

INCREASING THE STUDENTS' ABILITY IN SPEAKING BY USING TALKING CHIPS TECHNIQUE

Hidayati Daeli

Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan, Universitas Nias

e-mail: daelihidayati@email.com

Abstract

Speaking is one of the language skills that is very important to the speaker to make communication, express ideas, opinion, and feelings toward the other people orally. In the syllabus of Junior High School hopes that the students are able to speak English fluently, appropriately and accurately. But the fact show that the students are not able to speak English fluently, appropriately and accurately. The purpose of this research is to increase the students' ability in speaking by using Talking Chips Technique. To achieve the purpose of this research, the researcher applies CAR. The subject of this research is the students at the ninth grade of SMP Negeri 4 Mandrehe which the total number of the students are 30 students. This research is applied in two cycles. Each cycle consists of planning, action, observation, and reflection. The instruments used by the researcher to collect the data are observation paper, field notes, oral test, and camera. Based on the result of the research above, it shows that the students get increasing in speaking and they achieve the Minimum Competence Criterion through Talking Chips Technique. In the other words, Talking Chips Techniques suitable to help the students in getting progression in learning English. So, The researcher suggests the English teachers of SMP Negeri 4 Mandrehe to use Talking Chips Technique to increase the students' ability in speaking, the teacher should have good preparation before apply Talking Chips Technique in order that he will be succussfull in teaching speaking to students, the teacher should motivate the students to convey their idea during the teaching-learning process, the students should master English vocabularies fluently to help become free and active to express their ability in speaking.

Key words: *Speaking Skill, Talking Chips Technique*

INTRODUCTION

According to Morris and Novia (2002: 20) affirm that speaking is as a tool of communication naturally among the members of the society to express thought and as a form of social behavior. It is very clear that speaking is a tool for someone to communicate with the other whether it is to inform, to entertain, to persuade, etcetera. Also Richard and Renandya (2001:201) say, "Speaking is used for many different purposes and each purpose involves different skills when people use casual conversation". Speaking is a tool of someone to run communication or interaction such as greetings and responses, asking and giving information, telling story, etc. Curriculum 2013 in its syllabus of SMP Negeri 4 Mandrehe at the ninth grade states that speaking is one of language skills that is taught to the students to speak or expressing

comprehending, attention, and responses in English orally, correctly, and contently. To achieve the hopes above, SMP Negeri 4 Mandrehe has decided the minimum competence criterion (MCC) that is 60. It means that every student must achieve it, if they cannot achieve the minimum competence criterion (MCC) they will be fail. While many of the students get score around 50 and the average of the students score is 55 showed that the students were unsuccessful in speaking skill.

The reality was proved when the researcher observed the ninth grade of SMP Negeri 4 Mandrehe, the researcher found that the students were not able to express greetings and responses in English correctly, contently, and fluently. The problem is affected by some factors such as; the students unconfident in speaking, the lack of students' vocabulary so they do not know

how and what they will say when they speak English, the students have no ideas about the expression they will speak about, and the technique applied by the English teacher in teaching speaking uninteresting to the students.

Based on the problems above, the researcher inspires to find a solution in order that the students can achieve the MCC. The researcher tries to solve the students' problems by applying Talking Chips Technique in teaching-learning speaking process for the students. Through this technique, the students are free to give their opinions, ideas, feeling, and thoughts during teaching-learning process in the classroom.

As Lie (2007:63) says, "This technique divides every student in groups and the students in each group must take three buttons. Every student who has taken it has to give or share information, opinions or ideas and thought about the questions the teacher has gave by putting down one button. The students stop giving or sharing information opinions, ideas and thought, if there is no one of the button in their hand again."

Talking Chips Technique gives much time and motivates all of students in the class to give or share information, opinions or ideas and thought about something to their friends in the time after they make cooperation to their friends' in group. Moreover, Bejo (1996:1) says, "Every student must participate in teaching learning process." Every student does not hear only what they friends' opinions about something but they have to participate about topic they talk about.

The statements above explain that Talking Chips Technique is interesting and giving much time to the students to be active to respond something and the students take buttons that the teacher has provided then the opinion what in their mind they share or give it by putting down the buttons, at the last the students stop giving opinion about the questions that the teacher has given if there is no one of buttons in their hand again.

Based on the explanation above, the researcher uses Classroom Action research (CAR) design because the researcher wants to find the solution of the students' problem in speaking. Classroom Action Research helps the students to find, organize, prove, and

ensure classroom in teaching to improve and increase the students' ability in English. It is supported by Pelton (2010:7) says, "Classroom Action Research is a model for teaching with high transparency that enables to determine student's achievements in a daily basis rather than waiting for the end of a quarter".

Regarding to the explanation, to solve the students' problem in speaking, the researcher is interested to formulate a research title: "Increasing the Students' Ability in Speaking by Using Talking Chips Technique at the Ninth grade of SMP Negeri 4 Mandrehe in 2021/2022."

METHOD

In solving the students' problem in speaking, the researcher will apply Talking Chips Technique by using Classroom Action Research (CAR) research method to increase the students' ability in speaking during teaching-learning process. This research method is appropriate with the research title because in this research, the researcher tries to increase the students' ability in speaking.

According to Wallace in Edge (2001:46), " This is view of action research suggest that it is a means whereby teacher can improve their professional action by reflecting on it in a more structured way that would normally the case". It support by Kunadar (2008) in Iskandar (2009:21) says that action research is an activity done by the teacher or together with the collaborator to improve the quality and the atmosphere of the teaching and learning process.

The object will be searched by the resercher in this reserch is the students' ability in speaking especially in asking attention and responses by using Talking Chips Technique at the ninth grade of SMP Negeri 4 Mandrehe. During this research, the researcher believes that there are many difficulties faced by the researcher. So, The researcher needs help and support from the English teacher, as the teacher collaborator to observe the researcher and the students together with the researcher.

The location of this research is SMP Negeri 4 Mandrehe, it is located in Sisobambowo village, Mandrehe sub-district, Nias Barat regency. The researcher did the research in the ninth grade. This school consists of 5 classrooms. There are 2 class of

the ninth grade (VII), each class consists of 20 students; there are 2 class of the eighth grade (VIII) consists of 2 class, each class consist of 20 students, and a ninth grade (IX) consists of 30 students.

In getting the data in this research, the researcher will use research instrument. The function of observation paper is used in observing the researcher's and students' activities during teaching learning process is running or to notice the researcher's and students' weakness would be found during teaching learning process. Oral test will used to know the students' ability in speaking after applying Talking Chips Technique. This test given to the students at the end of every cycle to measure their ability in speaking after the researcher applies Talking Chips Technique. Field note, a blank paper, used by the researcher to note the students who are active, inactive, creative, uncreative, cooperative, uncooperative students during teaching learning process during implementing Talking Chips Technique and also the researcher's and students' activities close relating when applying Talking Chips Technique in the teaching learning process were not covered in observation paper.

These tools used to record such as the dialogues and took photos relating to the researcher's and the students' activities in the teaching learning process.

In doing this research, the researcher used Classroom Action Research (CAR). The researcher is going to apply one or more cycle, based on the students' achievement whether they can achieve Minimum Competence Criterion (MCC) 60 or not. In cycle I, the researcher is going to apply Talking Chips Technique in teaching speaking. Each cycle consists of two meetings. If cycle I is failed, the researcher will continue to the next cycle until the students can achieve MCC 60.

According to Carr and Kemmis (1999: 39) the procedure of each cycle in Classroom Action Research are planning, action, observation, and reflection as follows: planning consists of the plans of the activities the researcher will do in applying Talking Chips Technique in teaching-learning process in the classroom.

Action consist of the steps the researcher in implementing Talking Chips Technique to increase the students' ability in

speaking during teaching-learning process. Observation contains about the researcher' and collaborator' activities to notice and observe the students' activities and the researcher's activities during teaching-learning process to see the weaknesses and the strengths of each meeting or cycle.

Reflection notes the researcher's consideration for what will be done to improve the weaknesses (the researcher's and students') of cycle 1 based on the observation paper and field notes and then revises them in lesson plan of next cycle. Clearly, the researcher draws a conceptual framework describing how to apply Talking Chips Technique in teaching speaking in cycles.

FINDINGS

There are some procedures of CAR should be implemented in applying Talking Chips Technique in teaching speaking. They are: (a) planning, (b) action, (c) observation, and (d) reflection. During the action of this research, the researcher was helped by the English teacher of SMP Negeri 4 Mandrehe, as the collaborator to observe of the students' and the researcher's activities in order to run the teaching and lerning activities well and get the valid result. Then the evaluation done in the end of every cycle to measure the students' ability in speaking by applying the technique.

Cycle I run in two meetings. Every meeting need 2x40 minutes. The topic was about "Dancer". First meeting followed the steps 1) Planning, the researcher prepared some things, such as: lesson plan, material, recorder, small cards/ Chips, camera, and the observation papers for the researcher and students and a piece of field note. 2) Action, the researcher was accompanied by the teacher collaborator to help her to observed the students' and the researcher's activities. The reseacher conducted the activities of the teaching learning in the classroom based on the lesson plan of first cycle and first meeting which followed some steps, such as pre-teaching consists of opening activities of teaching learning, whilst-teaching contains the procedures modification of Talking Chips Technique from some experts to encrease the students' ability in speaking, and post-teaching acts about the closing activities of teaching learning process. 3) Observation, the researcher concluded the activities had been done by the researcher were 76,5% and

classified in 3+ ranting and the students that had done, the activities were 14 students (46,7%) and classified in 2 ranting. The researcher found some weaknesses, as follows: a) The researcher did not ask the students to repeat again the disscussion if their material have been not finished. b) The researcher did not improve the students' weaknesses and mistakes. c) The researcher did not conclude the teaching material. d) Some of the students did not master the expressing of asking and giving opinion. e) Some of the students could not followed the procedure of the technique. Meanwhile, the researcher found some advantages, such as: the students were interesting and active to practise, almost the students were able to express asking and giving opinion based on the topic given by the researcher, and the researcher was able to explain the material to the students. 4) Reflection, the researcher did some improvement, such as: the researcher asked the students to repeat again the discussion until finished, the researcher improved the students' weaknesses and mistakes, the researcher remembered to concluded teaching material, the researcher taught the students clearly about the expressing of asking and giving opinion to the students and explain the technique's procedures to the students clearly, so they did not confuse about the steps.

The second meeting, it also held in 2x40 minutes and foolowed the steps of CAR. 1) Planning, the researcher prepared some things, such as: lesson plan, material, recorder, small cards/Chips, camera, and the observation papers for the researcher and students, and field note. 2) Action, the researcher taught the students by followed the lesson plan of first cycle in the second meeting and she accompanied by the teacher-collaborator to enter the class. In the pre-teching, researcher opened the teaching learning process; in whilst teaching, the researcher did the improvement, run lesson plan, and asked the students to practise the dialog expressing asking and giving opinion by implementing the procedures of the technique, then evaluated the students by recorded their dialogs; and in the post-teaching, the researcher closed the activities of teaching and learning process. 3) Observation, the result of observation paper for the researcher was 81,8% classified in 3+ ranting and the students' observation paper

was 56,7% and classified in 2+ ranting. The researcher found some weaknesses, such as: the researcher did not ask the students difficulties in applying the technique, the researcher did not improve some of the students' weaknesses during practice the dialog, some students had little bit confusion to follow the technique's procedures in asking and giving opinion. The researcher also got some advantages of this meeting, suc as: the students were motivated, interest, and active to folow the teaching learning process, the researcher mastered the technique's procedures and made the the students motivated, the researcher had confident to to teach and improve the weaknesses of the first meeting, and some students were able to express to follow the steps of the technique in asking and giving opinion. The results of the observation papers done some improvements, namely: the researcher asked the students' difficulties in applying the technique, improved some of the students' weaknesses during practice the dialog, and explained more about the technique's procedures in asking and giving opinion. The average students' mark of the oral test done by the students was 49.13. It mean that the students did not pass the MCC 60. It needed the improvment of the researcher's and the students' weaknesses in lesson plan of cycle II.

Cycle II also did in two meetings. Each meeting need 2x40 minutes. The topic was about the "School Yard". The first meeting followed the steps, suc as: 1) Re-planning, the researcher prepared lesson plan had been improved, observation paper, small cards/Chips, material, recorder/camera, the observation papers for the researcher and the students, and field note. 2) Action, the researcher entered the class accompanied by the English teacher. She run this step based on the lesson plan had improved before. She opened the teaching learning process, acted the core activities of teaching learning by applying Talking Chips Technique in asking and giving opinion, and then close the teaching learning process. During teaching learning process taken place, the teacher colaborator observed the the researcher's and the students' activities. 3) Observation, the result of the researcher's observation paper in the first meeting in cycle II was 93,7% and classified in 4+ ranting and the students' observation

paper was 73.3% and classified in 3+ rating. There were some weaknesses found in this meeting, as follows: the researcher forgot to improve some of the students' weaknesses, and some students felt difficult to give their opinion about the topic. Meanwhile, there were some advantages, such as: the students were motivated, interested, and active to follow the teaching learning process, the researcher mastered the technique's procedures and made the students motivated and had confidence to teach, improved the weaknesses of the first meeting, and able to control the class during discussion run, and some of the students were able to follow the steps of the technique in asking and giving opinion. 4) Reflection, the researcher evaluated the students' and the researcher observation papers and gave some improvement such as: the researcher improved her and the students' weaknesses, motivated the students to give their opinion and asked what their difficulties they had.

The second meeting also run the steps, 1) Re-Planning, the researcher prepared some things, such as: lesson plan, material, small cards/Chips, recorder, camera, the observation papers, and field note. 2) Action, the researcher accompanied by the teacher-collaborator when enter the class to observed the researcher's and students' activities. Then, the researcher did pre-teaching, whilst teaching had been improved, and the post-teaching. At last core activities, the researcher gave the oral test to the students to measure their ability in speaking by implementing Talking Chips Technique. 3) Observation, the result of the researcher's observation paper was 100% and classified in 4+ rating and the result of the students' observation paper was 90% and classified in 4 rating. There were some of the students' mistakes in pronounce some words during run the dialog. While there were some the advantages were found as follows: the students had enough motivation, interest, and active to follow the teaching learning process, the researcher mastered the lesson plan and motivated the students well, had good performance to teach the students and improve the weaknesses of the first

meeting, able to control the class and the discussion, and almost the students were able to follow the steps of the technique in asking and giving opinion. 4) Reflection, the researcher motivated some students became more active in teaching-learning process to increase their students' ability in speaking by using Talking Chips Technique. In cycle II, the students' ability in speaking was increased. The students' average mark was 68.60. In the other words, the students got success to pass the MCC 60 and this research stopped to do. Then the researcher reported the finding.

Based on the result of the oral test, the students' ability in speaking in the first cycle was varying. There were 4 students got level of fluency 1 (13,33%), 9 students got level of fluency 1+ (30,00%), 7 students got level of fluency 2 (23,33%), 7 students got level of fluency 2+ (23,33%), 2 students got level of fluency 3 (6,68%) and 1 student got level of fluency 3+ (3,33). Also, the successful students from the data above were (33,3%) while unsuccessful students were (66,7%). The average of the students' mark was 49.13. From the data above, it can be stated that the students could not achieve the MCC 60, and also the researcher and the students still had some weaknesses in implementing Talking Chips Technique in speaking so the researcher planned to continue to the second cycle.

The students' ability in speaking in second cycle showed that there were 4 students got level of fluency 2+ (13,33%), 14 students got level of fluency 3 (56,67%), and 6 students got level of fluency 3+ (30,00%). Also, the successful students from the data above were 100 % and there were no unsuccessful students. And the average of the students' mark was 68.60. Based on the result of this last cycle, the researcher stated that this cycle was successful to increase the students ability in speaking by using Talking Chips Technique and all of the students passed the MCC 60. So the researcher stopped this research and reported the findings.

The entire results of the students ability and students' and researcher's activities in every cycle described in the tables as follows:

Tabel 1. The Students' Speaking Ability in all Cycles

Cycle	Ranting	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Classification
I	0+	-	-	Unsuccessful (66,7%)
	1	4	13,33	
	1+	9	30,00	
	2	7	23,33	
	2+	7	23,33	Successful (33,3%)
	3	2	6,68	
	3+	1	3,33	
	4	-	-	
	4+	-	-	
	0+	-	-	
II	1	-	-	Unsuccessful (0 %)
	1+	-	-	
	2	-	-	
	2+	4	13,33	Successful (100%)
	3	17	56,67	
	3+	9	30,00	
	4	-	-	
4+	-	-		

Table 2. The Results of the Observation Paper for Researcher and Students in all Cycles

Cycle	Meeting	Criterion	Frequency of Students	Percentage
I	1 st	Done	14	46.7 %
		Undone	16	53.3 %
	2 nd	Done	17	56.7 %
		Undone	13	43.3 %
II	1 st	Done	22	73.3 %
		Undone	8	26.7 %
	2 nd	Done	27	90 %
		undone	3	10 %

The main problem of the research was “How does Talking Chips Technique Increase the Students’ Ability in Speaking at the Ninth Grade of SMP Negeri 5 Mandrehe in 2021/2022?” The common response is Talking Chips Technique increased the students’ ability in speaking by implementing the procedures of Talking Chips Technique during teaching-learning process and gave the students a material about Asking and Giving Opinion.

Moreover, in applying the procedure of Talking Chips Technique, the researcher had conducted it into two cycles. To increased the students’ ability in speaking during two cycles, the researcher always improved all the weaknesses after conducting the research each meeting. In Cycle I, the average of the students mark in speaking was 49.13 and in the Cycle II

the average of the students mark in speaking was 68.60. Based on the average of the students’ ability in each cycle, the researcher found that the students’ ability in speaking through Talking Chips Technique passed the MCC 60. Therefore, the researcher concludes that Talking Chips Technique increases the students’ ability in speaking.

After conducting the research in two cycles, the researcher analyzed the result of the students’ speaking ability and the observation sheets either for the researcher’s and students’ activities.

In Cycle I especially in the second meeting, the researcher gave the oral test to the students was extended to know the students’ ability in speaking, and the students’ ability showed that most of the students did not pass Minimum Competence Criterion (MCC).

There were 20 students (66.7%) who classified in "Fail" and 10 students (33.3%) who classified in "Successful". This failness caused the students were able to followed the activities extend in the lesson plan. The students' activities percentage of Cycle I in the first meeting were done only 46.7% and undone 53.3%. Also the researcher's activities had done of cycle I in the first meeting was 76.5% and undone was 23.5%. The data described that the students and researcher had some weaknesses in followed and implemented Talking Chips Technique in speaking skill. The weaknesses needed to improve into the second meeting.

In the second meeting, the students' activities had done was 56.7% and undone was 43.3%. The researcher's activities had done was 81.8 % and undone was 18.2 %. The percetages showed the students and researcher still had some weaknesses in followed and implemented Talking Chips Technique in speaking skill in this meeting. The students' and researcher's weaknesses had to improve in the fist meeting of cycle II. Moreover, the result of the students' oral test showed that there were 20 (66.7 %) students did not pass the MCC 60 and 10 (33.3 %) students passed the MCC 60. Then the average og the students' mark was 49.13. Based on the explanation above, the reseacher underlined that the students could not pass the MCC 60 or fail and must improve the weaknesses of the students and researcher in to the cycle II.

In Cycle II, the researcher taught the students about the improvements of the cycle I that had designed before. The improvements had brought a big influence of the students' achievements in Cycle II. It showed from the result of observation sheet, most of the students had done all the activities or procedures of Whip Around Strategy. The students' activities percentage of Cycle II in the first meeting had done was 73.3 % and undone 26.7%. The reseacher's activities had done was 93.7% and un done was 6.3 %. Also in second meeting, the students' activities had done was 90 % and undone was 10 %. The researcher's activities had done was 100 % and undone 0 %. Moreover, the average of the students' mark was 68.60. It showed the the students' ability passed Minimum Competence Criterion (MCC) 60. Noone students did not pass the MCC 60. All of

students got mark classified in "Good level" or succesfull in applying Taking Chips Technique in speaking especially in Asking and Giving Opinion. Based on the result of the research, the researcher concluded that Talking Chips Technique increased the students ability in speaking and were able to solved the students' problem in speaking skill. So this technique can used in teaching speaking for the students because Taking Chips Technique motivated and made the students more active, interesting, responsive, and confidence in speaking to express their idea about the topic given to them. And also, the students had an opportunity to express their opinions, ideas and feelings orally without the pressure of having to speak so they can increase their confident and language fluency.

CONCLUSION

Based on the data analysis, the researcher took some conclusions as follows:

1. In Cycle I, the result of students' ability in speaking who got level 1 of fluency level (13,33%), level 1+ of fluency level (30,00%), level of fluency level 2 (23, 33%), level 2+ of fluency level (23,33%) and level 3 of fluency level (6,68%), and level 3+ of fluency level (3,33%). It showed that the researcher should be continuing to the next cycle (Cycle II).
2. In Cycle II, the result of students' ability in speaking who get level 2+ of fluency level (13,33%), level 3 of fluency level (56,67%) and level 3+ of fluency level (30,00%). These result described that the students were able to set up their point of view based on the topic given. The students' ability in speaking skill in the cycle II obtained had increased than result of the cycle I. The result of cycle I and II above supported by the researcher's and students' efforts to improve every weaknesses they have in every meeting to the next meeting. In conclusion, Talking Chips Technique encreased the students' ability in speaking skill effectivelly, appropriatly, and significantly.

REFERENCES

- Brown, 2004, *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*, Pearson Education, Inc, NY.
- Clark and Anderson. 2011. *Techniques in Teaching & Learning Language*.

- Printed in China: Oxford University Press.
- Edge, Julian. 2001. *Action Research*, Virginia: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL).
- Harmer, J., 2011. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Edinburgh: Pearson.
- Isjoni, 2004, *the Cooperative Learning Method*. Rineka Cipta, Bandung.
- Kagan, S & Kagan, M. 2009. *Kagan Cooperative Learning*. San Clemente: Kagan Publishing.
- Kemmis, S. Wilkinson, M, 1998, *Practicatory Action Research and The study of Practice*, (online), (<http://www.answer.com/topic/participatory>) diakses pada 30 Mei 2009
- Lie, Anita, 2007, *The Cooperative Learning Method*. Rineka Cipta, Bandung.
- Logan, Peterson, 1972, *Creative Communication, Teaching the Language Arts*, Mc. Grown Hill Ryeson Limited, Canada.
- Morris, D (2005). *The Howard Street Tutoring Manual: Teaching At-risk Readers in the Primary Graders*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Nunan, David, 2001, *Partical English Languages Teaching*, Mc.Graw-Hill
- Pelton, P. Robert. 2010 *Action Research for Teacher Candidates*, United States of America
- Perrin, G. Porter. 1959. *Writer's Guide and Index to English*. Chicago Printed in the United States of America.
- Richard, Jack, Willy, A. Renandya. 2002. *Methodology in Language Teaching and Anthology of Current Practice*. Cambridge, USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Tuckman, Nurgiyantoro, Burhan, 1986, *Penilaian Dalam Pengajaran Bahasa dan Sastra*, Yoyakarta, BPFE. Companies, New York.