SMARTies: Using a board game in the English classroom for edutainment and assessment

HYGINUS LESTER JUNIOR LEE

Sekolah Menengah Kebangsaan Mutiara,Federal Territory of Labuan

Malaysia

Abstract

Engaging students in learning can take a number of paths, including using games and play. The idea of playing games to learn a language in school is not new but many teachers do not favour games as a teaching and learning method. Board games, if aligned with the national curriculum and relevant learning objectives, can be effective and meaningful. This study examines the use of SMARTies, a formative testing tool designed in a form of a board game, as an alternative teaching and learning aid for the language classroom. Thirty voluntary students were involved in this study. Respondents were required to sit for a pre-test and post-test to monitor their achievement. A survey questionnaire was also used to find out about their attitudes and beliefs relating to using board games for language learning. The results showed that students had positive attitudes towards the use of SMARTies.

KEYWORDS: SMARTies, English language learning, board game, formative assessment, testing tool

Introduction

Over the years, there have been claims that the education systems in certain countries are examination-oriented and lack creativity. For example, the Education Minister of Singapore (Tharman Shanmugaratnam, 2004) believes that education in Singapore places too much emphasis on examinations. He claims that learning is aimed at recalling facts and memorising model answers for examinations. Many students study for the sake of examination and have the tendency to neglect and forget what they have learnt once the examinations are over. They have little time to read for pleasure and beyond the syllabus.

Although it cannot be denied that testing is a necessary tool used to measure performance, being dependent on it does not mirror a total mastery of subject matter. Testing is important but being dependent on examination scores may not be advantageous. Students need to enjoy learning and at the same time achieve the learning outcomes set by the authorities. Brown (2004) points that teachers should never cease to assess their students, be it incidental or intended. This would enable teachers to obtain valuable information in order to provide feedback on their students' performance. With proper methods of assessment, teachers will have a better idea on the strengths and weaknesses of their students. It will also help teachers plan more effective strategies for quality learning.

However, too much emphasis on examinations results in students who are not equipped with the confidence and competency to apply the subject matter in real life situations. Nayar (2008) suggests that there is a misconception that ten years of textbook teaching with an examination approach will yield any solid language learning. Nayar also reveals that questions in exams in Kerala have neither received students' support nor boosted their confidence. Examinations discourage the whole process of learning a second language and the appreciation of it. In the Malaysian context, Fauziah and Nita (2002) claim that many of the problems and challenges in education stem from the examination-oriented teaching and learning process, which tends to result in both teachers and students placing too much emphasis on what is being tested. Ho (2010) also shares the view that teachers are overly dependent on commercial teaching materials and have no time to produce their own. They still prefer to teach using traditional approaches and are reluctant to try out new approaches and innovations. Consequently, there is a low level of cognitive development amongst students, and critical and creative thinking skills are not emphasized.

Teaching the target language effectively requires teachers to be creative and innovative as this will increase learners' motivation and interest in the learning process. There are a number of ways to assist, develop and scaffold learners' proficiency. Learners are unique in their own way, bringing their personal experiences and cultures to share with their peers and teachers. They also have their own personal learning preferences and learning styles. When they have the opportunity to experiment and practice the target language,

learners usually make more sense of the world and the language through the context they find themselves in. Therefore, the purpose of learning for the sake of examinations does not support learning through different facets of multiple intelligences. Choy and Troudi (2006) propose a positive learning environment by revamping the method of delivery. They believe that there is a need to change the perception towards learning the English language so that students see their learning as fun and interesting. Sufficient exposure to the language is much needed as the study found students learn the language due to necessity of survival and not for love and interest.

Using games to teach language

Introducing games for learners with the intention to teach and further develop their language proficiency is one way to enhance language learning. Games meet the four conditions presented by Willis (1996), namely exposure, language use, motivation and instruction. Lee (1979, cited in Uberman, 1998) points out that a game "should not be regarded as a marginal activity filling in odd moments when the teacher and class have nothing better to do" (p. 20). A well-developed game has educational and pedagogical value. It is deemed meaningful when the players learn and produce chunks of language from it.

Chitravelu, Sithamparam and Teh (1995) believe that games can remove boredom without sacrificing repetition that is necessary for successful learning of language elements, especially grammar. Games should be competitive and rule-governed with learning goals in mind. Games have a definite point at which they start and finish. Players are challenged to complete, hence holding their attention and engagement. Using games in the teaching of a target language can bring about fun and excitement but teachers must be sure of its clear aim and purpose. According to Khan (1996, cited in Hong, 2002),

> Teachers need to consider which games to use, when to use them, how to link them up with the syllabus, textbook or programme and how, more specifically, different games will benefit students in different ways.

Moreover, teachers must follow the prescribed curriculum with has been designed to suit second language learners. Games which are of a high level may pose difficulties for players while being too easy to play does not challenge their intellect.

Read (2007) also believes that games provide stimulation, variety, interest and motivation to learners. Besides offering amusement and cooperation, games is said to help promote positive attitudes towards learning English. They encourage active participation among players and consequently boost confidence and self-esteem. For younger learners, Read (2007) elaborates, games help them to express themselves and this can provide positive foundations for language learning. Learners are given opportunities for repetition, production of language chunks and additional new language encounters.

Gaudart (2003) claims that with the current emphasis on communication in teaching language, board games was one identified solution for many teachers. Board games offer potential language practices if they are constructed according to specific syllabus specifications. Besides transforming formulaic forms of learning in the classroom to real life application, games can increase motivation and enjoyment. Gaudart also adds that Project RELATE, a research project using board games carried out over five years at University Malaya received a large degree of success and satisfaction. She, however, reminds that board games should suit learners' level of proficiency and current knowledge. However, Gaudart (2003) claims that many teachers are not keen to introduce games in the classroom because they find it troublesome to design games or feel that they are not creative enough to do so.

In relation to using games in the classroom, this paper presents the use of SMARTies, an acronym for *Simple, Meaningful and Rewarding Test: I am an English Specialist*. It is a formative testing tool made in the form of a board game and has been evaluated by a panel of education officers from the Labuan state Education Department and the Curriculum Development Centre for the nomination of the Innovative Teacher 2011 Award. This paper presents a brief description of SMARTies, and goes on to investigate the attitudes of students towards using the SMARTies board game; compares the

students' achievement upon using SMARTies and reports on the feedback received from the students on the use of SMARTies as a board game and testing tool.

SMARTies

SMARTies (see Appendix) is designed to be portable and easy to play. *Test*, as the name in the acronym suggests, does not refer to the traditional pencil-paper test or any summative assessment. It is purely a formative form of assessment. SMARTies is just a means of testing, but students are assessed as they are going through the process of learning. It is a process done during instruction with the purpose of providing feedback to improve students' achievement and performance. Assessment can be done continuously which enables the teacher to monitor progress and plan further assignments to improve their weaknesses.

Students take turns to play and answer questions. They are less likely feel threatened due to the nature of the game that does not assess them in a formal manner. SMARTies is different from any board games found in the market. This is because the creator takes into consideration the English syllabus at secondary level. A Form 2 KBSM English textbook covers three domains, namely the interpersonal, informational and aesthetic. Themes such as people, environment, social issues, health, and science and technology are covered. One textbook available today claims that each chapter consists of an integration

and consolidation of language skills and content. They are divided into 9 headings: *Let's Talk, Let's Read, Let's Tune In, Let's Say It Right, Let's Write, Let's Get Aesthetic, Let's Focus on Grammar, Let's Learn More* and *Let's Review*.

Ambigapathy (2004, in Ho & Wong, 2004) maintains that textbooks alone cannot be used to accommodate the differing levels of proficiency of students. Students come from diverse backgrounds with distinct localities, socio-economic backgrounds, characters, attainment and linguistic repertoire. Therefore, a single text cannot accommodate everyone's needs. Learning can sometimes be too easy or too difficult. Considering the local setting, the creator of SMARTies attempts to highlight important elements from the 9 headings and thus created SMARTies so that more opportunities for practice can be achieved. Grammar, the sound system and the word list can to be taught. The creator selected the language skills and content placed under *Let's Read, Let's Say It Right, Let's Focus on Grammar, Let's Learn More*, 4 out of the 9 headings found in the textbook. Based on the flow of content in the textbook, when learning a chapter, students learn language items under these 4 headings in isolation. For example, the learning of prepositions of direction under *Let's Focus on Grammar* does not use the reading text given in *Let's Read*.

SMARTies allows learning of selected language items simultaneously. Moreover, questions can be extracted from the corresponding chapter in the textbook. This helps students to make full use of the reading text by exploring and identifying the use of language. In games sold in the market, there is no language focus and students just learn generally. Students cannot relate what they pick up in the games to what is being taught in class.

Limitation of the study

This study is limited to students who volunteered to participate in this game. As such, the findings of this study may not be generalizable to the whole student population in a school or the state.

Research design

Respondents

This study was conducted using a random sampling of 30 students currently studying English as a second language in a national secondary school in the Federal Territory of Labuan. The student volunteers were from Form 1 to Form 5. There was no race or

gender specification for this study as it attempts to look at the outcome of using SMARTies *per se*.

Instrumentation

This research was an experimental study based on the board game SMARTies created and developed for this study. It used a pre-test and post-test to identify, obtain and compare data on students' level of knowledge. The pre-test intended to find out whether students knew the items being tested. It attempted to meet Bloom's first domain of knowledge (1984, cited in Heacox, 2002) taxonomy. This enabled students to exhibit memory of previously-learned materials by recalling terminologies and basic concepts of the target items. Students only needed to acknowledge whether or not they knew the items and if they did, an example should be given.

The administration of the post-test helped establish students' progress upon completion of the experiment. Questions in the post test were derived from the question cards played earlier. The questions tested their domain of knowledge by recalling familiar items. It should be made clear that the conduct of this test does not suggest the researcher's support for pencil-paper test. The test was carried out for the purpose of this research only. The researcher needed to obtain and compare students' performance to further defend the effectiveness of using rhe SMARTies board game.

This study also used a survey questionnaire to find out students' attitudes and beliefs towards using board games in language learning. Section A elicits students' attitude towards using board games. Answers for this section use a "Yes" or "No" indicator. Section B focuses on students' beliefs about using SMARTies as a test and learning alternative. The survey questionnaire included the use of a Likert scale, of which 5 choices were given for each item. The third choice stands as a "not sure" option, allowing the respondent to state a neutral opinion between the two extremes. Section C obtains students' personal views about the benefits and disadvantages of the game. Two questions were open-ended.

Data analysis procedures

The pre-test and post-test conducted were analysed using a paired t-test. Data collected were from the same group of samples from which each individual obtained two scores under different levels of the independent variable. In this pre-test and post-test design, the same sample of individuals obtained a score on the pre-test and after intervention, a score on the post-test is obtained. An additional assumption is noted on the normality of population difference scores. The difference between the scores for each participant should be normally distributed.

Descriptive analysis was used on the data using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) programme. Frequencies, percentages and mean values and standard deviations were computed to capture students' initial knowledge of the language items tested and the progress made afterwards. Similar descriptive analyses were carried out for Section A and B on the data obtained from the survey questionnaire. Content analysis was used for Section C to obtain keywords used by the respondents to report on the advantages and disadvantages of the game.

Research findings

Students' perceptions towards using board games in the language classroom

Table 1 shows that all respondents (N=30) like to play board games while Table 2 shows that only two respondents had never played board games previously. Table 3 shows that only ten respondents (33.3%) had played board games in their English lessons while the remaining 66.67% had never used board games in the classroom. Table 4 and 5 show that all respondents   think that board games should be introduced in the English classroom and they also believe that language board games can help them learn the target language.

Table 1. Do you like to play board games?

	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	Standard deviation
Yes	30	100.00	1.00	.00
No	0	0.00		

Table 2. Have you ever played board games?

	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	Standard deviation
Yes	28	93.33	1.07	.254
No	2	6.67		

Table 3. Have you played board games in any English lessons in school?

	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	Standard deviation
Yes	10	33.33	1.67	.479
No	20	66.67		

Table 4. Should board games be introduced in the English classroom?

	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	Standard deviation
Yes	30	100	1.00	.000
No	0			

Table 5. Do you believe that language board games can help you learn the language?

	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	Standard deviation
Yes	30	100	1.00	.000
No	0	0		

Attitudes towards the design of SMARTies as a testing tool and learning alternative

The results in Table 6 suggest that a majority of the respondents opined that the design of SMARTies corresponds with its acronym of simple, meaningful and rewarding. They responded positively that SMARTies is simple to use, meaningful, academically rewarding and fun and enjoyable.

Table 6. Students' opinion on the design of SMARTies

Beliefs	Answers	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD
Simple to use	Strongly disagree	0	0	4.27	.740
	Disagree	1	3.3		
	Neutral	2	6.7		
	Agree	15	50.0		
	Strongly agree	12	40.00		
Meaningful	Strongly disagree	0	0	4.63	.556
	Disagree	0	0		
	Neutral	1	3.3		
	Agree	9	30.00		
	Strongly agree	20	66.7		
Academically rewarding	Strongly disagree	0	0	4.37	.809
	Disagree	1	3.3		
	Neutral	3	10.0		
	Agree	10	33.3		
	Strongly agree	16	53.3		

Beliefs	Answers	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD
Fun and enjoyable	Strongly disagree	0	0	4.47	.730
	Disagree	0	0		
	Neutral	4	13.3		
	Agree	8	26.7		
	Strongly agree	18	60.0		
Non-threatening test and learning tool	Strongly disagree	0	0	3.93	.868
	Disagree	2	6.7		
	Neutral	6	20.0		
	Agree	14	46.7		
	Strongly agree	8	26.7		
Learn English creatively	Strongly disagree	0	0	4.57	.728
	Disagree	1	3.3		
	Neutral	1	3.3		
	Agree	8	26.7		
	Strongly agree	20	66.7		

Pre-test and post test

Table 7 presents the results of the pre-test conducted for general knowledge, spelling and selected grammatical items. The total shows the number of questions answered correctly by all respondents.

Table 7. Pre-test

General knowledge	Total	Spelling	Total	Grammar/ Language items	Total
G1	30	S1	21	Noun	28
G2	23	S2	17	Verb	26
G3	18	S3	20	Pronoun	8
G4	8	S4	24	Adjective	19
G5	23	S5	16	Adverb	7
G6	29	S6	14	Determiner	0
G7	27	S7	8	Preposition	10
G8	27	S8	3	Conjunction	9

G9	6	S9	8	Direct/indirect	0
G10	1	S10	7	S/present	12
G11	0	S11	15	S/past	19
G12	28	S12	17	S/continuous	5
G13	8	S13	9	P/continuous	1
G14	19	S14	1	S/Future	3
G15	11	S15	19	Gerund	0
G16	5	S16	2	Synonym	20
G17	6	S17	17	Antonym	21
G18	21	S18	2	Homophone	15
G19	11	S19	22	Simile	7
G20	3	S20	1	Idiom	0
				Proverb	0
				Abbreviation	3
Total	274		243		213

Table 8 shows the results of the post-test conducted for general knowledge, spelling and selected grammatical items. The total shows the number of questions answered correctly by all respondents.

Table 8. Post-test

General knowledge	Total	Spelling	Total	Grammar/ Language items	Total
G1	30	S1	18	Noun	24
G2	29	S2	30	Verb	27
G3	27	S3	30	Pronoun	24
G4	28	S4	30	Adjective	25
G5	30	S5	20	Adverb	19
G6	30	S6	27	Determiner	23
G7	29	S7	26	Preposition	21
G8	30	S8	17	Conjunction	21
G9	26	S9	27	Direct/indirect	6
G10	26	S10	27	S/present	25

G11	22	S11	29	S/past	18
G12	29	S12	28	S/continuous	12
G13	29	S13	29	P/continuous	23
G14	26	S14	27	S/Future	25
G15	25	S15	30	Gerund	25
G16	29	S16	28	Synonym	30
G17	19	S17	30	Antonym	30
G18	29	S18	27	Homophone	30
G19	29	S19	30	Simile	25
G20	25	S20	29	Idiom	18
				Proverb	23
				Abbreviation	28
	547		539		510

Table 9 presents the summary of the pre-test and post-test analysis. The summary shows that there is an increase of 46.00 % for general knowledge, 50.50 % for spelling and 47.98% for grammatical items.

Table 9. Summary of pre-test and post-test analysis

	Pre-test scores	Percentage	Post test scores	Percentage	Increment scores	Increment percentage
General knowledge	274	46.67%	547	91.17%	273	44.5%
Spelling	243	40.50%	539	89.83%	296	49.33%
Grammar/ Language items	213	32.27%	510	77.27%	297	45.00%

In order to determine if the use of SMARTies board game helps students' language learning, a paired-sample *t-test* analysis was performed. The results of the analysis showed a significant difference between pre (M=24.00, SD=7.629) and post-test scores (M=53.20, SD= 4.491), t(29)= -17.723, p<.05). The results indicate that the students' performance in the post test was significantly higher than that in the pre-test. The results suggest that SMARTies can improve students' language learning. In other words, the results suggest that when students use board games such as SMARTies, their language learning can improve.

Students' beliefs about using SMARTies as a testing tool and learning alternative

The results of the survey conducted in Table 10 suggest that a majority of the respondents believed that SMARTies can help them in learning the target language. Most of them strongly agreed that SMARTies serves its purpose in assisting language learning. Learning similes and homophones showed the highest rating of strongly agree at 73.3% (n=22) followed by spelling at 70% (n=21).

Table 10. Students' beliefs in using SMARTies as a testing tool and learning alternative

Beliefs	Answers	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD
Improve general knowledge	Strongly disagree	0	0	4.50	.731
	Disagree	1	3.3		
	Neutral	1	3.3		
	Agree	10	33.3		
	Strongly agree	18	60.0		
Improve spelling	Strongly disagree	0	3.3	4.63	.669
	Disagree	1	0		
	Neutral	0	0		
	Agree	8	26.7		
	Strongly agree	21	70.0		
Improve	Strongly disagree	0	0	4.53	.629

Beliefs	Answers	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD
grammar	Disagree	0	0		
	Neutral	2	6.7		
	Agree	10	33.3		
	Strongly agree	18	60.0		
Improve	Strongly disagree	0	0	4.63	.556
vocabulary	Disagree	0	0		
	Neutral	1	3.3		
	Agree	9	30.0		
	Strongly agree	20	66.7		
Improve	Strongly disagree	0	0	4.60	.621
synonyms	Disagree	0	0		
	Neutral	2	6.7		
	Agree	8	26.7		
	Strongly agree	20	66.7		
Improve	Strongly disagree	0	0	4.50	.682
antonyms	Disagree	0	0		
	Neutral	3	10		
	Agree	9	30		
	Strongly agree	18	60		
Learn similes	Strongly disagree	0	0	4.57	.606
	Disagree	0	0		

Beliefs	Answers	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD
	Neutral	2	6.7		
	Agree	6	20.0		
	Strongly agree	22	73.3		
Learn	Strongly disagree	0	0	4.63	.718
homophones	Disagree	1	3.3		
	Neutral	1	3.3		
	Agree	6	20.0		
	Strongly agree	22	73.3		
Learn proverbs	Strongly disagree	0	0	4.53	.681
and idioms	Disagree	0	0		
	Neutral	3	10		
	Agree	8	26.7		
	Strongly agree	19	63.3		
Learn	Strongly disagree	0	0	4.50	.820
abbreviation	Disagree	1	3.3		
	Neutral	3	10.0		
	Agree	6	20.0		
	Strongly agree	20	66.7		

The strengths and weaknesses of using SMARTies

Based on their opinions, respondents generally felt that SMARTies is fun, helps them learn and improves their English proficiency in an enjoyable and challenging manner. Respondents recommended that SMARTies be introduced in the classroom setting and played by more students. Some requested more challenging and interesting questions. One respondent suggested SMARTies be created as computer software.

Discussion

The majority of the students indicated that they like playing board games but not many were able to play during language lessons. They believed that board games should be introduced in the English classroom as language board games could possibly help them learn the target language. This reinforces the claim by Gaudart (2003) that teachers rarely make use of games and play in the formal classroom setting. It might also due to the fact that there are not many educational language-focused board games available in the market.

Brown (2004) acknowledges that tests in any classroom setting are not likely be something positive, pleasant and affirming. Test takers are often worried about their performance as the result might determine their future undertakings. However, the use of SMARTies appears to produce contrary results. Most respondents favour SMARTies

over the traditional paper test. They agreed that SMARTies is simple to use. They also strongly agreed that this board game is meaningful, academically rewarding, fun and enjoyable. SMARTIes is not a threatening test and learning tool.

It was noted that in the pre-test, a majority of students could neither answer general knowledge questions nor spell words correctly. They were also not able to identify and give examples of selected grammatical items. After playing SMARTies for a minimum of two times, students were able to perform better. There was an increase of 46.00 % for general knowledge, 50.50 % for spelling and 47.98% for grammatical items. Students also indicated in the survey questionnaire that SMARTies did help them learn and improve the items tested.

On the positive side, SMARTies is reported to be fun for the players involved. It helped them learn and improve their English proficiency in an enjoyable and challenging manner. Respondents suggested that SMARTies could be a better board game if more challenging and interesting questions were included. They recommended it to be introduced in the classroom setting and played by more students.

The study shows that the use of language board games is well accepted by students. It is able to assist learners in learning a target language. It is even more favourable when evidence shows that there are improvements in the areas tested. Learners become more

aware of the language items, thus reinforcing the belief that traditional classroom teaching is not the only way of disseminating knowledge. Brown (2004) points out that for optimal learning to take place, it is necessary for students to have freedom to experiment, to try out their own hypotheses about the language concerned without feeling that their overall competence is being judged. Brown explains that learners must have wider opportunities to use the language in the classroom without the fear of being formally assessed and graded.

Teacher-centred classrooms and an examination-oriented educational system should not be the common platform of excuses in the journey towards educational excellence. This study was carried out to look into other alternatives of teaching and learning a language. It took into account the current syllabus in use and the expectations of learners for a more enjoyable, interesting, fun and meaningful manner.

This study also shows the positive aspects of introducing board game and reinforces previous findings on the advantages of using games in language teaching and learning. There are always better alternatives to help teachers teach creatively than the renowned chalk-and-talk. Opportunities for language practice are always present when much thought is invested. Teachers have always been encouraged to be innovative and creative. Teachers who introduce new yet practical teaching and learning tools can help students in

learning the target language. However, extra care must be taken so that the innovation has an educational value and reachable objectives.

SMARTies is one of the many innovative tools to start with. This board game started out as the creator's action research project to inject fun and to break the monotonous daily teaching and learning activity. It became a starting point to informally assess students' strengths and weaknesses on the content studied in their textbook. It may be difficult to clearly identify what students know and do not know as some may either be too shy to ask or prefer to keep their thoughts to themselves. Some even prefer to ignore the problem, thinking that they have nothing to lose. By the end of the day, their competency is only measured by the examination conducted at the end of the year.

SMARTies is one way which a teacher can use to extract and highlight important focus areas for additional attention. A teacher may complete teaching a specific thematic-chapter but there is lack of opportunity to appreciate the language use, forms and functions. Certain words and phrases could be very useful for students to adopt in their speaking and writing. Therefore, when using SMARTies, the teacher can select relevant language items and put them into the question cards. Students who play the game would come across these items and thus learn them when they get the cards. In the process of playing, students may directly or indirectly exhibit their level of understanding. Students who know the answer would be able to answer and vice versa. Teacher may come in to

assess students' achievement and progress. If the teacher needs to know for which question students need remedial treatment and enrichment, notes should be taken.

Since one of the functions of SMARTies is to assess students with the purpose of helping them to improve on specific subject matter, the teacher could plan remedial and follow up activities. This would help enhance and reinforce students' understanding of the subject needing attention. Teacher may also want to give supplementary assignments and homework so that weaker students can be more successful.

Conclusion

SMARTies today serves as an innovation for the language classroom which could be used as a language board game for entertainment and also a testing tool for teachers. It is something unique as it integrates selected language items found in the textbook. A teacher is free to select any chapter from the textbook to informally assess students on their understanding of the content and the language used. Teachers are assured that the introduction of games in the classroom is still within the prescribed syllabus and the items assessed are from the corresponding chapter. Currently, there is no such board game available in the Malaysian market.

This study on theeffectiveness of SMARTies was done on a small-scale in a specific school. If teachers wish to widen the scope of language elements to be tested, they may add more to the board. They may also produce more cards so that the game takes a longer time to play. Further study is needed to further determine the success of using SMARTies on a larger scale. Nonetheless, this study has shown that using games in the classroom offers advantages especially when the identified language aspects have been truly considered.

References

Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment: principles and classroom practices*. New
York: Pearson Education, Inc.

Chitravelu, N., Sithamparam, S. & Teh, S. C. (1995). *ELT methodology: principles and
practice*. Selangor: Penerbit Fajar Bakti Sdn. Bhd.

Choy, S. C. & Troudi, S. (2006). An investigation into the changes in perceptions of and
attitudes towards learning English in a Malaysian college. *International Journal of
Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 18*(2), 120-130.

Fauziah Hassan & Nita Fauzee Selamat. (2002). Why aren't students proficient in ESL:
the teachers' perspective. *The English Teacher*. Retrieved October 27, 2011 from
http://www.melta.org.my/ET/2002/wp10.htm

Gaudart, H. (2003). *English language teaching practices*. Selangor: Sasbadi Sdn. Bhd.

Heacox, D. (2002). *Differentiating instruction in the regular classroom: how to reach
and teach all learners, grade 3-12*. Minnesota: Free Spirit Publishing, Inc.

Hong, L. (2002, August). Using games in teaching English to young learners. *The
Internet TESL   Journal, 3*(8). Retrieved August 18, 2010 from
http://iteslj.org/Lessons/Lin-UsingGames.html

Ho, C. C. (2010). *Review of teaching and learning of science and mathematics in schools*. Academy of Sciences Malaysia. Retrieved August 30, 2010 from http://www.akademisains.gov.my/download/relatednews/sci_math/Review.pdf

Ho, W. K. & Wong, Y. L. (Ed) (2004). *English language teaching in East Asia today: changing policies and practices*. Singapore: Eastern Universities Press.

Nayar, P. B. (2008, December). English in Kerala: Plus ça change? *TESL-EJ, 12*(3). Retrieved August 30, 2010 from http://tesl-ej.org/ej47/a1.html

Read, C. (2007). *500 activities for the primary classroom*. Oxford: Macmillan.

Tharman Shanmugaratnam (2004). Speech by Education Minister of Singapore. MOE Work   Plan Seminar 2004. Retrieved from http://www.moe.gov.sg/media/speeches/2004/sp20040929.htm

Uberman, A. (1998, Jan-Mac). The use of games for vocabulary presentation and revision. *English Teaching Forum*, 36(1). Retrieved August 18, 2010 fromhttp://eca.state.gov/forum/vols/vol36/no1/p20.htm

Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning*. England: Addison Longman Limited.

APPENDIX

Description of SMARTies

Objective

To collect as many points by answering questions correctly on each card (see Figure 1).

Setting up

1. Make sure the inventory is checked

    -   Game board
    -   One dice/spin
    -   20 general knowledge cards
    -   20 spelling cards
    -   20 grammar cards
    -   20 synonym cards
    -   20 antonym cards
    -   20 homophone cards
    -   20 simile cards
    -   20 proverb/idiom cards
    -   20 abbreviation cards

How to play

1. After the game board has been placed on the table, put the question cards faced down in the middle of the board, arranged according to colours.
2. Appoint one "Professor". This person will be in charge of ensuring the game is played fairly. He/she will verify answers given by players. The mentioned

professor will also pick the spelling card on behalf of the player who has to spell a word written on the card.

2. Each player should choose a player token (coin, sweets and other miniature items can be used) and place their token on the "START" space which acts as the starting point for the game to begin or end.

3. To begin the game, each player will roll the dice once. The highest throw will go first. The first player will roll the dice again and advance his/her token around the board the number of spaces indicated by the dice. The process continues for the following player.

4. The player will continue playing based on the type of space he/she lands on. The player must answer the question in the card and points stated on the card will be awarded if the answer is correct. Otherwise, he/she loses a turn.

5. Landing on "Smart Points" means the player gains 20 points for free.

6. Your turn ends when you land yourself in "Detention" or when the cards are finished.

7. The player with the most points wins the game.

Figure 1. The SMARTies board game