THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TALKING CHIPS TECHNIQUE IN IMPROVING STUDENTS' SPEAKING ABILITY AT MAN 2 BANDAR LAMPUNG

E. Lilis Yulisa[1], Hery Yufrizal, Ari Nurweni

English Department, University of Lampung

Abstrak : Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui apakah ada peningkatan kemampuan berbicara siswa setelah diajarkan dengan teknik *Talking Chips* dan aspek berbicara apa yang paling meningkat. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kuantitatif dan dilakukan kepada 27 siswa kelas XI IIS 1 di MAN 2 Bandarlampung. Peneliti memberikan tes berbicara untuk pengumpulan data. Hasilnya menunjukan bahwa terdapat peningkatan yang signifikan terhadap kemampuan berbicara siswa setelah diajarkan *Talking Chips* teknik. Hal itu dapat terlihat dari peningkatan nilai rata-rata siswa dari pretes ke postest, 43.68 ke 67.34. Disamping itu, peningkatan terbesar dari setiap aspek adalah aspek pemahaman. Hal ini dapat terlihat dari nilai rata-rata aspek pemahaman dari pretes ke postest, 7.34 ke 14.83. T-Test tersebut menyatakan bahwa hasil tes-tes tersebut adalah signifkan, karena $p<0.05$, $p= .000$. Dengan demikian, *Talking Chips* adalah teknik yang sesuai untuk meningkatkan kemampuan berbicara siswa.

Kata Kunci: *Teknik Talking Chips,* kemampuan berbicara, peningkatan.

Abstract : This research was aimed at finding out whether there was a significant improvement in students' speaking ability after being taught through Talking Chips Technique and which speaking aspect improved the most. This research used quantitative approach and was conducted to 27 students in class XI IIS 1 of MAN 2 Bandarlampung. The researcher administered speaking test to collect the data. The result showed that there was an improvement in students speaking ability after being taught through Talking Chips Technique. It could be seen from the increase of students' mean score from pre-test to posttest, 43.68 to 67.34. Besides, the most improvement of each speaking aspect was comprehension. This could be seen from the mean score of comprehension from pre-test to posttest, 7.34 to 14.83. The T-test revealed those results were significant because $p<0.05$, $p= .000$. Thus, Talking Chips Technique is one of the appropriate techniques to improve students' speaking ability.

Keywords: Talking Chips Technique, speaking ability, improvement.

[1]Lilisyulisa702@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Speaking is an interactive process of constructing meaning that involves producing, receiving and processing information (Burns & Joyce, 1997). Its form and meaning depends on the context in which it occurs, including the participants themselves, their collective experiences, the physical environment, and the purposes of speaking.

In learning English the students have to master the four basic language skills: speaking, writing, reading and listening. From the four basic skills, speaking might be the skill which must be emphasized. This is as what Weltys (1976:47) states that speaking is the main skill in communication. Since speaking is the main skill of communication, the teacher should promote the students to be able to communicate well. But in fact, students are difficult to speak. It means that more effort is required by the students and various interesting activities are also required by the teacher.

From the previous research conducted by Jisda (2014:2) who used Talking Chips Technique found that there were many problems in learning English. First, some students were difficult to speak English very well and they could not produce some words in English. This was because they did not know how to say it. Second, students were afraid of being criticized by others students and the teacher. Third, they did not know how to use grammar effectively in speaking. Fourth, the students did not get opportunities to train their speaking skill in the classroom.

Furthermore Ghassanie (2015) who involved one of senior high school in Palembang showed that eleventh grade students found it hard to speak. For example, they were not confident in speaking and did not know how to express what they wanted to say.

In addition, the researcher had done pre-observation at MAN 2 Bandarlampung to determine the problems of students' speaking ability. Based on the interview between the researcher and the teacher, the reserarcher found some problems in students' speaking ability. They are; (1) some students do not want to speak up in the classroom because they are afraid of making mistakes, (2) there are dominations from some students so that some other srtudents do not have any chance to share their ideas, and (3) there is less teamwork skill in discussion.

Looking at these problems, the researcher tried to apply one technique that could give a chance to every student in the classroom. Thus, this research attempted to apply Talking Chips Technique in teaching speaking since this technique can give a chance to the students to speak in the classroom. By giving a chance to every student to speak, the researcher believed that the students' speaking ability would improve because they had to practice speaking every meeting in the classroom.

Bowers and Keisler (2011: 138) state Talking Chip technique is a technique that ensures everyone has an opportunity to share in a discussion. By giving chance to every students to speak, the researcher assumed that students' speaking ability would improve because they had to practice speaking every meeting in the classroom.

Kagan (2010:17) pointed out that Talking Chips 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. Next, this technique makes the students have chance to speak English because in Talking Chip Technique, students are divided into several groups and each member of group will have a role to speak English.

Based on that opinion, the writer wanted to teach using Talking Chips Technique. Since this research concerned to teach speaking, the researcher who would be as the teacher of this research would teach the students about argumentative dialogue through Talking Chips Technique to improve students' speaking ability. The researcher used argumentative dialogue in teaching speaking through Talking Chips Technique because this dialogue could attract the students to speak up in the classroom to argue their friends arguments with the topic that they choose.

METHODS

The objectives of this research were to find out whether there was any significant improvement or not of students' speaking ability, and which aspect of speaking improves the most after being taught through Talking Chips technique. This study applied one-group pretest-posttest design of pre-experimental design. In this study, the students were given the pre-test in order to know the students' initial ability. Moreover, they were given treatment that was Talking Chip technique to teach speaking. After that, the teacher gave the posttest in order to obtain the aspect of speaking that improved the most after implementing Talking Chip technique in the class.

This research was conducted in XI IIS 1 of MAN 2 Bandarlampung which consists of 27 students. In collecting data, the researcher asked the students to work in group. The data of this research were in the form of students' speaking skill in performing argumentative dialogue in terms of pronunciation, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension, and grammar.

The instrument, which was used in this research, was speaking tests. The speaking tests were administered in the beginning of meeting before the students get the treatments (pre-test), and the end of the meeting after students got the treatments (posttest). The treatments were conducted in three meetings. Each meeting took 2 hours lesson (2x45 minutes). In analyzing the data, the researcher used Paired Sample T-test of SPSS 16.00 to find out whether there was an improvement on the students' speaking ability after the implementation of Talking Chip Technique. The researcher also used ANOVA test to find the significant difference between one aspect of speaking and the others.

According to Hatch and Farhady (1982:281), there are two basic types of validity: content validity and construct validity. Firstly, content validity is concerned with the comprehensiveness and representativeness of the instruments toward the material which was taught. In this type of validity, the material given should be suitable with the curriculum. Precisely, in this research, the material given was suitable with the Curriculum 2013 which was applied in MAN 2 Bandarlampung.

Secondly, Construct validity is the process of determining the extent to which test performance can be interpreted in terms of one or more construct. Since the researcher wants to know the students' speaking ability, this research administered a speaking test in form of argumentative dialogue, which consisted of a pretest and posttest, as the instrument. It investigated the result of the students' speaking ability based on five aspects of speaking: pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension. Therefore, it can be concluded that the test of this research was valid because in maintaining the validity, the researcher used the indicators which were stated in the competency and syllabus of the curriculum of senior high school.

In order to avoid subjectivity in scoring the students' speaking performance, the researcher used inter-rater reliability. Inter-rater reliability is extent to which two or more

raters agree. It addresses the issue of consistency of a rating system implementation. So, the Inter-rater reliability was used in order to reach the reliability in students' speaking score. Furthermore, in order to know the reliability scores in the pre-test and the posttest, the researcher used SPSS 16.0 to calculate the result. Moreover, the calculation of the result showed that the coefficient of rank correlation of the pretest in the class was 0 .811 and the posttest was 0 .857. It could be assumed that this instrument had a very high reliability and proper to be used to get the data.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Results

After conducting the research and gathering the data, the researcher analyzed the result of the pretest and the posttest as follows:

Table 1. The Mean Score of Students' Pretest and Posttest

Technique	Mean of the Pre-test	Mean of the posttest	Gain
Talking Chips	43.68	67.34	23.66

Table 1 reveals that students' mean scores of speaking performance improve from the pre-test to the posttest. After analyzing the improvement of the students' speaking ability scores in the class, the researcher used Paired Sample T-test to answer the first research question. The result of the test is elaborated in the following table:

Table 2. The Result of Paired Sample T-test

Paired Samples Test

	Paired Differences					T	df	Sig.
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower	Upper			
Pair 1 posttest - pre-test	2.36395E1	4.04645	.77874	22.03876	25.24021	30.356	26	.000

Based on the criterion, the test has a significant improvement if the significance level is lower than 0.05. It can be seen from the table that the significance level of the test is 0.00. It can be concluded that there is significant improvement of students' speaking ability after being taught through Talking Chip Technique.

With regard to Table 2 and to the analysis above, it can be seen that the improvement in students' speaking ability was significant. As mentioned earlier, each aspect of the students' speaking ability improved and there was a difference between one aspect and others numerically, so the researcher used ANOVA test of SPSS 16.0 to find out if there are significant differences among all aspects of speaking statistically. It can be seen in the following table:

Table 3. ANOVA Test of the Aspects of Speaking

Descriptives

Result

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
pronunciation	27	3.6422	1.54520	.29737	3.0310	4.2535	1.33	6.63
grammar	27	4.0385	1.40304	.27002	3.4835	4.5935	1.33	6.65
vocabulary	27	4.1856	1.71689	.33042	3.5064	4.8647	1.33	9.31
fluency	27	4.7293	1.85189	.35640	3.9967	5.4618	1.33	7.98
comprehension	27	7.4852	1.92140	.36977	6.7251	8.2453	3.99	11.95
Total	135	4.8161	2.17151	.18689	4.4465	5.1858	1.33	11.95

ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	256.818	4	64.204	22.254	.000
Within Groups	375.055	130	2.885		
Total	631.872	134			

Regarding to the analyses above, it can be concluded that there are differences of all aspects of speaking in the class, because the table shows the value of significance was 0.000 or ($p<0.05$). Furthermore, it is needed to discover which aspect that has the highest improvement in the class. Thereby, in order to find out which aspect that improves the most in the class, the gains of all the aspects are compared.

Table 4. The Students' Different Scores in Each Aspect of Speaking

No	Aspects	The possible max score	Pre-test	Posttest	Gain	Improvement (%)
1	Pronunciation	20	8.92	12.36	3.44	17.2
2	Grammar	20	9.50	13.55	4.05	20.25
3	Vocabulary	20	9.19	13.35	4.16	20.8
4	Fluency	20	8.52	13.25	4.73	23.65
5	Comprehension	20	7.34	14.83	7.49	37.45
	Total		43.68	67.34	23.87	23.66

It can be seen from table above that comprehension is in the place with the highest gain. It means that comprehension is the aspect which improves the most after the implementation of Talking Chip technique.

Discussion

In this research, there was one class used as the sample of the research. The research was begun by conducting the pretest. The aim of the pretest is to see how the ability of the students in descriptive writing before the treatments. The objectives of this research are to find out whether there is significant improvement or not in students' speaking ability, and to find out what aspect improved the most after being taught through Talking Chip Technique. 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 Chip Technique. Based on the result of the research, the researcher suggested recognizing Talking Chip technique as one of the techniques in improving students' speaking ability especially in teaching argumentative dialogue. The researcher found that there was a significant improvement on students' speaking ability.

The result is also supported by Kagan (2011) which says that Talking Chip as one of the teaching strategy in cooperative learning which plays the significant role in the process of learning speaking. Talking Chip could improve students' speaking achievement because the technique built an interaction among the students. Since the activity in Talking Chip technique was by dividing the students into small groups, it encouraged the students to be more confident to speak. It made the students tent to interact and communicate to other students. So, Talking Chips technique give the significant improvement towards the students' speaking performance, It could also be seen from the improvement mean score in the students' pretest and posttest. The mean score of the pretest is 43.68 and the mean score of the posttest is 67.34.

Moreover, the researcher conducted the pre-test and the posttest to know the improvement of students' speaking achievement. The students were asked to give their arguments about a topic which they had chosen. From the result of pre-test, it can be reported that the highest mean score in five aspect of speaking was grammar (9.19) and the lowest was comprehension (7.34). This happened because they were not habituated in speaking English in their learning process. In learning process, they usually focused on grammar, and how to answer questions which are in the written form, so they were good enough in grammar. Since they were not habituated in speaking English, they sometimes mispronounced some words which occasionally can lead to misunderstanding, so the students could not comprehend what was being said. That was why grammar got the highest score, and comprehension got the lowest score. Some students' pronunciation in pre-test was actually good, although there were some errors made by them. As the example the students sometimes mispronounced the English words. As the example, students often pronounced "think" word as /tIŋ/, while it should be read /0Iŋk/, the students often pronounced "opinion" word as /0pInIon/, while it should be read /Ə'pInjƏn/. In order to overcome the problems, the researcher gave some chances to the students to increase students' frequency in speaking, so that they would be more fluent. For the result of posttest, it can be seen that all aspect 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 problems inequitable participation (Gray, 2010).

Meanwhile, the result of posttest showed that comprehension became the highest gain (7.49). The students were easy to understand what the speaker said because they focused on the message more than on the form or the structure. This was relevant with Heaton (1991) said that if a person get the message which was delivered by speaker and can answer or express their ideas well, it shows that she or he can comprehend the conversation. Furthermore the pronunciation was the lowest gain (3.44). Even though the

gain of pronunciation was the lowest, but the score was not really different. In the posttest, the students sometimes still mispronounced some words, because of their accent of mother tongue. It was not likely as native, even though it still could be understood. That was relevant with Avery and Ehrlich (1992) claim that sound pattern of the learners' first language is transferred into the second language and it likely caused foreign accent. Mispronunciation of words which produced by nonnative speakers reflect the influence of the sounds, rules, stress, and the intonation of their native language. It made the pronunciation got the lowest gain. That was why the comprehension of students was the highest gain although the pronunciation was the lowest. In the treatment, the researcher also used common expression and emphasized the students understanding so that they could comprehend much better than in the pre-test.

Furthermore, based on the result of this research it can also be concluded that comprehension is the aspect which improves the most. Besides, all aspects got a good improvement based on the comparison of the pre-test's result and the posttest's result. Pronunciation increased up to 17.20 %, grammar increased up to 20.25%, vocabulary increased up to 20.80%, fluency increased up to 23.65%, and the biggest improvement was in comprehension which increased up to 37.45%.

In relation to the explanation above, it can be inferred that Talking Chip technique is one of appropriate techniques to teach speaking. This is because this technique gives the students chance to speak without feeling afraid of making mistakes. This is likely the same as the researcher had mentioned in Chapter 2. Based on Bowers and Keisler (2011:138), Talking Chip Technique is a technique that ensures everyone has an opportunity to share in a discussion, so there is no gap between students who are active to speak and those who are not. This extends students to practice speaking, and students will have an equal opportunity to speak in the classroom.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Conclusion

In line with the results of the data analysis and discussion, the writer concluded that On the whole, there is a significant improvement of students' speaking ability after being taught through Talking Chip technique. It is proved by the result of Paired Sample T-test which shows the level of significance is under 0.05. It means that the Talking Chips technique can be an alternative technique to improve students speaking ability, especially in argumentative dialogue. It can also be seen from the improvement of students' mean scores from the pre-test to posttest: 43.68 to 67.34.

The highest improvement is on comprehension, followed by fluency, vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation. The result of the posttest showed that comprehension became the highest gain (7.49). The students were easy to understand what the speaker said because they focused on the message more than on the form or the structure. This was relevant with Heaton (1991) said that if a person can answer or express their ideas well without focusing on the form or the structure, it shows that she or he can comprehend the conversation. Furthermore the pronunciation was the lowest gain (3.44). Even though the gain of pronunciation was the lowest, but the score was not really different. In the posttest, the students sometimes still mispronounced some words, because of their accent of mother tongue. It was not likely as native, even though it still

could be understood. That was relevant with Avery and Ehrlich (1992) claim that sound pattern of the learners' first language is transferred into the second language and it likely caused foreign accent. Mispronunciation of words which produced by nonnative speakers reflect the influence of the sounds, rules, stress, and the intonation of their native language. It made the pronunciation got the lowest gain.

Suggestion

After conducting the research the researcher gives several recommendations for the students, English teacher, and the other researchers. They are presented as follows:

1. Students of Senior High School
   The students as the subject in the teaching and learning process should involve more and actively participate in the activities during the class. They also need to be serious and build more confidence to learn English, especially speaking. They need to keep practicing if they want to master the speaking skill.

2. English Teachers
   Students rarely had chances to practice their speaking outside the class, so the teacher needs to maximize the students' opportunity during the lesson to practice their speaking skill. The teacher should also be able to create an atmosphere where it is comfortable and challenging for the students to maintain their motivation on learning.

3. Further researchers

   a. Before implementing the Talking Chip technique, it would be better if the other researcher explore the students' knowledge related to the topic and give more background knowledge.

   b. The researcher could not control all of the students' speaking activity at the same time, meanwhile all of the students' speaking activity during the lesson need to be controlled. The researcher suggests further researchers to have two or more partners to work with, so that the students speaking process can be controlled. The partners also will help the researcher to answer the students' questions during the process of learning, but make sure that the partners have the same perspective and have a good understanding about the technique.

   c. In implementing this research, the researcher found it a bit hard to divide the students into small group. The researcher suggests further researcher to make a time before the implementation of the technique. This time is used for dividing the students into small group. This occasion can also be a time for the further researcher to explain how the technique runs, and can be a kind of trying out the technique.

References

Avery, P & Ehrlich, S. (1992). *Teaching American English Pronunciation. Oxford: Oxford University Press.*

Bowers, E & Keisler, L. 2011. *Building Academic Language: Through Content Area Text.* Huntington Beach: Shell Education

Burns, A & Joyce, H. 1997.*Focus on Speaking*. Sydney: National Center for English Language Teaching and Research.

Jisda A W. 2014. Public Knowledge Project*: Teaching Speaking by Combining Talking Chips and Numbered Heads Strategies for Senior High School*. Retrieve December 4th, 2018.

Ghassanie, S.F. 2015. *The Effectiveness of Using Galery Work Strategy in Improving Students' Speaking Achievement Of The Tenth Grade Students*

Gray, Dave. 2010. *Gamestorming*. Sebastopol: O'reiey Media. Inc.

Harmer, Jeremy. 2007. *The Practice of English Language Teaching (Longman Handbooks for Language Teacher*). New York: Longman Inc.

Harris, David. 1974. *Testing English as Second Language*. New York: Mc Graw Hill Book Company.

Hatch, E & Farhady, H. 1982. *Research Design and Statistics for Applied Linguistics.* Rowley: Newburry House Publisher. Inc.

Heaton, J B. 1991. *Writing English Language Testing*. New York: Longman Inc.

Kagan, Spencer. 2010. *Cooperative Learning*. San Clemente, CA: Kagan Publishing.

Weltys, D,A. 1976. *The Teacher Aids in the Instruction Team.* New York: Mc. Graw Hill