



DEVELOPING PARAGRAPH WRITING INTEGRATED WITH VERBS PHRASE THROUGH RUN BOARD GAME

Minguelita da Silva Carvalho¹, Sebastião Pereira^{2*}, Jose A. Sarmento³, Pedro da Costa⁴
Institute Superior Cristal, Dili, Timor Leste ^{1,2,3,4}

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 23-05-2025

Accepted: 25-06-2025

Published: 13-07-2025

Keyword: developing paragraph writing, run board game, classroom action research

ABSTRACT

The objectives of this study were to find out the improvement in writing skills of eighth-grade students of Ensino Basico 3 Ciclo Cristal, Dili, in the school year 2024 and their levels in using short paragraphs through to the Run Board game. The methods used in this study were descriptive of quantitative and qualitative methods. The sample used in this study was 25 students in the eighth grade of Ensino Basico 3 Ciclo Cristal, Dili, in the school year 2024. The instruments were verbs, phrases, cards/envelopes, and pictures of my everyday activity. This test was divided into two (2) types, pre-test and post-test, and there was a treatment between them. The pre-test result shows that the eighth-grade students' writing ability only got 527 scores of 21,08. That was only categorized in seventh (7) levels. Firstly, two (2) students were categorized at good level 8%. One (1) student was categorized at a pretty good level of 4%, seventh (7) students were categorized at average level 28%, six (6) students were categorized at below-average level 24%, three (3) students were categorized at poor level 12%, five (5) students were categorized at inferior level 20% and one (1) student were categorized at bad level 4%. None of the students was rated at an excellent level. However, after the writer took action (treatment), the writer explained in detail about writing in a short paragraph, showed a picture of my everyday activity, and gave an example of Run to the board game; the result presented a different categorized level in post-test. They reached 820 scores with 32.8%. Firstly, none of the students were categorized as having a poor level. While ten (10) students were categorized at excellent level 40%, six (6) students were categorized as excellent level 24%, seven (7) students were categorized as good level 28%, and two (2) students were categorized at fairly good level 8%. Finally, the result showed that ten (10) students did better in the post-test than in the pre-test. This

means that the method of teaching writing skills in short paragraphs through Run to the board game is suitable for teaching writing skills.

INTRODUCTION

In the national curriculum of Education in Timor-Leste, English is a compulsory subject to be taught and learned as a foreign language for students from seventh to the university level. English is the most favorable language for students who want to access any foreign scholarship. English is starting to be taught in grade eight, focusing on grammar, vocabulary, reading, listening, speaking, and writing skills. Among these skills of the English language, writing skill is one of the most difficult to learn and understand by students in grade Eight, as the researcher based her direct observed through the teaching practice that took 3 months in students grade Eight at Cristal school that students could not write any single sentence or a short paragraph.

Therefore, the writer would need to teach the grade eight students paragraph writing through the Run Board game to teach the EFL learners how to write paragraphs with a well-formed structure and correct grammar. Paragraph writing is composed of several simple sentences that have meaning and reflect the content of the paragraph. However, the writing skill focuses on how the students produce short paragraph writing skills through Run the board games.

Based on the paragraph above, the students must know how to write words, clauses, phrases, and sentences with the correct written forms, such as handwriting or typing, and spelling, based on each punctuation mark (Ur, 1996). Related to the purpose of teaching writing, the first step in teaching writing skills is teaching capitalization and punctuation as parts of the mechanics of writing, as well as recognition of whole sentences and paragraphs (Celce-Murcia, 2001; Harmer, 2004). It will help the students correctly write capital letters, recognize letters, and move from letters to words, meaningful sentences, and larger discourse units.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: mynof2@gmail.com (Nofi Maria Dyaningsih)*, dwi.sulistyrorini.fs@um.ac.id (Dwi Sulistyrorini), bu.titich@ecampus.ut.ac.id (Titi Chandrawati).

ISSN: 2523-613X (Online) - ISCE: Journal of Innovative Studies on Character and Education is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

A short paragraph is part of a piece of writing that usually deals with one subject that begins on a new line and that is made up of one or more sentences (Wikipedia). On the other hand, Martin H. Manser. (1991) argued that writing is a process of transferring ideas into written form, which is understandable. When writing a text, the students must pay attention to the content, organization, vocabulary, structure and grammar, language, and mechanism. Writing skills are important to understand to develop paragraphs into meaningful compositions. It includes ideas, paragraph unity, sentence pattern, grammar, correct punctuation, spelling, and capitalization.

A writer needs writing skills to present ideas through a mechanically correct written text. The impact of mechanically correct written text is that it helps readers comprehend the message easily and correctly. The writer and the readers may misunderstand the writing text because writing is translating thoughts from a writer to readers. Therefore, a writer needs to use correct scripts, spelling, and punctuation to avoid mistakes and errors in writing (cited in Javed, Juan, & Nazli, 2013). As Richards (1990) says, written language aims to convey information accurately, effectively, and appropriately.

Furthermore, Crème and Lea (2003) mentioned that writing consists of words in a particular pattern to make sentences. This means that writing is an activity that arranges words into sentences, sentences into paragraphs, and paragraphs into a good text.

This research applied the game to teaching English because, hopefully, it can help students enrich their base experience and stimulus responses for the development of writing, recalling the vocabulary so that they can easily express their ideas or opinions in a sentence or paragraph.

There are so many types of games, and the teacher can choose one that is compatible with the students. One simple game that can be applied to English class is board games. Studying with board games might be more exciting since it also requires students' competitiveness. Their eagerness to become the best among their groups will motivate them to study better.

The study is about improving students' writing skills on short paragraphs through the use of Run Board games by the grade eight students of Ensino Basico CRISTAL, Dili, in the school year 2024. Does the Run Board game develop writing

skills? Are there any significant differences between before and after the implementation of teaching writing skills with the Run Board game?

METHOD

This Chapter discusses the research design, the subject of the study, the research instrument, the technique of data collecting, the technique of data analyzing,

Creswell (2009; p.3) defines research design as “a plan and procedures for a research that spans the decision from board assumption to the detailed method of data collection and analysis.” Thus, Stringer (2014) states that “the purpose of action research aims to discover new facts, or revising accepted law or theories to acquire information having practical application to the solution of specific problems related to certain work.”

In this research, the writer applies classroom action research to the proper strategy of Run Board games: teachers teaching writing to seventh-grade students.

Population of the Study. Johnson and Christensen (2012; p. 218) state that “population is the total number of inhabitants; race, class or a group in a specific area.” The population of this study is the students of Ensino Básico 3 Ciclo Cristal, Dili, in the school year 2024.

Sample of the Study. Johnson and Christensen (2012; p. 212) clarified that a “sample is a set of elements taken from a large population according to certain rules.” According to both definitions above, the sample of this study will be selected from the 25 students of grade eight in Escola Ensino Basico Cristal Dili in the school year 2024 to represent all students.

The instrument used to gather the data, the writer provides 25 phrasal verbs to be developed as the paragraph writing test in one set of pre-tests and post-tests.

The data in this study were collected from two sources: library and field research, as presented below.

Library Research. The writer conducts the library study to find some sources to support her ideas, such as books, the internet, and other electronic devices that relate to the definition of writing and Run Board games as supporting ideas. It needs to start with the general and specific topic of the resources related to the study.

Field Research. After library research, the writer carried out field research to find out the students' ability and level of understanding in using short paragraph writing through board games. This field research dealt with secondary data collection for this study.

Furthermore, the data collected by Kemmis, S. (2011) has developed a cyclical nature of the typical Classroom Action Research process, which involves the following steps: *plan, action, observation, and Reaction*.

Population of the Study. Johnson and Christensen (2012; p. 218) state that "population is the total number of inhabitants; race, class or a group in a specific area." The population of this study is the students of Ensino Básico 3 Ciclo Cristal, Dili, in the school year 2024.

Sample of the Study. Johnson and Christensen (2012; p. 212) clarified that a "sample is a set of elements taken from a large population according to certain rules." According to both definitions above, the sample of this study will be selected from the 25 students of grade eight in Escola Ensino Basico Cristal Dili in the school year 2024 to represent all students.

The instrument used to gather the data, the writer provides 25 phrasal verbs to be developed as the paragraph writing test in one set of pre-tests and post-tests.

The data in this study were collected from two sources: library and field research, as presented below.

Library Research. The writer conducts the library study to find some sources to support her ideas, such as books, the internet, and other electronic devices that relate to the definition of writing and Run Board games as supporting ideas. It needs to start with the general and specific topic of the resources relatrelatehtotudy.

Field Research. After library research, the writer carried out field research to find out the student's ability and level of understanding in using short paragraph writing through board games. This field research dealt with secondary data collection for this study.

Furthermore, the data collected by Kemmis, S. (2011) has developed a cyclical nature of the typical Classroom Action Research process, which involves the following steps: *plan, action, observation, and Reaction*.

PLAN. The activities that have been planned are preparing the pre-test and post-test test items, teaching material, and designing the lesson plan. The writer designs the lesson plan and elaborates the pre-test of paragraph writing to administer the test. Preparing the teaching material integrated with the lesson plan pre, paring the list of students' names and preparing to teach (*color, pen, board, and markers*) through the types of spelling bees, preparing the classroom observation sheet, and preparing a test (to know how far student's knowledge of grammar, vocabulary, meaning, and mechanism in writing).

ACTION. The activities will be conducted here: The researcher administers the pre-test—teaching how to write paragraph writing through a Run Board game to encourage the students to learn english paragraph writing sentences. The researcher briefly explains and guides the students to learn based on the lesson plan. The researcher gives opportunities to the students to ask about difficulties or problems. The researcher asks the students to answer orally and then checks the students' understanding. The teacher administering post-testing will be the last meeting. The researcher will get the declaration letter of the research.

OBSERVATION. Observation is one of the instruments used to collect the data as a direct observation in the classroom, which will be observed by the local English teacher to the researcher. In this step of action, research can be systematically used to observe and note all of the phenomena through investigation, like the students' feelings, perceptions, and thinking, the performance of teaching, and the learning process about teaching paragraph writing through Run a board game as a strategy that can be observed through the observation sheet that has been provided.

The researcher observes all the activities in the teaching and learning process and creates a conducive atmosphere in the classroom observation to make collaborative efforts to explore teaching possibilities. It is proposed to create the student's motivation to learn. In Classroom Action Research, the researcher, as the English teacher, observes every action of teaching and learning process sheets as follows:

The researcher used an observation sheet to analyze the condition when the class ran. The local English teacher observed the researcher's performance in teaching paragraph writing to collect the data, which is shown in the following table.

Activities	Observation				
	Excellent	Very good	Good	Average	Low
Pre-test	5	4	3	2	1
1. Opening/greetings					
2. Asking condition (how are you?)					
3. Attendance					
4. Introduction of teaching material					
5. Motivation					
6. Explanation					
7. English Paragraph Writing					
8. Runa Board Games					
9. Exercise					
10. Checking students understanding/concluding					
Total	4	3	3		
Process of Teaching					
1. Teacher prepares the teaching material					

2. Students self-introduction					
3. Questions and answer					
4. Students pay attention of teacher's explanation					
5. Students feel happy to enjoy the class					
6. Students have to be active in class					
7. Students were tested orally.					
8. Exercises					
9. Checking students understanding					
10. Post –test					
Σ	7x5	6x4	7x3		
Σ	35	24	21		
Score	80				

Table 3.4.2: Presents the Classroom Observation Sheet

REFLECTION. Reflection is an activity in expressing experience, which the teacher does as self-evaluation. The teacher makes evaluations based on observation to find the weaknesses of the activities carried out through the runa board as a strategy for teaching English paragraph writing. Therefore, it could be determined how effective using Run Board games as a technique of teaching English paragraph writing is. The writer analyses the results of the pre-test and post-test mean scores, and both are to be compared.

This data analysis will be collected from two types of research.

Non-test. The writer observes class teaching and learning process activities as shown in Table 3.4.2 Classroom Observation sheet above. Test. The writer will administer the *pre-test* and *post-test* of English paragraph writing skills, presented as tabulation and compared. It is important to know the significant differences between before and after the implementation of teaching paragraph writing through a Run Board game—mean score. Mean is the average from the division between sums of students' scoring with the Total number of respondents. The research applied the following formula are

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\Sigma X}{N}$$

X = score

N = number of students

Σ = sum or add

1. The formula of T-test dependent means are;

$$\text{T-test} = \frac{\Sigma D}{\sqrt{\frac{n(\Sigma D^2) - (\Sigma D)^2}{n-1}}}$$

Suhararimi, A. (1987) presents the basis of education evaluation as getting the average score. She compares the percentage with the criteria adopted to measure the classroom observation sheet in the table below:

No	Range	Level
01	9.6-1.0	Excellent
02	9.5-8.6	Very good
03	8.5-7.6	Good
04	7.5-6.6	Fair good
05	6.5-5.6	Average
06	5.5-4.6	Sufficient
07	4.5-3.6	Below average
08	3.5-2.6	Poor
09	2.5-1.6	Bad
10	1.5-0.0	Very bad

Table 3.4.3: Standard of Measurement Usually Uses in The Local School Follow

RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS

The researcher used a test Verb Phrase (descriptive test) card or envelope game to test students' writing skills. This study was to find out the students' improvement and the level of English writing skills through run to the board game. The data was taken from the two cycles: pre-test t, and cy, the second post-test. The pre-test and post-test scores were taken in four (4) criteria: vocabulary, meaning, grammar structure, and content mechanics.

The Result of the First Cycle (Pre-test)

The writer administered the pre-test to the students without teaching them in order to determine the students' basic knowledge of writing skills. In the pre-test, the writer tested the students by giving the papers for students and telling them to write about (their everyday activities by Run a board game).

The means score of **PRE-TEST** above indicates the total result of writing skills scores in pre-test from the 25 students on eighth-grade students of Ensino Básico 30 Ciclo Cristal, Dili, in the school year 2024. The eighth graders' writing skills ability is **5.3**, and they are classified as **poor**.

Based on the standard of measurement below, the mean score of the pre-test, 5.3, does not achieve a passing grade. This is why the researcher must continue to teach short paragraph writing skills through Run Board Game.

The results of the students' categorized pre-test level show that three (3) students were categorized as poor, with 12%. Then, five (5) students were categorized at an inferior

level with 20%. Then, four (4) students were categorized at a bad level with 4%. Then, seventh (7) students categorized average level 28%. Then, six (6) students were categorized below the average level of 24%. Then, two (2) students were categorized as good at 8%. Lastly, one (1) student categorized fairly good level 4%. However, none of the students were categorized as excellent. It can be seen that the students were categorized as having a poor level. This means the students need treatment by using the run-to-the-board game.

The individual percentage is in four components. There was one of the students got 7%, seventh of the students got 6.75%, five of the students got 5.75%, three of the students got 4.75%, six of the students got 3.25%, one of the students got 2,5%, and one of the students got 8.5%. The higher percentages of the results were 8.5%, and the lowest was 2.5%.

The results of students' percentages in categorized levels. Ten students were categorized as poor, with 40%. Then, eight students were categorized at a sufficient level, with 32%, and a seventh of the students were categorized at a reasonable level, with 28%. None of the students were categorized at an excellent level. The higher score of the pre-test was at a sufficient level, with 40%, and the lower was at a good level, with 28%. There is no student categorized at an excellent level.

The results of each student's vocabulary ability. One student got scores of 9, one student got scores of 8, three students got scores of 7, six students got scores of 6, seventh students got scores of 5, four students got scores of 4, and three students got scores of 3. It can be seen that one student got the higher score, but three students got the lower scores of vocabulary.

The results of each student's ability in grammar and structure. One student got scores of 8, five students got scores of 7, seven students got scores of 6, five students got scores of 5, two students got scores of 4, three students got scores of 3, and two students got scores of 2. It can be seen that one student got higher scores, and two students got lower scores in grammar and structure.

The results of each student's ability in the content and mechanics. There were two students got a score of 9, three students got a score of 8, two students got a score of 7, four students got a score of 6, three students got a score of 5, two students got a score of 4, six students got a score of 3, and two students got scores of 2. It can be seen that two students got a higher score, and one student got a lower score in the content and mechanics.

The results of each student's ability are shown below. Three students got scores of 8, four got scores of 7, nine got scores of 6, two got scores of 5, two got scores of 4, two got

scores of 3, and three got scores of 2. It can be seen that three students got a higher score of 8, and three students got a lower score of 2.

In the pre-test, the writer observed that all students faced difficulties in writing the vocabulary, grammar structure, content mechanics, and meaning in answering the questions in writing skills. In addition, the main issues were not mechanics and grammar. However, some students did not improve their writing in their sentences. Some students have limited vocabulary, which makes it hard to write. Some students wrote using basic English to answer the questions, although the grammar was incorrect.

The writing skills in English of eighth-grade students at Ensino Básico 30 Ciclo Cristal, Dili, were low and needed improvement. Therefore, the writer implemented the run-to-board game method in the treatment before the post-test to measure the students' improvement in writing skills.

The results and their percentages in writing skill in several components in the pre-test, such as the students' improvement in vocabulary component was with 5,36 %, the students' improvement in grammar and structure component was with 5,24%, the students' improvement in content and mechanic component was with 5,04%, and the students' improvement in meaning component was with 5,44%. So, the higher result for each component was 5,44%, and the lower was for content mechanics with 5,04%.

Implementing the Classroom Action Research as the following steps;

Treatment plan. After conducting the the pre-test, the writer did the following steps for the teaching process: planned and reflected on the results of the information test. Prepared the lesson plan based on what the informants need to improve. Prepared material for the teaching process. Prepared the checklist for observation (writing skills).

Action. In this action, the writer planned and carried out the method for implementing the activities used in this study, which were presented in plans using verb phrases. Moreover, the writer planned to explain the instructions for writing a short paragraph about running to the board game by using a card or envelope in the piece of picture my everyday activities (run to the board game), then practice writing in front of the board. Then, running to a board game is implemented.

Implementing treatment. The students needed some practice before the presentation. The writer gave the example of verb phrases for students to practice how to write short paragraphs and sentences, use content mechanics, vocabulary, grammar structure, and meaning in English writing, and understand what questions are about the

writer asked the students to answer based on each question. After practicing, the writer asked each student to produce sentences using the verb phrase and present them in front of the class. During the student's presentation, the writer found the level of students' components of writing skill, such as; "vocabulary, grammar structure, content mechanic and meaning."

Observing. The writer observed the students' works in the first circle on mistakes that students made, such as errors in writing in English, grammatical mistakes, and difficulty forming English sentences. Therefore, the writer reflected and planned before acting in the class.

Reflecting. The writer reflected on the student's results in the first circle or pre-test, which showed that most students were poor in the four components. Then, the writer planned and acted to solve the problem that students faced. So, in the post-test, the students did better after implementing the method of running a board game.

The result of the mean score of post-tests (cycle one of post-test)

After implementing the run-to-the-board game technique, the writer administered the post-test to 25 students to teach short-paragraph writing.

First, in exercise 1 (practice), the teacher puts students to work and gives them answers to the questions on paper by following the instructions. One student takes the question, and another student answers the question. Do it by changing the position until you finish the questions of the verb phrase (my everyday activity).

Secondly, exercise 2 (presentation). The teacher put students in the normal sitting and then instructed them to do and/or answer the question of verb phrases by following the instructions. One student asked a question and then wrote it on the board.

Lastly, the post-test was administered to them to determine the improvement of students' writing of short paragraph writing skills after the action or treatment about the verb phrase by running to the board game.

The scores were concluded from four components of writing skill: vocabulary, grammar and structure, content mechanics, and meaning. The result of the short paragraph writing skill test in post-test from 25 students of the eighth grade of Ensino Básico 3^o Ciclo Cristal, Dili, in the school year 2024. The ability of eighth-grade writing skill mark is 7.9, which is classified as a **GOOD Level**.

The results of the students' categorized level in the post-test showed that none were categorized as poor, with 0a %. Then, ten (10) students were categorized at an excellent

level with 40%, and six (6) students at an excellent level with 24%. Then, seven (7) students were categorized at a good level of 28%, and two (2) students were categorized at a pretty good 8%. The students were categorized at a reasonable level. Moreover, ten (10) students were categorized at an excellent level, which did not happen in the pre-test.

The individual students' percentages in four components of the post-test. Ten of the students got 9%, six of the students got 8.75%, seven of the students got 7.75%, and two of the students got 6.75%. The data shows that the higher percentages of the results were 9%, which belongs to students with no 2,4,5,6,8,9,11,13,16,17, and the lowest was 6.755%, which belongs to students with no 18 and 25.

The results of students' percentages in categorized level. None of the students were categorized as a poor level. Then, ten of the students were categorized at an excellent level with 40%, six of the students were categorized at a very good level with 24%, seven of the students were categorized at a reasonable level with 28%, and two students were categorized at a pretty good level with 8%. Most of the students were categorized at an excellent level. There was none of the students categorized at a poor level.

The results of each student's improvement in vocabulary. There were threatened students who got scores of 9, eight who got scores of 8, and four who got scores of 7. It can be seen that threatened students got the higher scores of four, and students who got the lower scores of one in the vocabulary.

The results of each student's improvement in grammar structure. Ten students got scores of 9, eight got scores of 8, and five got scores of 7. It can be seen that ten of the students got higher scores, and five students got lower scores in grammar structure.

The results of each student's improvement in grammar: Sixteen students got scores of 9, four got scores of 8, four got scores of 7, and one got scores of 6. Sixteen students got higher scores in the content mechanic, and one got lower scores.

The results of each student's improvement in the meaning component. Twelve students got scores of 9, three students got scores of 8, eight students got scores of 7, and two students got scores of 6. It can be seen that twelve students got higher scores, and two students got a lower score of one in the meaning component.

After implementing the method in treatment, the writer observed that the last post-test showed the most improvement in student's writing skills in short paragraphs by running to the board game. It was because there were none of the students who could be put at a poor level, and most of the students had different results in improving four components of writing skills: grammar structure, vocabulary, meaning, and content mechanics. Overall,

the writer was satisfied with teaching writing running to the board game. This is because the students showed different results in terms of improvement between the pre-test and post-test. A few students were still having difficulty with content mechanics and grammar structure.

The results and their percentages in writing skill in several components in post-test; such as the student's improvement in vocabulary component was 8,36%, the students' improvement in grammar structure component was 8,04%, the students' improvement in content mechanic component was 8,4%, and the students'

Improvement in the meaning component was 8%. So, the higher result of each component was in content mechanic 8,4%, and the lower result was meaning with 8%.

The pre-test and post-test were the same test. Overall, the table below presents the comparison between students' percentages in the pre-test and post-test results.

The results and percentages of comparison between pre-test and post-test; such as, in the pre-test, two students were categorized at a reasonable level with 8%, one student was at a pretty good level with 4%, and seventh of students was at an average level with 28%. Six students were at below-average level, 24%. Three students were poor level 12%. Five students were at an inferior level of 20 %. Lastly, one was at a bad level of 4%. Moreover, none of the students was categorized at an excellent level.

However, after the writer implemented the treatment and method teaching for the students before the post-test in the classroom, the students showed different results, and percentages in the post-test were improved; for example, in the post-test, there none of the students categorized as a poor level, the excellent level was ten of students with 40%. Six students were rated at an excellent level, with 24%. Then, a seventh of the students were categorized at a reasonable level, with 28%. Two students were at a good level of 8%. The post-test result showed that the students had improved their knowledge after the treatment.

Students' individual results in pre-test and post-test were compared in four categories. The blue bar indicates the total scores of the pre-test, and the red bar indicates the total scores of the post-test. Students' numbers from 1 to 25 and 10 to 36 showed the comparison of individual scores of students in pre-test and post-test.

The pre-test and the d post-test results show that, before treatment, t, the students only got a total score of 527 in the pre-test. There was two of the students got 8 scores, one of the students got 7 scores, the seventh student got 6 scores, six students got 5 scores, three

students got 4 scores, five students got 3 scores, one student got 2 scores, the higher was (8) cores and the lowest was (2) scores.

Meanwhile, the student's results in the post-test showed that the students improved after treatment. The students reached a total of 820 scores post-test. As demonstrated, ten students got 9 scores, six got 8, six got 7, and the work of the students got 6 scores. The highest score of the result was 9, and the lowest was 6. The data shows that the students got different scores between the pre-test and post-test.

Then, the following graphic presented the improvement of each component in the pre-test and post-test.

The percentage of students' category levels of each component in pre-test and post-test. Moreover, the writer found that the students' skills were sufficient in the pre-test session. The problem that students faced in the pre-test was that they did not have the confidence to write on the board. Second, the students had limited vocabulary. Third, the students made grammatical mistakes. Lastly, most students did not know how to use punctuation, commas, and how to start and end sentences. Therefore, it is difficult for students to form and create sentences on writing skills; for example, in the pre-test, the results show that the students scored 527 with 21.08%%. Moreover, the content mechanic scores were 126 with 5,04%, vocabulary score 134 with 5,36%, grammar structure score 131 with 5,24%, and meaning score 136 with 5,44%. The results showed that the vocabulary scores were higher than the content mechanic.

However, after the writer implemented the treatment and method teaching for the students before the post-test in the classroom, the students showed the results and percentage in post-test were improved; for example, the students reached 820 scores with 32,8% %. Moreover, the content mechanic scores are 210 at 8,4%, vocabulary score at 209 at 8,36%, grammar structure scores at 201 at 8,04%, and meaning scores of 200 at 8%. Moreover, the results show that the meaning scores were higher than vocabulary, content mechanic, and grammar structure scores. Overall, the writer was enthusiastic about students' improvement in writing skills.

Interview. In the interview section, the writer listed some questions used to interview and summarized other information about learning English writing skills from teachers and students in that location.

The teacher's views on the treatment. Based on the students' improvement in writing skills from the pre-test and post-test. The English teacher said that the teacher usually used other methods to teach his students writing skills, such as practicing dictation

dia, Logue, and information questions used on the topic. Then, they used the topic based on the textbook (Manual dos Alunos 8^o ano) that The Minister of Education had prepared. Moreover, the teacher did not use run-to-the-board games to teach her students. However, the English teacher said that using run-to-the-board game activity effectively improves students' writing skills regarding content mechanics, grammar structure, vocabulary, and mechanics. It is because the student can interact with their friends and make an effort to write by asking and answering the question.

Students' view on the treatment. The student's views on learning English writing skills through the run board game. Most students said they like to learn the English language, especially in English writing skills. This is because English is an international language. With the English language, people can use every electronic thing and go everywhere and at any time, depending on the situation and conditions. However, the tricky thing that they have faced in English class is the process of learning methods. This is because the teacher usually uses the activity to teach them English writing skills, such as writing; writing dialogue. Moreover, the English teacher has never used attractive and engaging activities or methods like running to the board game in the classroom. Another tricky thing that they faced in learning English writing skills is content and mechanics.

This is because the students did not know how to elaborate on the writing and how to start and end. Moreover, they did not know how to use commas and punctuation, and English grammar was complicated when creating sentences. Moreover, the students enjoyed learning writing skills by running to the board game. They can read and practice their writing skill by asking and answering the questions. Additionally, the students who got high marks in the pre-test and post-test said they had taken part-time courses outside SOLS/24 and other outside courses. Moreover, those students who got low marks said they only studied English during school.

Results of Qualitative and Quantitative

In qualitative results, the writer interviewed the school administration staff, the English teacher, and the school principal and said that the school principal's function was to employ and guide all activities related to teaching and learning to be effective and efficient. The school administration was essential within a school organization so they could solve problems related to teaching-learning activities. In addition, the function of administration was to arrange the cases of the officials or the teachers in the mentioned school and resolve the school equipment. There are 25 teachers, 16 females and 9 males, and their educational

qualifications were bachelor's degrees; six (6) teachers were contracted, and the other were permanent teachers.

There was one English teacher, and they were all permanent teachers. The school had no library or English books; it only had manual ones. The writer interviewed the students of Ensino Básico 3^o Ciclo Cristal, and they said that some of them attended English courses at SOLS 24/7 and studied by themselves, like watching English movies and YouTube and listening to English music. They said the school had a library but did not have English books or articles. They said they followed manual books from the Minister of Education but enjoyed the method.

The quantitative result showed that the students were rated the improvement from 6.28% in the pre-test to 8.2% in the post-test. It can be seen that the results of the qualitative and quantitative research have some links. Therefore, this study is effective and efficient.

The mean score of Students' Writing skills in the pre-test is 5.3. POOR LEVEL. The total result of writing skills scores in pre-test from the 25 students on eighth-grade students of Ensino Básico 3^o Ciclo Cristal, Dili, in the school year 2024.

The summary percentage mean score of the pre-test based on the measurement standard shows the results of students' categorized level of the pre-test, which is described as three (3) students categorized at poor level with 12%. Then, five (5) students were categorized at an inferior level with 20%. Then, four (4) students were categorized at a bad level with 4%. Then, seventh (7) students categorized average level 28%. Then, six (6) students were categorized below the average level of 24%. Then, two (2) students were categorized as good at 8%. Lastly, one (1) student categorized fairly good level 4%. However, none of the students were at an excellent level. It can be seen that the students were categorized as having a poor level. This means the students need treatment by using the run-to-the-board game.

The mean post-test score from 25 students of the eighth grade of Ensino Básico 3^o Ciclo Cristal, Dili, in the school year 2024 in writing skill mark after the treatment through run board game is 7.9, which is classified in **GOOD Level**.

The summary percentage standard of measurement reflected the mean score of the post-test, which shows the results of students' categorized level in the post-test. None of the students were categorized as poor, with 0%. Then, ten (10) students were categorized at an excellent level with 40%, and six (6) students at an excellent level with 24%. Then, seventh (7) students were categorized at a good level of 28%, and two (2)

students were categorized at a pretty reasonable 8%. Most of the students were categorized at a reasonable level. Moreover, ten (10) students were categorized at an excellent level, which did not happen in the pre-test. The following graphic displays the percentage of each component of students' results in the post-test.

The result of the Classroom Observation Sheet: The researcher used the observation sheet to analyze the condition when the class ran. The researcher's performance in teaching paragraph writing, which was observed by the local English teacher during the teaching of English writing skills through the Run Board Game, was **80**.

CONCLUSIONS

The result of pre-and post-test scores before and after the implementation of teaching short paragraph writing skills through run board games has been analyzed, and it was found that: 1) run board games could develop short paragraph writing skills. 2) there were some significant differences between the mean score of the re-test, which was 5.3, and the mean score of the po, which which the test was 7.9. The result of the classroom observation sheet was 80, which is classified based on the standard of measurement as GOOD LEVEL.

It is meant that the English short paragraph writing skill of the eight-grade students at Ensino Básico 30 Ciclo Cristal, Dili, in school year 2024 was developed through Run Board Game. There are a few problems that the eight-grade students still face in learning English writing skills in content mechanics, grammar, and structure.

Two (2) 8% of students were categorized reasonably in the pre-test. Then, one (1) 4% of students were at a reasonable level. Then, seven (7) 28% of students were categorized as average levels. Six (6) 24% students were categorized as below average. Three (3) 12% of students were categorized as poor level. Then, five (5) 20% of students were then categorized at an inferior level. Lastly, one (1) student was categorized at a poor level with 4%. This means the student's writing skills were not developed before the treatment for students in the running board games was implemented.

The post-test result showed that none of the students were categorized as poor. Then, ten (10) students, 40%, were categorized as excellent, and six (6)

students 24%, were categorized as very good. Then, seven (7) students, 28%, were categorized at a reasonable level, and lastly, two (2) students, 8%, were categorized at a pretty good level. It means that, after implementing the treatment for the teaching method of the running board games, the students developed writing skills at a reasonable level.

In this section, the writer would like to suggest the following for the English teachers and eighth-grade students of Ensino Básico 3 Ciclo Cristal, Dili, in 2024.

For the English teacher, the lesson plan, method, and materials through Run Board Game should be created to teach English Writing skills before teaching in class. Teachers should provide good conditions and encourage students to develop self-confidence in their writing skills. Moreover, they should manage or control the timekeeping in the teaching and practice process. This would make the students comfortable in the classroom and use attractive methods to help students learn English.

For the students. The students who get high marks should keep practicing and influence other friends to learn English writing skills by using a run board game because it stimulates the ideas to think to write immediately. The students should study and practice more involved participation with friends and teachers in English writing skills.

For the English Language Department in Institution Superior Cristal, the Ensino Básico 3^o Ciclo Cristal Dili needs to provide more facilities and use the library as a learning medium to support the students' activities in learning English. This study needs to be researched deeply in the future as a reference for the next thesis writing.

REFERÊNCIAS

- Akaln, H., David, R., & Richard, M. (2005). *Punctuation*. Yazım Klavuzu-Ankara: Türk.
- Ary, D. (2006). The definition of quantitative & qualitative. Retrieved February 20, 2022, from <https://aidaform.com/blog/qualitative-&-quantitative.html>
- Bodla, B. S. (n.d.). *Introduction to Research Methodology*.
- Carly, & Dawar. (2010). The Advantages of Board Game Method. Retrieved April 2, 2022,

from (URL tidak lengkap)

- Crème, P., & Lea, M. R. (2003). *Writing at University*. Glasgow: Bell & Bain Ltd.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (5th ed.). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Day, T. (2013). *Success in Academic Writing*. London, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Harmer, J. (2004). *How to Teach Writing*. United Kingdom: Longman.
- Hadfield, J. (1996). *Intermediate Communication Games*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- John, B., & Christensen. (2012). *Educational Research*. California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Lamb, B. (2008). *Linguistics Across Cultures*. USA: University of Michigan Press.
- Manser, M. H. (1991). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. Oxford University Press.
- Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (1999). *Writing Academic English* (3rd ed.). New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (2007). *Introduction to Academic Learner's Dictionary*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press. (Judul perlu dikonfirmasi, tampaknya keliru)
- Savage, A., & Mayer, P. (2012). *Effective Academic Writing* (2nd ed.). United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Studies English. (1999). *Grammar III: Punctuation and Capitalization*.