



The Use of Talking Chips Technique in Improving Students' Speaking Achievement

Syafryadin

Indonesia University of Education (Indonesia)

Syafryadin2011@gmail.com

Abstract

Speaking English is one of difficult skills for students. Based on cursory observation, it was found that most of students could not speak English well because of several reasons. Those were lack of vocabularies, did grammatical mistakes in speaking, mispronounced words, got stuck in speaking, pausing, and still shy to speak. Therefore, the researcher wanted to investigate and solve those problems by applying Talking Chips Technique in teaching speaking. The objective of this study was to find out whether teaching speaking by using Talking Chips Technique could improve the students' speaking or not. The subject of this study was students at grade x in of the senior high schools in Bandung. The total number of students was 36 students. This present study applied action research design. This present study was conducted in three cycles. This present study also implemented observation sheet, note taking, and speaking test. The findings of this study were that the students got improvement in speaking from cycle one to the cycle 3 by using Talking Chips Technique. It could be seen from the mean score of the first cycle was fluency (61,1) and accuracy (62.2) while in the second cycle was fluency (67) and accuracy (68.02). In the third cycle, the mean score of fluency was 71 and accuracy was 74.69. Those improvements were also caused by all students active in speaking and had good motivation. The conclusion is Talking Chips Technique can improve the students' Speaking achievement.

1. Introduction

Speaking is a skill which is still difficult for students. Then, it can be proved by observation and interview to the teacher and the students at grade tenth in one of the senior high schools in Bandung where it was found that most of students had low ability in speaking. Furthermore, most of the students got stuck and did not know what they wanted to say. Then, they had many mistakes in speaking like grammatical mistakes and poor vocabularies. Next, they used Indonesian language for several words. Furthermore, they pronounced words incorrectly and so many pauses when they were speaking. in addition, they were lack of motivation in speaking because the teacher just taught them by using asking and answering questions. Therefore, the students were not enthusiastic in speaking English. Reference [4] stated that students have problems in speaking activities, such as inhibition, low motivation, mother tongue use, and nothing to say. Reference [7] also declares that there are two elements of speaking which become problems for students. Those elements are accuracy and fluency.

Based on the problems, this research attempts to apply Talking Chips technique in teaching speaking in order to help students to speak fluently and accurately. References [2] pointed out that Talking Chips Technique is a technique in teaching speaking which make the students interested in speaking English. It is because this technique encourages the students to be active in the classroom and learns about cooperation in group. Next, this technique makes the students have chance to speak English because in Talking Chip, students are divided into several groups and each member of group will have a role to speak English. The objective of this study was to look at how to teach speaking by using Talking Chips Technique and whether Talking Chips Technique improve students' speaking achievement or not at grade X in one of the senior high schools in Bandung.



2. Speaking and Teaching Speaking Through Talking Chips Technique

Reference [1] states that speaking has several important functions. Those are (1) facilitating students to analyze the information, problems, and conditions requiring the formation of attitudes. (2) Helping student to create effective communication. (3) Helping students to pronounce the words correctly. Next, Reference [3] states that three stages in teaching speaking namely introduction new language, practice, and communicative activity. Reference [2] points out that Talking Chips Technique is a technique in teaching speaking which makes the students work in group. Then, in holding Talking Chips Technique, students will be given chips and the chips are used for every time they speak, they must put the chips in the center of table. It is done until the chips are over. If the chips are over, the students may not speak until chips of all members of group are over too. If all chips have been used, while the task has not been finished. The students can be given the chips again. The procedures of Talking Chips are also proposed by Reference [2]. The procedures are as in the following.

- Teacher provides a discussion topic.
- Any student begins the discussion, placing his or her chip in the center of the team table.
- Any student with a chip continues discussion, using his or her chip.
- When all chips are used, teammates all collect their chips and continue the discussion using their talking chips.
- During the students speak about the topic, Accuracy and fluency of students will be observed. Besides, in evaluation, the students will be assessed either their fluency or accuracy.

3. Method

This research was carried out in one of the senior high schools in Bandung. The number of students was thirty six students. The design of this research is an action research which had aim to achieve speaking accuracy and fluency of respondents. Then, action research consists of four steps namely planning, action, observation, and reflection. The researchers's role in this study namely the researchers became a teacher. In this research, there were four instruments that researchers used in this research. Those instruments were observation sheet, note taking, and handy camera and speaking test. Next, there were two kinds of data collection namely qualitative and quantitative data. Firstly, qualitative data was taken by using note taking and observation sheet with looking at the implementation of Round-Robin technique. Secondly, quantitative data was got by looking at the result of pre and evaluation test. In technique of data collection, researcher used Observation and gave a speaking test at the end of each cycle. The evaluation of this study used two independent raters. The two raters were the researcher and the English teacher. The bands score that were used as follows.



Table 1: Band Score of oral testing criteria for accuracy.

Proficiency Description	Score
Accent	
Pronunciation frequently unintelligible	1
Frequent gross errors and a very heavy accent make understanding difficult, require frequent repetition	2
"Foreign accent" requires concentrated listening, and mispronunciations lead to occasional misunderstanding and apparent errors in grammar or vocabulary.	3
Marked "foreign accent" and occasional mispronunciations which do not interfere with understanding.	4
No conspicuous mispronunciations, but would not be taken for a native speaker.	5
Native pronunciation, with no trace of "foreign accent"	6
Grammar	
Grammar also entirely inaccurate phrases.	1
Constant errors showing control of very few major patterns and frequently preventing communication.	2
Frequent errors showing some major patterns uncontrolled and causing occasional irritation and misunderstanding.	3
Occasional errors showing imperfect control of some patterns but no weakness that causes misunderstanding.	4
Few errors, with no patterns of failure.	5
No more than two errors during the interview.	6
Vocabulary	
Vocabulary inadequate for even the simplest conversation.	1
Vocabulary limited to basic personal and survival areas (time, food, transportation, family, etc.)	2
Choice of words sometimes inaccurate, limitations of vocabulary prevent discussion of some common professional and social topics.	3
Professional vocabulary adequate to discuss special interests; general vocabulary permits discussion of any non-technical subject with some circumlocutions.	4
Professional vocabulary broad and precise; general vocabulary adequate to cope with complex practical problems and varied social situations.	5
Vocabulary apparently as accurate and extensive as that of an educated native speaker.	6

Reference [5]

The way of calculating final accuracy:
 Accuracy : $\frac{\text{total score of accuracy (accent, grammar, vocabulary)}}{\text{total maximum score (18)}} \times 100\%$



Table 2: Band Score of oral testing criteria for fluency.

Proficiency Description	Score
Speech Flow	
hesitations, slowness, or even silences in language processing may prevent communication	1
speech is very slow and exceeding halting, strained, and stumbling except for short or memorized expressions	2
speech is slow and often hesitant and jerky. Sentences may be left uncompleted, but speaker is able to continue	3
speech is medium and there may be occasional loss of fluency, but this does not prevent effective communication	4
speech is fast but with some hesitation and unevenness caused primarily by rephrasing and grouping for words	5
speech is effortless and smooth with speed that approaches that of a native speaker	6
Average Speed	
No word along conversation	1
Utterances are produced in few words, even in a short and single word	2
Average speed indicates up to 50 words per minute	3
Average speed indicates between 50 and 100 words per minute	4
Average speed indicates ability to speak at length with relative ease on familiar topics, between 100 and 200 words per minute	5
Average indicates ability to speak at natural length, more than 200 words per minute	6
Pausing	
Producing any pauses, whether silent pause, fillers uh/um only, or fillers uh/um plus continuously and distractingly	1
Producing stretches of language with long pauses to get understand with interlocutors, pauses are distracting	2
Producing sentences with pauses that are sometimes distracting. Pauses occur when looking for lexical choices	3
Producing sentences with pauses that are sometimes not distracting	4
Producing sentences with pauses that are not distracting	5
Producing pauses that are supported by good arrangement, it approaches native speaker expression	6

Reference [6]

The way of calculating final fluency

$$\text{Fluency} = \frac{\text{total score of fluency (flow, speed, pause)}}{\text{total maximum score (18)}} \times 100\%$$



4. Findings and Discussion

4.1. Findings

In the first cycle, researcher conducted Talking Chips Technique based on the planning that had been made before. During this technique was implemented in the classroom, teacher and researcher observed students. In the first cycle, researcher found several problems. Those problems were (1) Some students were still confused about the technique and researcher re-explained Talking Chips Technique technique. (2) The class was noisy and researcher motivated students to use soft voice and sit close to each other. (3) Some students were passive and researcher gave each student a role in doing the task. (4) Some students did not ask questions to the speaker and researcher asked to all students prepared the questions. (5) Majority of students made mistakes in pronouncing words. For example, 1958 (ninti fipti eig) instead of naintin fifti eight and researcher provided the model of pronunciation (6) Majority of students added *to be* when they said something (ex: "I am not have") and researcher explained the difference between sentences with *to be* and without *to be*, *have and has*, *s/es*. And Most of them misplaces about have and has with its subject (ex: It have). (7) Students still lack of vocabularies related to the topic and lexical choice (ex: agustus) and researcher asked them to make the list of vocabularies. (8) There were several students were still slow, the rest of them tend to medium and researcher backed to motivate students to speak out. (9) Several students couldnot produce between 50 and 100 words per minute and researcher encouraged them to speak everything on their mind and built students' self confidence. (10). Several students produced silent pause, fillers uh/um only, or fillers uh/um and researcher informed students to focus their mind before they spoke something. In the second cycle, the problems were decreased. The problems found only fluency and accuracy problems. Then, teacher tried to solve those problems like the previous cycle. In this case, teacher still gave motivation and feedback to students. In the third cycle,. The problems of fluency and accuracy were still existed, but the problems were fewer than previous cycle. In this case, the students were enthusiastic in doing Talking Chips Technique and active in speaking.

4.2. Discussion

The implementation of Talking Chips Technique had been finished at grade X in one of the senior high schools in Bandung. This technique was conducted in three cycles and students got improvement from cycle to cycle. Then, before conducting the first meeting of the first cycle, there was review about simple present tense. For more details, in this discussion, there were several things should be discussed. Based on the activities and the mean score of each cycles, it can be stated that the speaking of students got improvement from the cycle one to the cycle three. Those improvements can be shown in the mean score of each cycle. In cycle one, the mean score of fluency was 61.1 and 62.81 for accuracy. In cycle 2, mean score of students in fluency was 67.207 and accuracy was 68.05. In cycle 3, the mean score of fluency was 71.451 and accuracy was 74.69. Next, several problems could be solved well even though there were still problems related to the fluency and accuracy, but those problems were fewer in every cycle. The improvement of students in speaking because Talking Chips Technique tried to make all students active in speaking class. Besides, students could be said successfully in speaking class by using Talking Chips Technique because they have fulfilled the characteristics of successful in speaking activities (Reference [4]). Those characteristics were high participation, most of leraners talk a lot about the topic which had been given, and students had good motivation to speak. Next, after applying this technique in teaching speaking, it could be seen that group work is effective to encourage students to speak. Reference [7] stated that working group had several advantages. Those were increasing the number of talking opportunities, sharing idea, cooperating and active in grouping.

In addition, these students speaking improvements were also supported by cooperative learning principle which had been implemented well in speaking class. Reference [2] stated that there were cooperative learning principles like simultaneous interaction, face to face interaction, individual accountability, and equal participation. During Talking Chips technique was implemented in the classroom, all students did face to face interaction because they worked together and face to face in group. Besides, it also happened simultaneous interaction because in group, they cooperated and interacted between one student to other students. Next, it happened individual accountability because



every student in group must be responsible to their task or role. The last, it also occurred equal participation because all students were given equal opportunity to speak. In short, during Talking Chips technique was implemented in teaching speaking, students got improvement in their speaking from the first cycle until the third cycle. Those improvements proved that Talking Chips technique could increase the students' achievement in speaking. Those improvements were influenced by several things like they had been active in speaking, they had good motivation, and so on. The last sentence is that Talking Chips could improve students' achievement in teaching speaking at one of the senior high schools in Bandung.

5. Conclusion

There are several things that should be concluded in this research. Those things are summary of how Talking Chips Technique can improve the students' speaking and the results of the study. Firstly, Talking Chips Technique had been implemented well in teaching speaking in three cycles. After implementing it, students got improvement from cycle 1 to cycle 3. The problems could be solved cycle per cycle, even though, there were still problems related to fluency and accuracy. Secondly, In cycle one, the mean score of fluency was 61.1 and 62.81 for accuracy. In cycle 2, mean score of students in fluency was 67.207 and accuracy was 68.05. In cycle 3, the mean score of fluency was 71.451 and accuracy was 74.69. Those mean scores got improvement from cycle 1 until cycle 3. It was caused by the progress of students each cycle in speaking. For example, they were active in speaking, high motivation, responsible to their task and so on. Besides, the cooperative learning elements which had been implemented well during Talking Chips Technique was implemented in teaching speaking.

References

- [1] E, Arnold. *Starting to teach study skill*. London: Edward Arnold Ltd, 1983, pp.112.
- [2] S, Kagan. *Cooperative learning*. San Clemente, CA: Kagan Publishing. Retrieved April 12nd, 2010, from http://www.gdrc.org/kmgmt/c_learn/methods.html, 1992, pp. 17.
- [3] J, Harmer. *The practice of English language teaching*. London: Longman, 1993.
- [4] U, Penny. 1996. *A Course in language teaching practice and theory*. United Kingdom. Cambridge University Press, 1996, pp.120.
- [5] A, Hughes. *Testing for language teachers: Second edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003, pp.111.
- [6] R, Cauldwell. *Resource paket – Assessment of speech: Fluency*. ED -4076 Rev. 07.09. Department of Education. Retrieved April 25th, 2010, from <http://www-docstoc.com/docs/67625460/speakingfluency.doc>, 2005, pp.9.
- [7] J, Harmer. *The practice of English language teaching (Longman Handbooks for Language Teacher)*. New York: Longman Inc, 2007, pp. 121.