{2}$ = Mean score of the control class ($X\_{2}$)

$\sum\_{}^{}x\_{1}^{2}$ = Sum of squared deviation score in experiment class

$\sum\_{}^{}x\_{2}^{2}$ = Sum of squared deviation score in control class

$N\_{1}$ = Number of students of experiment class

$N\_{2}$ = Number of students of control class

$2$ = Constant number

df = Degree of Freedom (df = $N\_{1}+N\_{2}-2$)

Table 4.10

The result calculation of post-test in experimental class and control class

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NO.** | **X2** | **Y2** | **x2****(X2 – M1)** | **y2****(Y2 – M2)** | **x22** | **y22** |
|  | **80** | **63** | **4,3** | **-2,75** | **18,49** | **7,56** |
|  | **75** | **72** | **-0,7** | **6,25** | **44,89** | **39,06** |
|  | **88** | **59** | **12,3** | **-6,75** | **151,29** | **45,56** |
|  | **73** | **63** | **-2,7** | **-2,75** | **7,29** | **7,56** |
|  | **76** | **59** | **0,3** | **6,75** | **0,09** | **45.56** |
|  | **73** | **59** | **-2,7** | **6,75** | **7,29** | **45,56** |
|  | **69** | **69** | **-6,7** | **3,25** | **44,89** | **10,56** |
|  | **67** | **59** | **-8,7** | **-6,75** | **75,69** | **45,56** |
|  | **79** | **63** | **3,3** | **-2,75** | **10,89** | **7,56** |
|  | **63** | **57** | **12,7** | **-8,75** | **161,29** | **76,56** |
|  | **76** | **82** | **0,3** | **16,25** | **0,09** | **264,06** |
|  | **75** | **68** | **0,7** | **2,25** | **0,49** | **5,06** |
|  | **69** | **63** | **-6,7** | **-2,75** | **44,89** | **7,56** |
|  | **73** | **67** | **--2,7** | **1,25** | **7,29** | **1,56** |
|  | **90** | **75** | **14,3** | **19,25** | **204,49** | **370,56** |
|  | **69** | **59** | **-6,7** | **-6,75** | **44,87** | **44,89** |
|  | **73** | **63** | **-2,7** | **-2,75** | **7,29** | **7,56** |
|  | **75** | **63** | **-0,7** | **--2,75** | **0,49** | **7,56** |
|  | **79** | **63** | **3,3** | **-2,75** | **10,89** | **7,56** |
|  | **79** | **74** | **3,3** | **8,25** | **10,89** | **68,06** |
|  | **82** | **61** | **6,3** | **-2,75** | **39,69** | **7,56** |
|  | **75** | **73** | **0,7** | **7,25** | **0,49** | **52,56** |
|  | **69** | **69** | **-6,7** | **3,25** | **44,89** | **10,56** |
|  | **90** | **75** | **14,3** | **9,25** | **204,49** | **85,56** |
| **∑** | **1.817** | **1.578** |  |  | **1.143** | **1.271** |

Notes:

 X2 = Post-test score (experimental class)

 Y2 = Post-test score (control class)

 x2 = X2 – M1 (Mean X1)

 y2 = Y2 – M2 (Mean X2)

 x22 = The squared value of x2

 y22 = The squared value of y2

$$t\_{0}= \frac{M\_{1}-M\_{2}}{\left(\frac{\sum\_{}^{}x\_{1}^{2}+ \sum\_{}^{}x\_{2}^{2}}{N\_{1}+ N\_{2}-2}\right) \left(\frac{N\_{1}+ N\_{2}}{N\_{1} . N\_{2}}\right)}$$

Notes:

 $t\_{0}$ = t observation

 $M\_{1}$ = Mean score of the experiment class

$M\_{2}$ = Mean score of the control class

$\sum\_{}^{}x\_{1}^{2}$ = Sum of square deviation score in experiment class

$\sum\_{}^{}x\_{2}^{2}$ = Sum of square deviation score in control class

$N\_{1}$ = Number of students of experiment class

$N\_{2}$ = Number of students of control class

$2$ = Constant number

df = Degree of Freedom (df = $N\_{1}+N\_{2}-2$)

From the table above, the writer got the data ∑x2 = 1.817, ∑y2 = 1.578, ∑x22 = 1.143, ∑y22 = 1.271 whereas *N*1 = 24 and *N*2 = 24. After that, the writer calculates based on the step of t-test formulation as follows:

1. Determine mean of variable X1 and X2 :

Variable X1 *M*1 = $\frac{∑ x2}{N1}$ = $\frac{1817}{24}$ = 75,70

Variable X2 *M*2 = $\frac{∑ y2}{N2}$ = $\frac{1578}{24}$ = 65,75

1. Determine t-test :

∑*x*22 = 1.143

∑*y*22 = 1.271

d*f* = *N*1 + *N*2 – 2 = 24 + 24 – 2 = 46

*t*o = $\frac{M\_{1}-M\_{2}}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\sum\_{}^{}x\_{2}^{2}+\sum\_{}^{}y\_{2}^{2}}{N\_{1}+N\_{2}-2}\right)\left(\frac{N\_{1}+N\_{2}}{N\_{1}.N\_{2}}\right)}}$

 = $\frac{75,70-65,75}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1.143+1.271}{24+24-2}\right)\left(\frac{24+24}{24.24}\right)}}$

 = $\frac{9,95}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{2.414}{46}\right) X \left(\frac{48}{576}\right)}}$

 = $\frac{9,95}{\sqrt{\left(52,47\right) X \left(0.08\right)}}$

 = $\frac{9,95}{\sqrt{4.20}}$

= $\frac{9,95}{2,05}$

= 4,85

From the result of the calculation above, it is obtained that the value of *t*o (t observation) is 4,85. After found the data the researcher compared it with tt (t table) both in degree significance 5% and 1%.

1. **Hypothesis Testing (t-test)**

Data obtained from both pre-test and post test are analyzed and calculated using t-test formula. To prove it, the data obtained of the experimental class and the control class are calculated with the foll owing assumptions:

If *to* > *tt* : The alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted and null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected. It means there is significant effect of using ludo games on students’ speaking skill.

If *to* < *tt* : The alternative hypothesis (Ha) is rejected and null hypothesis (Ho) is accepted. It means there is no significant effect of using ludo games on students’ speaking skill.

Based on assumption above, it is obtained that the value of *to* (t observation) is 4,85, degree freedom (d*f*) is 46. In degree significance 5% from t table is 1.67. In degree of significance 1% from t table is 2.41.

After got the data, the writer compared it with *tt* (t table) both in degree significance 5% and 1%.

*tt* 5% < *to* > *tt* 1% = 1.67 < 4,85 > 2.41

*to* : *tt* = 4,85 > 1.67 in degree of significance 5%

*to* : *tt* = 4,85 > 2.41 in degree of significance 1%

The statistic hypothesis states that if *to* is higher than *tt*, it shows that *H*a (alternative hypothesis) of the result is accepted and *H*o (null hypothesis) is rejected. It means there is effect of ludo games to enhance students’ speaking skill.

1. **Data Interpretation**

After calculating and analyzing the data, the writer found that result showed that the use of Ludo games can increasing students speaking skill. From the research that the average from pre-test scores of experimental and control class before treatment that is no significance difference. It can be seen from the average of pre-test of experimental class is 62,12 and the average of pre test of control group is 55,45. The highest score of pre-test in the experimental class is 71 and in the control class is 69. The lowest score of pre-test in the experimental class is 63 and in the control class is 49.

The average from the post-test scores in the experimental class is 75,70 greater than the control is 65,75. The highest score of post-test in the experimental class is 90 and in the control class is 82. The lowest score of pre-test in the experimental class is 63 and in the control class is 59. It means that distribution of scores in the experimental class is greater than the control class.

The improvement of experimental class can be seen after learning process using ludo games. When the teacher uses this media in the learning process, the students enjoy and relax. They can freely express their ideas in the classroom. As we know in order to deliver what the students say in front of the class, they require the confident well. So that ludo games influences students in order to improving their speaking skill.

On the other hand, in control class where students are taught the speaking skill without ludo games, students look so bored and not enthusiastic in speaking skill, it makes it difficult to absorb the material. When the teacher ask the students for perform their dialogue in groups, they are not enthusiasts in learning process and they are do not prepare the explanation well.

Finally, based on the interpretation above, the researcher can conclude that ludo games is one of speaking activity that able to improve the students’ speaking skill.

**CHAPTER V**

**CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION**

1. **Conclusion**

In this chapter, the writer would like to conclude of the research based on the data obtained and the hypothesis submitted at the previous chapter as follow:

1. Before the writer gave treatment both of experimental class (VIII A) and control class (VIII B), the writer got mean score of pre-test from experimental class was 62,12 and control class was 55,45. It means that the students’ speaking in SMPI Al-Mubarok Tigaraksa at second grade taken as sample of the research have relatively same both experimental class and control class. After the writer giving treatment by using ludo games for VIII A as experimental class and without ludo games for VIII B as control class, the writer got mean of post-test score from experimental class was 75,70 and control class was 65,75. It can be seen that students’ speaking skill got different increase. Experimental class got higher increase after giving treatment than control class.
2. The use of ludo games as a new method to improve students’ speaking in SMPI Al-Mubarok Tigaraksa has been showed that means score from experimental class after giving treatment as new method got higher score than control class (75,70>65,75). In addition, the writer got the result from the calculation that the value of the to is 4,85 and df is 46. According to t-table as degree significance of 5% = 1,67 in degree of significance 1% = 2,41. After that the writer compared the data with $t\_{t}$ (t table) both in degree significance 5% and 1%. Therefore $t\_{o}:t\_{t}$ = 4,85 > 1,67 in degree of significance 5% and $t\_{o}:t\_{t}$ = 4,85 > 2,41 in degree significance 1%. it means that $H\_{a}$(alternative hypothesis) of the result is accepted and $H\_{o}$(null hypothesis) is rejected.
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 Based on the fact above, the writer can summarize that the use of ludo games has significant effect to increase students’ speaking in SMPI Al-Mubarok Tigaraksa.

1. **Suggestion**

Based on conclusion above, it can be delivered some suggestion that might be useful. The suggestion are for teacher and students. As a follow:

1. For Teacher
2. The writer hopes to be the one of some alternative in improving students’ speaking skill by using ludo games.
3. In studying speaking at the classroom, the teacher is hoped more creative in teaching students to increase teaching learning process and make students active in learning.
4. For School

It will be beneficial for school in giving beneficial contribution of the improvement of the quality of the educational in the school. Therefore, if the school has a good quality of course the society will trust and believe it and they will be motivated to register their children to the school.

1. For Students
2. The students should practice a lot of speaking English, especially in speaking to more correct about aspect of speaking skill like accent, grammar and vocabulary.
3. This media give students opportunity to think critically and also requires the students to be active.
4. For other researcher

The writer hopes that this research could be one of the references in conducting some research for better result.
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