Recount board game on students' speaking skills

Rohmaniyah

rohmaniyahrohmani@gmail.com
Sultan Agung Islamic University

Devi Enggar Nastiti

devienggarnastiti@std.unissula
Sultan Agung Islamic University

Choiril Anwar

choirilanwar@unissula.ac.id
Sultan Agung Islamic University

Abstract: This study was aimed at finding the effectiveness of "Recount Board Game" in teaching and learning students' speaking skills to the the tenth grade students of SMA Islam Sultan Agung 3 Semarang, Indonesia. The researchers used quasi experimental method and chose two classes for it, they were: X-1 as experimental class with 33 students and X-2 as control class with 34 students. In the both of classes, researchers conducted the research in three steps: pre-test, treatment, and post-test to look for the data then were analyzed by using SPSS for Windows Version 21.0. The result of this study showed that there was a significant difference in the result of pre-test and post-test in both of two classes. The mean of pre-test in experimental group was 59.19 and the mean of post-test in experimental group was 83.03. Whereas the mean of pre test in control group was 57.65 and the mean of the post-test in control group was 76.47. Based on independent t-test, t-value was higher than t-table (4.474 > 1.997) and $p < 0.05$ (0.000< 0.05). It meant that there was a significant difference in the student's skills achievement between the experimental and control groups. So, it could be concluded that H_1 was accepted and the use recount board game was effective in teaching students' speaking skills.

Keywords: recount board game, speaking skills

Skehan (1996) states that language is part of learning process implies the goal toward learners in a set of communication skills, those are: speaking and writing are the

productive skills, then reading and listening are the receptive skills. Communication will be easily received when people speak. Although speaking is important, but many people expect that mastering speaking is difficult. Students often think that speaking is frightening because it needs extra confidently in speaking, should good pronunciations, good dialect, smart in choosing words, and correct grammar. Actually, students want to speak English well, but they are afraid of being wrong. Whereas, the success of speaking is in habit how often students try to speak then they will improve their speaking ability day by day.

Seeing it as a matter, teacher should be aware of that problem when English is not students' mother tongue but it is as a second language (L2). Teacher should look for solutions to make students having enthusiasm and feeling enjoy in learning speaking. Teacher can choose a game as a method teaching learning to increase and to motivate students' desire. Game is identical with fun thing and it able to change students' mindset that learning speaking is something interesting. There are games to improve speaking ability, from traditional up to modern games, such as: Guessing game, storytelling, role play, and board game.

One of the interesting games is using board game which is used to attract students' desire to follow teaching learning process. By using this game, the students can describe a certain topic what they have seen to their friends until able to correct answer. Therefore, board game is expected to bring students' desire to learn English without feeling depressed. They will be down less to speak at least in two languages.

In conducting this research, researchers included the recount board game to apply in teaching and learning English. Researchers used the tenth grade students of SMA Islam Sultan Agung 3 as the research object because the recount board game has not been applied frequently before in the school. Applying that game as a new medium was expected to refresh and to introduce not only the students but also the English teacher. Researchers observed that the school especially the tenth grade students through interview with the English teacher. From the interview, the teacher explained that recount board game was a new medium for her students of tenth grade students who had low passion in English skills. That was the effective way to apply the game with such condition and with easy material. Mostly, as new students were awkward if the material is difficult. Recount board game can help increase students' passion in speaking English.

After all, the important one of four skills in language learning is speaking skill. If students want to speak well, they have to make a habit of their speaking ability as well. According to Poerdarminta (2007), the ability in talking and speaking is the classical meaning of speaking. Speaking delivers the message for the other one or to be able to communicate about something in language and listener able to understand. Speaking skills is considered have many challenges to prove the language learning successes if it is done by habit.

Speaking makes relation directly between speaker and listener, which consider doing repetition, clarification, diction, more attention than other skills in language. Bygate (1987) argues that speaking needs more attention every bit as much as literacy skills, in both first and second language. He adds that learners need to be able to speak with confidence and fluency not only with the purpose of learning a foreign or second language but also because is a medium to social solidarity, and a vehicle to make or lose friends. Whereas Cunningham & Edmonds (1999) believe that speaking is more than producing words. It means that the speaker should know which words should be used at an appropriate moment, the amount of stress and intonation in a sentence, to use grammar forms exactly, to make use of the appropriate lexicon that is comprehensible for the listeners, to use gestures and body language, to determine the adequate vocabulary, rate of speech, and to check the listeners comprehension of the discourse.

In short, speaking skill looks more complex than other skills in language. Speaking does not just talk but also need understanding on pronunciation, diction, stress. The speaking roles, the purpose of speaking and the context where there is oral interaction may also be changed. The aspects mention before might be the reason why there are different methods used by researchers whether in English as a second language or as a first language to approach the speaking skill.

Researchers made suitable material with syllabus and the material learned by students before, such as recount text. So, the researchers repeated the materials. That was recount text included in the fun game like "Recount Board Game". Learning by board game means to include the material through this game. It consists of many cabins which fills material inside. Hammond (2011) states that the concept of board game is a learning strategy for mixed groupings involving the recognition of team and responsibility for individual learning group members. So, playing this game needs more than a group to achieve the goal.

There are many kinds of board game. Like the name, board game purposes to make fun the players with strategies, such as: snakes and ladders, monopoly, *zathura*, chess, and many others. Then for this study, the researchers has modified the board game with purpose not only for fun but also as method to teaching and learning English with fixing some material of syllabus. They takes material suitable with material which still is learned by students of the tenth grade. The material is recount text and the game is filled with material related to recount, such as: the definition of recount, formula of recount, example, etc. So, that is why this board game is named as "Recount Board Game".

Carly (2010) claims that there are many advantages of using board game in the classroom, the researchers takes some that relates to speaking skills, they are: 1) is motivating and challenging, 2) helps students make and sustain the effort of learning, 3) encourages students to interact and to communicate, and helps students learn and hang on to new words more easily.

So, board game is divided into some groups which need togetherness on every member. Students can help the other member in own group to built cooperative group. This game needs oral communication during the game in which it is assumed to be good to improve students' speaking skills.

Recount board game is kind of board game that was modified by researchers. This game is combining recount text and board game. This board game fills with many cabins inside. Every cabin fills with challenge that every group should do or answer about recount. According to Hyland (2004), recount is kind of genre which has social function retelling event with purpose for informing and entertaining. The researchers chose recount text because of making to match with material at the time in the tenth grade. So, this board game was named recount board game. Through this game, researchers hoped that students will easily apply the game and improve their speaking skills.

Some studies related to this research have been conducted. They are theses conducted by Hanan (2013); Junita (2012), Muflikhah (2014), and Efrizal (2012). Hanan, Junita and Efrizal used action research method. They did not specific material either. Whereas Muflihah used role play as done by Anwar (2016) to improve students' speaking skill while in this study recount board game is used.

Applying this game, researchers then tried to investigate the different achievement skills of the students were taught with board game and the one with conventional method. From the background above, the researchers formulated the particular statement of the problem as follows: "Is recount board game effective in teaching students' speaking skills at the tenth grade of SMA Islam Sultan Agung 3 Semarang?"

METHOD

The researchers used quantitative method to look for the effect of the experiment. The result of the experiment wrote in number measured. For quantitative data, a precise sample numbers can be calculated according to the level of accuracy and the level of probability that the researchers requires in her working. Creswell (1994) states that a quantitative study, consistent with the quantitative paradigm, is an inquiry into a social or human problem, based on testing a theory composes of variables, measures with numbers, and analyzes with statistical procedures, in order to determine whether the predictive generalizations of the theory hold true.

So, this study belongs to experimental design, because the researchers taught method which had chosen then applied in class to prove the effectiveness of her teaching

and learning method then the results were collected at one point in time. The specific research was quasi experimental design. It was researched based of comparing two groups, they are experimental and control group with selected sample (no random). This is based on the theory from Cohen and Manion (1989) on quasi-experimental designs in which there will be no treatment in the control group and vise versa for the experimental group.

For the sampling technique of the study, researchers chose purposive sampling. In line with Cohen and Manion saying that in purposive sampling, researchers handpick the cases to be included in the sample based on the judgments, experience, and knowledge. In this study, researchers chose two classes were expected same level in English achievement through the Teacher's expectation and assessment. Researchers asked the teacher of subject about their students' speaking achievement at the class so far. Researchers then chose grade X-1 as experimental group class and grade X-2 as control group class.

Instrument is important part to measure students' achievement so far. According to Denzin & Lincoln (2005), it is the generic term that researchers use for a measurement device survey, test, questionnaire, video recorder and others. For the purpose of collecting data to measure students as respondents, researchers had instrument was used. It was speaking test. Brown (2004) says that test is a method of measuring a person's ability, knowledge, or performance in a given domain. To know the achievement, researchers asked students to speak in speaking test about telling student's experience minimum in one paragraph one by one, and then researchers took a note of the results.

Researchers used content validity for this study. It was content validity when researchers gave material that suitable with curriculum and tested in experimental and control class through speaking test. The instrument had been validated by teacher and the researchers' supervisor.

For this research, researchers used speaking test about telling experience at least in a paragraph as validity of the test because could be proven directly whole of activity then directly could be tested and could be assessed. They had consulted with English the English teacher in the school, Miss Arvi. About to measure validity of the material content, researchers had made suitable with the material of syllabus of first semester tenth grade with *KTSP 2006*. It was recount text in telling experience. The instrument had been agreed by teacher and did the scoring the result along speaking test in the pre test and post test to get the reliability of the instrument. The test could be decided as reliability after the researchers knew the result were the same in the experimental and control class although the condition when doing test in the same time.

Speaking assessment had some categories that should be considered, there were: pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. Every category consisted five levels of measuring students' speaking skills for pre-test, treatments, and post-test. For this study, researchers used speaking scoring rubric based on *Testing English as a Second Language* (Harris, 1969)".

After all the data have been collected, researchers analyzed of the rubric speaking score which consisted of three categories be measured: grammar, vocabulary, and fluency. There were five levels for each category, so the total maximal score could be achieved fifteen times three equal one hundred. After all scores were calculated then were categorized based on Harris's classification of achievement level.

The data were collected from the result of students' speaking ability through pre-test, post-test. After collecting the data, the researchers analyzed them in a ratio scale. Then they processed the data statistically to know the homogeneity and normality. The researchers analyzed the multivariate normality by using one-sample Kolmogrov-Smirnov and for the homogeneity test using Independent sample t-test. After getting the result, they continued to determine the hypothesis by using independent sample t-test formula because they would like to find out the significant difference between the experimental group and the control group. The researchers used SPSS for Windows Release version 21.0 to determine the hypothesis and standard normality based on Ghozali (2011): the distribution is not normal, if sig (2-tailed) < 0.05. On the contrary, if sig (2-tailed) > 0.05, the distribution is normal.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Researchers conducted pre-test of X-1 grade as experimental class with 33 students inside and X-2 grade as control class with 34 students inside . They used speaking test about telling student's experience minimum in one paragraph one by one as pre-test. It was occurred in first meeting in two classes. This was to know about their speaking achievement before doing treatments.

When doing the pre-test, researchers recorded students' voice and scored their English speaking immediately and the teacher of the subject joined the class to guide because the English teacher knew better about their students' achievement. In scoring students' speaking achievement in the pre-test, the researchers focused on the scoring criteria according to the three elements in scoring speaking. The elements were fluency, vocabulary, grammar. Each element rated from 1 to 5 with the maximum score 100. The researchers also grouped the score level result of both groups in the following criteria in the table 1:

Table 1. The result of the pre-test of the speaking level's achievement through Harris' Scoring Classification

Grade	Category	Score	Frequency		Percentage	
			E	C	E	C
1	Poor	0-49	1	7	3%	20.6%
2	Poor to Fair	50-59	13	6	39.4%	17.6%

3	Fair to good	60-79	19	21	57.6%	61.8%
4	Good	80-100	0	0	0%	0%

Source: Testing English as a Second Language (Harris, 1969)

From the table before, it can be seen the result that there were four categories or levels toward student's achievement, they were: 1. "Poor", it was the lowest level if student got score between 0-49. 2. "Poor to Fair', it was the level was if student got score between 50-59, "Fair to Good', it was the level if student got score between of 60-79, and the last 4. "Good", it was the lowest level if student get score between of 80-100.

Based on the classification, so in this pre-test result in this research can be divided that in the experimental group there were 1 student in the 3% Poor level, 13 students in the 39.4% Poor to Fair level, 19 students in the 57.6% Fair to Good level, and there wasn't student in the 0% Good level. Whereas, in control group there were 7 student in the 20.6% Poor level, 6 students in the 17.6% Poor to Fair level, 21 students in the 61.8% Fair to Good level, and there wasn't student in the 0% Good level.

After knowing the pretest result both of the classes, the researchers used One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test to know the standard normality and homogeneity data of the groups using SPSS for Windows Version 21.0. It can be shown in the table 2:

Table 2. The Result of Normality both Control and Experimental

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Experimental	Control
N		33	34
Normal Parameters[a]	Mean	59.19	57.65
	Std. Deviation	6.823	8.666
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.229	.225
	Positive	.229	.187
	Negative	-.165	-.225
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.315	1.310
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.063	.065

a. Test distribution is normal.
b. Calculated from data.

The table 2 showed that the total students (N) of experimental was 33, the mean of getting score was 59.19 and the standard deviation was 6.823. Whereas, the total students (N) of control was 34, the mean of getting score was 57.65 and the standard deviation was 8.666. From the table, it knew that both of the classes were normal. The

experimental group was normal because the sig. (2-tailed) = 0.063 (p > 0.05) and the data of control group showed that the sig. (2-tailed) = 0.065 (p > 0.05). There were also the graphs of students' score distribution of control and experimental group.

The result also showed in this table below:

Table 3. Group Statistics

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Class	1	33	59.19	6.823	1.188
	2	34	57.65	8.666	1.486

Based on the table 3, it was known that the mean difference between experimental group and control group was 1.54 to prove that both of groups were non-homogeneous. Then, for analyzing the hypothesis of the study, the researchers used Independent Sample t-test in table 3:

Table 4. Independent Samples Test

Class	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
							Std. Error Differen ce	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
	F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Differen ce		Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	1.608	.209	.809	65	.421	1.545	1.909	-2.268	5.358
Equal variances not assumed			.812	62.373	.420	1.545	1.903	-2.258	5.347

Sig.(2-tailed) ≤0.05 = Significance difference
Sig.(2-tailed) ≥0.05 = No significance difference

From the table 4 showed that the total number of subjects (N) in this research for both groups experimental and control were 67 with the degree of freedom (df) = N-2= 65. The result of independent sample t-test for pre-test showed that t-value derived was -0.809 and t table was 1.997, thus t-value was lower than t-table (-0.809 < 1.997).

Next, the independent sample t-test showed that sig. (2-tailed) was 0.209 (p>0.05), and for the 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference was obtained -2.268 for the lower interval and 5.358 for the upper interval. Based on that, the researchers

concluded that there was no significant difference between control and experimental group in pre-test, and those had the same skills in their achievement.

In this study, researchers used recount board game to teach the students which contain fix material suitable with students' handbook and syllabus at the time. It was applied in the four times meeting of treatment in experimental class. Meanwhile, the conventional method was thought in every meeting in control class. Every meeting was conducted for 2 x 45 minutes. There were two classes directly in a day. Both of methods were recorded by voice recorder as conducted speaking activity then to measure.

Post-test Analysis

Researchers conducted post-test of X-1 grade as experimental class with 33 students and X-2 grade as control class with 34 students in the same day They used the same speaking test as like in pre test about telling student's experience minimum in one paragraph for one by one student as post-test. It occurred in the last meeting in two classes. This was to know about their speaking achievement after doing treatments.

When doing the post-test, researchers recorded students' voice and scored their English speaking immediately and the teacher of the subject joined the class to guide because the English teacher knew better about their students' achievement. In scoring students' speaking achievement in the post-test, the researchers focused on the scoring criteria according to the three elements in scoring speaking. The elements were fluency, vocabulary, grammar. Each element rated from 1 to 5 with the maximum score 100. The researchers also grouped the score level of both groups in the following criteria in the table 5:

Table 5. The result of the post-test of the speaking level's achievement through Harris' Scoring Classification

Grade	Category	Score	Frequency		Percentage	
			E	C	E	C
1	Poor	0-49	0	0	0%	20,6%
2	Poor to Fair	50-59	0	0	0%	17,6%
3	Fair to good	60-79	7	24	21.2%	70.6%
4	Good	80-100	26	10	78.8%	29.4%

Source: Testing English as a Second Language (Harris, 1969)

Based on the classification, so in this post-test result this research can be divided result that in the experimental group there were no one student in the 0% Poor level, no one student in the 0% Poor to Fair level, 7 students in the 21.2% Fair to Good level, and 26 students in the 0% Good level. Whereas, in control group there were no one

student in the 0% Poor level, no one student in the 0 % Poor to Fair level, 41 students in the 70.6% Fair to Good level, and 10 students in the 29.4% Good level.

After knowing the post-test result both of the classes, the researchers used One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test to know the standard normality and homogeneity data of the groups using SPSS for Windows Version 21.0. It can be shown in the table 6:

Table 6. The Result of normality both Control and Experimental
One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Experimental	Control
N		33	34
Normal Parameters[a]	Mean	83.03	76.47
	Std. Deviation	6.475	5.501
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.258	.422
	Positive	.166	.422
	Negative	-.258	-.284
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.484	2.459
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.024	.000

a. Test distribution is normal.
b. Calculated from data.

The table 6 showed that the total students (N) of experimental was 33, the mean of getting score was 83.03 and the standard deviation was 6.475. Whereas, the total students (N) of control was 34, the mean of getting score was 76.47 and the standard deviation was 5.501. From the table, it knew that both of the classes were normal. The experimental group was normal because the sig. (2-tailed) = 0.024 ($p < 0.05$) and the data of control group showed that the sig. (2-tailed) = 0.000 ($p < 0.05$). There were also the graphs of students' score distribution of control and experimental group. It can be seen in the table 7:

Table 7 Group Statistics

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Class	1	33	83.03	6.475	1.127
	2	34	76.47	5.501	.943

Based on the table 7, it was known that the mean difference between experimental group and control group was 6.56 to prove that both of groups were non-homogeneous. Then, for analyzing the hypothesis of the study, the researchers used Independent Sample t-test in the table 8.

Table 8 Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Class	Equal variances assumed	2.249	.139	4.474	65	.000	6.560	1.466	3.631	9.488
	Equal variances not assumed			4.463	62.703	.000	6.560	1.470	3.622	9.497

Sig.(2-tailed) ≤0.05 = Significance difference
Sig.(2-tailed) ≥0.05 = No significance difference

The table 8 showed that the total number of subjects (N) in this research for both groups experimental and control were 67 with the degree of freedom (df) = N-2= 65. The result of independent sample t-test for post-test showed that t-value derived was 4.474 and t table was 1.997, thus t-value was higher than t-table (4.474 > 1.997).

Next, the independent sample t-test showed that sig. (2-tailed) was 0.00 (p<0.05), and for the 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference was obtained 3.631 for the lower interval and 9.488 for the upper interval. Based on that, the researchers concluded that there was significant difference between control and experimental group in post-test, and those had the different skills in their achievement.

DISCUSSION

In the pre-test, researchers measured the students' speaking achievement with speaking test before doing treatment. From the pre-test result, there was relatively the same ability between experimental class students with the mean score of 59.19 and control class students with the mean score of 57.65. It indicated that the different score was 1.54. There were four times both of the two classes got treatments. The experimental class got lesson by implementing with recount board game, whereas the control class got lesson with conventional method. Next, researchers did post-test in the last meeting. Same as with pre-test, in this post-test researchers also used speaking test as to measure students'

speaking achievement. As the result, there were improving score in students' achievement of both classes. The experimental class students with the mean score of 83.63 and control class students with the mean score of 76.47. It indicated that the different score was 6.56.

Based on the result above, it was known that after treatment both of two classes got improving score. Although, the experimental class which got lesson by implementing using recount board game got the higher score than the control class which got lesson with conventional method. It indicated that in experimental class got good achievement and more understand than control class.

The effect of the treatment

The researchers found the some effects after doing the research. There were: 1) This result showed that there was significance different in students' achievement who were taught by recount board game and who were taught by conventional method; 2) Recount board game helped students in learning speaking achievement. It was useful of this research, because this recount had challenge where students in the group should talk active when placed in every cabin; 3) Learning with recount board game was fun for speaking's achievement. It happened when students did not afraid when together with their group had enthusiastic to talk active in answering the challenges in every cabin their got place.

CONCLUSION

Based on the result of the research, researchers gave some conclusions: they were that there were a significant difference of the students' speaking achievement in learning recount text between students who were taught by using Recount Board Game and those who were taught by using Conventional Method to the tenth grade students of SMA Islam Sultan Agung 3 Semarang in the academic year of 2015/2016. The researchers found that the total number of subjects (N) in this research for both groups experimental and control was 67 with the degree of freedom (df) = N-2= 65. The result of independent sample t-test for post-test showed that t-value derived was 4.474 and t table was 1.997, thus t-value was higher than t-table (4.474 > 1.997). So, the Independent Sample T-test showed that sig (2-tailed) was 0.000 < 0.05. It meant that H_0 was declined and H_1 was accepted.

The researchers then have some suggestions for the other researchers, teachers, or readers to develop the research. Some of them are as follows: For the teacher, in learning speaking, teacher has to find the challenging way to make students get enthusiasm and talk active in speaking lesson, such as recount board game. When implementing in game, teacher should be fair, creative, and guide the students well so that the goal can be reached. Make sure that the teacher had prepared well their lesson such as planning activities, goal, lesson management so there will not waste time. Recount board game should be done continuously, because this method was effective in teaching speaking and can be replaced

with suitable material such as based on syllabus at the time. For the other researchers and readers, this research can be references about one of the games which can be applied in teaching and learning speaking skills and adding the knowledge about it for various needs.

The last but not least, the researchers would like express acknowledgment to the dean of language faculty of Sultan Agung Islamic University as well as the supervisor who guided the researchers to finish this article shortly with some improvement.

REFERENCES

Anwar, C. (2016). Role-play and show-and-tell in grade 5 student's speaking learning. *Edulite: Journal of English education, literature and culture, 1*(1), 76-102. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.30659/e.1.1.76-102

Brown, H. D.. (2004). *Language assessment: principles and classroom practice*. White Plains, New York: Pearson Education.

Bygate, M. (1987). *Speaking.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carly, S. (2010). *The advantages of learning games for kids.* Internet Tessol. http://w.w.w. livestrong.com

Cohen, L. and Manion, L. (1989). *Research methods in education.* Fifth Edition. London: Routledge.

Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Cunningham, A.J. and Edmonds, C.V.I. (1999). Delivering a very brief psycho-educational program to cancer patients and family members in a large group format. *Psycho-oncology, 8:*177-182.

Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (2005) Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In: Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y. S., Eds., Handbook of Qualitative Research, 3rd Edition, Sage, *Thousand Oaks*, 1-32.

Efrizal, D. (2012). Improving students' speaking through communicative language teaching method. *International journal of humanities and social science Vol. 2 No. 20* [Special Issue – October 2012]

Hammond , M., Reynolds, L. & Ingram, J. (2011). *How and why do student teachers use ICT?* https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2729.2010.00389.x

Hanan, A. (2013). Increasing students' speaking ability through board game. *Unpublished thesis*. Selong: STKIP Hamzanwadi.

Harris, D. P. (1969). *Testing English as a second language*. Washington DC: Georgetown University.

Hyland, K. (2004). *Genre and second language writing*. The United State of America: The University of Michigan Press.

Junita. (2012). The effectiveness of role play as a method in teaching speaking. *Unpublished Thesis*. Semarang: Universitas Islam Sultan Agung.

Muflikhah. (2014). The effectifeness of using snowball throwing for improving the speaking skill of the tenth grade students of MAN 2 Semarang in academic year of 2013/2014. *Unpublished Thesis*. Semarang: Universitas Islam Sultan Agung.

Poerdarminta, W.J.S. (2007). *Kamus umum Bahasa Indonesia: Edisi ketiga*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.

Skehan, P. (1996a). A Framework for the Implementation of Task-Based Instruction. Applied Linguistics, 17, 38-62. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/17.1.38.