USING TALKING CHIPS TECHNIQUE TO IMPROVE SPEAKING ACHIEVEMENT OF 11th GRADERS OF ONE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL IN INDRALAYA UTARA

NANIK PURWASIH, MACHDALENA VIANTY, & MARGARETHA DINAR SITINJAK

Department of English Education
Sriwijaya University
Palembang, e-mail: purwasihnanik@gmail.com, machdalena074@yahoo.com, magiedinar@yahoo.com

Abstract

The objectives of this study were to find out whether or not there were a significant difference in speaking achievement of students who were taught by using Talking Chips technique, a significant difference in speaking achievement between the students who were taught by using Talking Chips technique and those who were not, a significant improvement in each aspect of speaking achievement after they were taught by using Talking Chips technique, and an aspect of speaking that gave the biggest and the smallest contributions to the speaking achievement of the 11th grade students of one senior high school in Indralaya Utara who were taught by using Talking Chips technique. The sample of this study was 61 eleventh grade students of one senior high school in Indralaya Utara which were grouped into a control and an experimental groups. In collecting the data, each group was assigned a pretest and a posttest. The data were analyzed statistically by using paired and independent sample t-test. The results of this study are as follows: 1) there was a significant difference in speaking achievement of students who were taught by using Talking Chips technique; the mean difference was 9.355 and *p*-value=.000, 2) there was a significant difference in speaking achievement between the students who were taught by using Talking Chips technique and those who were not (mean diff= 13.65, and *p*-value=.000), 3) there was significant improvement in each aspect of students' speaking achievement, and 4) there was an aspect of speaking that gave the biggest and the smallest contributions to the speaking achievement of the 11th grade students of one senior high school in Indralaya Utara who were taught by using Talking Chips technique. In conclusion, there was a significant difference in speaking achievement between the students who were taught by using Talking Chips technique and those who were not. The result of this study showed that Talking Chips Technique is effective in improving students' speaking achievement.

Keywords: Speaking Achievement, Talking Chips, Eleventh Grade Students

1. Introduction

English plays a very important role in international communication. It is a key to the store house of the knowledge because many books on all branches of knowledge are written in English (Patel & Jain, 2008). English is also used as a tool for international communication in many fields such as transportation, commerce, banking, tourism, technology, diplomacy, and scientific research (Brown, 2001).

In Indonesia, English is taught as a compulsory subject for Junior High School and Senior High School (Depdiknas, 1989). This is also supported by The Government Regulation, Number 28, 1990, (as cited in Lauder, 2008) which states that English is to be taught from the first year of Junior High School. Thus, it can be inferred that teaching and learning English is very important in Indonesia.

There are four language skills in the teaching and learning of English. They are listening, speaking, reading, and writing. These four language skills are equally important, but speaking skill is the leading skill during English teaching and learning process. As Welty and Welty (1976) claim, speaking is the main ability in communication, thus speaking is the most important language skill to master. According to Nunan (as cited in Bahrani & Soltani, 2012), a success in language learning is measured in terms of the ability to carry out a conversation in the (target) language. In addition, the meaning of a language is a means of communication. It means when students are able to speak a target language, they are considered success in learning or acquiring the language. Thus, speaking plays the most important role in terms of the successfulness of students to learn a language.

According to the Regulation of National Education Minister Number 23 in 2006 (Depdiknas, 2006), the aim of teaching speaking skill is to help the students be able to express the meaning in transactional and interpersonal language in daily life context. People who have a good ability in speaking would be better in sending and receiving information or message from the others. Despite the fact that Indonesia is in the 32nd position out of 70 countries for English Proficiency Index (EPI) and is categorized as moderate (Education First, 2015), English proficiency among

Indonesia students is low (Lie, 2007) . In addition, Indonesia students face many difficulties in communicating in English (Muamaroh, 2013). This is supported by a research conducted by Mukadimah and Jamilah (2013) who got involved the 11th graders of SMAN 1 Pengasih in Yogyakarta showed that there were five common problems faced by the students in speaking English. The first problem was the opportunity to speak English. Teachers usually dominate the students. In fact, the students need a lot of opportunities to express their thought in speaking. The second problem was the vocabulary. Because of the lack of vocabularies, as the result the students usually got stuck to speak. The third one was pronunciation. The students rarely spoke English in their daily life. Therefore, the students found it hard to pronounce the words. Another problem was the resources used during learning process. The last one was the activities in the classroom which did not encourage students. As the results of those problems, the students failed to speak English (Mukadimah & Jamilah, 2013).

In line with the finding of research conducted by Mukadimah and Jamilah, Syafryadin (2011) who conducted a research by involving one of senior high schools in Bandung found that the tenth grade students faced many problems in learning speaking such as the lack of vocabularies, mispronunciation, and less motivation. Therefore, the students were not enthusiastic in doing the speaking activities.

Furthermore, a research conducted by Ghassanie (2015) by involving one of senior high schools 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.

Those problems mentioned above were also faced by the 11th grade Students of one of senior high schools in Indralaya Utara. A preliminary investigation through interviewing the English teacher oshowed that the students found it hard to speak. They lacked vocabularies and had less motivation in learning English. In addition, they also did not know how to pronounce the words of English correctly and fluently.

To help the teacher to solve the problems faced by the 11th grade students of one of senior high schools in Indralaya Utara in speaking, the writer applied Talking Chips technique which was developed by Kagan and Kagan (2009). It is one of the techniques in cooperative learning. This technique allows the students to work in groups to discuss a specific topic. Moreover, Kagan and Kagan (2009) says that Talking Chips technique is a technique of teaching speaking which make the students interested and help the students to speak. It is because this technique can make the students: be active in the classroom, learn how to cooperate in a group and have a chance to speak English because the students are divided into several groups and each member will have a turn to speak English.

The implementation of Talking Chips technique had been proven in many previous studies. For example, the research conducted by Syafryadin (2011) who involved one of senior high school in Bandung found that there was improvement in speaking achievement. Mukadimah and Jamilah (2013) also showed that there was a positive improvement in speaking achievement. Another study conducted by Estiningrum (2014) who involved junior high school students in Klaten showed that there was a significant improvement in speaking achievement.

Accordingly, the writer was interested in conducting a study entitled "Using Talking Chips Technique to Improve Speaking Achievement of 11th grade Students". There were three problems that were formulated in this study; 1) Was there any significant difference in speaking achievement of the students before and after they were taught by using Talking Chips technique?, 2) Was there any significant difference in speaking achievement between the students who were taught by using Talking Chips technique and those who were not?, 3) Was there any significant improvement in each aspect of speaking achievement of the students after they were taught by using Talking Chips technique?, and 4) which aspect of speaking that gave the biggest and the smallest contributions to the speaking achievement of the 11th grade students of one senior high schools Indralaya Utara who were taught by using Talking Chips technique.

2. Theoritical Background

Despite the fact that speaking is a tool by which a language is used and is considered important since by speaking, people can share and deliver what they need to others, it is considered a complex skill in language learning because it, at once, involves those five aspects of language spontaneously when one wants to deliver his massage to others. According to Harris (1969), speaking takes the part of pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, fluency and comprehension altogether. Thus, it is important to find out a strategy to teach speaking.

Kagan and Kagan (2009) develops Talking Chips as one of the teaching strategies of cooperative learning. This technique supports accountable participation in small group interaction by regulating how often each group member is allowed to speak. As this technique points out the full and even participation, it encourages passive students to be more confident in speaking. This technique also helps the students to improve their critical thinking since it is possible for the students to discuss controversial issues which will lead them to engage to one another opinion.

In implementing the Talking Chips Technique, the writer modified the procedures proposed by Syafryadin (2011) which are as in the following.

1. Teacher provides a discussion topic. The teacher could provide certain topics for the groups to be discussed. It would help the students to maintain their ideas to be shared.
2. Begins the discussion. Anyone in the group could start the discussion related to the topic by placing his or her chip in the center of the team table.
3. Continues the discussion. Any student could continue the discussion by using his or her chip. However, they need to wait until the first speaker done speaking.
4. When all chips are used, teammates collect all their chips.
5. During the students' discussion about the topic, the aspects of speaking would be observed.

3. Method

In conducting this study, the writer applied a quasi-experimental research method. According to Creswell (2012, p. 309), "quasi-experiments are experimental situations in which the researcher assigns, but not randomly, participants to groups because the experimenter cannot artificially create groups for the experiment."

In this study, the writer gave the pre-test and post-test to both of the experimental group and control group. Pretest was given to the sample before the students get the treatment while the posttest was given after the students get the treatment. The posttest was given to measure the students' speaking achievement after being treated by using Talking Chips Technique. Meanwhile, the teaching materials during the treatment were based on the students' guide book curriculum 2006. The materials also had been already discussed with the teacher in charge.

The population of this study was the eleventh grade students of one of senior high schools in Indralaya Utara in the academic year of 2015/2016 with the total number 117 students. The writer applied a convenience sampling method because the school only provided two specific classes to be involved as the sample. In convenience sampling, the participants were selected because they were willing and available and they represented some characteristics the writer sought to study (Creswell, 2012, p. 145). In this study, there were two classes which were available; XI IPA 1 and XI IPA 2. Those two classes represented the characteristics the writer sought to study that they had problems in speaking. These two classes were taught by the same English teacher. From the two classes, the writer took one class as the experimental group and the other class as the control group. In deciding which class would be the experimental group and control group, the writer got suggestion from the teacher who taught both of the classes.

The data collection used by the writer to collect the data was speaking tests which was conducted twice; pretest and posttest. The pretest and posttest were given to measure the students' speaking achievement before and after the treatment. The

students were asked to present a specific material. The writer recorded the students' voice while they were doing their speech.

For achieving a high degree of the content validity, the writer devised a topic in accordance with the objectives of the test that is to measure students' speaking achievement. Then, the writer asked two advisors to check the appropriateness of the content of the test. To estimate the reliability of the test, inter-rater reliability was applied. Two raters did the scoring for the students' pre-test and post-test based on the rubric provided by the writer. The first rater is a lecturer of English Education Study Program of FKIP in Sriwijaya University and the second rater is an English instructor of Sriwijaya University Language Institute.

To check the reliability of the the results of the students' speaking checked by the two raters were, the writer used a statistical measure of the interrater reliability, which was Cohen's Kappa It ranges from 0 - 1.0. The data were analyzed using SPSS version 22. Then, it was found that the result of the reliability of experimental group pretest was 0.807, and the experimental group posttest was 0.810, the result of reliability of control group pretest was 0.761 and control group posttest was 0.843. It could be interpreted that reliability coefficient of pretest of experimental group and control group was in "Substantial agreement" and the reliability coefficient of posttest of the experimental and control groups was in "Almost perfect agreement". It means that the results of students' speaking test were reliable.

T-test was used in analyzing the data. Paired-sample and independent t-test were applied in this study. Paired sample t-test was used to find out whether or not there was a significant difference in speaking achievement of the students before and after they were taught by using Talking Chips technique, and to find whether or not there was a significant improvement in each aspect of speaking achievement in the experimental group after they were taught by using Talking Chips technique. Then, the independent sample t-test was used to find out whether there was a significant difference in speaking achievement between the students who were taught by using

Talking Chips technique and those who were not. To run the analysis, the writer employed the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 22 for windows.

4. Results and Discussion

1. The Scores Distribution

Based on the data obtained (see Table 1), there were seventeen students (54.8%) in the experimental group were in Average category and fourteen students (45.2%) were in Good category based on the result of the pretest. In the pretest, there were no students (0%) in the Excellent category. However, after the students got the treatments for 16 meetings, there was improvement from the students' score. There were six students categorized as Excellent, twenty students were in Good category, and four students in Average category. Furthermore, there was significant improvement in students' mean score from 68.97 to 78.32. Thus, it can be concluded that there was a progress occurred in experimental group.

Table 1

The Score Distribution in the Experimental and Control Group

Score Interval	Category	Control Group				Experimental Group			
		Pretest		Posttest		Pretest		Posttest	
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
86-100	Excellent	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	19,4
71-85	Good	6	20	8	26,7	14	45,2	21	67,7
56-70	Average	24	80	16	53,3	17	54,8	4	12,9
41-55	Poor	0	0	6	20	0	0	0	0
0-40	Failed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL		30	100	30	100	31	100	31	100

In addition, in the pretest of control group, there were twenty four students (80%) in average category and four student (20%) in good category, and there was no student in poor and excellent category. Meanwhile, in the posttest there were six students (20%) in poor category, sixteen students (53.3%), eight students (26.7%) in average category, and there was no student (0%) in excellent category. There was no improvement in control group's mean score. It could happen because the control group students did not get the same treatment as experimental group.

2. Normality Test

Before checking the data by using t-test, normality test was conducted to know whether the data have normal distribution or not. In analyzing the normality test, one sample of Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z test in SPSS version 22 was applied. In one sample of Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z test, if the significance (2-tailed) $\geq$0.05, the distribution of the sample in the population is normal. The result of normality test of the data in this study was presented in the following table.

Table 2

The Result of Normality Test

Group	Pretest				posttest			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig.	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig.	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z
ExpGroup	68.97	6.711	**.200**	.126	78.32	7.268	**.117**	.141
Cg Group	65.47	7.982	**.125**	.142	64.67	9.400	**.200**	.111

According to Harmon (2011, p. 33), data is normally distributed if $p > 0.05$. The significance (2-tailed) of pretest and posttest of the experimental group were 0.200 and 0.117, while the significance (2-tailed) of pretest and posttest of the control group were 0.125 and 0.200. Since all of the significance values higher than 0.05, it was concluded that the data were normally distributed.

3. Homogenity Test

Homogeneity test was applied to know whether the sample groups from the population had similar variance. Levene's test was conducted to know the homogeneity of the sample groups; experimental and control groups. The data were homogenous if the significance (2 tailed) is greater than 0.05. The result of homogeneity test of the data in this study is presented in the table below.

Table 3

The Result of Homogeneity Test

Group	Levene Statistic	df1	f2	Sig
Pre-test and Post-test in EG	**.589**	**1**	**0**	**.446**
Pre-test and Post-test in CG	**.802**	**1**	**8**	**.374**
Pre-test and Pre-test in EG and CG	**.492**	**1**	**9**	**.486**
Post-test and Post-test in EG and CG	**1.123**	**1**	**9**	**.294**

The significance (2-tailed) of pre-test and post-test in experimental group was 0.446, while the significance (2-tailed) of pre-test and post-test in control group was 0.374. In addition, the significance (2-tailed) pre-test and pre-test in experimental and control groups was 0.486, while significance (2-tailed) the post-test and post-test in both groups was 0.294. Since all of the significance values higher than 0.05, it was concluded that the data were homogenous.

4. The Result of Paired Sample t-test in the Experimental and Control Groups

Paired sample t-test was applied to analyze the score of pre-test and post-test in both group (experimental and control). The paired sample t-test was used to answer research question number 1 (Was there any significant difference in speaking achievement of the 11th grade students of one senior high schools in Indralaya Utara before and after they were taught by using Talking Chips technique?). The summary of statistical analysis of the pre-test and post-test in experimental and control groups can be seen in Table 4. Based on the result of paired sample t-test in the experimental group (see Table 4), the mean score of the posttest (78.32) was higher than the mean score of the pretest (68.97) with the mean difference -9.355. Since the *p* value was less than 0.05 (0.000 < 0.05) (see the *sig 2 tailed* column), it could be concluded that there was a significant difference between the mean score of pretest and posttest of the experimental group.

Table 4

The Result of Paired Sample t-test for Students' Speaking Achievement

Groups	Test	Mean	Mean Diff	Std. Dev	Std. Error Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Experimental Group	Pretest	68.97	-9.355	6.711	1.205	-7.368	30	**.000**
	Posttest	78.32		7.268	1.305			
Control Group	Pretest	65.47	.800	7.982	1.457	0.845	29	**.351**
	Posttest	64.67		9.400	1.716			

Meanwhile, the result of paired sample t-test in the control group showed that the mean score of the posttest (64.67) was lower than the mean score of the pretest (65.47) with the mean difference was .800. Since the *p* value was higher than 0.05 (0.000>0.05), it could be said that there was no any significant difference in the mean score of pretest and posttest of the control group.

The writer also used paired sample t-test to find out whether or not there was significant improvement in each aspect of students' speaking achievement after they were taught by using Talking Chips technique.

Table 5

The Result of Paired Sample T-test for Each Aspect of Speaking Achievement Score

Aspect of Speaking	**Exp Group**		**Mean dif**	**Std. Dev**	**Sig.**	**Cg Group**		**Mean dif**	**Std. Dev**	**Sig.**
	Pre	**Post**				**Pre**	**Post**			
Content	3.58	4.25	.677	.665	**.000**	3.18	3.3	.116	.625	.315
Fluency	3.48	4.06	.580	.708	**.000**	3.6	3.45	-.150	.297	.010
Pronunciation	3.41	3.76	.338	.637	**.006**	3.18	3.10	-.083	.349	.202
Vocabulary	3.26	3.56	.306	.494	**.002**	3.17	3.17	.000	.435	1.000
Grammar	3.50	3.95	.451	.522	**.000**	3.23	3.15	-.083	.296	.351

As shown in Table 5, there was significant improvement in each aspect of the students' speaking achievement score. It means that there was significant improvement in each aspect of students' speaking achievement after being taught by using Talking chips technique. Meanwhile, based on the table, there was only one aspect of speaking in the control group which was improved, that is *Fluency*.

5. Independent Sample t-test of Experimental and Control Groups

To find out whether or not there was a significant difference between the students who were taught by using Talking Chips technique and those were not, the writer compared the result of the posttest of experimental group and control group, the result is presented in the table 6 below

Table 6
The Result of Independent Sample t-Test Analyses

Pretest					Postest				
Group	**Mean**	**Mean diff**	**Std Dev**	**ig.P**	**Group**	**Mean**	**Mean diff**	**Std Dev**	**Sig.P**
Exp	**8.97**	**3.501**	**11.33**	**068**	**xp**	**78.32**	**3.65**	**7.28**	**.000**
Cg	**5.47**		**11.96**		**g**	**64.67**		**9.40**	

The result of independent sample t-test revealed that although the mean of pre-test in Experimental group was higher than in control group (68.97 > 65.47), the *p* value was higher than 0.005 (0.068 >0.005). Since *p* value > 0.005, it means that there was no significant difference in pre-test of speaking achievement of both experimental and control groups. Meanwhile, the mean score of the post-test in the experimental group was higher than the mean score of the post-test in the control group (78.32 > 64.67). According to Mendenhall, Beaver, and Beaver (2008, p. 352), if *p* value is less than or equal to 0.05, the null hypothesis can be rejected. Since the *p* value (sig. 2-tailed) was less than 0.05 (0.000 < 0.05), it can be concluded that there was significant difference in the post-test between the experimental and control group. In conclusion, it could be claimed that the null hypothesis ($H_0$2) was rejected and research hypothesis (H_A2) was accepted.

6. The Result of the Independent Sample t-test for Each Aspect of Students' Speaking Achievement Score

The analysis of speaking score per aspects; content, fluency, pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar, was done by using independent sample t-test (see Table 7).

Table 7

The Result of the Independent Sample t-test for each Aspect of Students' Speaking Achievement Score

Aspects	Postest		Mean Difference	Sig
	Exp Group	Cg Group		
Content	4.258	3.300	.958	.000
Fluency	4.064	3.450	.614	.000
Pronunciation	3.758	3.100	.658	.000
Vocabulary	3.564	3.166	.397	.005
Grammar	3.952	3.150	.801	.000

It **can be inferred from the data presented in Table 7 that** there were significance differences in the mean scores between posttest of control and experimental groups for each aspect of students' speaking achievement scores.

7. The Result of Regression Analysis

Multiple regression analyses was conducted to know the significant contribution in each aspect of the students' speaking achievement after they were taught by using Talking Chips technique. To analyze it, multiple regression analysis was used by applying stepwise method. The result of the analysis can be seen in the following table.

Table 8

The Contribution of each Aspect of Speaking of the Experimental Group (N=31) toward Speaking Achievement

Model	R^2	AdjR Square	Change Statistics	
			R Square Change	Sig. F Change
Content	**.714**	**.704**	**.714**	**.000**
Fluency	**.878**	**.869**	**.164**	**.000**
Pronunciation	**.945**	**.938**	**.067**	**.000**
Vocabulary	**.988**	**.986**	**.044**	**.000**
Grammar	**1.000**	**1.000**	**.012**	**.000**

Table 8 shows that each aspect of speaking gave significant contribution to the students' speaking achievement score. *Content* gave contribution 71.4%, *Fluency* 16.4%, *Pronunciation* 6.7%, *Vocabulary* 4.4%, *Grammar* 1.2%. The result showed that the aspect of speaking that gave the highest contribution was *Content* and the lowest was *Grammar.*

Discussion

Based on the findings of this study, some interpretations are drawn. The findings show that (1) there was a significant difference in speaking achievement of experimental group before and after given treatment, (2) there was a significant difference in students' speaking achievement of both experimental and control group, and (3) there was significant improvement in each aspect of speaking achievement after they were taught by using Talking Chips technique.

The first finding showed that there was significant difference in speaking achievement of experimental group before and after they were given the treatment. It can be seen from the mean difference of students' speaking test in pre-test and post-test. The mean difference between pre-test and post-test in the experimental group was 9.355 at the significance level of *p* value <0.05), $H_0$1 was rejected and there was

a significant difference in speaking achievement between pre-test and post-test of experimental group. The improvement itself could happen because after the experimental group was assigned pre-test, the writer gave them the treatment by using Talking Chips technique for one month. Meanwhile, there was also improvement in control group although it was not really significant. However, the experimental group showed much better improvement than the control group. Thus, it can be stated that the use of Talking Chips technique in the experimental group gave significance contribution in improving students' speaking achievement.

There are two reasons why Talking Chips technique can improve students' speaking achievement. Firstly, Talking Chips technique offers an interesting way of learning in which they have a turn to speak. By Talking Chips, each student was motivated to be active. Even though they had equal chance to speak, the students can only speak if they still have the chips. It is supported by Kagan and Kagan (2009) that Talking Chips make the students interested and provide accountability to speak.

Secondly, Talking Chips encourage students to be confident and respect their friends during discussion in order to create mutual understanding. It is in line with the finding of Mukadimah and Jamilah (2013) Talking Chips technique allowed the students learn how to give contribution in discussion by giving and sharing their opinion.

The second finding confirmed that there was significant difference in speaking achievement between experimental and control groups. The mean difference between the post-test and pre-test in the experimental group was higher than the mean difference between post-test and pre-test in the control group. It can be stated that there was significant difference in students' speaking achievement both of experimental and control groups. There was also an improvement in control group's speaking achievement although it was not as much as the experimental group. The control group was only given pre-test and post-test. However, during the teaching and learning activity, the students also learned the same materials as experimental group. Mostly, the teacher gave them explanation about the materials. They were barely

exposed to express their ideas, they only took note and actively answered questions on the text book.

The third finding showed that there was significant improvement in each aspect of students' speaking achievement in experimental group. It can be proven from the statistical analysis done by paired sample t test. Furthermore, the result of the multiple regression analysis by using stepwise method showed that all the aspects of speaking achievement contributed significantly. This could happen because during the treatment, they were exposed to a group discussion to discuss a specific topic in which they had to take turn to speak.

The improvement in the speaking aspect *Content* is relevant with what Kagan and Kagan (2009) state that Talking Chips is a way to expose the students to communication. It helps students to get new vocabularies as they shared their opinion to one another. Before the students were exposed to Talking Chips, the students were lack of ideas in expressing their opinion. They had difficulties to convey the ideas meaningfully.

The improvement in the speaking aspect *Fluency* is relevant with what Estiningrum (2014) state that the students are able to be more confident in expressing their opinions. Initially, the students had difficulties in speaking fluently. The students found it hard to speak since they rarely spoke English during learning process. However, since the students were exposed to Talking Chips technique, they could be able to express their opinion.

The improvement in the speaking aspect *Pronunciation* is also in line with what Estiningrum (2014) state that through Talking Chips technique, the students actively get involved in teaching and learning process. During the teaching and learning process, the researcher corrected the students' pronunciation. Before the treatment, the students found it hard to pronounce the words correctly. They pronounced the words as they are written.

The improvement in the speaking aspect *Vocabulary* is also relevant with what Estiningrum (2014) state that in the implementation of Talking Chips technique, the

students' vocabulary mastery become better because they are exposed to various topics. In the beginning, the students still had difficulties in selecting appropriate vocabularies. But step by step, after giving them more topics to discuss, they became good at speaking by using appropriate words.

The last, The improvement in the speaking aspect *Grammar* , mostly the students found grammar as the most difficult aspect. Sometimes the students neglected the structures of the sentences as they did not know the correct structures. Nevertheless, gradually the students learned how to organize sentences correctly while they were discussing.

The forth finding showed that there is an aspect of speaking that gives the biggest and the smallest contributions to the students' speaking achievement. The aspect of speaking that gives the biggest contribution is *Content* aspect. According to Kagan and Kagan (2009), talking chips technique allows the students to deliver their opinion in turn. Therefore, each student will get many ideas from the other students that will enhance their knowledge. Meanwhile, the aspect that gives the smallest contribution is *Grammar* aspect. It is because the students still found it hard to use grammar while they were speaking.

From the explanation above, the experimental group performed better than control group. It could be concluded that the students who received the treatment had significant improvement in speaking achievement. Although the score of control group increased as well, but the increasing was not high as the score of the experimental group was. Therefore, it can be stated that Talking Chips technique was effective to improve speaking achievement of the experimental group. Hence, using Talking Chips technique is considered effective in teaching speaking to the 11th grade students of SMAN 1 Indralaya Utara.

5. Conclusion and Remark

Based on the findings and the statistical analysis in previous chapter, the writer concluded that Talking Chips technique is significantly effective to improve the students speaking achievement in class XI IPA 1 (experimental group) of SMAN 1 Indralaya Utara. Most of the students in the experimental group showed better improvement that can be seen from the result of the students in test. The result of the study showed that there was significance difference between the 11th grade students of SMAN 1 Indralaya Utara who were taught in the experimental group by using Talking Chips technique and those who were not taught in the control group. The statistical analysis in paired sample t-test showed that there was significance difference in mean score between students' pretest and posttest both in the experimental and control group; however the experimental group showed much better improvement than the control group. It was also proved by the independent sample t-test that there was significance difference between the mean score of posttest in the experimental group was higher than the mean score of the posttest in the control group. It means that the treatment was effective to improve students' speaking achievement.

In accordance to the above explanation, the writer proposes the following suggestions.

1. For English Teacher

   English teacher should be more active to find interesting and appropriate topics in applying Talking Chips technique. It is very helpful to encourage the students to improve their speaking, especially to help those who are lack of confidence.

2. For Students

   The students also have to be active in the classroom. It is also suggested to the students to do more practices in speaking not only in the

classroom but also outside the class. Thus, they will find speaking as interesting activity to do.

3. For Other Researchers

The writer hopes this study becomes a reference for next researchers who are interested in conducting a study to improve the students' achievement in speaking by using Talking Chips technique. It is suggested that other researchers use bigger number of sampling and provide more topics and time allocation in teaching and learning process in order to engage the students and enhance their learning achievement. In addition, to make sure the students have different opinions, the students can be grouped in to two different groups; positive and negative.

References

Bahrani, T., & Soltani, R. (2012). How to teach speaking skill? *Journal of Education and Practice*, *3*(2), 26-29. Retrieved from http://www.iiste.org/Journals/ index.php/JEP/article/view/1147

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Longman, Inc.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods research* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Depdiknas. (1989). *Sistem pendidikan nasional*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Depdiknas RI. Retrieved from http://www.dpr.go.id/dokjdih/document/uu/UU_1989_.pdf

Depdiknas. (2006). *Pedoman kurikulum tingkat satuan pendidikan bahasa Inggris untuk tingkat SMA.* Jakarta, Indonesia: Depdiknas RI.

Education First. (2015). *EF English Proficiency Index*. Retrieved from http://www.ef.com/epi

Estiningrum, D. (2014). *Using talking chips to improve VIIA students'speaking ability at SMPN 1 Trucuk in the academic year of 2013/2014* (published undergraduate thesis), Yogyakarta State University, Yogyakarta. Retrieved from http://www. Eprints.uny.ac.id/17680

Ghassanie, S. F. (2015). *The effectiveness of using gallery walk strategy in improving speaking achievement of recount text of the tenth grade students of SMK Negeri 2 Palembang* (Unpublished undergraduate thesis), Sriwijaya University, Indralaya.

Harmon, M. (2011). *Normality testing in Excel*. Incline Village, NV: Excel Master Series.

Harris, D. P. (1969). *Testing English as a second language*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Kagan, S., & Kagan, M. (2009). *Kagan cooperative learning*. San Clemente, CA: Kagan Publishing.

Lauder, A. (2008). The status and function of English in Indonesia: a review of key factors. *Jurnal Makara Sosial*, *12*(1), 9-20. Retrieved from http://www.repository.ui.ac.id/doc/jurnal/33

Lie, A. (2007). Education Policy and EFL Curriculum in Indonesia: Between the Commitment to Competence and the Quest for Higher Test Scores. *TEFLIN Journal*, *18*(1). Retrieved from http://journal.teflin.org/index.php/teflin/article/viewFile/113/102

Mendenhall, W., Beaver, R. J., Beaver, B. M., (2008). *Introduction to probability and statistics* (13th ed.). Canada, CA : Cengage Learning.

Muamaroh. (2013). *Improving indonesian university students' spoken English by using group work and cooperative learning* (Unpublished doctoral thesis),Charles Darwin University, Australia.

Mukadimah, H., & Jamilah. (2013). The use of talking chips strategy to improve speaking ability of grade XI students of SMAN 1 Pengasih in the academic year of 2013/2014. *English Language Teaching Journal*, *3*(9). Retrieved from http://journal.student.uny.ac.id/ jurnal/artikel/10081/11/1044

Patel, M. F., & Jain, P. M. (2008). *English language teaching: Methods, tools, & technique*. Jaipur, India: Sunrise Publishers & Distributors.

Syafryadin. (2011). *The use of talking chips technique in teaching speaking in one of senior high school in Bandung* (Unpublished undergraduate thesis), Indonesia University of Education, Bandung.

Welty, D. A., & Welty, D. R. (1976). *The teacher aids in the instruction team*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.