

IMPROVING SPEAKING ACHIEVEMENT OF THE ELEVENTH GRADE STUDENTS OF SMA NEGERI 5 PALEMBANG THROUGH TIME TOKEN ARENDS

Visca Yulandia, Rita Hayati, Lingga Agustina Suganda

English Education Study Program

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University

viscayulandia13@gmail.com

Abstract: This study was aimed to find out whether or not (1) there was a significant difference in speaking achievement before and after the students were taught through time token arends strategy, and (2) there was a significant difference in speaking achievement between the students who were taught through time token arends strategy and those who were not. The sample of this study was 60eleventh grade students of SMA Negeri 5 Palembang which was chosen by using purposive sampling. It was divided into experimental and control groups, and each group had 30 students. To collect the data, pretest and posttest were given to the students. In scoring the students' pretest and posttest, the writer used the rubric by Harris (1996). Then, the data were analyzed by using paired sample t-test and independent sample t-test in SPSS Version 24. The result of paired sample t-test showed that the p-value was lower than significance level ($0.003 < 0.05$). It means that there was a significant difference in speaking achievement before and after the students were taught through time token arends strategy. The result of independent sample t-test showed that the p-value was lower than significance level ($0.006 < 0.05$). It means that there was a significant difference in speaking achievement between the students who were taught through time token arends strategy and those who were not. In brief, time token arends strategy is helpful in enhancing students' speaking achievement.

Keywords: *Improvement, Speaking Skill, Time Token Arens*

In this modern era, people need a language as a tool for communication with others around the world. In other words, they need a lingua franca as a bridge language. It has been known that English is acknowledged as a lingua franca (Coleman, 2006). Lingua franca is used to communicate with people who have different languages.

English has been implemented in every country. It has been applied as a subject that should be taught in curriculum especially in Indonesia. English is one of the compulsory subjects for junior high school, senior high school, and university. Based on the regulation of Republic of Indonesia No.24 year 2009, foreign language is other languages except

Indonesian language and local language. It means that English is a foreign language in Indonesia. In learning English there are four skills to be learned. They are listening, reading, speaking, and writing. According to Haris (1996), these four skills are divided into an encoding and a decoding process. Speaking and writing are the encoding processes where we express our ideas, thoughts, or feelings by using one or other language forms. Meanwhile, listening and reading are decoding processes where we can receive either a spoken or a written message. In order to use English fluently, students need to master these four skills.

Speaking is one of the language skills which is taught by English teachers

as a foreign language. It focuses on communication and it is an important thing when we want to interact with other people. Sukmayati (2014) describes speaking as an interaction between two people, who acted as the speaker and the listener, that aimed to bring information or intention of the speakers during the conversation. Thus, it is important for the teachers to teach speaking to the students and make them able to communicate with others. It is suitable with the goal of teaching which were explained by Richard (2005), which is to develop students' competency on communication and students' abilities to show themselves through speeches.

According to the Standard of Competence (Standar Kompetensi / SK) and Basic Competence (Kompetensi Dasar / KD) as written in syllabus of the 2013 curriculum, one of the text genres that must be learned by eleventh grade students in Indonesia is procedure text. Derewianka (2004) states that procedure text is designed to inform someone on how to accomplish something through a sequence of steps or actions.

The writer interviewed one of the English teachers at SMA Negeri 5 Palembang. The writer found some of students' problems related to studying English in the implementation of 2013 curriculum. First, their first languages cause them difficulty to use the foreign language. Second, they lack of motivation to practice the foreign language in daily conversation. Third, they are too shy and afraid that they will mispronounce words and say grammatically incorrect sentences. In addition, the writer also interviewed some students and found some factors that may make it difficult for students to speak in English. They are the weaknesses of vocabulary mastery in English, the fear that teacher will ask the students to speak in English, and the difficulty of having idea when the students want to speak in English. From the explanation, it means that teachers should use a strategy that is

suitable for teaching speaking in order to make the learning process effective. The strategy itself should be adjusted with students' abilities and the condition of the class.

Considering the problems about students' difficulties in speaking English, the writer offered a strategy in teaching speaking skill because a suitable strategy can help the students improve their speaking. Time Token Arends is one of the solutions that can solve students' problems in speaking skill. Time Token Arends, which is developed by Arends in 1998, is a cooperative learning strategy. According to Arends and Kilcher (2010), "Cooperative learning is a teaching model or strategy that is characterized by cooperative task, goal, and reward structures, and requires students to be actively engaged in discussion, debate, tutoring, and teamwork" (p.306). In this strategy, the students are engaged in cooperative activities where they help each other in understanding the topics during learning process. According to Suprijono (2015), the main procedure of time token activity is every student in a group is given a coupon to talk about the material. If the students already use all the coupons, they are not allowed to participate to talk again. In addition, Arends (2012) states that there are some students who dominate to speak and some others who are shy and never say anything when they do the discussion. Time Token can help distribute participation more equitably. It means that this strategy can give the students the same opportunity to speak and give their opinions in the classroom.

Therefore, the objectives of the study were to find out whether or not there was a significant difference in students' speaking achievement before and after they were taught through Time Token Arends Strategy and to find out whether or not there was a significant difference in speaking achievement between students who were taught through Time Token Arends Strategy and those who were not.

RESEARCH METHOD

The experimental method was used in this study. The writer used a quantitative quasi-experimental research method in order to find out whether or not there was a significant difference in students' speaking achievement before and after the students were taught through Time Token Arends Strategy and whether or not there was a significant difference in students' speaking achievement between the students who were taught through Time Token Arends Strategy and those who were not.

There were two groups in this study. They were experimental and control groups. Both of them were given pretest and posttest, but the experimental group was taught through Time Token Arends Strategy in learning speaking while the control group was not. It means that the experimental group received the treatment while the control group did not.

Before the treatment, the pretest was given to the experimental and control group. A pretest was given to assess the students' abilities before having treatment. Then, the writer taught the experimental group for 14 meetings with the time allocation of 2 x 45 minutes for each meeting. After the 14 meetings with the treatment, the writer gave the posttest which was exactly the same as the pretest given.

There were some stages of time token arends strategy. (1) Teacher asked the students to make a group consists of 6 students each group, (2) teacher gave brief explanation about the topic, (3) teacher explained about Time Token Arends Strategy, and teacher explained the function of the coupon, (4) teacher gave two coupons for each students, there were two sessions in the discussion, for the first session, the teacher gave one coupon for each student with time 15 seconds, for the second session, the teacher gave one coupon for each student with time 30 seconds until 1 minute, the students explained about one topic of procedure

text based on the time given, (5) teacher gave the topic of discussion about procedure text, (6) teacher asked the group to discuss the material with their groups ± 10 minutes, (7) teacher led discussion of all the groups, (8) students spoke in turn, each student continued the steps from their friends' explanation, (9) every student used a coupon for speaking, if the students already used the coupons, they were not allowed to participate to talk again, (10) teacher gave supports for the students who still had coupon to speak.

In this study, the writer chose the eleventh grade students of SMA Negeri 5 Palembang in academic 2018/2019 as the population with the total numbers of students of 306. There were 10 classes of the students in the second year. From the population, the writer took two classes with the total of 60 students as the sample by using purposive sampling technique. According to Etikan, Musa, and Alkassim (2015), "Purposive sampling technique or judgment sampling is the deliberate choice of a participant due to the qualities the participant processes"(p.2). The samples were the classes which were taught by the same teacher, the same number of students, and had the similar average score in their English achievement. The two classes were class XI science 3 as the experimental group and class XI science 4 as the control group.

The materials for test that the writer gave to the students were (1) How to make a cup of tea, (2) How to make a cheese omelet, (3) How to cook fried rice, (4) How to serve instant boiled noodle, (5) How to make an origami boat. The materials for teaching that the writer gave to the students were (1) **How to plant a flower**, (2) How to make a glass of orange juice, (3) **How to make fruit ice**, (4) **How to make a cup of milo**, (5) **How to make pancakes**, (6) How to play the hole game, (7) How to insert sim card cell phone, (8) How to operate Microsoft windows, (9) How to use chopsticks, (10) How to make a kite, (11) How to make a chicken soup,

(12) How to use rice cooker, (13) How to mend a puncture, (14) How to make a bookmark.

In order to have a high degree of content validity of the speaking test, the test has been checked based on the curriculum and the syllabus used in the school. Besides that, three validators were also asked to validate the test. The validators are a lecturer from Sriwijaya University, a lecturer of Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Fatah Palembang, and an English teacher of SMA Negeri 5 Palembang. The validators checked the level of appropriateness of each test item. There were 4 test items with 5 levels. The levels were (1) Very inappropriate, (2) Inappropriate, (3) Moderate, (4) Appropriate, (5) Very Appropriate. The total of the level of appropriateness that the validators chose were 5 in appropriate levels and 7 in very appropriate levels. The result showed that the speaking test is valid. The test was recorded and it was scored based on the rubric from Harris (1996). The aspects of speaking in the rubric were pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. The rating scales in the rubric were from 5 to 1.

To estimate the study of the reliability of the test, inter-rater reliability was used to find out the reliability of the

result in students' speaking achievement. There were two raters involved to give score on students' speaking test by using rubric. SPSS 24 was used to find out the reliability of the speaking test. The writer used Kuder-Richardson 20 (KR20) to find out the level of reliability of the test. The result showed that the test was reliable at the level of 0.580.

In analyzing the data, t-test in Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS 24) was used by the writer. The experimental group and control group were given pretest and posttest. Then, paired sample t-test used to look at the pretest and posttest of scores for the experimental group which was taught through Time Token Arends Strategy. Meanwhile, to answer the research question number 2, independent sample t-test was applied to find out the significant difference in speaking achievement between the students who were taught through Time Token Arends Strategy and those who were not. To find out the difference, the writer compared the results of posttest between the experimental group and control group.

FINDING AND INTERPRETATION

Findings

Table 1
The Score Distribution in the Experimental Group and Control Group

Score Interval Category		Experimental Group				Control Group			
		Pretest		Posttest		Pretest		Posttest	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
21-25	Very Good	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16-20	Good	5	16.7	10	33.3	7	23.3	2	6.7
11-15	Average	23	76.6	18	60	21	70	25	83.3
6-10	Poor	2	6.7	2	6.7	2	6.7	3	10
0-5	Very poor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total		30	100	30	100	30	100	30	100
Mean Score		13.8		14.27		14.07		12.9	

As presented in table 4.1, the result from the pretest in experimental group shows no student (0%) in very good category, five students (16.7%) in good category, twenty-three students (76.6%) in average category, two students (6.7%) in poor category, and none of students (0%) in very poor category. Meanwhile, in the posttest of the experimental group, there were no students (0%) in very good category, ten students (33.3%) in good category, eighteen students (60%) in average category, two students (6.7%) in poor category, and none of students (0%) in very poor category. Moreover, the mean score significantly enhance from 13.8 to 14.27. It can be concluded that there was improvement after the students got the treatment.

On the other hand, the result from the pretest in control group shows no student (0%) in very good category, seven students (23.3%) in good category, twenty-one students (70%) in average category, two students (6.7%) in poor category, and none of students (0%) in very poor category. Meanwhile, in the posttest of the control group, there were no students (0%) in very good category, two students (6.7%) in good category, twenty-five students (83.3%) in average category, three students (10%) in poor category, and none of students (0%) in very poor category. There was a decrease in mean score for control group. It went from 14.07 to 12.9.

Normality Test

Table 2
The Results of Normality Test

Group	Pretest		Posttest	
	Statistic	Sig.	Statistic	Sig.
Experimental Group	.134	.181	.115	.200
Control Group	.136	.167	.148	.093

From the table above, the significance (2-tailed) for pretest and posttest of experimental group were 0.181 and 0.200, meanwhile the significance (2-tailed) of pretest and posttest in control group were 0.167 and 0.093. Since all of the the result

were higher than 0.05, it can be concluded that the data sets were normally distributed.

Homogeneity Test

Table 3
The Results of Homogeneity Test

Group	Levene's Statistics	Sig.
Pretest and Posttest in Experimental Group	.127	.722
Pretest and Posttest in Control Group	2.165	.147
Pretest in Experimental & Control Group	.467	.497
Posttest in Experimental & Control Group	1.279	.263

The data can be considered homogeneous if the significance is higher than 0.05. The result of the homogeneity tests showed that the significance of pretest and posttest in experimental group was (.722>0.05). The result of the significance of pretest and posttest in control group was (.147>0.05). The result of the significance of pretest in experimental and control group was (.497>0.05) and the result of the significance of posttest in experimental and control group was (.263>0.05). Since all the data sets were higher than 0.05, it

could be concluded that all the data sets were homogeneous.

Paired Sample t-Test

Paired sample t-test was used to know whether or not there was a significant difference in students' speaking achievement before and after they were taught through Time Token Arends Strategy. Table 4 shows the result of paired sample t-test.

Table 4
The Results of Paired Sample t-Test in Experimental and Control Groups

Group	Test	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	T	Df	Sig.(2-tailed)
Experimental	Pretest	13.8	.77608	.14169	-.3294	29	.003
	Posttest	14.27					
Control	Pretest	14.07	2.77095	.50590	2.306	29	.028
	Posttest	12.9					

In experimental group, the mean score for posttest (14.27) was higher than the mean score for pretest (13.8) with sig. level (.003) which was less than 0.05. It means that the null hypothesis (H₀1) was rejected; therefore the alternative hypothesis (H₁1) was accepted. It could be concluded that there was a significant difference in speaking achievement before and after the students were taught through Time Token Arends Strategy. Meanwhile, in control group, the mean score of posttest (12.09) was lower than

the mean score of pretest (14.07) with sig. level (.028) which was lower than 0.05. It means that there was a significant difference between pretest and posttest of the control group.

The writer also used paired sample t-test to see the improvement of each aspect of speaking. Not only to know the improvement in achievement of speaking in general, but also the improvement of each speaking aspect. The result of the test could be seen in the table 5.

Table 5
The Results of Paired Sample t-test in Each Aspect of Speaking

Aspect	Mean		Mean Difference	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Pretest	Posttest		
Comprehension	2.80	2.95	0.15	.000
Pronunciation	2.58	2.65	0.07	.000
Vocabulary	2.66	2.75	0.09	.001
Fluency	2.50	2.75	0.25	.001
Grammar	2.53	2.66	0.13	.018

Based on table 5, the result of paired sample t-test for each aspect of speaking showed that the mean scores of the post-test for each aspect of speaking were higher than the mean scores in pre-test. The paired sample t-test's result showed the significance values for all aspects were lower than 0.05. It means that all the aspects of speaking have improvement.

Independent Sample t-Test

Independent sample t-test was used to find out the significant different in speaking achievement of the students taught through Time Token Arends Strategy and the speaking achievement of those who were not taught through Time Token Arends. In order to find the difference of posttest both in the experimental group and control group, the writer did independent sample t-test in the SPSS 24. The result was shown in the table below:

Table 6
The Results of Independent Sample t-Test

Group	N	Mean	Mean Diff	Std. Error Difference	T	Sig. (2-tailed)
Experimental	30	14.27	-1.36667	.47834	-2.857	.006
Control	30	12.9				

The result showed that the mean score for the experimental group was higher than control group (14.27>12.9), the mean difference was -1.36667, the standard error difference was .47834, t-obtained was -2.857, and p-value was .006. Since p-value was lower than significance level (0.05) the second null hypothesis (H_02) was rejected. It means that there was a significant difference in students' speaking achievement between the two groups.

Regression Analysis

The contribution of each speaking aspect towards students' speaking achievement on the experimental group can be seen with regression analysis. Although not the focus of the study, the writer believe it is important to know which aspect contributes to students' speaking achievement. The result of the regression analyses on each speaking aspects' contribution can be seen below:

Table 7
The Result of Regression Analysis for Each Aspect of Speaking

Model	R	R Square	Change Statistics	
			R Square Change	Sig.F Change
1	.947 ^a	.896	.896	.000
2	.978 ^b	.956	.060	.000
3	.986 ^c	.973	.016	.001
4	.991 ^d	.982	.009	.001
5	.993 ^e	.986	.004	.018

1. Predictors: (Constant), comprehension
2. Predictors: (Constant), comprehension, pronunciation
3. Predictors: (Constant), comprehension, pronunciation, vocabulary

4. Predictors: (Constant), comprehension, pronunciation, vocabulary, fluency

5. Predictors: (Constant), comprehension, pronunciation, vocabulary, fluency, grammar

Table 4.7 showed that each aspect of speaking gave contribution to the students' speaking achievement. The contribution of comprehension to speaking was 89.6%, pronunciation was 6%, vocabulary was 1.6%, fluency was 0.9% and the lowest was grammar aspect with 0.4% contribution. From the five aspects of speaking; comprehension, pronunciation, vocabulary, fluency, and grammar, all gave the significant contribution because the significance F values of all aspects were lower than 0.05. It means that comprehension has higher contribution than other aspects while grammar has the least contribution.

Interpretations of the Study

Based on the results of paired sample t-test in the experimental group, the students' scores between the pretest and posttest increased with mean difference 0.47. Besides that, the p-value of paired sample t-test in the experimental group was 0.003 lower than 0.05 which indicates there was a significant difference in students' speaking achievement before and after the treatment.

Furthermore, it was also proved by the results of independent Sample t-test that there was a significant difference in speaking achievement between the students who were taught through Time Token Arends Strategy and those who were not as the p-value was lower than 0.05 ($0.006 < 0.05$). The reason why there was a significant difference between those groups was because the control group was not given the treatment. Moreover, since the control group was not given the treatment, the result of their posttest slightly decreased. The mean difference between the pretest and posttest of the control group was -1.17. Therefore, it could be stated that the strategy which was used in this study gave a significant

improvement in students' speaking achievement.

The result of this study implies that Time Token Arends Strategy improved the students' speaking achievement especially for class XI science 3 as the experimental group. It was shown from the results of their posttest. In brief, it can be said that Time Token Arends is one of learning strategies which was helpful in teaching students' speaking achievement.

By using Time Token Arends Strategy, the students were given many chances to practice their speaking in every meeting. Then, they became trained to speak in English and they were more active in explaining their opinions. It is in line with the finding of Abdullah, Bakar, and Mahbob (2012), "Based on the various types of classroom behaviors, to be an active learners, whenever in the classroom, students must engage actively by playing the roles of information seekers. The acts of asking questions, give opinions or simply answering questions posed by the instructor or fellow students are examples of active type of classroom participation" (p.517).

During implementing treatment through Time Token Arends Strategy, the students worked together with their friends in group. In group discussions, each member was always asked to convey their opinions based on the topic given. Then, each member spoke in turn about the result of their discussion. Each member continued the steps from their friends' explanation. All students have the same opportunity to speak. According to Istarani (2011) Time Token Arends is a strategy used to teach social skills, to avoid one students dominating in discussions, and/or encourage passive students to engage more during learning activities. It means that by using Time Token Arends, there is time of talking which have been set and the chance

for each student to speak. In other words, there is no quiet student, but only the active students. Since every student has the same chance to speak and deliver their ideas, it will promote a good class atmosphere. In addition, the highest score of aspect of speaking was comprehension. It can happen because when the students did the discussion, the students shared the information to each other and they got feedback from their friends and the writer. As explained by Ornstein and Lasley (2000) that dividing students into small group seems to provide an opportunity for students to become more actively engaged in learning and for teacher to monitor students' progress better. It can also enhance students' cooperation and social skills.

In conclusion, Time Token Arends can be an effective way to improve speaking achievement in the experimental group. Therefore, it could be interpreted that Time Token Arends Strategy could improve the eleventh grade students' speaking achievement at SMA Negeri 5 Palembang.

Conclusions

Based on the findings and statistical analyses, three conclusions were drawn. First, the use of Time Token Arends Strategy can improve the eleventh grade students' speaking achievement at SMA Negeri 5 Palembang. The students in the experimental group had better result in their speaking after treatment by using Time Token Arends Strategy. It can be seen from the result of their posttest. Second, comprehension has the higher contribution than other aspects in this study. Third, the result of this study indicated that there was a significant difference in speaking achievement between the eleventh grade students of SMA Negeri 5 Palembang who were taught through Time Token Arends Strategy and those who were not.

Suggestions

Based on the findings of this study, the writer would like to offer suggestions to English teachers and the students. First, teachers should use an appropriate strategy during the process teaching speaking, in order to maintain students' interest and make them understand the materials easier. Time Token Arends is one of the strategies that teachers could use to achieve this. The teacher should make sure about time management and choose the topic with short explanation. So that all the students will get the chance to talk. Second, students should have confidence in doing speaking activity. Besides that, the students should be able to improve all aspects of speaking in developing their potential in learning English.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, M. Y., Bakar, N. R. A., & Mahbob, M. H. (2012). Student's participation in classroom: What motivates them to speak up?. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 51(1), 516-522.
- Arends, R. I., & Kilcher, A. (2010). *Teaching for student learning, becoming an accomplished teacher*. New York, NY: Routledge Taylor Francis Group.
- Arends, R. I. (2012). *Learning to teach* (9th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Coleman, J. A. (2006). English-medium teaching in European higher education. *Language teaching*, 39(1), 1-14.
- Derewianka. (2004). *Exploring how texts work*. Sydney, Australia: Primary English Teaching Association.
- Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2015). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1-4.

- Harris, D. P. (1996). *Testing English as a second language*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill Book Company.
- Istarani. (2011). *Innovative instructional model as teachers' references in deciding learning instruction*. Medan, Indonesia: Media Persada.
- Ornstein, A. C & Lasley, T. J. (2000). *Strategies for effective teaching*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Richard, J. C. (2005). *Communicative language teaching today*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Sukmayati. (2014). *Improving speaking ability of the eleventh year students of SMA laboratorium unsyiah banda aceh by using time token arends technique*. 36-44. ISSN 2355-004X.
- Suprijono, A. (2015). *Cooperative learning: Teori dan aplikasi PAIKEM (10th ed.)*. Yogyakarta, Indonesia: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 24 Tahun 2009 tentang Bendera, Bahasa, dan Lambang Negara, serta Lagu Kebangsaan*. (2009). Jakarta: Sekretariat Negara RI.

About the Authors:

Visca Yulandia was the graduate of English Education Study Program Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Sriwijaya.

Rita Hayati and Lingga Agustina Suganda are the lecturers at English Education Study Program Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Sriwijaya.