

Improving Students' Speaking Ability Through Talking Chip Technique At The Second Grade Of Senior High School

FKIP University of Lampung

Jl. Soemantri Brojonegoro No.1 Gedung Meneng Universitas Lampung

Ariza Yuliska, Hery Yufrizal, Ramlan Ginting Suka

Liska.riza@gmail.com/Phone 085783670273

Abstract

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui apakah penggunaan teknik talking chip meningkatkan kemampuan berbicara siswa. Pendekatan penelitian ini adalah penelitian kuantitatif. Tes berbicara digunakan sebagai instrument pengambilan data. Subyek penelitian ini adalah 70 siswa kelas sebelas pada siswa sekolah menengah atas. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa secara statistik ada peningkatan yang signifikan dalam peningkatan berbicara siswa setelah siswa diajarkan menggunakan teknik talking chip. Penelitian ini menyarankan bahwa teknik talking chip memfasilitasi siswa untuk meningkatkan pencapaian.

The aim of this study was to find out whether the use of talking chip technique improved the students' speaking ability. The approach of this study was quantitative. Speaking tests were used as the instrument to elicit the data. The subjects of this study were 70 second grade students of senior high school students. The result showed that there was a statistically significant improvement of students' speaking achievement after the students were taught through talking the chip technique. This suggests that talking chip technique facilitates students to improve achievement.

Key words: *Talking Chip Technique, Speaking Ability.*

INTRODUCTION

Speaking is the action of conveying information or expressing one's thoughts and feelings in spoken language. It means that when someone produces the expressions that should influence people's thoughts and can give new information to hearer.

Based on Competence Based Curriculum speaking is one of the four basic skills that the students should gain well. It has an important role in communication. Speaking can be found in spoken cycle especially in Joint Construction of Text stage (Departmen Pendidikan Nasional, 2004). In carrying out speaking, students face some difficulties. One of them is about language its self. In fact, most of students get difficulties to speak even though they have a lot of vocabularies and have written them well.

Speaking is a productive skill. It can not be separated from listening. When we speak we produce the text and it should be meaningful. In the nature of communication, we can find the speaker, the listener, the message and the feedback. Speaking could not be separated from pronunciation as it encourages learners to learn the English sounds.

Speaking has been regarded as merely implementation and variation, outside the domain of language and linguistic proper. Linguistic theory has mostly developed in abstraction from context of use and source of diversity. Therefore, Clark and Clark (in Nunan, 1991: 23) said that speaking is fundamentally an instrument act. Speakers talk in order to have some effect on their listener. It is the result of teaching learning process. Students' skill in conversation is core aspect in teaching speaking, it becomes vitally aspect in language teaching learning success if language function as a system for expression meaning, as Nunan (1991:39) states that the successful in speaking is measured through someone ability to carry out a conversation in the language. We confess that there are many

proponent factors that influence teaching speaking success and there are many obstacle factors why it is not running well.

Beside the problem before, the researcher had done pre-observation at SMA N 1 NATAR to determine the problems of students' speaking ability. Based on the interview between the researcher and the teacher, the researcher found some problems in students' speaking ability. they were; (1) some students did not want to speak up in classroom because they were afraid of making mistakes. (2) there were domination member in group discussion so that some students did not have any chance to share their ideas. (3) there were less teamwork skill in discussion activity.

Kagan (2010 : 17) pointed out that talking chip technique is a technique in teaching speaking which makes the students interested in speaking english. It is because this technique encourages the students to be active in the classroom and learns about cooperation in group. Then, this technique makes the students have chance to speak english because students are divided into several groups and each member of group will have a role to speak english. So each member should be active to think what will she/he say. Based on that opinion, the writer wants to teach using talking chip technique. Since this research concerns to teach speaking, the researcher who will be as the teacher of this research would teach the students about argumentative dialogue through talking chip technique to improve students' speaking ability. The researcher uses argumentative dialogue in teaching speaking through talking chip technique because it can attract the student to speak up in the classroom to argue their friends arguments with the topic that they choose.

From the previous research of Safryadin (2011) who had done his research, The Use of Talking Chip Technique in Improving Students' Speaking Achievement, he found some problems at process of teaching speaking using talking chip technique. Then, the

previous research of Khairun Nisa (2015) who had done her research, The Use of Talking Chip Technique in Improving Students' Speaking Ability, she said that there were many improvement of students' speaking ability after implementing this technique.

From those problem, the researcher tries to apply one technique that could give a chance to every students in the classroom. Thus, this research attempts to apply talking chip technique in teaching speaking since this technique can give a chance to the students to speak in the classroom. By applying this technique, the researcher believes that the students' speaking ability would improve because they had to practice speaking every meeting in the classroom.

METHOD

This research was experimental research within quantitative research design. The researcher will use *control group pretest-post test design*. In this experimental research two classes will be selected, in this case, one class as the control class and the other one will be the experimental class.

The subject of this research was the second grade students of SMAN I NATAR the year of 2016/2017. 2 classes in the second year of senior high schools in Lampung, SMAN I NATAR were involved in this study. There were XI IPA 3 and XI IPS 1.

Control class will be used to control the students' progress in the experimental class, whether the progress is affected by the treatment or not. In the control class, the talking chip technique will be given as the treatment, the pretest and the posttest are administered. In the experimental class, the talking chip technique will be given as the treatment; both of the classes will have the same pretest and the posttest. There are three times of treatment. In this case, speaking along with some certain topics will be provided to

ultimately be taught through talking chip technique. The pretest treating is aimed at recognizing students' prior knowledge in speaking. Then, the posttest will be administered once after treatment already given to finally be compared with the result of students' works had collected in the previous time.

FINDINGS

1. Results of Pre-Test

Belows are the explanation of improvement of students' speaking performance through the implementation of talking chip technique in pre-test.

Table 1.1. Distribution of Pre-Test Scores

IPA CLASS

Score Interval	Number of Students	Percentage
100	-	
80-99	-	
60-79	-	
40-59	25	78.6 %
20-39	15	21.4 %

This table show us the distribution of pretest scores of IPA class is still low. It can face the score interval of students in 20-39 to 40-59.

IPS CLASS

Table 1.2. Distribution of Pre-Test Scores

Score Interval	Number of Students	Percentage
100	-	
80-99	-	
60-79	-	
40-59	28	97.1 %
20-39	2	2.9 %

This table show us the distribution of pretest scores of IPS class is still low. It can face the score interval of students in 20-39 to 40-59.

2. Result of Posttest

Table 2.1. Distribution of Posttest Scores

IPA CLASS

Score Interval	Number of Students	Percentage
100	-	
80-99	17	53%
60-79	33	47%
40-59	-	
20-39	-	

This table show us the distribution of posttest scores of IPA class is better after gave the treatment. It can face the score interval of students in 60-79 to 80-99.

Table 2.2. Distribution of Posttest Scores

IPA CLASS

Score Interval	Number of Students	Percentage
100	-	
80-99	30	100 %
60-79	-	
40-59	-	
20-39	-	

This table show us the distribution of posttest scores of IPS class is better after gave the treatment. It can face the score interval of students in 80-99.

3 Analysis Of Interview

In order to get the valid data, the researcher used observation in the classroom. On the hand, the purpose of the observation used in this research was to determine students' achievement in English skill which covers five aspects of speaking including: pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. There are two different subjects, however the researcher used the same observation since the researcher planned to compare the results of students' observation between social and Science class.

There are five questions in the observation prepared. These five questions were in the form of essay. It means that all students had to answer the questions provided along with the reasons why they would say so. Furthermore, in answering those questions, the time for answering those questions was restricted. They had to answers the questions given in only 20 minutes. The first question concerned with their interest in learning English. The second question asked about their judgement on teacher's way of teaching, whether or not they like it. Next, the third question was at what activity they like or dislike English speaking. The forth question regarding what they wanted to achieve with English abilities that they have. And the last question was what kind of activity the teacher should apply in teaching learning process in order to sharpen students' ability in speaking.

The first question concerned with whether or not they were interested in learning English. There are various answers given by the students whether from social class and science class. Firstly from social class students' answers. From social class subject, there are some kind of answers and so unique. The students gave the answers in different ways since the questions provided were opened questions and were not restricted. A big part of students gave the similiar answers. They were incredibly interested in learning English. It was, however, the reason why they were so

interested in English were different. Most of students agreed to learn English and were so interested since English is an international language. According to them, now days English is a key to get money. For instance, when apply a job, there must be an English teacher for the worker candidate. Based on this fact, almost all students were interested in learning English, especially in speaking. Next is the analysis of Science class students' answers. The students of Science class were also interested in learning English, especially in mastering English speaking skill. They were interested in English with various reasons. Some of them wanted to work in foreign corporation, and some were keen on taking their study abroad, and a few of students were eager to be experts.

The second question asked about their judgement on teacher's way of teaching, whether or not they like it. The students' answers were vary in types. First of all the students of Science class. Almost all students criticized on teacher's way of teaching. They expressed that they did not like the teaching learning process as it was wearying and classic. Some of them said that the teaching learning was to boring since the teacher tends to bring the class in a serious condition and finally, the students were rigid, nervous, and shy. They could not even deliver their opinions or ideas to the teacher. Some of them said, the media in the classroom were not enough. However, the dominant answers coming from the teacher's way of teaching was so boring. Secondly, the results of answers which were given by Social class students. Five students of this class commented that they agreed with the teacher's way of teaching because it was so relax and not tensional. However, a big part of students had the opinions with the Science class that the class used to be boring. Finally, students' passion in learning English did not grow well and are still sticking in speaking problem.

Next, the third question was at what activity they like or dislike English speaking. This question is actually asked their sense of being satisfied of what they learnt this long time. For the Social class, there are two groups of students based on the answers they had given. The first group is those who liked the activity in practicing English speaking skill. Those students were active when the teacher invites the students to have dialogue, monologue, or doing role play activity in order to sharpen their speaking ability in front of the class. The second group were those who wanted and expected their teacher to give them more regarding modeling and grammar. According to the second group students, they preferred to master the theory and following by the practices. The answers that had been given by the Science class were slightly similar to the answers of Social class students. But, the dominant answers were some of them did not like English since the teacher just gave the topics to them to further be analyzed. They almost never had time to do practice, and as the result they disliked English.

The forth question regarding what they wanted to achieve with English abilities that they have. In responding to this question, there are many different answers given both by social and science class students. From the social class students, some of them aspired to be English teacher, and some wanted to be Lecturers, and some more wanted to be businessmen and businesswoman. A small part of them were keen on being entrepreneurs, having small business, open book store, and my more. The point is that, all students wanted to achieve what they wanted to be in the future. Next is the answers that had been given by students of science class. Some of them have the same ideas with the students of social class, however a big part of this class has different ideas. The differences can be viewed from the answers that had been given by the students. Several students of science class wanted to go abroad in order for to conduct the research. Two of them said that

they wanted to continue their study in human's health disciplines to abroad and after finished, they would be back to Indonesia to helped out people from deases.

The last question was what kind of activity the teacher should apply in teaching learning process in order to sharpen students' ability in speaking. This question was actually a chance for the students to put forward what they feel, what te problems they tend to confront day by day in learning English both inside and outside class, and also express their complaint. Seeing the answers given by both of social and science classes, the inner-most points were: lack of teaching media, method of teaching, classroom management and also teacher's patient toward students' attitude and behaviour. It means that students wanted the teacher to use more compatible media with students, and method of teaching used to apply by the teacher was persistently the same, and also the teacher did not manage the class.

In order to make teaching learning process go well, the classroom management is urgently needed. Classroom management covers, media, methods, timeable, and vehicles used in a teaching learning process McDougal, Littell & Company (1981). One of the most important aspects of classroom management is the teaching method in teaching. Therefore, there should be specific method, technigue, or learning model which furthermore in teaching learning process can support teachers in teaching and notably for the students to comprehend well through the method or learning model that is about to apply. If the teacher does not use an appropriate method, technigue, or learning model then it can further be influential toward students' comprehension. If only the method used in learning is suitable with the students, but if the teacher has no any ability in applying the method being used then it can bring nothing and the no result ultimately.

Based on the three constraints found above, those matters therefore should be considered as a must for English teachers to cope with. The first problem was the students' outage in mastering English speaking skill. Speaking as the ability to express oneself in life situation, or the ability to report acts or situation in precise words, or the ability to converse, or to express a sequence of ideas fluently, Lado (1961:240). The second problem found was the lack of seriousness of students in participating when the teacher teaches in the class. And finally, the third problem was the teaching method used does not support learning process, thus the researcher proposes to deal with this constraint there should be a specific learning model. Learning model is a conceptual framework that describes a systematic procedure in organizing learning experiences to achieve specific learning objectives and serves as a guide for learners and teachers in implementing the learning activities, Winataputra in Sugiyono (2008).

DISCUSSION

In this part, the researcher tries to discuss quantitative data which found that there was an improvement of students' speaking ability after being taught through Talking ChipTechnique. Based on the results of the research, the researcher suggested recognizing Talking Chip Technique as one of the techniques to improve the students' speaking ability in teaching argumentative dialogue. The researcher found that there was a significantimprovement of students' speaking ability after being taught argumentative dialogue through Talking ChipTechnique. It can be seen from the different of mean in pre-test and posttest. The mean for IPA class is from 41.8 up to 76.3,while for IPS class is from 46.4 up to 74.8.

Talking Chip Technique is one of the appropriate techniques to teach speaking. This is because the role of Talking Chip Technique is like a game so that the students feel free to express their arguments. This is likely the same as the researcher has mentioned in the chapter 2 about the procedure of Talking Chip Technique based on Barkley, Cross and Major (2005: 20). The students can use token or chip that they got to speak up since that chip is as the chance to speak up in the classroom. They used their chip to give their arguments. For example, when a student wanted to ask his friend argument, he showed his chip which side was written *ask* to his friend while asking his question. After that his friend would give his argument by showing his chip which was written *give* while giving his argument. This is adapted from Kagan's statement who said that every student with a chip continues discussion using his/her chip (2010:17).

In the field, the researcher conducted pre-test for the first process of the research. Pre-test was aimed to measure how far the students ability in speaking. In the pre-test the researcher gave some issues to be discussed in the group. The students had to give their argument to the issue that they had chosen. The arguments should consist of agree and disagree argument. And the result of pre-test was showed that the students' ability in speaking were still low. This was proved by the students' score in pre-test. The mean score of pre-test of two classes were 41.8 and 46.4. After conducting pre-test in the first meeting, the researcher had three times treatments in the next three meeting. This was intended to improve the students' ability through applying the technique.

The researcher started the first treatment by giving the explanation of asking and giving opinion and introducing the technique. After that the researcher started to apply the technique in learning process. In the next meeting, the researcher started by brainstorming about the previous research.

And then, the researcher who was the teacher of this research applied the technique by giving a chip to every student which consisted of two chances to give argument. And the last meeting of giving treatment, the teacher explained about the expression of agreement and disagreement. Then, the teacher applied Talking chips Technique to emphasize the students understanding of the material and also to make the students more practice their speaking in the classroom.

The last meeting, the researcher conducted posttest. This aimed to find out the improvement of students' speaking ability after being taught through Talking Chip Technique. The researcher gave the same topics and the same instructions of pre-test in posttest. And the result of posttest showed that the students' speaking ability improved. The mean score of posttest of two classes were 76.3 and 74.8. While The mean score of pre-test of two classes were 41.8 and 46.4.

From the result of pre-test, it can be reported that the highest mean score in five aspects of speaking was pronunciation (8.8) and the lowest mean score was fluency (7.8) for IPA. For IPS, the highest mean score in five aspects of speaking was Vocabulary (9.5) and the lowest mean score was pronunciation (9.0). This happened because in giving their arguments, students just needed to speak up without thought about the grammar. Their friends given to them to give the appropriate answer. For example, when a student asked *What do you think about smoking?* the other student answer *I agree because Smokers are two and half times more likely to die of heart disease.* The answer of the student was coherence to the question although there were some grammatical mistakes. That was why the higher score was comprehension while the lowest was grammar.

Some students' pronunciation in pre-test was actually good although there were some errors

made by the other students. As the example, there were some students pronouncing the result as /resul/ whereas it should be /rɪ 'zʌlt/. Then, the students often pronounced "because" word as /bikos/, while it should be read /bi 'kɜz/. In the other hand, most students were not fluent enough to speak English. They often stopped talking in the middle when they were giving their arguments. This might be caused by students' frequency to speak English was lack. And this is what the researcher did in the treatments. The researcher gave some chances to each student to increase students' frequency in speaking so that they would be more fluent speaking English.

For the result of posttest, it can be seen from the result table that all aspects of speaking improved after being taught through Talking Chip Technique. It might be caused this technique could develop teamwork skills and self-awareness to solve problemsinequitable participation (Gray, 2010: 217). Then, the result of posttest still showed that comprehension became the highest mean score (16.1 and 16.7) and fluency was in the lowest mean score (14.1). In posttest, students were able to give their arguments more fluently than pre-test. All students could pronounce the word better than in pre-test. After that, the students got a lot of vocabularies from three times treatment. Then, their grammar in speaking improved too although they were still making little errors. Last, their comprehension improved since in treatments the researcher used common expression and emphasized the students understanding so that they could comprehend better than in pre-test.

In terms of average improvement of five aspect of speaking, we can see that comprehension is the one aspect which improved significantly with 7.6 (8.5 upto 16.1). This may be caused by the students were get used with the expression and the vocabularies were easy to understand by the students. Students could understand the material which had been delivered by the

researcher easily. So, the students comprehended the instructions in speaking test, and tried to give their arguments although they could not speak fluently. Besides, in treatments, students were get used to give respond directly to their friends' questions so that the students could answer well and correctly. When the students could answer or express well and correctly, it showed that the students could comprehend well. This is in line to the statement from Heaton who said that comprehension denotes the ability of understanding the speakers' intention and general meaning (1991: 35).

From the result above it can be seen that the hypothesis proposed by the researcher was accepted. The hypothesis proposed by the researcher is there is an improvement in students' speaking ability after being taught through Talking Chip Technique. Finally, the researcher can conclude that Talking Chip Technique can be a good technique of teaching speaking to increase students' speaking ability. After implementing this technique, students got improvement from the first until the last treatment.

The result of this research is almost the same with the previous research of Syafryadin, a college student of Indonesia University of Education, who found out the improvement in students' speaking ability after giving treatments. Syafryadin already conducted his research with the title *The Use of Talking Chip Technique in Improving Students' Speaking Achievement*. In his research, he used CAR (Class Action Research). And he could prove that Talking Chip Technique can improve students speaking achievement after implementing the technique. The students got improvement from cycle 1 to cycle 3 (Syafryadin, 2011: 6). The other result of this research is also the same with the previous research of KhairunNisa, a college student of Lampung University, who found out the improvement in students' speaking ability after giving treatments. KhairunNisa already

conducted his research with the title *The Use of Talking Chip Technique to Improve Students' Speaking Ability*. In his research, he used CAR (Class Action Research). And she could prove that Talking Chip Technique can improve students speaking achievement after implementing the technique. The students got improvement from three treatments (KhairunNisa, 2015).

However, the process of teaching speaking through Talking Chip Technique in SMAN 1 NATAR which conducted by the researcher ran successfully since it could increase the students' speaking skill. The result showed a positive improvement in students' speaking ability. The mistakes which occurred during the research can be fixed by giving the students longer treatment so that they have more time to develop their ability.

CONCLUSION

Having conducted the research at the second grade of SMAN 1 NATAR and analyzing the data, the researcher would like to give the conclusion as follows:

1. Talking Chip Technique is one of the appropriate techniques to improve students' speaking ability. This can be seen from the result of this research. There is a significant improvement of students' speaking ability after being taught through Talking Chip Technique. It means that Talking Chip Technique can improve students' speaking ability. From the result, it can be seen that posttest is higher than pre-test. There is an improvement from average score of pre-test (41.8 and 46.4) to posttest (76.3 and 74.8).
2. It can be concluded that talking chip technique is most effective technique to teach speaking for the second grade

students of senior high school. The effectiveness of the technique is influenced by the students' level of intelligence.

SUGGESTION

Some suggestion that the researcher would like to propose based on the conclusion are as follows:

1. Suggestions for the teacher
 - a. The English teacher are suggested to use Talking Chip Technique in teaching speaking because the researcher found in the field that most of students was interested to study speaking through Talking Chip Technique. And this is proved by the result of students' speaking test score. This technique can be used by the English teachers when they are teaching Argumentative dialogue. It can make the students enjoy the learning process in Argumentative dialogue and stimulate the students' speaking ability.
 - b. For the English teachers who want to use Talking Chip Technique are suggested to be able to make some variations of topic in teaching which interest for the students. This is to make the students do not feel bored and hard to follow the learning process. Besides, the teacher should pay attention to the token or chip that will be used as a tool in learning process. That should be matched the amount of students multi the number of chances for the students to speak in the classroom.
 - c. In implementing this technique, the teacher should give more attention to students awareness in grammar since the result of this research the lowest improvement was grammar.
2. Suggestions for further researcher

- a. The researcher implemented Talking Chip technique to improve students' speaking ability and found out that the most improvement aspect of speaking is comprehension. Further researcher should pay attention more to the lowest aspect by developing the technique to make a significant improvement of the lowest aspect.
- b. In this research, the researcher used Talking Chip Technique to improve speaking skill. Further researcher should try to use this technique to improve the other skills.
- c. Besides, the researcher used this technique to improve students' speaking ability of Senior High School. Further researcher should conduct this technique at different levels of students.

Syafryadin. (2011). The use of talking chips technique in improving students' speaking achievement: International Conference the Future of education. Bandung: Indonesia University of Education.

Sugiyono, H. (2008). Model-model pembelajaran inovatif. Cetakan 2. Surakarta: Yuma Pustaka.

REFERENCES

Barkley, E., Cross, K. P., & Major, C. H., (2005). Collaborative learning techniques. San Fransisco: Jossey Bass.

Depdiknas. (2004). Kurikulum tingkat satuan pendidikan. Jakarta: Depdiknas.

Gray, D. (2010). Gamestorming. Sebastopol: O'reiley Media. Inc.

Kagan, S. (2010). Cooperative learning. San Clemente, CA : Kagan Publishing.

Khairunnisa. (2015). The use of talking chips technique in improving students' speaking achievement: Bandar Lampung: Lampung University

Lado, R. (1961). Language teaching a scientific approach: New technique and principles in language teaching. Oxford: oxford University.

Nunan, D. (2003). Practical english language teaching. Singapore : Mc Graw Hill.