APPLYING TALKING CHIPS METHOD IN TEACHING

Hamid Ismail[1)], Saiful[2)], Rina Asrini Bakri[3)], Sumirna[4)]

[1)]STKIP Kie Raha Ternate, Ternate, Indonesia. [2)]Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar, Makassar, Indonesia. [3)]STKIP YPUP Makassar, Makassar, Indonesia. [4)]Akademi Bahasa Asing UMI, Makassar, Indonesia

e-mail korespondensi : hamidismail1061@gmail.com

Abstract. The purpose of this study is to understand how the use of Method Talking Chips can increase the capacity of students boarding students at the first-year sole school in Kabupaten Gowa. First grade students of SMAN 13 Gowa year 2019/2020 is the focus of this essay. There are 247 participants who make up the seven classes, which are the exact class (X IPA 1), which has 33 participants, the exact class (X IPA 2), which has 34 participants, and the exact class (X IPA 3), which has 37 participants. X Social 1) was composed of 36 students, while X Social 2 was composed of 34 students. The 35 students who make up the social class (X social 3). The 38 women who make up the social class (X social 4). Purposive sampling techniques were used in this study. Class that is advertised as a secondary school. The recording is used to analyze the language that was spoken by the students. The total score for all participants in the pre-test can be interpreted as being 6.8. In the post-test, the mean scores of students' fluency and the mean scores of students' comprehension were respectively 4.03 and 3.68. The total number of average students at the post-test was 7.71. By comparing the total number of participants at the pre- and post-tests, it can be seen that the post-test had a higher total number of participants than the pre-test. With other words, it can be said that 7.71>6.8. It is possible to demonstrate that using the chip-based speaking method, students understanding and speaking fluency both significantly increase.
Keywords: Talking Chips Method, Speaking, Fluency, Comprehensibility.

I. INTRODUCTION

Everyone understands that English is the current international language. As an international language, English is taught to students from kindergarten through upper-level professors. At the moment, perhaps, English is also taught to the women in the children's enclosure. The most essential requirement for graduating from the third level of education and for filling a single position in a variety of jobs is to be able to speak English. English provides opportunities for growth in people's professional lives (Harmer, 2021:1). People will receive better pay if they speak two languages, or even more if they only understand their own native tongue. In addition to this, English as an international language serves as an international communication tool in every field, including science, technology, social interaction, economics, and others. Learning English is very important because it has many benefits for our professional lives. In contrast to using receptive skills when requesting information from others, productive skills is used when gathering information from others. The single most important communication skill in learning and teaching English is bicycling. Speaking is a crucial tool for communicating, observing, and learning. Because of this, all language learning is based on the foundational language of Spoken Language. It is a starting point for other languages. Through speaking students learn concepts, develop vocabulary, and comprehension of the English language's grammatical structure, which is a crucial component of the learning process. Students who have a strong foundation of oral communication will relate academically because school achievement depends on the ability to learn in clear and acceptable forms in both spoken and written.

In addition to that, speaking is a means of connecting an individual with the general population. In order to arrive in the world in a more discreet and socially aware manner, they can be helped by their students' relationships with their colleagues and teachers. When their sisters talked about their ideas, they verified their own words. They are able to understand what they are thinking and where they are located in any given situation. As a result, many people learn English as a second language place a high priority on speaking with others in a bi- or trilingual manner. Those who study the English language regularly assess their progress in their language learning as well as the effectiveness of their courses in English based on how well some of them perform in their spoken language proficiency. According to Saiful at. al (2021), there are a number of issues that women face when working on cooperative projects, including barriers, low motivation, the use of Ibo, and a lack of anything that can be characterized. Problems.

According to the results of the previous study, the teacher stated that the common problem experienced by the students in their speaking is a lack of interest in speaking in English. Due to their ignorance of what they were intending to say, the majority of women were inconsolable. They produce numerous errors in the English language, such as bad vocabulary and grammar. Finally, they employ Indonesian language for a few words. When speaking English, they also added a few salient words and quite a few pauses. In addition to that, they lack motivation while standing still because their teacher only instructs them by asking questions and answering their queries. Due to this, the students are not enthusiastic when speaking English. In accordance with the current curriculum, the teacher must develop lessons that are engaging, creative, effective, and fun for students to learn from. Due to this, proceed carefully in order to accomplish the stated goal. Hundreds of techniques have been developed into a structure that can be applied to any situation. Think-Pair-Share, Think-Pair-Write, a variety of Round Robin, and Reciprocal Teaching Technique are a few easy-to-use structures. The most well-known cooperative learning techniques are Jigsaw, Jigsaw II, and Reverse Jigsaw.

Talking Chips is the only cooperative learning technique that Kagan uses (2014). The Talking Chips method is a speaking instruction technique that makes participants more enthusiastic and encourages them to engage in speaking. This is due to the fact that using this technique, a student can become active in class, learn how to work together as a team, and have the motivation to speak English. This is because when using a Talking Chip, a student can become a member of several different groups, and each group's member will receive instruction in how to speak English related to the Talking Chips method. Talking chips from Method.

II. RESEARCH METHOD

The method used in this study is a quasi-experimental one. This method consists of three steps, namely the pretest, treatment, and post-test. This is intended to help you understand whether Method Talking Chips can increase your capacity for students speaking. According to Sukardi (2006:272), empirical research is any study that focuses on determining whether there is a connection or not. According to Hartoyo (2006), a variable is defined as a structure, a structure that is operational, or a particular property that attracts the attention of readers. She also distinguishes between two types of variables. Variables that are both based and based. The key variable in this study is speaking, and the key independent variable is a chip speaking method. First grade students of SMAN 13 Gowa year 2019/2020 is the focus of this essay. It is composed of 247 students who are currently enrolled in 7th grade, or exact class (X IPA 1). X Social 1 and 2 social classes were made up of 36 and 34 students, respectively. The 35 students who make up the social class (X social 3). The 38 women who make up the social class (X social 4). The researcher employs the technique of purposive sampling. The class that was proposed as the model class X Social 3 was composed of 32 students. There are two types of this research instrument: speaking test and recording. The test is used in both the pre-test and the post-test. The recording is used to analyze the language that was spoken by the students. The procedure for data collection in this study is described as follows:

Pre-test

Before giving out the actual test, a pre-test is given to determine the students' understanding of the first lesson. In this particular instance, the teacher is providing tests in an oral-shaped format. In the course of the test, the students were given a choice of a topic, after which they were asked to comment and express their opinions on the said topic. Prior to giving out the actual work, the pre-purpose test's was to identify some minor weaknesses in the student's coping mechanisms. After using the Talking Chips Method to teach the subject matter, the pre-results test's were analyzed.Treatment

After giving the pre-test, the students were given a treatment by using Talking Chips Method and it was conducted 3 meetings, each meeting was took 90 minutes. The procedure of treatment as follow:

1. The researchers gave the topic discussion and prepared the box.
2. The researchers gave each group 4 or 5 chips. The chips were used by the students to give an idea, respond to an idea, give a comment and answer the question.

3. The researchers allowed for each group discussed about the topic which was given.
4. After finishing the discussion, the researchers gave the question.
5. Each group which wanted to answer the question and gave a comment of the question, had to use the chip and put the chip in the box in the middle of table. Each member of groups was given 5-10 minutes to speak about the topic.
6. If all the member of groups took the chips in the box firstly, the researchers declared the winner.

1) Post-Test

After finishing the treatment process, post-test data collection was done. The post-test is the test that is given at the end of the session after the final assessment. This is intended to help determine whether Talking Chips can increase student speaking skills or not. In this session, the students received an oral test. When assessing the skills of a student using the Method Talking Chips, the investigator introduces the following system:

Table 1. The rating score for the students' fluency was taken from Heaton

Score	Category	Criteria
5	Very good	You must allot time to look for words. However, in this case, only a few of the pauses were unimportant, and the shipment sped up throughout.
4	Good	Despite the fact that she must create, work hard, and look for words, the majority of the time there aren't any dependable couriers. There are a lot of pauses that are not alert. While occasionally being erratic, it was eventually possible to portray the most common form of ad-proof expression.
3	Average	A lot of time must be set aside to thoroughly search for and confirm shipments. Ineffectively performing an attempt on a limited range of expressions.
2	Poor	The long pause as she searches for anything that has a language, discerning tone and ensures the delivery of goods. In the midst of a range of expressions crisis, barely gave up created an upswing.
1	Very poor	Full of disjointed and fragmentary deliveries, unnaturally long pauses. The range of expressions that is very erratic.

Table 2. The rating score for the students' Comprehensibility was taken from Heaton

Classification	Score	Indicator
Very good	5	The General Intent and Meaning speaker is self-explanatory. Several interruptions caused by listener after classification is required.
Good	4	The majority of what is implied by "easy to follow speaker" is true. Although the night is generally quiet, a few interruptions are necessary to help the person find classification or write down a message.
Average	3	The listener can understand a lot of what is being said, but she seeks classification the most. One cannot comprehend many more complex or long sentences.
Poor	2	Only a few small items (usually short sentences and phrases) can be understood before moving on to a really clumsy strategy employed by someone who understands the speaker.
Very poor	1	Nearly nothing is said to be something that can be understood. The speaker may not be able to clarify whatever was stated after the listener carried out a significant effort interruption.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Findings

The entire study is related to the student pre- and post-test scores, the student frequency and percentage scores, the student average, the student t-test, and the hypothesis testing. Gain/difference (D), the square of gain, the students' pre-test (X1) and post-test (X2) scores (D2). Pre-test and post-test results were compiled by the participants in order to obtain insight from the questions they had during the previous exam. Prior to delivering work intended to better understand the capabilities of previous employees of the company, pre-tests are given to employees. A post-test is given to students after receiving their diplomas with the goal of helping them understand their level of achievement in the class once they have received their diplomas. Pre-test and post-test results are compared to see if there are any significant results from the students bias testing. Pre- and post-tests are given to employees in a clear manner, and they are provided with a chip to enable them to ask questions. During treatment, the patient transforms the students into an six group. The number of students was thirty-two (32) students, making them into six groups with five (5) students in group one. Treatment is being provided by the patient using the Talking Chips method, which has been used approximately three times, with each session lasting 90 minutes. The researcher provided information regarding Family in the first part of the episode, Famous Actress and Actor in the second part of the episode, and Love in the third. Researchers observe that they are very capable and knowledgeable about the method in question, that they can respond to questions put to them, and that they can offer feedback to other groups of people. As a result of the data analysis, the goal of the study is to increase the number of women participating in speaking, which will be measured using data from the pre- and post-tests and displayed in the following table.

1.The score of two components of the students speaking in pre-test

The scores of the two components of students' speaking on the pre-test are shown in Table 4.1 of the appendix. According to the results of the speaking student survey, there are no students who have obtained a score that is "very good," no more than eight, no more than 18, no more than six, and no more than none. However, according to the women who participated in the study, there were none who had a score that was "very" favorable; instead, there were nine who had a score that was "good," seventeen who had a score that was "average," six who had a score that was "poor," and none who had a score that was "very" unfavorable. Following the completion of the task, the examiner gave the participant a post-test to determine their level of proficiency in the two components of bicycling, namely fluency and speed.

2.The students of two components of the students speaking in post-test

In the appendix, table 4.2, the score from each of the two composed by women in the post-test is shown. Students' speaking fluency resulted in 8 students getting very good marks, 17 students getting good marks, 7 students getting an average score, no students getting poor marks In contrast, according to the student's capabilities, there are six students who have a very good value, ten who have a good value, sixteen who have a good value, none who have a bad value, and none who have a very bad value. Prior to delivering work intended to better understand the capabilities of previous employees of the company, pretests are given to employees. After receiving the required materials in order to understand the limits of the subject's speaking student capacity, the subject is given a post-test. After they completed the pre-test, the judges provided continual punishment for three consecutive days. The researcher gives the students three topics. Every time a transaction is made, a different tip is provided. The researcher introduced the Talking Chips Method to the students and explained its functions while they were in a talk. The researcher presents the topic and presents three to four questions about the topic in the course of treatment. Researchers brought six teams to discuss the topic at hand. The researcher is provided with assistance using the Talking Chips method. Researchers saw that they were very interesting and happy with this method, answered the questions posed by the researcher, and they gave their comments to other groups. The researcher comprehends that there are distinct differences in the capabilities of being a student before and after a transaction.

3.The students score of pre-test (X_1) and post-test (X_2) gain/ difference between the matched pairs (D) and the square of the gain (D^2)

The present study's data were collected by using pre- and post-tests. Before the start of the lesson, a pre-test is given. This is intended to help you understand what it took to be a student previously. After receiving a passing grade, students received a post-test. This is intended to help you understand students talk about achievement. Results from the pre- and post-tests are compared in order to determine whether there is or is not significant evidence of student speaking capability. During patient treatment, patients frequently engage in conversation using the Talking Chips method. The students is committed to describing their speech in 2 to 5 minutes. Pre-test participants reported experiencing a lot of stress when trying to remember the information that was given because they were afraid of starting to play the game of billiards. After receiving treatment, a woman's suffering can be reduced. It was discovered after the students completed the post-test. The researcher describes the total row of students' pre-test (X1) and post-test (X2), gain or difference with a suitable pair (D), and the percentage of gain in table 4.3 of the above lamp (D2) Total pre-test scores (X1) are 198, and total post-test scores (X2) are 247. The gain or the difference between the optimal pair (D) and the squared gain (D2) is 47. The minimum gain (D) of the students threshold is 1 and the maximum threshold is 3.

4.Scoring classification of students score in pre-test and post-test

Both the pre-test and the post-test contain open-ended questions for the students in two different sections. They were grouped based on a few factors, such as percentage and student frequency. The frequency and percentage of students' achievement levels at the pre-test (prior to using the Method Talking Chips) and the subsequent frequency and percentage of students' achievement levels at the post-test are shown in the information in the table above (after using the Talking Method chips). The results of the pre-test and post-test surveys are shown in the following table.

Pre-test

1) Fluency

Table 3. Classification, score, frequency, percentage of the students' speaking fluency in the pre-test result

No	Classification	Score	Number of students frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Very good	5	0	0%
2	Good	4	8	25%
3	Average	3	18	56,25%
4	Poor	2	6	18,75%
5	Very poor	1	0	0%
Total			32	100%

Data in Table 3 above indicate that, in the pre-test prior to using "Methode Talking Chips," there were no participants who had obtained a score of "very good," 8 participants had obtained a score of "good," 18 participants had obtained a score of "medium," 6 participants had obtained a score of "poor," and there were no participants who had obtained a score of "very poor." The above table reveals that the majority of women speak in two tones. There are beginner levels with 8 frequency units, intermediate levels with 18 frequency units, and advanced levels with 6 frequency units.

2) Comprehensibility

Table 4. Classification, score, frequency, percentage of the students' speaking comprehensibility in the pre-test result

No	Classification	Score	Number of students frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Very good	5	0	0%
2	Good	4	9	28,125%
3	Average	3	17	53,125%
4	Poor	2	6	18,75%
5	Very poor	1	0	0%
Total			32	100%

In the pre-test using "Method Talking Chips," according to the frequency and percentage of participants, there were no participants who had a score that was "single-digit good," nine participants had a score that was "28.125 percent good, " seventeen participants had a score that was "53.125 percent good," six participants had a score that was "bad," and there were no participants who had a score that was "single-digit bad." The author emphasizes in Table 4 above that the majority of the participants were present at the rate-rate with 17 frequency.

Post-test

1) Fluency

Table 5. Classification, score, frequency, percentage of the students' speaking fluency in the post-test result

No	Classification	Score	Number of students frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Very good	5	8	25%
2	Good	4	17	53,125%
3	Average	3	7	21,875%
4	Poor	2	0	0%
5	Very poor	1	0	0%
Total			32	100%

The data in table 5 above shows the post-test scoring scales for reliability, frequency, and precision. In this case, the post-test results show that eight of the 32 participants (or 25%) found the result to be extremely favorable, seventeen participants (or 53.15%) found the result to be favorable, seven participants (or 21.875%) found the result to be consistent, and zero participants (or 0%) found the result to be extremely unfavourable.

2) Comprehensibility

Table 6. Classification, score, frequency, percentage of the students' speaking comprehensibility in the post-test result

No	Classification	Score	Number of students frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Very good	5	6	18,75%
2	Good	4	10	31,25%
3	Average	3	16	50%
4	Poor	2	0	0%
5	Very poor	1	0	0%
Total			32	100%

The data in table 6 above show the post-test scores for each participant's gender, frequency, and persuasion. In this case, the post-test results showed that 6 out of 32 women (or 18.75 percent) had obtained a highly favorable result, 10 out of 32 women (or 31.25 percent) had obtained a favorable result, 16 out of 32 women (or 50%) had obtained a favorable result, and 0 out of 32 women (or 0%) had obtained a favorable result that was highly unfavorable.

5. Related to the data in the previous table the followings are some tables show the two components in the speaking the situation score of the students pre-test and post-test.

a. Fluency

Table 7. The situation score of the students pre-test and post-test on the speaking fluency

Situation of score	Number of students	Percentage (%)
Increase	32	100%
Unchanged	-	-
Decrease	-	-
Total	32	100%

The seventh table above lists the results of the pre-test and post-test on the participants in the talking experiment. There are 32 women out of 32 women who have values that are negative; there is not a single woman out of 32 women who has rated that are positive, and there is not a single woman out of 20 women who has rated that are more positive. In other words, 100% of the employees experience downgrading value, while 0% don't, and 0% of the employees receive higher value.

b. comprehensibility

Table 8. The situation score of the students post test on speaking comprehensibility

Situation of score	Number of students	Percentage (%)
Increase	18	56,25%
Unchanged	14	43,75%
Decrease	-	-
Total	32	100%

The above Table 8 outlines the situation regarding the post-test results for women in bicarb education. There are 18 women who are up, and 14 women who are up but not yet changed. And there wasn't a single one of the 21 women who had a more valuable currency. Specifically, 53.25 percent of employees experience declining performance, 43.75 percent do not experience change, and 0% of employees receive higher pay. It is possible to infer from this result that the statistical significance of the difference is significant. Due to this, there are significant differences between classrooms using Talking Chips after and before using a Talk method of instruction. Learning about business after using the Talking Chips Method is more effective than learning about business before using the Talking Chips Method. This can be seen in the test results where the students' scores increased after the completion of the task based on the results of the pre- and post-tests from the evaluation.

Table 9. The development of the students' speaking skill

The development of speaking skill	
Fluency	Comprehensibility
100%	56,25%

6. The Comparison between pre-test and post-test on fluency and comprehensibility

Table 10. The comparison of the students' pre-test and post-test on fluency

No	Classification	Pre-test	Post-test
1	Very Good	0%	25%
2	Good	25%	53,125%
3	Average	56,25%	21,875%
4	Poor	18,75%	0%
5	Very Poor	0%	0%
Total		**100%**	**100%**

Table 10 above compares the results of the pre- and post-tests for the given task. It can be seen that while no women were found to have a score of zero on the pre-test, there were 25 percent on the post-test. In the pre-test there were 25% of the participants who had positive results, while in the post-test there were 53.125% of the participants who had positive results. In the pre-test there were 56.25 percent of women who received equal pay, whereas in the post-test there were 21.875 percent of women who received equal pay. Pre-test results showed that 18.75% of the students received a passing grade, but there were no students who received a passing grade at the post-test. There wasn't a single student during the pre- and post-test who had a score that was so high. This data indicates that the post-test score was higher than the pre-test score.

7. The comparison between pre-test and post-test on comprehensibility

Table 11. The comparison of the students' pre-test and post-test on comprehensibility

No	Classification	Pre-test	Post-test
1	Very Good	0%	18,75%
2	Good	28,125%	31,25%
3	Average	53,125%	50%
4	Poor	18,75%	0%
5	Very Poor	0%	0%
Total		**100%**	**100%**

The table 11 above compares the results of the pre-test and post-test for the students in the area of understanding. It can be seen from this that no subjects took the pre-test and that only 18.75 percent of subjects took the post-test and that 28.125 percent of subjects took the pre-test with exceptionally high scores. Pre-test scores were lower, while post-test scores were 31.25 percent. In the pre-test, there were 53.125 percent of women who received the average score, whereas in the post-test, there were 50 percent of women who received the average score. There are 18.75 percent of participants who report having received a false positive result, compared to zero participants in the pre-test and no participants in the post-test who reported having received a false positive result..

8. Calculating the mean score of students' on accuracy and comprehensibility in both pre-test and post-test

1. The mean score of students' pre-test:

After calculating the results of the students' pre-test, the mean score of the students' pre-test and post-test were shown in the following table.

Table 12 The mean score of students' pre-test and post-test

Test	Total score	Mean score
Pre-test	198	6,18
Post-test	247	7,71

Based on the information in Table 12 above, it is clear that the total pre-test scores were 198, with a average score of 6.18, while the total post-test scores were 247, with a average score of 7.71. Based on the available data, it can be inferred that the pre-test student score was higher on average than the post-test score.

9.T-test Value

Finding out the significant difference between the mean scores of the pre-test and post-test by calculating the value of the test. The test of students' speaking ability achievement after they had the treatments was presented in the following table:

Table 13. Students' speaking ability achievement

Variable	T-test	T-table
(X2-X1)	20,85	2,042

Table 13 above indicates that there are differences that are significantly different between the learning outcomes because the test-to-table ratio is less than the t-test score of students' speaking achievement, which is 20.85, and the test-to-table ratio is 2,042. pre- and post-test observers.

10. Hypothesis Testing

Because df wasn't present in the table, the t-results table's were adjusted using the interpolation method described in Riduan's Ganggur (2010) in order to reach a significant level of P=0.05 and df =N-1 (31) . The formula and procedure used in locating DF number (32) are summarized as follows: To understand the degrees of freedom (df) formula being used, consider the following: N = 32

Df = N-1
Df = 24-1
Df = 31

In comparison to the t-test value, it can be seen that the t-test value (20.85) is higher than the t-table value (2.042). With other words, it can be said that 20.85 > 2.042. There is, in fact, a significant difference between post-test results and student performance after using the Talking Chips method of instruction. This means that the primary hypothesis (H 0) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (H 1) is presented. From the analysis presented above, the researchers infer that there were significant differences between the scores received by the participants in the pre-test and post-test when using Talking Chips. The capacity for speaking students can be increased through speaking instruction using the Talking Chips Method.

Discussion

The researcher discusses the student data analysis that results from the test of problem-based learning. Prior to beginning work, a pre-test was conducted. Data from the two tests—the pre- and post-tests—have been compared. Data from the pretest show that most large students violated the poor stipulation on the three speaking elements. Based on data from the pre-test, the participants selected two components for the speech test: fluency and understanding. In terms of the percentage of test takers who achieved a score of "very good," there were no test takers (0%), 8 (25%), 18 (56.25%) who achieved a score of "average ," six (18.75%) who achieved a score of "poor," and none (0%), who achieved a score of "very poor." The above table reveals that the majority of women speak in two tones. There is a flat rate of 18 frequencies and a fixed rate as well. In the sample, there were no women who obtained a particularly favorable result (0%), nine (28.125%), seventeen (53.125%), six (18.75%), and no women who obtained a particularly unfavorable result (0 %). The above table indicates that the majority of the women are at the average level with frequency 17 as shown. A significant portion of the results from the students pretest on two elements were considered to be average. The task in question was carried out roughly three times. After receiving a passing grade, the student takes a post-test. Here is the post-test analysis of the results. In the survey, there were eight women (25%) who had found a particularly advantageous number, seventeen (53.125%) who had done so, seven (21.875%), who had done so on average, and not a single woman (0%), neither of whom had found a particularly unfavorable number. Comprehensibility is present in the text. According to test results, it can

be inferred that the majority of women failed to achieve the agreed-upon standard on the two speaking elements. Pre-test and post-test conditions for women at the speaking fluency. There are 32 women among the 32 who have a value increase; however, there isn't a single woman among the 32 whose value hasn't changed and there isn't a single woman among the 32 whose value is more expensive. According to this rule, 100% of the workers experience value downgrading, while 0% of the workers experience increase and 0% of the workers receive higher value. Situation of the female student in the pre-test and post-test discussion. There are 18 women who are up, and 14 women who are up but not yet changed. And there wasn't a single one of the 32 women who had a more valuable currency. According to the data, 56.25 percent of women experienced an increase in their score, 43.75 percent did not, and 0 percent did not.

The results of the pre-test and post-test can also be understood from the ratio of the test takers, whether it be for the pre-test or the post-test. Pre-test results showed a student's average fluency score of 2.53 and a student's average comprehension score of 2.53. The total number of students' mean scores on the pretest was 6, 18. In the post-test, the students' average fluency scores and the students' average comprehension scores were 4.03 and 3.68, respectively. The total number of average students at the post-test was 7.71. By comparing the total number of participants at the pre- and post-tests, it can be seen that the post-test had a higher total number of participants than the pre-test. With other words, it can be said that 7.71 > 6.18. T-test and t-table are other values that must be compared. The research t-test in this instance is 9.36, while the research t-table in this instance is 2.690. T-table for analysis in this case is smaller than t-test. After examining the pre- and post-test data, it was discovered that the post-test score was higher than the pre-test score, but that there was one score that also needed to be adjusted, namely the t-test and t- scores table. The data indicate that the t-test value is higher than the t-table. This indicates that there is a significant difference between the ratio of pre-test to post-test results. Based on the data above, the author asserts that by utilizing the Talking Chips method, a person's ability to engage in conversation with another person can be increased in both the fluency and the understanding aspects of conversation. Students' speaking ability using the Talking Chips Method is shown on page 48; total score without Talking Chips Method is 6.18. The total number of people who have used the Talking Chips method to engage in speaking students is 7.71. This indicates that after receiving training in talking using the Method Talking Chips, the student's speaking capacity is higher than it would be without the use of the Method Talking Chips. The capabilities of a student to participate in two components of the pre- and post-tests are as follows: 1. The average percentile score for students taking the post-test was 4.03, while the average percentile score for students taking the pre -test was 2.53. This indicates that the average student score from the pre-test was higher than the pre-test on the speaking unit scale. 2. The percentage of speaking students who passed the post-test was 3.68, while the percentage of speaking students who passed the pre-test was 2.53; this indicates that the percentage of speaking students who passed the post-test was higher than the percentage of speaking students who passed the pre-test.

IV. CONCLUSION

After conducting the study and receiving the results, the participants came to the conclusion that there was a statistically significant increase in speaking and students understanding following the completion of three sessions of cooperative Talking Chips instruction. The results of the pre-test and post-test of the achievement of additional students' speaking skills can be seen by the average score of students and the average score of student understanding is 2.53 students. The overall student pass rate on the pretest was 6.8. In the post-test, the mean scores of students' fluency and the mean scores of students' comprehension were respectively 4.03 and 3.68. The total number of average students at the post-test was 7.71. By comparing the total number of participants at the pre- and post-tests, it can be seen that the post-test had a higher total number of participants than the pre-test. With other words, it can be said that 7.71>6.8.

REFERENCES

[1] Harmer, Jeremy. 2021. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. London: Person Longman.
[2] Saiful. (2018). Empowering speaking ability for efl students using psychology game technique to the second grade students at sman 2 bulukumba. JOURNAL OF ADVANCED ENGLISH STUDIES**,** *Vol. 1, No.1, February 2018, Page 1-7*
[3] Saiful (2021). *The Power of Instructional Materials in Teaching Students' Speaking Skill.* Celebes Journal of Language Studies Vol. 1, No. 1 June 2021 ISSN. 2776 – 7493 Published by. HAR PRESS Indonesia.
[4] Ryeni, 2011. Improving Writing Ability Trough Cooperative Learning of the tenth grade students of SMA NEGERI 9 Makassar. A Thesis: FBS-UNM
[5] Saiful. (2017). A study on western english lecturer styles in teaching at uki toraja. The 1st International Conference on Education, Science, Art and Technology (the 1st ICESAT) Universitas Negeri Makassar. 22 – 23 July 2017
[6] Kagan. 1994. *The Advantage of Cooperative Learning.* [online]. Available: http://www.geocities.com/lolonrian/kooperatif.html (Accessed from internet on 15thMarch 2014).
[7] Bailey, K., & Savage, L. (Eds.). 1994. *New ways in teaching speaking*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
[8] Sukardi. 2011. *Methodologi Penelitian Pendidikan*. Yogyakarta: BumiAksara.
[9] Hartoyo. 2006. Academic Writing Integrating Grammar Into Writing skills. Semarang: UPT UNNES Press.
[10] Saiful. Baso jabu. Haryanto Atmowardoyo. (2019). The effect of the PORPE method on students' reading comprehension and metacognitive awareness. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, Vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 569-582, May 2019
[11] Saiful. (2020). Preventive efforts against konjo language extinction through multilingual learning. https://journal.unismuh.ac.id/index.php/exposure Exposure: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris.