IMPROVING SPEAKING ABILITY OF THE ELEVENTH YEAR STUDENTS OF SMA LABORATORIUM UNSYIAH BANDA ACEH BY USING TIME TOKEN ARENDS TECHNIQUE

Sukmayati[1]

Abstract

This research is intended to investigate the effect of Time Token Arends Technique application in teaching speaking to the eleventh grade students of Senior High School (SMA) Laboratorium Unsyiah Banda Aceh. The main purpose was to know whether the students who were taught by using Time Token Arends Technique would get a better performance in their speaking compared to those who were not. The topic given to the students was the expression of asking and giving opinion and suggestion. The population and sample of the study was the eleventh year students of SMA Laboratorium Unsyiah Banda Aceh which consists of 58 students; 29 in each class. The data of this research was collected by giving the pre-test and post-test. The data was analyzed using statistical formula including mean, standard deviation, and t-test. The result of the data analysis can be seen from the result of the post-test of the experimental and the control group. The mean of the post-test of the experimental group was 48,97 while the mean of the control group was 38,10. The mean score of the pre-test of the experimental group was 35,52 and the mean score of the experimental group was 48,97. In order to prove the hypothesis, the t-test score of the experimental group was compared with t-table score, it shows that the result of t-test of the post-test of experimental group was 2,279 while the result of t-table at a level of significance with a = 0,05 is 2,048. It indicates that the t-test score is higher than the t-table 2,048. It means that the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted and the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected. So, it can be concluded that the students who were taught by using Time Token Arends Technique have a better performance than those who were not. As the follow up for this research, it is suggested that English teachers should use various technique in teaching. In teaching speaking, Time Token Arends Technique can be an alternative technique to be applied.

Key Words : *Speaking Skills, Time Token Arends Technique*

[1] Sukmayati, Guru Bahasa Inggris SMA Laboratorium Unysiah

INTRODUCTION

Speaking is an interaction between the speaker and listener where the aims are to deliver speakers' information or intention during the conversation. When people start to speak, it means they want to deliver or share their ideas to others. Brown.et al, (2005) stated that speaking is oral interaction where participants need to negotiate meaning of ideas, feeling and information. In this case, the speaker must see the relationship between ideas presented. In general, the goal of teaching speaking is to enable learners to communicate in the language they are learning. As Richards (2005:2) stated that the goal of teaching speaking is to provide learners with communicative competence, and classroom activities that develop learners' ability to express themselves through speech. In Indonesia the goal of teaching speaking to senior high school students grade 11th; as stated in the school-based curriculum (KTSP); is senior high school students are expected to be able to express meaning both in formal and informal transactional and interpersonal exchanges accurately, fluently and acceptable in daily life context.

According to 2006 curriculum, a student is considered success in passing the English subject if he/she reaches the minimum standard criteria score (KKM) determined by each school. For 2012/2013 academic year, SMA Laboratorium Unsyiah determines 75 for the English KKM which means that a student has to achieve at least 75 in order to pass the English subject.

For majority of the students especially who occupy the second grade of this school, reaching the stated passing score is not easy though the materials or the topics provided in the curriculum have been delivered within the time limit.

Based on the researcher's experience during her teaching period for more than seven years, it is found that most of her students still get problems in achieving the KKM especially in speaking English. To find out the students' problems, the researcher conducted a preliminary study through a survey by interviewing some students in her class. Based on the result of the interview with the students, she found that most of the students do not have high motivation to speak English because of different reasons. Some students said that they were reluctant to speak English because they felt afraid of making mistakes especially in case of grammar and pronunciation. Some other mentioned that they did not have any idea to tell when the teacher assigns them to speak English while some others cited that they have the idea about particular topics but they do not have enough vocabulary to use in that context.

In language teaching, it is teacher's responsibility to choose and apply the appropriate technique in order the students become active and creative in communication. Appropriate teaching strategy can influence students' in English especially in speaking

skill. As an English teacher at SMA Laboratorium Unsyiah, the researcher initiated to apply a teaching technique that she never used before. She was convinced that the technique she chose could create a challenging classroom atmosphere. She, therefore, decided to apply Time Token technique in teaching speaking to her students.

As the feedback for the research problem above, the research question of this study can be formulated as: Can Time Token Arends Technique improve the students' speaking skill?

In line with the above research question, the objective of this study is to find out whether or not Time Token Arends Technique improve the students' speaking skill.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A. Time Token Arends Technique

Time Token Arends is one of cooperative learning developed by Arends in 1998. In this technique, students do cooperative activities and help each other in understanding particular topics. Istarani (2011:194) defines Time Token Technique as a structure that can be used to teach social skills, to avoid talking domination of particular students or to avoid the students silence during class activities. This is due to the reason that by arranging the time for speaking and the giving of time for each student to speak, the teacher can create a comfortable situation for the students to speak. In addition, Suprijono (2013:133) suggests several steps of how a time token activity can be administered. It starts by arranging the students' seating

arrangement into a discussion form. Then each student is given talking tokens. Each student will be given points depending on the time they spend in speaking or expressing opinion.

A number of research have been conducted about the application of time token technique in teaching. On August to December 2013, Yunitha conducted a classroom action research on the application of time token technique in improving students' speaking skill at the first year students of SMA Negeri 2 Surakarta. The result shows that the application of time token technique can improve the quality of the teaching learning process. It reveals in the increase of the students' activity, interest, and cooperation during the learning process. It also shows that the application of time token technique can improve the students' speaking skill. Similarly, Fanani conducted a research about the impact of applying time token technique towards the students' achievement of the students of SMK Negeri 1 Sidoarjo. He compared the students' achievement taught using time token technique and those taught using STAD technique. The finding shows that students' who are taught through time token technique have significantly better achievement than those taught through STAD. In addition to that, Valentina et al. (2012) condunted a research to investigate the influence of using time token Arends technique towards the 7th grade students' achievement in Civil Education. The finding shows that the students taught using time token technique have better achievement in the given topics.

B. Speaking as a Skill

Speaking, as one of the four language skills is highly important in learning to communicate. Speaking is an interaction between the speaker and listener where the aims are to deliver speakers' information or intention during the conversation. When people start to speak, it means they want to deliver or share their ideas to others. Brown, et all, (2005:115) stated that speaking is oral interaction where participants need to negotiate meaning of ideas, feeling and information. In this case, the speaker must see the relationship between ideas presented. Bailey and David (2005:2) cited "Speaking is an interactive process of constructing meaning that involves producing and receiving and processing information. It is often spontaneous, open ended, and evolving, but it is not completely unpredictable." From both definition of speaking stated above, it can be concluded that speaking is an oral communication that is used to convey meaning.

Speaking in a foreign language is a complex activity. If a student wants to be able to speak fluently in English, a student needs to know and acquire many aspects of the language. Harmer (2007:343) says that in order to be able to speak fluently in a English, speakers of English-especially where it is the second language- do not only need to be able to pronounce phonemes correctly, use appropriate stress and intonation pattern and speak in connected speech, but they will also have to be able to speak in a range of conversational and conversational strategies. They will need to be able to survive in typical functional exchanges. Nunan (1999:226) added that in order to speak in another language, one needs to know how to articulate sounds in a comprehensible manner, one needs an adequate vocabulary, and needs to have mastery of syntax. These various elements add up to linguistic competence. Besides, one needs to have the notion of communicative competence which includes a range of other sociolinguistic and conversational skills that enable the speaker to know how to say what to whom, when.

Similar idea was also stated by Thornbury (2005:11). He claims that learning to speak a foreign language requires more than knowing its linguistic knowledge. Students must also acquire the knowledge of extra linguistic such as topic, cultural knowledge, knowledge of the context, and familiarity with the other speakers. It means that when somebody is speaking the language, she/he should not only know the grammatical rules of the language but more on how it is used appropriately in different context of life.

METHODOLOGY

This study is an experimental quantitative research which is referred to true-experimental design. Arikunto (2006:125) defines an experimental study as the research in which there are two classes observed at the two points; they are control and experimental groups; one before the treatment and one after the treatment which was aimed at obtaining the information for the study. In this study the researcher addressed the treatment about the application of Time Token Arends Technique

in teaching speaking to the experimental group.

The target population of this study was all the students of SMA Laboratorium Unsyiah of 2013/2014 academic year with the total number of 463 students. 120 students belonged to second year students divided into seven classes; 4 Natural Science and 3 Social Science classes. There were two Social Science classes selected randomly from three classes in which both selected classes were similar in many cases. The classes chosen were XI-IPA2 as the control group and XI-IPA3 as the experimental group. The experimental class consisted of 29 students; 18 female and 11 male, while the control class consisted of 29 students; 17 female and 12 male.

In this study, one kind of instrument was used to collect the data; it was a test. The test includes pre-test and post-test in oral form. The pre- test was given to both classes before the treatment, while post- test was given after implementing the treatment. The pre-test was given to know how good the students' performance in speaking English was. In the pre-test activity, each student was required to give their opinion and suggestion to the issue and problem delivered by the teacher. Completing the pre-test, the researcher began the treatment to the experimental group by teaching speaking through Time Token Technique in five meetings. The researcher

used subjective test. The result was examined and scored by using the rubric which was adapted from ESL Speaking Scoring rubric. The students were assessed on some aspects; they are clarity, pronunciation, fluency, comprehension, and content. They were scored and put into four category of speaking skill levels; they are Poor, Fair, Good, and Excellent.

Post-test was a test given to both the experimental and control groups at the end of treatment. The goal of the post-test is to know the students' speaking performance as the effect of Time Token Technique application. The effect was to know whether the intervention in the experimental group significantly improved the students' speaking skills compared to the control group. In order to see on what aspects of the students' speaking increased, then the same scoring rubric used in the pre-test was applied.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

1. The Statistical Summary of Pre-test and Post-test for both Experimental and Control Groups.

The statistical summary of the pre-test is described on the tables below. In order to know whether there are differences among the range, mean, t-test and standard deviation for both experimental and control groups. The pre-test score of the EG and CG is presented in the following table.

Table 1. Statistical Summary of the Pre-Test of EG and CG

	Experimental Group (EG)	**t - test**	**Control Group (CG)**
N (Number of Students)	29		29
R (Range)	60		65
$\bar{X}$(Mean Score)	34		40
S (Standard Deviation)	16,93	- 1,12	-23,05

To see the pre-test and post-test scores of the EG is summarized in table 2

Table 2. Statistical Summary of the Pre-Test and Post-Test of EG

	Pre-Test of EG	t - test	Post-Test of EG
N (Number of Students)	29		29
R (Range)	60	-2,9	70
$\bar{X}$ (Mean Score)	34		48
S (Standard Deviation)	16,93		19,73

To see the differences between the pre-test and the post-test scores of the EG. The result is presented in the following table.

Table 3. Statistical Summary of the Pre-Test and Post-Test of CG

	Pre-Test of CG	t - test	Post-Test of CG
N (Number of Students)	29		29
R (Range)	65	0,56	70
$\bar{X}$ (Mean Score)	40		37
S (Standard Deviation)	-23,05		16,72

To see whether there is significant difference of EG and CG in their performance, table 4 is constructed.

Table 4. Statistical Summary of the Post-Test of EG and CG

	Experimental Group (EG)	t - test	Control Group (CG)
N (Number of Students)	29		29
R (Range)	70		70

$\bar{X}$ (Mean Score)	48	2,3	37
S (Standard Deviation)	19,73		16,72

The discussion concerned with the data from the description that have been explained before with the statistic procedure; the writer also interpreted the data that have been calculated above. Here is the detail information about the discussion of the issue. In general results, the experimental group is better than the control group because it has higher mean compared to the control group. It is based on the mean of data analyzing of post-test on EG and CG ($\bar{X}_1$:48 and $\bar{X}_2$:37). In this case, to support this finding more reliable, Slavin (1991) elaborated on the preceding chapter. It showed that Snowball Throwing as one of cooperative learning methods has positive effects in all major subjects, all grade levels, in urban, rural, and sub-urban schools and for high average, and low achievers.

Based on the source of the data, the number of the students of EG is the same as the CG; those are 29 for each. The range of the scores of EG and CG are not small so that the distribution appears normal since there are no extremes scores. The range of the pre-test score is 60 for the EG and 65 for the CG. From this range, it can be noticed that the two groups of scores are not widely scattered. Thus, the score distribution of the pre-test of the CG is higher scattered than the EG. It means that the score spread off for about 5 point increase.

The $\bar{X}$ statistic (arithmetic mean) of each test shows the relative achievement of the groups. The pre-test mean for the EG is 34 and 40 for the CG. The standard deviation of pre-test of EG is 16,93 while the standard deviation of pre-test of CG is -23,05. So, the score distribution of the pre-test for the EG is better than that of the CG. The T-test of pre-test of EG and CG is -12 at level of significant 0,05. So, null hypotheses (H_o) is accepted and because the T-test in the limit given (-1,96 and 1,96). It means that there is no significant different between EG and CG.

The pre-test scores of EG is different from that of the post-test score. The range of the pre-test of EG is 60 and the range of post-test is 70. The mean score of the pre-test is 34 and the mean score of the post-test is 48. The standard deviation of the pre-test is 16,93 and the standard deviation of the post-test is 19,73 on EG. It means that the score distribution of the post-test is significantly different than that of the pre-test. Then, the T-test of the pre-test and post-test on EG is -2,9 at the level of significance 0,05. Thus, we can accept the alternative hypotheses (H_1). This indicates that there is a significant difference between two means of pre-test 34 and post-test 48 of EG. We could say that the outcome of the test on the EG is due to the effect of the treatment.

If the procedures of Time Token Technique and the test statistics taken as appropriate indicators, it is proposed that the Time Token Arends Technique is a better alternative. Since there is no treatment for the CG, the mean differences between post-test

and pre-test are considerably not meaningful; 40-37=3 with the T-test statistic of 0,56 and the level of significance at 0,05. It means that the two groups are significantly different (see also Table 4.2 page 45). At the same time, it proves that the treatment has given a positive effect on the students' achievement. In other words, the technique employed in the EG provided more significant results than those used in the CG, (see Table 4.3 page 46).

The range of the post-test score for the EG is 70 and 70 for the CG. The ranges theoretically are not quite different from the range of the post-test which is 60 for the EG and 65 for the CG. The mean of post-test is 48 for EG and 37 for the CG. The standard deviation of the post-test is 19,73 for EG and 16,72 for the CG which means that the EG standard deviation is better than the CG. The t-test of the post-test of EG and CG is 2,30 at the level of significant 0,05. Therefore, we

should accept the alternative hypotheses because there is no significant difference between the two groups, where some students have better performance and some of them have lower performance in mastering speaking skills.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings and the discussion presented in the previous chapter, some conclusions are drawn in relation with teaching speaking by using Time Token Arends Technique. They are: (1) there is a significant difference in speaking performance between the students who were taught by using Time Token Technique and those who were taught through Audio-Lingual Method, (2) The students who were taught by using Time Token Arends Technique achieved higher score than those who were taught through Audio-Lingual Method.

REFERENCES

Arikunto, S. 2006. *Prosedur Penelitian. Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Bailey, K.M, and Nunan D. 2005. *Practical English Language Teaching: Speaking.* Inc.New York: McGraw-Hill Companies

Brown, H. D. 2005. Language Assessment; Principles and Classroom Practices: New York, Pearson Education

Departemen Pendidikan Nasional. 2006. *Standar Kompetensi dan Kompetensi Dasar Bahasa Inggris SMA/MA* Jakarta: Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan (BSNP) Depdiknas

Harmer, J. 2007. *The Practice of English Language Teaching* Fourth Edition; Pearson Education Limited.

Istarani. 2011. *58 Model Pembelajaran Inovatif, Referensi Guru Dalam Menentukan Model Pembelajaran*.Medan; Penerbit Media Persada

Nunan, D. 1999. *Second Language Teaching and Learning*; Heinle & Heinle Publishers, An International Thomson Publishing Company, Boston, Massachuset, USA

Suprijono, A. 2013. *Cooperative Learning: Teori dan Aplikasi PAIKEM*.(10th edition). Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar

Thornbury, Scott. 2005. How to teach Speaking. England: Longman. United States of America: Library of Congress Cataloging.

Yunitha. 2013. *Peningkatan Keterampilan Berbicara Melalui Penerapan Model Pembelajaran Kooperatif Time Token Arends pada Sisa Kelas X IPA 1 SMA Negeri 2 Surakarta Tahun Ajaran 2013/2014.* Thesis. Program Studi Bahasa Indonesia, Program Pasca Sarjana, Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta.

Fanani Hanif and Pramukantoro. 2011. *Pengaruh Teknik Pembelajaran Kooperatif Tipe Time Token Arends Terhadap Hasil Belajar Siswa Pada Mata Diklat Dasar-dasar Kelistrikan di SMKN 1 Sidoarjo*. Thesis. Pendidikan Teknik Elektro, Fakultas Teknik, Universitas Negeri Surabaya.

Febrayani, Valentina, et.al. 2012. *The Influence of Cooperative Learning Time TokenArends towards Students' Achievement in Civil Education for fifth grade students of Seririt District;* thesis, University of Ganesha, Singaraja Indonesia