THE EFFECTIVENESS OF TALKING CHIPS TO TEACH SPEAKING VIEWED FROM STUDENTS' INTELLIGENCE

Muhammad Iqbal Ripo Putra

Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, IKIP-PGRI Pontianak,
Jalan Ampera No.88 Pontianak 78116
e-mail:Ripoputra@rocketmail.com

Abstrak

Penelitian eksperimental ini dilaksanakan di jurusan pendidikan Bahasa Inggris IKIP PGRI Pontianak pada tahun akademik 2014/2015. Populasinya semua siswa semester satu jurusan pendidikan Bahasa Inggris IKIP PGRI Pontianak pada tahun akademik 2014/2015. Sampel diambil dengan menggunakan *cluster random sampling* mendapatkan dua kelas: kelas A sebagai kelompok eksperimental dan kelas B sebagai kelompok kontrol yang masing-masing terdiri 30 siswa sebagai sampel. Kelompok eksperimental dengan metode talking chips; kelompok kontrol dengan metode peer tutoring. Masing-masing kelas dibagi ke dalam dua kelompok (siswa yang meiliki IQ tinggi dan rendah) Alat yang digunakan untuk mengumpulkan data yakni tes kemampuan berbicara dan dokumen IQ. Data dianalisis menggunakan multifactor analysis variance (ANOVA 2x2) dan uji Tukey. Dari penemuan di atas dapat disimpulkan bahwa Talking Chips adalah metode yang efektif dalam pengajaran berbicara. Dengan metode Talking Chips, para siswa dapat meningkatkan kemampuan berbicaranya. Oleh karena itu, guru disarankan untuk mengaplikasikan metode Talking Chip dalam pengajaran berbicara.

Kata kunci *:* Kemampuan berbicara, Metode *Talking Chips*, Metode *Peer Tutoring*, IQ, Penelitian Eksperimental.

Abstract

This article refers to an experimental study about the effectiveness of talking chips to teach speaking at an English Education Department of a University in Pontianak, West Kalimantan. The sample of this research consists of two classes; class A was used as the experimental group treated by using Talking Chips method and class B as the control group treated by using peer tutoring method. The sampling technique used is cluster random sampling. The instruments used to collect the data are students' documents of intelligence test and speaking test. The data were analyzed by using multifactor analysis of variance (ANOVA 2X2) and Tukey test. Based on the above findings, it can be concluded that talking chips method is an effective method to teach speaking for the first semester students of the English Education Department of a University in Pontianak. The effectiveness of the method is influenced by the students' level of intelligence. Based on the research findings, in general it can be concluded that Talking Chips is an effective method to teach speaking.

Keyword: *Speaking Skill, Talking Chips Method, Peer Tutoring Method, Intelligence Quotient, Experimental Study.*

INTRODUCTION

In general, speaking is an activity used by someone to communicate with others. It takes place everywhere and has become part of our daily activity. When someone speaks, he or she interacts and uses the language to express his or her ideas, feeling, and thought. Speaking is one of language skills besides writing, reading and listening. As a language skill, speaking has to be developed by someone who wants to acquire a language well.

According to Ur (1996: 120) all of the four skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing),speaking seems intuitively the most important. It also becomes a crucial part of second and foreign language learning and teaching, because it consists of producing and conveying meaningful ideas and message systematically to the interlocutor. In addition, Nunan (2003: 48) defines speaking as productive aural/oral skill. It consists of producing systematic verbal utterances to convey meaning. Nunan's consideration of speaking in line with that of Spratt, Pulverness & Williams (2005) who states that speaking is productive skill. It involves using speech to express meaning to other people. By having good speaking ability English learners are easier to access various information and knowledge of the world form any sources either printed of electronic media than those having mediocre English.

Speaking skill is the ability to use oral language appropriately and effectively in communication. Speaking is thinking of what one wishes to say, choosing the right words from our vocabulary, putting the words in the proper grammatical framework, communicating the feelings we have, and so on. According to Guang (2007: 1) speaking is the ability to express oneself or communicate orally by using a language. It means that speaking is an interactive process for producing, receiving, and processing information. Furthermore, the students are expected to use language proficiency well. Through speaking, learners need intonation, stress, pronunciation, grammar, and expression to express their idea or opinion. Moreover, they perceive the structure of the English language which is essential component of learning In university, speaking

becomes one of the important skills for the students who take English study program. While speaking is important, many students have to master this skill as well as they can. They do many ways to be better in speaking. In fact, speaking is not easy to be mastered. Because, learning to speak is not only learn about grammar but also learn the knowledge of how to use the language. Therefore, there are some students still have problems in speaking.

Speaking should be taught effectively in order that students can convey the message in the form of information, knowledge, or experience to other people not only inside the classroom but also outside the classroom. Then speaking skill for university students is important because by mastering speaking skill the students are prepared for the numerous presentations and performances that they will be required to give in high level. These activities build knowledge and skill, as well as improve the student's confidence level in front of an audience. Meanwhile, the difficulties that students generally find in speaking English are that students are frequently difficult to speak English well and fluently as they do not know what to speak about and how to speak it. These difficulties are judged to be some of the causes resulting in low achievement and acquisition of the students' speaking ability in the class.

Based on preliminary study, the common problems that usually faced by the students in speaking are cannot participate actively in conversation, poor grammar, and lack of vocabulary. Hinkle states (2005: 674), communication problem occur because the learners encounter a word they do not understand, a form of word they do not know how to use, or find that they are unable to express their intended meaning.

The teacher model to teach speaking is one of factors in this case. The teacher of reading should have variety techniques or methods. There are many methods and techniques to teach speaking, one of them is talking chips. According to Kagan (2009: 6.36), Talking chips is one of the teaching methods of cooperative learning which are students participate in a group discussion, giving a token when they speak. The purpose of this method is to ensure equitable participation by regulating how often each group member is

allowed to speak. Because it emphasizes full and even participation from all the members, this m e t h o d encourages passive students to speak out and talkers to reflect. Talking chips is useful for helping students discuss controversial issues, and it is useful to solve communication or process problem such as dominating or clashing group members.

Meanwhile, peer tutoring method creates communicative competence in learners. Most teachers expect an effective classroom to be quiet and orderly. Students are seated and not talking to each other. Students are trained to become passive observers rather than active participants in their own education. Hence, Peer tutoring gives teachers more time to work with students individually and also obtain a detailed understanding of each student's learning style and degree of subject mastery. Peer tutoring helps create child-centered classroom.

In teaching speaking, internal factor play important role. One of the most internal factors that influence students' speaking skill is the students' intelligence. Intelligence is included in cognitive ability which is very influential and plays important role in the process of teaching and learning. Gardner (1990: 557) states that intelligence is the ability to solve the problems or to develop outcomes and product that are valued in one or more cultural settings.

Based on the phenomena, this study wants to investigate Talking Chips in teaching speaking that can enhance the students' speaking skill. The hypotheses are formulated as follows: (1) talking chips method is more effective than peer-tutoring method to teach grammar; (2) the students with high level of intelligence have better speaking skill than those with low level of intelligence; and (3) there is an interaction between teaching methods and students' intelligence to teach speaking. Based on the above findings, it can be concluded that talking chips method is an effective method to teach speaking for the first semester students of the English Education Department of a University in Pontianak.

The researcher found several studies; the researcher has collected through research repot and journal before conductiong this research. First, Farima and Atefe (2012), this study has attempted to determine whether applying cooperative

learning approach can enhance the language learners' speaking proficiency. There were totally 40 male and female students involved in this study. One group consisted of 20 participants as experimental group taught by cooperative language learning and the other 20 participants were as control group in which cooperative language learning was not applied. The independent sample t-test indicated that there is significant different between experimental group and control group. It can be concluded that the cooperative learning has significant effect on the students' oral proficiency. Hence, cooperative learning has positive effects to the students' achievement and can improve the students' speaking proficiency.

Second, Yan Zhang (2010), the focus of this paper is cooperative learning have positive effects on foreign language learning and teaching. This paper compared cooperative learning with traditional language teaching. The paper reveals cooperative learning benefits for language learning and teaching. The comparison between cooperative learning and traditional language teaching can be identified by process activities in the class. In cooperative learning the students become active participator and contribute their idea in group work. It can build interaction and communication among the student. Meanwhile, traditional language teaching places the students in a passive receiver. Teaching learning process is focus on teachers' explanation. Therefore, by using cooperative learning the students are able to encourage communication with others. Furthermore, the students can create a positive interdependence, individual accountability, interpersonal and social skill within groups.

Third, Babatunde (2008), this study investigated the effects of three teaching strategies (Cooperative learning, problem-solving, and conventional) on junior secondary school students' achievement in social studies. The research design was quasi-experimental design. The sample consists of 150 students (80 boys and 70 girls). Stratified cluster sampling was used in the selection from three public secondary schools in Ife Central Local Government Area of Osun State, Nigeria. The result showed that students exposed to cooperative learning strategy perform better than those in the conventional strategies. The finding also showed that the boys had higher achievement than girls in cooperative learning; while

girls had higher achievement under problem solving strategy than boys. Cooperative learning encourages students to work together. Through cooperative learning, teacher should encourage team work among the students in order to help each other.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research was conducted at an English Education Department of a university in Pontianak, West Kalimantan. The research was conducted from October 2014 to January 2015 beginning from writing the research proposal, conducting the research, and writing the research report.

Experimental study was employed in conducting this research. The purpose is to determine cause-and-effect relationship. Through experimentations, cause and effect relationship can be identified. Because of this ability to identify caution, the experimental approach has come to represent the prototype of scientific method for solving problems (Christensen and Johnson, 2000: 23). The research design used in this research was factorial design 2x2. It allows a researcher to study the interaction of an independent variable with one or more variables (Tuckman, 1978: 135).

The population of the research was the first semester students of the the English Education Department of a university in Pontianak. There are four classes. Total of population is 140 students. The sample of this research consist of two classes; class A as experimental group treated by using inquiry based teaching and class B as the control group treated by using lecture method. Each class consists of 30 students which were divided into two group based on the students' level of intelligence. The sampling technique used was cluster random sampling technique. In this study, the researcher set the experimental and control group using lottery. The data obtained are the result of intelligence test and speaking skill test. Thus, there are two techniques of collecting data; document and speaking skill test. Intelligence test is used to know the level of students' IQ and speaking test is used to know the result of students' speaking skill after the treatment. The data are analyzed using descriptive analysis and inferential

analysis. Descriptive analysis is used to know the mean, median, mode and standard deviation of the scores of the speaking skill test. To know the normality and the homogeneity of the data, the writer uses normality and homogeneity test.

The normality and homogeneity tests are done before testing the hypothesis. Inferential analysis used is multifactor analysis of variance (ANOVA 2x2). It is used to test the hypothesis. H_o is rejected if F_o is higher than F_t. If H_o is rejected, the analysis is continued to know which group is better using Tukey test.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Measuring the normality using Liliefors. The result can be seen on the table 1.

Table 1. Normality Test

Data	(Lo)	(Lt)	(α)	Status
A_1	0.144	0.161	0.05	Normal
A_2	0.1080	0.161	0.05	Normal
B_1	0.1100	0.161	0.05	Normal
B_2	0.124	0.161	0.05	Normal
$A_1 B_1$	0.1790	0.220	0.05	Normal
$A_2 B_1$	0.1210	0.220	0.05	Normal
$A_1 B_2$	0.1720	0.220	0.05	Normal
$A_2 B_2$	0.113	0.220	0.05	Normal

the highest value of L_o is lower then L_t or ($L_o<L_t$) at the significance level α = 0.05, it can be concluded that the data are in normal distribution. For measuring the homogeneity test, the researcher used Bartlett formula. The result can be seen on the table 2.

Table 2. Homogeneity Test

sample	Df	1/(df)	s_i^2	log s_i^2	(df) log s_i^2
1	14	0.071	27.553	1.440	20.162
2	14	0.071	85.6	1.932	27.054
3	14	0.071	107.95	2.033	28.465
4	14	0.071	110.38	2.042	28.600
				Sum	104.2826

The result of the calculation, χ_o^2 (7.454) is lower than χ_t^2 (7.815). Thus, it can be concluded that the data are homogenous.

The result of mean scores can be seen on table 3.

Table 3. The mean scores of the Cells

	A_1	A_2	
B_1	79.13	62.33	70.73
B_2	62.20	69.33	65.77
	70.67	65.83	

To reveal whether the hypoteses are rejected or accepted, the researcher measured the data using ANOVA. The result can be seen on the table 4.

Table 4. The Summary of Analysis of Variance 2 x 2

Source of Variance	SS	Df	MS	F_o	$F_{t(.05)}$	$F_{t(.01)}$
Between columns (The Teaching Methods)	350.4167	1	350.4167	4.228	4.00	7.08
Between rows (IQ)	370.0167	1	350.4167	4.465	4.00	
Columns by rows (Interaction)	2148.017	1	2148.017	11.538	4.00	
Between groups	2868.45	3	956.15			
Within groups	4640.8	56	**82.87143**			
Total	7509.25	59				

From the table 4, it can be concluded that: (a) because F_o between columns (4.228) is higher than F_t(4.000) at the level of significance α = 0.05, Ho is rejected and the difference between columns is significant. There is a significant difference between the students who are taught by using talking chips method and those who are taught by using peer-tutoring method in their speaking skill. The mean score of the students who are taught by using talking chips method (70.67) is higher than the mean score of students who are taught by using peer tutoring method (65.83). It can be concluded that talking chips is more effective than peer tutoring method to teach speaking; (b) Because F_o between rows (4.465) is higher than F_t (4.00) at the level of significance α = 0.05, H_o is rejected and the difference between rows is significant. The students with high level of intelligence and those with low level of intelligence are significantly different in their speaking skill. The mean score of the students with high level of intelligence (70.73) is higher

than those with low level of intelligence (65.77). It can be concluded that the students with high level of intelligence have better speaking skill than those with low level of intelligence; (3) because F_o columns by rows (11.538) is higher than F_t (4.00) at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$, H_o is rejected and there is an interaction between teaching methods and students' intelligence to teach speaking. Thus, it can be concluded that the effect of teaching methods on speaking depends on the level of students' intelligence.

The researcher used Tukey test to clarify the significant difference of each mean. The result can be seen on the table 5.

Table 5. The Summary of Tukey Test

Data	Sample	q_o	q_t	α	Status
A_1 and A_2	60	2.9083	2.830	0.05	Significant
B_1 and B_2	60	2.984	2.830	0.05	Significant
A_1B_1 and A_2B_1	30	7.147	2.890	0.05	Significant
A_1B_2 and A_2B_2	30	3.033	2.890	0.05	Significant

From the table 5, it can be known that: (a) the score of q_o between columns is 2.9083 and the score of q_t of Tukey's table at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ is 2.830. Because $q_o > q_t$ or q_o (2.9083) is higher than q_t(2.830), it can be concluded that there is a significant difference on the students' speaking skill between those who are taught using talking chips method and those who are taught using pee-tutoring method. Meanwhile, based on the calculation result, the mean of the students who are taught using talking chips method (70.67) is higher than that of those who are taught using peer tutoring method (65.83), it can be concluded that talking chips is more effective than peer tutoring method to teach speaking; (b) the score of q_o between rows is 2.984 and the score of q_t of Tukey's table at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ is 2.830. Because $q_o > q_t$ or q_o (2.984) is higher than q_t (2.83), it can be concluded that there is a significant difference on the students' speaking skill between those who have high intelligence and those who have low intelligence. Based on the calculation result, the mean of the students who have high intelligence (70.73) is higher than that of those who have low intelligence (65.77), it can be concluded that the students who have high intelligence have better speaking skill than those who have low intelligence; (c) the score of q_o

between columns A_1B_1 and A_2B_1 is 7.147 and the score of q_t of Tukey's table at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ is 2.890. Because $q_o > q_t$ or q_o (7.147) is higher than q_t (2.89), it can be concluded that there is a significant difference on the students' speaking skill of the students having high level of intelligence between those who are taught using talking chips method and those who are taught using peer tutoring method. Meanwhile, the mean score of A_1B_1 (79.13) is higher than A_2B_1 (62.33), it can be concluded that talking chips method is more effective than peer tutoring method to teach speaking for the students who have high intelligence; (d) the score of q_o between columns A_1B_2 and A_2B_2 is 0.249 and the score of q_t of Tukey's table at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ is 2.890. Because $q_o < q_t$ or q_o (3.033) is higher than q_t (2.890), it can be concluded that there is a significant difference on the students' speaking skill of the students having low intelligence between those who are taught using talking chips method and those who are taught using peer tutoring method. Whereas, the mean score of A1B2 (62.20) is lower than A2B2 (69.33). The difference between them is only 0.5 so it can be concluded that peer tutoring does differ significantly from talking chips teaching to teach speaking for the students who have low intelligence.

After clarifying the findings of the study, a discussion is presented as follows:

1. Talking chips method is more effective than peer tutoring method

Talking chips is more effective than peer tutoring method to help students to improve their speaking skill. Talking chips is kind of cooperative learning method. The students work in small group to help one another to improve their skill. It makes students more creative, confidence and communicatively. Jolliffe (2007: 3) states that pupils work together in small group to support each other to improve their own learning and that of others. Using talking chips the students try to solve their problem in group discussion. Lie (2010: 61) proposes that talking chips can be used in all subjects and for all grades of students. Where in speaking activity, each member of group has a chance to give their contribution in listening view and thinking of the other members. Moreover, Lie (2010: 60) also reveals that each member of the group gets a chance to contribute to and listen to the

views and thinking of other members. Another advantage of this method is to overcome barriers opportunity in group work. In many groups, there are members who are too often dominant and outspoken. On the other hand, there are also members tend to be quiet and passive. In situations like this, equalization responsibilities in the group could not be achieved because of the passive members will rely on his overly dominant, while Peer Tutoring is a method which emphasizes on oral activity-pronunciation, pattern drills, and conversation practice-with virtually none of grammar and translation found in traditional classes. Moreover, drills-based behaviorism theory which concerns on language behavior, thus language can be acquired through imitating, repeating, and practicing orally. Whitman (1976: 532) states that Peer Tutoring is small-group sessions, alternative textbooks, workbooks, program med instruction, games, and of course, the one-to-one interaction with tutors may help a particular students comprehend what to do and learn. She also states that it is similar to individualizing instruction. This method can be used to help students at any age level. In most tutoring program, the tutors have been nonprofessional teachers. They may be students just a few years older than the ones being tutored, or the tutor may be an adult without special training in education beyond that received as part of the tutoring program.. David (1984: 534) states that Peer Tutoring is small-group sessions that consists of one-to-one or one-to-few. The one-to-one instructional lows greater adaptation to an individual's need. Teachers take into account differences in ability to understand instruction by organizing their teaching of the same part of curriculum in various way. Small-group sessions, alternative textbook, workbook, program med instruction, games, and, of course, the one-to-one interaction with tutors may help a particular student comprehend what to do and learn.

Cecil and Ann (1989: 87) states that Peer Tutoring is one student with the teacher allows for intensive instruction. It is frequently used to help students by learning problems to learn a new skill. In addition, one-to-one teaching can be used spontaneously to prevent or relieve frustration. When the teacher observes that a student is having difficulty during group instruction or seat work, it is often

helpful to give him one-to-one attention at the first opportunity.

All activities in Talking Chips use varieties of tasks that are proposed to make students able to use language creatively. This method leads the students to formulate some problems and guide the students to solve the problem. It can help students to speak up and more active Talking Chips method gives the students chance to express themselves to deliver their opinion to speak in the teaching and learning process. Meanwhile, Peer Tutoring method emphasizes on oral activities, written forms are avoided firstly, and students imitate what his or her partner says. In short, Talking Chips method is more effective than Peer Tutoring method to teach speaking.

2. The students who have high intelligence have better speaking skill than those who have low intelligence

Students with high intelligence tend to have better comprehension in learning any lessons including speaking in subject contents. The high intelligence students are easily able to develop cognitive thinking process fast. They are motivated to learn and compete to obtain good achievement. The students having high intelligence are active, creative, and have good participation to study in getting good competence and performance. High intelligence students are more active in teaching and learning process. They have much bravery in answering the questions from teacher whenever they are asked. They have strong intention in learning that makes them understand the lesson easier. Students with high intelligence give more argumentation and opinion during the teaching and learning process that makes the situation in the classroom more interesting. The students become the center of teaching and learning process. Baumeister, et al. As cited in Guindon (2010: 19) state that students with high intelligence seem to perform better in workplace and experience more occupational success, persist following failure, sometimes better in groups, and perceive themselves as well liked and popular.

On the contrary, students having low intelligence usually do not have any interest in joining the learning process. They prefer listening to the teacher to doing something necessary for them. They are passive in the

classroom and just count on the teacher and their friends. They prefer to become the audience or listeners in the learning process because it takes time for capture and store the new words. They also need more time on how or when to use those new words in their activity because it is quite difficult for them to understand the new material. Lahey (as cited in Ekawati, 2012: 89) says that a child with low intelligence will often seem less competent than an average younger child with the same mental age. In speaking skill, low intelligence is the cause of speaking disability when appropriate educational adaptations are not made. They do not understand easily the information within the content. They get confused to recognize parts of speech through spoken language. Some of them still get difficulty in finding the ideas and still do not know the meaning of each information. It is because low intelligence students fail to master basic speaking process such as conveys the idea despite intelligence. Griffen et al. (as cited in Vanauker-Ergle, 2002: 31) state that low intelligence students tend to have the following characteristics such as: a) they do not fit into the curriculum pace that the majority of learners do, b) the repeated failure they face can be damaging to their self esteem, c) they may be less motivated to learn due to chronic failing experiences, d) they need more drill and repetition, and e) they may have little or negative social interactions with peers due to being viewed as failures.

3. Interaction between teaching methods and students' intelligence in teaching speaking

In teaching speaking, the teacher has to use appropriate and suitable method to make the students more interested and have motivation to learn and join the teaching learning process. Talking Chips method is kind of method that can be applied to teach speaking. Talking Chips method makes the students active in teaching and learning process.

Talking Chips method is regarded as an appropriate method to teach speaking for students having high intelligence because they believe their potential in the learning process to speak better in the speaking class. The students who have high intelligence will enjoy and be easy to join the class. They will maximize their

potential in teaching learning process. Moreover, they have creativity to make question based on the instruction from the teacher and try to solve the problems with their group. So, it can be concluded that Talking Chips method is more effective for students who have high intelligence. Meanwhile, Peer Tutoring method is supposed for students who have low intelligence, because the students drill the students in the use of grammar. In Peer Tutoring method, the students more dominate to be a model of the target language. It makes the students more passive and less to speak in front of the class. The students who have low intelligence are not effective if taught by Talking Chips method because they will be shy, not comfortable and afraid if they make a mistake to speak in front of the class. The students who have low intelligence in learning process tend to need guidance from his or her friends. They do not want to try developing their skill by themselves. Stenberg's (1985) theory of intelligence performance identifies components which might be enhanced during peer tutoring. In addition Hartman in Topping (1996:324) proves that peer tutoring has been proposed to enhance cognitive processes of perceiving, differentiating, selecting, storing, inferring, applying, combining, justifying and responding.

Liu and Jackson (2011: 35) also reveal that in numerous SL/FL learning situations, learners, especially Asian learners, have been observed that they are keep silent in language class, rarely respond to teachers' questions, or actively take part in class interactions. These behaviors are frequently interpreted as a lack of motivation, low proficiency in target language, peer pressure, fear of losing face, lack of confidence, fear of making mistake, and so on.

The result of ANOVA test shows that F_o is higher than F_t which means that talking chips method differs significantly from the peer tutoring method for the students having high intelligence. The mean score of students having low intelligence is lower than those students who have high intelligence.

From the above research findings, the result of ANOVA test is used to conclude. So, there is an interaction between teaching methods and level of intelligence toward students' speaking skill.

CONCLUSION

Based on the description of the data analysis, some findings of the research are: (1) talking chips method teaching is more effective than peer tutoring method to teach speaking for the first semester students of the English Education Department of a University in Pontianak; (2) the students with high level of intelligence have better speaking skill than those with low level of inteliigence for the first semester students of the English Education Department of a University in Pontianak; (3) there is an interaction between teaching methods and the students' intelligence to teach speaking for the first semester students of the the English Education Department of a University in Pontianak.

It can be concluded that talking chips method is an effective method to teach speaking for the first semester students of the English Education Department of a University in Pontianak. The effectiveness of the method is influenced by the students' level of intelligence.

The methods used in this research are Talking Chips method and Peer-Tutoring method. Talking Chips method is more effective than Peer-Tutoring for teaching speaking. In teaching and learning process Talking Chips method focuses on the students' activity. Teacher gives opportunity to the students to express themselves and build the students' confidence to speak up. It makes the students more active and creative to develop their skill. In Talking Chips method, the students are invited to work in group. The students work in a group to help each others to discuss the problem or questions that are given by the teacher. Talking Chips method begins with problem or questions that are given by the teacher. After that, distribute a different problem or question to each group and ask the students to discuss it. After that, each student placed a chip on the table when they want to contribute to the conversation. Each student is not allowed to speak unless they have placed their chip on the table. The Chips helped the students to build listening and communication skills because students who tend to "spout off" consider more carefully that they have to say, since it will require their surrendering a token passive students feel encourage to speak because the ground rules have created an environment that promotes participants by all in. After that

the group speaks up one by one to present the result and other groups give comment or question for the previous group. Therefore, it can be concluded that this method will help students improve their speaking skill.

REFERENCES

Cecil, H. & Ann, O. 1989. *Classwide Peer Tutoring and Acquisition*. Boston: Hammilton Company.

Christensen, Larry & Burke Johnson. 2000. *Educational Research (Quantitative and Qualitative Approach).* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

David, B. 1984. *Fundamental Learning Strategies.* New York: USA.

Ekawati. 2012. *Improving students' speaking ability through Peer Tutoring (A classroom action research at the seventh grade Students Of SMP Negeri 1 Makasar in the Academic Year of 2011/2012).* Universitas Negeri Makasar: Un Published Thesis.

Gardner, H. 1993. *Multiple Intelligences: The Theory in Practice*. New York: Basic Books.

Guang, W., & Liang, J.X. 2007. Analysis of Psychological Barriers in Oral English Teaching. *US-China Foreign Language Journal*, 5 (9), 53-57. Retrieved September 02, 2013, from http://www.linguist.org.cn/doc/uc200709/uc20070911.pdf.

Guindon, F. 2010. Factor affecting students' speaking skill. *Journal of Educational Development. 22 (3). 9-10.*

Hinkel, Eli. 2005. *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*. London: Seattle University.

Jolliffe, W. 2007. *Cooperative Learning in the Classroom*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Kagan, S. 1994. *Cooperative Learning*. San Clemente: CA.

Lie, Anita. 2010. *Cooperative Learning*. Jakarta: Grasindo

Liu, C., & Jackson, J. 2011. Students' difficulties in learning Foreign Language. *Journal of Educational Psychologist.* Vol 32, No 12, pp. 502-533.

Nunan, David. 2005. *Practical English Language Teaching: Grammar*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc. 12221 avenue of the Americas.

Spratt, M., Williams, W., & Pulverness, Alan. 2005. *The TKT (Teaching Knowledge Test) Course*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Strenberg, Robert. 2005. *Human Intelligence*. New York: Pearson.

Topping, K.J. 1996. The Effectiveness of Peer Tutoring in Further and Higher Education: A Typology and Review of the Literature. *Journal of Educational Psychologist.* Vol 32, No 3, pp. 321-345.

Tuckman, Bruce W. 1978. *Conducting Educational Research 2nd ed*. New York: Harcourt Brace.

Ur, P. 1996. *A Course Language Teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vanauker. E. 2002. *Enhance students' speaking skill.* New York: Oxford: St. John College.

Whitman, J. 1976. *Teachers' Learning Strategies*. Longman: London.