TALKING CHIPS TO IMPROVE STUDENTS' SPEAKING SKILL IN DESCRIPTIVE TEXT

Iin Inayatilah [1]
Sri Murtiningsih [2]

[1] the Graduate of English Education Study Program
Peradaban University Bumiayu - Brebes
E-mail: inayatilah_iin@yahoo.com
Phone: 085290775659

[2] the Lecturer of English Education Study Program
Peradaban University Bumiayu - Brebes
E-mail: murtining_hadiyanto@yahoo.com
Phone: 081225716559

Abstract

The objective of this study is to find out whether using *talking chips* technique is effective to improve the students' speaking skill or not. The population of this study is the Eighth Grade Students of SMP N 2 Bumiayu Brebes Regency in the academic year 2015/2016. This is an experimental study with randomly selected pre and post-test group. There are 64 students as the objects of the study which are divided into control class and experimental class. Class VIII B is chosen as the experimental class consisted of 32 students and class VIII D as control class consisted of 32 students. In

collecting the data, the writer uses pre and post-test with quantitative method to analyze the data. The data are analyzed by using SPSS *(Statistical Package for Social Science)* 16 program. The study finds the *Independent Samples Test* between control and experimental class' score; the *sig'*s score is 0.816 (more than 0.05) and the score from *t-test* and *Equal Variance Assumed* is 0,002 (less than 0.05). It means that both of classes has same variant but has different achievement. It can be seen from comparing the means of both classes; the mean of the experimental class is 61.375 which are higher than the control class, 54.298. Meanwhile, the result of the mean of post-test of experimental class is 61.375 which are higher than the pre-test, 54.298. For that reason, it could be concluded that *talking chips* technique is effective to improve the students' speaking skill in descriptive text on the Eighth Grade students of SMP N 2 Bumiayu in the academic year 2015/2016.

Keywords: talking chips technique, speaking skill, descriptive text

A. Introduction

Speaking is the core means of communication which is used by the people to express thought and feeling orally. Tarigan in Agustiyani (2008:21) states that speaking is the capability to articulate the sounds, expressing and delivering thought, opinion, and wishes. Adopted from Tarigan (2008: 22) speaking is also a productive skill, it involves many components: fluency, comprehension, grammar vocabulary and pronunciation. It is not only an utterance but also a tool of communication. Its relationship, in short,

speaking is a tool of communication to express feeling, deliver opinion, and idea in social life.

Speaking is believed to be difficult to master by the students learning English. Almost all English students' have difficulty in English communication. There are some problems in speaking activities faced by English Corner at SMP N 02 Bumiayu. This activity aims to apply the teaching learning process in the classroom, the group should be able to evaluate and observe the character and problems of students in learning process; the problem are the students do not have anything to say, they still have difficulty in pronouncing the English words, alck of confidence and participation.

In addition, they have poor motivation in speaking. Therefore the students were not enthusiastic to join the class, students not interested to join the speaking class, and most of them just silent when their teacher encourages them to speak. As we know that speaking is the second skill of four skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Therefore, the writer tried to solve the problems so that the students could speak effectively through talking chips technique.

Based on the problem above, the writer is interested to apply *Talking Chips* Technique in English speaking class especially in descriptive text. Descriptive text describes the characteristics of something in order to explain a person, place, object or event. Thus, this study tries to answer whether *Talking Chips Technique* is effective or not in improving the students' speaking skill in Descriptive Text on the Eight Students of SMP N 02 Bumiayu in the academic year 2015/2016.

B. Literature Review

Some theories reviewed here discuss about speaking skill, talking chips, and descriptive text.

1. Speaking Skill

According to Harmer (2005: 1) Speaking is so much a part of daily life that we take it for granted. The ability to speak fluently followed naturally from the teaching of grammar and vocabulary with a bit of pronunciation thrown in. Adopted from Brown (2004: 142) speaking is a productive skill that can be directly and empirically observed, those observations are invariably colored by the accuracy and effectiveness of a task taker's listening skill, which necessarily compromises the reliability and validity of an oral production test.

Tarigan in Agustiyani (2014:1) states that speaking is the capability to articulate the sounds, expressing and delivering thought, opinion, and wish. Speaking is also a productive skill it involves many components: fluency, comprehension, grammar vocabulary and pronunciation. It's not only an utterance but also a tool of communication. Its relationship, in short, speaking is a tool of communication to express feeling, deliver opinion, and idea in social life.

Brown (2004: 141-142) classifies oral production into five: (a) Imitative means that at one end of continuum of types speaking performance is the ability to simply parrot back (imitate) a word or phrase or possibly a sentence. While this is purely phonetic level oral production ,a number of prosodic, lexical and grammatical properties of language may be included in the criterion performance; (b)

Intensive means the production of short stretches of oral language designed to demonstrate competence in narrow band grammatical, phrasal, lexical, or phonological relationship (such as prosodic elements –intonation-stress, rhythm, juncture); (c) Responsive which include the interaction and test comprehension but at the somewhat limited level of very short conversations, standard greetings and small talk , simple request and comments and the like; (d) Interactive which has the purpose of exchanging specific information or interpersonal exchanges which have the purpose of maintaining social relationships; and (e) Extensive (Monologue) which is including the speeches, oral presentations, and story- telling, during which the opportunity for oral interaction from listeners is either highly limited (perhaps to nonverbal responses) or ruled out altogether. Therefore, the writer was focused on the Responsive of basic types of speaking consist of short conversations, standard greetings and small talk, simple request and comments and the like.

To score the speaking skills, there are five categories according to Hammer (2005: 124) such as pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and content.

2. Talking Chips

According to Kagan (1994) states that the goal of this strategy is to promote equal participation and develop discourse abilities. Adopted from Barkley et al. (2005: 177) talking chips is students participate in a group discussion, giving a token where they speak.

The Procedure of Talking Chips Technique based on (http//Kagan.1994. Metacognitive.com) are: (1) Each member of a group gets different chips that they must use whenever they want to speak, (2) these chips include different strategies to use in conversation and could include: Expressing a doubt, Answering a question, Asking a question, Giving an idea, Asking for clarification /clarify an idea, Respond to an idea, Summarize, Encourage participation, Say something positive about someone's idea; (3) Students place one of these chips on their desks before speaking. When they finish speaking, the other members think of different ways to respond and continue the discussion; and (4) Students should not speak unless they use one of the talking chips. The goal is for all students to use their chips, avoiding the risk that only some members of the group participate in the task.

Talking chips technique is believed to: (a) give a chance to students to find the concept of solve the problem; (b) give a chance to students to create creativity in doing communication with a friend of his group; and (c) improvement the students motivation.

3. Descriptive Text

According to Gerrot and Wignel in Mursyid (2005: 4), descriptive text is a kind oftext with a purpose to give information. The context of this kind of text is the description of particular thing, animal, person, or others, forinstance: our pets or a person. The social function of descriptive Text is to describe a particular person, place, or thing.

There are two generic structures of descriptive text according to Hammond in Mursyid (2005: 4): (a) identification which identifies phenomenon to describe and (b) description which contains the description of parts, qualities and characters.

C. Method of Investigation

To be able to answer, the techniques used in data collecting and analysis is based on the qualitative method. Tests consisted of pre-test and post-test questionnaire, and documentation are used to obtain the data. Further, before the data analysis, the writer proves the validity and reliability of data using SPSS program. After that the data are analyzed and interpreted based on the appropriate steps.

D. Discussion

The discussion here is divided into two parts: findings and interpretation.

1. Findings

In collecting the data, the writer conducts try out test to know whether the validity and reliability of the instrument is appropriate or not, and the test has been tried out before. For the pre-test and post-test, the writer uses the same test to see whether there is a significant different score between experimental and control group or not.

Herewith, the writer conducted pre and post-test. Before implementing the instrument of test, the writer delivers the instrument to the students in which the procedure of the treatment between experimental group and control group is different. In the experimental group the writer

uses *Talking Chips* Technique on the other is conventional technique.

a. Try Out Analysis

Before the writer conducts Pre and Post-test, the writer tries out the instruments in the Eighth Grade Students of SMP N 2 Bumiayu. It is held on April, 20th 2016. The number of the students is 16. The following table shows the result of the test.

Table. 1. The Result of Try Out

No	Score
1	50
2	48
3	48
4	46
5	52
6	64
7	52
8	60
9	61
10	52
11	50
12	52
13	46
14	62
15	62

	16	59
	Total	912

Based on the result of the instrument score above, we can find out whether the validity and reliability of the instrument is appropriate or not. Based on the result of output test of validity conducted, it is obtained that the score of Pearson Correlation for score and total are **1.000**** and 1, it means that the instrument of the research is valid. Meanwhile for the reliability, by using SPSS program, the score of Alpha > 0.514 from table r *table level of significant* means that the item of question is reliable.

b. The Result of Test

After conducting the pre and post-test, the writer applies the result of the test into a table. The results are as follows:

Table 2: The Result of Pre and Post Test Control and Experimental Group

No	Control Class		Experimental Class	
	Y	Y1	X	X1
1	50	53	52	64
2	48	50	50	62
3	48	49	52	60
4	46	48	48	50
5	52	55	52	65
6	48	56	49	63
7	52	58	56	64
8	48	50	52	68
9	46	50	60	76

	Y	Y1	X	X1
10	52	63	59	64
11	50	50	52	60
12	46	50	53	64
13	46	50	64	70
14	54	60	50	60
15	48	50	48	58
16	47	50	48	53
17	46	49	56	72
18	48	52	56	65
19	48	54	54	62
20	48	63	49	50
21	40	48	46	60
22	50	50	50	63
23	52	51	48	58
24	56	60	54	60
25	50	50	50	66
26	50	50	60	65
27	50	50	44	55
28	46	50	49	59
29	50	50	58	62
30	40	52	56	68
31	55	60	50	60
32	52	58	63	65
SUM	**1572**	**1737**	**1731**	**1964**
MEAN	**49.125**	**54.281**	**54.293**	**61.375**

Where:

Y   : The Score of Pre-Test of the Control Group

Y1   : The Score of Post-Test of the Control Group

X   : The Score of Pre-Test of Experimental Group

X1   : The Score of Post-Test of the Experimental Group

c. Normality Test

In this part, the writer counts the normality for control and experimental group, and based on the result of output normality above, it can be seen that the score of sig. was 831; it means that visually, the control and experimental group has a normal distribution.

d. Applying the Data into the Formula t-Test (Equal Test).

There are some steps to find out the mean of both groups; the experimental and control group by proving its homogeneity and normality as follows:

1) Homogeneity

Homogeneity is used to prove that both classes are homogeneous. It is important because the similarity of both samples of the experimental group and the control group will influence the test result. By using the independent sample test, it is obtained that F score = 0.055 and sig = 0.835 = 83,5%. F score is used to prove similar variant between control and experimental group. The result of F score, eventually, was more than 0.05 = 5%, 83,5% > 5%, it means that the classes have the same variant.

2) Comparison between Pre-Test and Post-Test of Control Group

After conducting group statistics using SPSS program, the score of the students' speaking score of pre-test is

49.125 and post-test of control group is 54.281. It means that the mean score of the post-test is higher than pre-test of the control group (54.281 > 61.375).

3) *Comparison between Pre-Test and Post-Test of Experimental Group*

After conducting group statistics using SPSS program, the score of the students' speaking score of pre-test is 54.293 and post-test of the control group is 61.375. Where the mean score is 61.375 > 54.293 it means that both groups have different mean score.

4) *Comparison between Post- Control and Post- Experimental Group*

Comparison test is intended to compare the mean of a variable between the samples of control group and the ones of experimental group. The post-test score of students speaking in experimental group is higher than in the control group. It is obtained that the mean of post-test is higher than pre-test in experimental group (61.375 > 54.281)

5) *The Interpretation of the Score*

Based on the *t* result, the score of *sig* is 0.002 = 0.2 % < 5%, so H_0 is rejected; it means that H_1 is accepted. Thereby, the mean score of Experimental Class is different from the mean score of Control Class.

To interpret the result, by accepting H_1, so the mean score of both classes is different. Based on the output of *Group Statistics* in table 3, it can be seen that the mean score of experimental class is 61,375 and the mean score of control class is 54.281. It shows that the mean score of experimental class is better than control class (54.281 > 61.375). It can be concluded that *talking chips* is effective to improve the students' speaking skill in descriptive text because there is different achievement between control group and experimental group.

6) *The Interpretation of the Result of Questionnaire*

In the pre and post-test activity, the writer distributed questionnaire sheet to the students. Questionnaire is intended for the students to be able to answer the problem in learning process. The questionnaire is to compare the pre-test and post-test in experimental group.

The result of the questionnaire is to find out the activity of the students' in the teaching and learning process before using *talking chips* technique and the result is as follows:

Table 3: The activity of the students

No	Questions	Score	
		Yes	No
1	Do you like speaking?	75%	25%

2	Have you ever spoken descriptive text?	60%	40%
3	Do you feel interested in speaking descriptive text?	80%	20%
4	Do you feel excited in speaking descriptive text?	96,875%	10%
5	Do you feel bored when speaking descriptive text?	20%	93,75%
6	Do you feel fun when speaking descriptive text?	85%	15%
7	Do you have any difficulties of vocabulary in speaking descriptive text?	90%	10%
8	Do you understand the social function of descriptive text?	93,75%	20%
9	Do you understand the generic structure of descriptive text?	100%	-
10	Do you understand the language feature in descriptive text?	50%	84,375%
11	Do you understand the simple present tense well?	93,75%	20%
12	Do you have some problems when speaking descriptive text?	100%	-

Based on the result of questionnaire above, it can be seen that 75% of the students feel interested, fun and excited in speaking descriptive text. Meanwhile 15%

of them are not excited in speaking descriptive text and 20% students answer do not understand the social function of descriptive text. In other hand, about 100% students have any difficulties in vocabulary building in speaking descriptive text. About 84,375% students do not understand the language feature and just 50% students do not have difficulties of vocabulary in speaking. 100% students say that they have some problems when speaking descriptive text. The result of the questionnaire after using *talking chips* technique is as follow:

Table 4: The Result of Questionnaire Using the Technique

No	Questions	Answer	
		Yes	No
1	Do you like to lea descriptive text?	85%	15%
2	Are you interested in the *talking chips* technique?	75%	25%
3	Do you like the learning process by using technique?	70%	30%
4	Does your teacher explain how to make descriptive text based on *talking chips* technique?	90%	10%
5	Do you like learn descriptive text by *talking chips* technique?	85%	15%
6	Do you think *talking chips* technique helps you to understand the material?	80%	20%

7	Do you feel satisfied with the learning process?	75%	25%

The result of the questionnaire that using *talking chips* can improve their speaking skill especially in descriptive text indicated that 75% of the students like to learn descriptive text. Most of them are very interested and excited to learn descriptive text using *talking chips* technique. They answer that *talking chips* technique can help the students understand the material.

During treatment with *talking chips*, the presence of the students is always 100%. It means that the students felt interested in teaching and learning process by using *talking chips*. Hence, the students are actively asking what they do not know about the material. If they have difficulty with the material, they are not hesitated to ask. They also understand the instruction from the teacher. During the teaching and learning process, the students pay attention carefully. They enjoy the class and are enthusiastic to join the class. From these evidences, the writer can conclude that the students agreed that *talking chips* can help them in understanding the spoken material of descriptive text.

This condition is different from control group. In learning process, the writer gives material conventionally, without *talking chips*. On the contrary the presence of the students' in control group is

70% which is lower than the experimental group. The activity is only speaking with the writers' instruction to make some description about human, animal or things it is made the students confused and boring. Consequently, their scores in speaking are still low. We can see that although there is improvement score from pre to post-test in control group but it is still lower than experimental group. Then, based on the result of the questionnaire, the result shows that using *talking chips* technique makes students more active in learning activity.

Therefore, it can be concluded that using *talking chips* technique is effective. Referring to the explanation above, it can be seen that using *talking chips* technique to improve students in speaking skill has significant influence for the student's achievement. The result score of using *talking chips* technique was better than teaching speaking descriptive text without using *talking chips* technique.

2. Interpretation

There are three important things which can be interpreted from the data of the study. First according to the data, the students' ability in speaking descriptive text after using *talking chips* technique could be measured. Second, the problems which are probably experienced by the students in speaking descriptive text can be identified, and the last is about possible solutions the writer offers to solve the problems. Therefore, the writer would like to

elaborate them based on the research questions and the results of questionnaire sheet.

The research question of this study, "Can Using Talking Chips Technique is effective or not to improve the students speaking skill in Descriptive Text on the Eight Students of SMP N 2 Bumiayu in the academic year 2015/2016?" is answered by using quantitative method. The result of the test shows that the average score of post-test score of the students taught by using talking chips is higher than they who are taught by using conventional technique. The average of the experimental group before the treatment is 1731 and 1964 after the treatment. It is higher than the control group which made average 1572 before the treatment and 1737 after the treatment. Therefore, it can be stated that in this study, the use of *talking chips* was effective than the use of conventional technique in teaching spoken descriptive text.

Based on the data that were analyzed by using SPSS 16.0 program above, it could be concluded that the post-test mean score of the students taught by using *Talking Chips* is higher than the students taught conventionally. The post-test mean score of experimental group before getting the treatment is 54.289 and after getting the treatment is 61.375 (61.375 >54.293). It is higher than control group the post-test mean score is 54.281. Therefore, it can be said that there is significant score of pre to post-test of experimental group. The score is increased because the writer used *Talking Chips* as the

technique to improve the students speaking skill in descriptive text.

This condition is different from the control group. In learning process of speaking descriptive text the writer gives material conventionally with picture media, the activity focuses on speaking descriptive text from the writer's instruction. Consequently, their score in speaking is still low. We can see that although there is effective score from pre to post-test in control class but it is still lower than experimental class. Then, based on the result of the questionnaires, the result shows that 94.25% of the students in experimental group agree that talking chips technique make them find it easy to compose in making descriptive text. This condition makes them more enthusiasm and more excited in joining the class. Consequently, when the teacher gives them some exercises, they can do it well.

This condition is different from the control class; the students get bored to join the class. The teacher just gives material conventionally and the activities focus on discussing and speaking directly from the teachers' instruction.

This condition makes the students bored and they do not have much spirit to study. Consequently, their score in speaking is low. We can see that although there is improvement from pre-test to post-test in control class but it still lower than experimental class.

Referring to the explanation above, it could be seen that using *talking chips* technique to improve the Students Speaking

skill in Descriptive text has significant influence for the students' achievement.

E. Conclusion

Based on the results of research findings and interpretation that are analyzed by using SPSS *(Statistical Package for Social Science)* 16.0 program in the previous chapter, the writer, it can be concluded that there is improvement between speaking descriptive text by using talking chips technique and without using talking chips technique. It means that speaking descriptive text using talking chips technique is more affective. It can be seen from comparison of the difference mean of the both groups. It is found that the mean of experimental group is higher than control group (61.375 > 54.281).

The result of this study showed that students in experimental group got better score than students in the control group. The difference of the average score is statistically significant at the (0, 05) alpha level significance. It is found that there is different achievement for those who are taught by using *talking chips* technique. The students score of speaking achievement before using *talking chips* technique is enough because the mean of the total score of students is 54.293 in which mean is the average score taken from total score of the students. Then, the students' score of speaking achievement after using *talking chips* technique is good because the mean of the total score of the students is 61.375 in which mean in the average score taken from total score of the students. Therefore the experimental group using *talking chips* technique is more effective in the average scores than control group. It is

indicated by the different mean score between the experimental and control group.

The mean score of pre-test and post-test of the experimental group are 54.289 and 61.375. Meanwhile the mean score of the pre-test and the post of the control class are 49.125 and 54.281. From two scores, the writer found out that the differences score of the experimental group shows the effectiveness of students speaking skill. Therefore the effectiveness of using talking chips is strengthened by the result of data analysis, in which, if the significant level is less than 0.05. It means alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted. Meanwhile, if the significant level is more than 0.05, the null hypothesis (H_0) is accepted. Therefore, the findings shows sig. (2-tailed) is 0.000 which is less than 0.05 (0.000 < 0.05). Therefore the Hypothesis (H_a) is accepted and the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected.

Finally, based on the explanation above, it means that there is significant different of students' speaking score before and after using *talking chips* technique. It can be concluded that using *talking chips* technique is affective the students speaking skill on the Eight grade students of SMP N 2 Bumiayu in the Academic year 2015/2016.

Acknowledgement

Bibliography

Agustiyani, Eka. 2014. *The Effectiveness of Using Mix Pair Share Method as a Cooperative Learning to Improve Students Speaking Skill.* Paguyangan: STKIP Islam Bumiayu. Not Published.

Arikunto, Suharsimi. 2010. *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*, Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta.

_____. 2010. *Manajemen Penelitian.* Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta.

Barkley, et. al. 2005. *Collaborative Learning Technique.* Bandung, Nusa Media.

Basfi, Husni Syahbela. 2014. *The Effectiveness of Using Muted Video in Teaching Spoken Procedure Text to Improve Students' Speaking Skill.* Paguyangan: STKIP Islam Bumiayu. Not Published.

Brown, H. Douglas. 2004. *Language Assessment, Principles and Classroom Practice.* New York: Pearson Education.

Djamarah, Bahri. 2010. *Guru dan Anak Didik dalam Interaksi Edukatif.* Jakarta, Rineka Cipta.

Fulcher and Davidson. 2007. *Language Testing and Assessment.* New York: Madison Ave.

Forum. Guru Nusantara. 2014. *Pembelajaran Cooperative Talking Chips.* Online Available at: *http//forumgurunusantaraartikel.com* *(Accessed* on June 20th 2016 at 18:36 pm)

Harmer, Jeremy. 2001. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kagan. T.A 1994. *Metacognitive Talking Chips.* Online Available at: *http//www.Kaganarticles.com (Accessed* on March 14th , 2016 at 13:00 pm).

Lembaga Penelitian dan Pengabdian Masyarakat (LP2M). 2012. *Petunjuk Teknis Proposal dan Skripsi*. Bumiayu: STKIP Islam Buniayu

Margono. 2010. *Metodologi Penelitian Pendidikan.* Jakarta: RinekaCipta.

Mursyid. 2005. *English Learning Handout for Grade VIII Learning Descriptive Text.* SMP N 1 Karang dadap.

Nurjamal, Daeng, et.al. 2011. *Terampil Berbahasa.* Bandung: Alfabet.

Sudarmanto, Gunawan. 2005. *Analisis Regresi Linear Ganda dengan SPSS.* Yogyakarta: GrahaIlmu.

Sukmadinata, Nana. 2011. *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan*. Bandung, PT Remaja Rosdakarya

Sugiyono. 2014. *Metode Penelitian Kombinasi (mixed methods)*. Bandung. Alfabeta.

Supriyatna. 2013. *The Effectiveness Methods in Improving the Students' Speaking Ability*. Paguyangan: STKIP Islam Bumiayu. Not Published.

Sukestiyarno. 2010. *Statistika Dasar*. Semarang: Universitas Negri Semarang (UNNES).

Suryabrata, Sumadi. 2000. *Metodologi Penelitian.* Jakarta: PT.Garfindo Raya Persada

Tarigan, Henry Guntur. 2008. *Berbicara Sebagai Suatu Ketrampilan Berbahasa*. Bandung: Angkasa Bandung.

Thornbury, Scoot. 2008. *How to Teach Speaking.* England: Longman Press.

Wardhaugh, Ronald. 1977. *Introduction to Linguistics*. America. Kingsport Press.

Yanuar, Indra. 2015. *The Effectiveness of Using Sequence Pictures for Teaching Writing Procedure Text.* Paguyangan: STKIP Islam Bumiayu. Not Published.

Yakin, Asep. 2013. *The Effectiveness of Contextual Teaching and Learning (CTL) Model to Improve the students in Writing Descriptive Text.* Paguyangan: STKIP Islam Bumiayu. Not Published.