

ENHANCING STUDENTS' SPEAKING ACHIEVEMENT THROUGH TIME TOKEN TECHNIQUE

Resi Silvia

Universitas Adiwangsa Jambi

Writer Correspondence: Resi.fillah88@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The main focus of the study was to know whether Time Token Technique effective or not to enhance English speaking achievement of second year nursing students of University of Adiwangsa Jambi. The study was mix research in which combination of quantitative and qualitative approaches were used in this research. 33 nursing students of second year were selected be samples through total sampling procedure. The data was collected through pre-test and post-test, video shooting, and field note. The main findings of the study were: the value of t-test is bigger than t-table and there is raising students' speaking achievement percentage that involves pronunciation, grammar, fluency and vocabulary from pre-test to post-test. Moreover, this technique can help inactive student to be more active to speak English every day, increase self-confident, vocabulary and improve pronunciation and grammar.

Keywords: *Time Token Technique; Speaking Achievement; Pronunciation; Fluency; Vocabulary*

INTRODUCTION

Speaking is very crucial because one of the main purposes of language learning is to enable the students to communicate orally in the target language. This purpose can be fulfilled completely if the students are trained with the activity which is able to invite them to speak. Therefore speaking is one of the important language skills that are expected by the students.

Based on the observation in nursing students in University of Adiwangsa Jambi, most of the students in the second year didn't want to speak English when they were studying English in the class. They were afraid of making mistake and didn't have self confidence to speak in front of the class. It was shown when the researcher showed a picture in a paper and asked the students to tell about the picture. In fact, only some students responded it. It made them likely to dominate the conversation whereas other students just kept silent.

Although they actually could tell it, they prefer not speaking English with other friends in front of the class because of feeling inferior and shy.

Based on the fact above, the researcher tried to find some techniques to overcome that problems. After several times browsing on the internet, the researcher found a technique called time token that the researcher thinks suitable to overcome this problem. In this technique, the students were given three cards and each of the cards had different pictures. Each of the students had to tell the pictures to other friends based on the time that had been written in the picture. Of course this activity would obligate all of the students to speak English so the students would be trained to speak English. This reason made the researcher interested to choose this technique as her research concern.

According to Ibrahim (2000), time token is an activity conducted by a teacher in cooperative learning by

using cards with different pictures. Time token can help students to take role in teaching speaking, because each of students has to tell the pictures in front of the class. According to Arends ((1998) [online]) "time token only can be done if the students who are grouped in cooperative learning consist of some students that dominate the conversation in the classroom whereas other students are passive learners.

Time token is variation in cooperative learning that arranged to influence pattern of students' interaction. It is done because not all of students want to take a part in group activity. This learning (time token) is used to increase students' speaking to take part in group. It can be done if the teacher had group in learning, but not all of students want to take a part there. This learning is effective for class which not all of the students can speak in teaching speaking. It means that there are some students that dominate the conversation in the class and there are also be passive.

According to Ibrahim (2000), steps in time token as follows:

- a. Make discussion class.
- b. Every student is given cards to speak and each of the cards has different pictures.
- c. For one card is given time about fifteen seconds.
- d. Students speak (speech-don't read) based on the picture in the card.
- e. After the students tell about the pictures in the cards, those cards have to be given to the moderator.

Whereas according to Arends ((1998) [online]) steps in time token as follows:

- a. Make class discussion.
- b. Ask a student to be moderator that monitors this activity and control the time that is used.
- c. Every student is given some cards by the teacher and then they have to tell about the pictures in the cards to the other friend. The time is about fifteen seconds.
- d. The teacher will give score based on the time and speaking skill aspects like pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, and fluency used by the students when they are telling the picture in the cards to the other friend.
- e. If the students have finished tell the picture in the cards, it must be given again to the moderator; they may not speak again and return to their chair.

From the opinion above, it can be concluded that steps in time token are make small class discussion that consists of 3-6 person, ask a student to be moderator that monitors this activity and control the time that is used, every student is given three cards by the teacher and then they have to tell about the pictures in the cards to the other friend and the time is about fifteen seconds for each card, then the teacher will give score based on the time and speaking skill aspects like pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, and fluency used by the students when they are telling the picture in the cards to the other friend. The last step is if the students have finished tell the picture in the cards, it must be given again to the moderator; they may not speak again and return to their chairs.

According to Heaton (1990: 70) the criteria to assess speaking are:

Table 1. The Criteria to Assess Speaking

Pronunciation	
Score	Descriptions
6	Pronunciation is very good (is not influenced by L1).
5	Pronunciation slightly influenced by L1.

4	Pronunciation influenced a little by L1.
3	Pronunciation influenced by L1.
2	Several serious pronunciation errors.
1	A lot of serious pronunciation errors.

Grammar

Score	Descriptions
6	Only 2 or 3 grammatical errors.
5	A few grammatical errors but most sentences correct.
4	A few grammatical errors but only 1 or 2 causing serious confusion.
3	Grammatical errors, several errors cause serious confusion.
2	Basic grammar errors.
1	Many basic grammar errors.

Fluency

Score	Descriptions
6	Not much searching for words, very few long pauses.
5	Sometimes searches for words, not too many long pauses
4	A few unnatural pauses.
3	Longer pauses to search for word or meaning, fairly limited expression.
2	Unnaturally long pauses, very limited expression.
1	Full of unnaturally long pauses, very halting delivery, extremely limited expression.

Vocabulary

Score	Descriptions
6	Fairly easy to understand, very few interruptions necessary, has mastered all oral skills on course.
5	General meaning fairly clear but a few interruptions necessary, has mastered almost all oral skills on course.
4	Conveys general meaning fairly clearly, a few interruptions usually necessary but intention always clear, has mastered most of oral skills on course.
3	Much can be understood although some effort needed for parts, some interruptions necessary, has mastered only some of oral skills on course.
2	Need some effort to understand much of it, interruptions often necessary and sometimes has difficulty in explaining or making meaning clearer, only a few of oral skills on course mastered.
1	Almost impossible to understand, interruptions constantly necessary but cannot explain or make meaning clearer, very few of oral skills on course mastered.

Note:

- 6 = Very good
- 5 = Good
- 4 = Good enough
- 3 = Enough
- 2 = Weak
- 1 = Poor

Methodology

This design of this research is mixed research. According to Tasakhori and Teddlie ((2003) [online]), mixed research is research in which the researcher used a combination of quantitative and qualitative approaches in a single research study. In quantitative approach, it uses quasi experimental design with One Group Pretest-Posttest Design. According to Arikunto (2007), One Group Pretest-Posttest Design is an experiment that is conducted in one group without control group. It means there was only one group that would be given a treatment in conducting the research. He also states quantitative research was used to express or generate the numeric data to understand and explain phenomena. Meanwhile in qualitative approach, it uses qualitative data that was taken from shooting video and classroom observation data.

There were three steps to know the significant effect of using time token technique toward student's English speaking achievement. First was giving pre-test to the students for one meeting. Second was giving a treatment in which there were four meetings. For each meeting there were two groups that did presentation. In the last meeting, the students were given post-test

in order to know students' English speaking achievement after the treatment given. The result of pre-test and post-test after giving treatment was compared. This comparison showed the using of treatment whether it is successful or not.

Population is a group of potential participants to whom the researcher want to generalize the result of study (Salkind, 1994:80). The population of this research was all nursing students in the second year of University of Adiwangsa Jambi. The sample is selected by total sampling. Therefore, all the nursing students in the second year of University of Adiwangsa Jambi are selected as sample in this study. Total number of students was 33 students.

To collect the data, the researcher used pre-test, treatment and post-test. The first test was pre-test. It was done to see students' speaking ability before giving treatment. After that, the treatment was conducted by using time token technique. In the last, the students were given post-test. The students' score of pre and post test were collected to be analyzed. Beside that the researcher also used video shooting and classroom observation in conducting this research.

The procedure both of pre-test and post-test were the same. In pre-test the researcher did it once by asking students to do speaking test one by one. The time for each student was thirty seconds so the time for all students was 21 minutes. In pre-test and post-test, every student were given one card that has been written names of medical tools then they were asked to tell the things. While the students were speaking, the assessor assessed students' spoke.

Video shooting is one of the techniques that used in collecting the data. The video shooting was done in order to avoid student's speaking missed by the researcher. This technique was used to asses student's speaking in teaching speaking. An analytic scale was used in doing the assessment graded based on some criteria. In doing this assessment, the researcher was not alone to turn directly to get the data in the classroom.

In video shooting section, handycam and assessment guidance were used. The assessment guidance used analytic scales which have six criteria of assessments which were adopted from the theory that was stated by J B Heaton about speaking assessment that has been mentioned in the previous page. Each criterion was scored from 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1. Score 6 means student's speaking achievement was very good, Score 5 means student's speaking achievement was good, score 4 means student's speaking achievement was good enough, score 3 means student's

speaking achievement was enough, score 2 means student's speaking achievement was weak and score 1 means student's speaking achievement ability was poor.

Observation is one of technique that was used in data collection which notes some aspects which relates to the study (Salkind, 1994). It was in order to record human behaviour and physical environment without interfering with it. In this research, the observation was done by using field note in order to strengthen the data that was gathered and to see how the students' speaking development from pre-test until post-test. Some aspects that were assessed in the field note were students' performance when the action applied or during English teaching and learning process that includes their anxiety and motivation in speaking English.

The data that was gathered by pre and post test were analyzed by using some procedure: the data which was gotten from analytic scale changed into scoring form by calculating by calculating scale every item and divided by amount of speaking skill aspects. The result of this calculation is divided by amount of items and times one hundred. Then, the score of analytic scale above was analyzed by using one group Pretest- Posttest design. According to Arikunto (2007) the steps are:

1. Look for the mean of pre test (O_1)
2. Look for the mean of post test (O_2)

3. Calculate the difference of mean by using t-test formula.

To find the significant difference, the result of T-table was compared to T-test. It was assumed that there was a significant effect of using time token technique toward student's English achievement if T-test was bigger than T-table. On the contrary, there was no effect of using time token technique toward student's English speaking achievement if T-test was less than T-table.

The data that was gathered by video shooting and classroom observation was analyzed by using some procedures: the analysis of video shooting data was gotten by watching the video several times. The field note of classroom observation was described in general to see the improvement during the pre-test, treatment and post-test section. Finally, the conclusion and suggestion were drawn.

The Results of the Study

In order to see the significance difference between two variables, the t-test was used. In order to analyze the data, the result of t-test was compared with the value of t-table. Before counting the t-test, the researcher counted value of D (the difference of score in pre-test and post-test) and then the D value was quadrate.

From the calculation the value of "t-test" is -7.15 but here, sign - (negative) is regarded absolute so the value of "t-test" is 7.15 whereas the value of "t-table" with number of students 33 and level of the significance of 0.005 is 2.04. It means that t-test is bigger than t-table; it indicates that the null hypothesis is rejected while the alternative one is accepted. It means that there is significant effect in students' English speaking achievement by using time token technique.

Discussion

The assessment guidance used analytic scales which have six criteria of assessments about speaking assessment; they are pronunciation, grammar, fluency, and vocabulary. Each criterion had four descriptions which were scored from 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1. Score 6 means student's speaking achievement was very good, score 5 means student's speaking achievement was good, score 4 means student's speaking achievement was good enough, score 3 means student's speaking achievement was enough, score 2 means student's speaking achievement was weak and score 1 means student's speaking achievement was poor. The scoring of speaking achievement was presented for each point can be seen in appendix 4. The percentage of students' speaking achievement for each cluster was shown in the table below.

Table 2. Pre-test and Post-test Score of Students' Pronunciation Pre-test

Scoring	Assessment Result	Number of Students		Percentage
		Assessor I	Assessor II	
6	Very Good	-	-	-
5	Good	3	-	3.6 %
4	Good Enough	12	5	20.2 %
3	Enough	26	30	66.7 %
2	Weak	1	6	8.3 %
1	Poor	-	1	1.2 %

Based on the table above, the data showed that there are no students that have very good pronunciation in speaking English. 3.6 % students have good pronunciation, 20.2 % students have good enough pronunciation, 66.7 % students have enough pronunciation, 8.3

% students have weak pronunciation and 1.2 % students have poor pronunciation. From the explanation above, it indicated that the most common students' pronunciation achievement in pre-test is "enough (66.7 %)".

Post-test

Scoring	Assessment Result	Number of Students		Percentage
		Assessor I	Assessor II	
6	Very Good	-	-	-
5	Good	1	3	4.8 %
4	Good Enough	7	15	26.2 %
3	Enough	33	24	67.9 %
2	Weak	-	-	-
1	Poor	-	-	-

The data above showed that there are no students that have very good pronunciation in speaking English. 4.8 % students have good pronunciation, 26.2 % students have good enough pronunciation, and 67.9 % students have enough pronunciation and no students that have weak and poor pronunciation. From the explanation above, it indicated

that the most common students' pronunciation achievement in post-test is "enough (67.9 %)".

Looking at the pre and post test table above, it could be concluded that there is raising percentage on students' pronunciation from 66.7 % to 67.9 %. It means that the treatment have improved their pronunciation as 1.2 %.

Table 3. Pre-test and Post-test Score of Students' Grammar

Scoring	Assessment Result	Number of Students		Percentage
		Assessor I	Assessor II	
6	Very Good	-	-	-
5	Good	-	2	2.4 %
4	Good Enough	12	6	21.4 %
3	Enough	22	27	58.3 %
2	Weak	8	7	17.9 %
1	Poor	-	-	-

The data table above showed that there are no students that had very good grammar in speaking English. 2.4 % students have good grammar, 21.4 % students have good enough grammar, 58.3 % students have enough grammar,

and 17.9 % students have weak grammar and no students that have poor grammar. From the explanation above, it indicated that the most common students' grammar achievement in pre-test is "enough (58.3 %)".

Post-test

Scoring	Assessment Result	Number of Students		Percentage
		Assessor I	Assessor II	
6	Very Good	-	-	-
5	Good	1	2	3.6 %
4	Good Enough	13	19	38.1 %
3	Enough	21	16	44 %
2	Weak	7	5	14.3 %
1	Poor	-	-	-

Based on the data above, the data showed that there are no students that have very good grammar in speaking English. 3.6 % students have good grammar, 38.1 % students have good enough grammar, 44 % students have enough grammar, and 14.3 % students have weak grammar and no students that have poor grammar. From the explanation above, it indicated that the most common students' grammar

achievement in post-test is "enough (44 %)".

Both of the comparison the data above showed that the most common students' grammar achievement in post-test is lower than in pre-test, but there are raising on students' grammar on criteria "good". It means that there is significant effect on students' grammar achievement during the treatment.

Table 4. Pre-test and Post-test Score of Students' Fluency

Scoring	Assessment Result	Number of Students		Percentage
		Assessor I	Assessor II	
6	Very Good	-	-	-
5	Good	2	2	4.8 %
4	Good Enough	12	6	21.4 %
3	Enough	22	16	45.2 %
2	Weak	6	18	28.6 %
1	Poor	-	-	-

Based on the table above, there are no students that have very good fluency in speaking English. 4.8 % students have good fluency, 21.4 % students have good enough fluency, 45.2 % students have enough fluency,

and 28.6 % students have weak fluency and no students that have poor pronunciation. From the explanation above, it indicated that the most common students' fluency achievement in pre-test is "enough (45.2 %)".

Post-test

Scoring	Assessment Result	Number of Students		Percentage
		Assessor I	Assessor II	
6	Very Good	-	-	-
5	Good	2	2	4.8 %
4	Good Enough	10	15	29.8 %
3	Enough	25	23	57.1 %
2	Weak	5	2	8.3 %
1	Poor	-	-	-

The data above showed that there are no students that have very good fluency in speaking English. 4.8 % students have good fluency, 29.8 % students have good enough fluency, 57.1 % students have enough fluency, and 8.3 % students have weak grammar and no students that have poor grammar. From the explanation above, it indicated

that the most common students' fluency achievement in post-test is "enough (57.1 %)".

Looking at the pre and post test above, it could be concluded that there are rising on students' fluency percentage. It means that through the treatment, there are stood out improvement on students' fluency be better than before.

Table 5. Pre-test and Post-test Score of Students' Vocabulary

Scoring	Assessment Result	Number of Students		Percentage
		Assessor I	Assessor II	
6	Very Good	-	-	-

5	Good	-	-	-
4	Good Enough	11	5	19 %
3	Enough	27	22	58.3 %
2	Weak	4	15	22.6 %
1	Poor	-	-	-

Looking at the data above, it means that there are no students that have very good and good vocabulary in speaking English. 19 % students have good enough vocabulary, 58.3 % students have enough

vocabulary, and 22.6 % students have weak vocabulary and no students that have poor vocabulary. From the explanation above, it indicated that the most common students' vocabulary in pre-test is "enough (58.3 %)".

Post-test

Scoring	Assessment Result	Number of Students		Percentage
		Assessor I	Assessor II	
6	Very Good	-	-	-
5	Good	-	2	2.4 %
4	Good Enough	7	20	32.1 %
3	Enough	27	20	56 %
2	Weak	8	-	9.52 %
1	Poor	-	-	-

From the data above showed that there are no students that have very good vocabulary in speaking English. 2.4 % students have good vocabulary, 32.1 % students have good enough vocabulary, 56 % students have enough vocabulary, and 9.52 % students have weak vocabulary and no students that have poor vocabulary. From the explanation above, it indicated that the most common students' fluency achievement in post-test is "enough (56 %)".

"good" in which in pre-test no students have good vocabulary whereas in post-test 2.4 % students have good vocabulary. It means that applying of this technique have brought improvement toward students' vocabulary achievement.

From both of the data above showed that the most common students' fluency achievement in post-test is lower than in pre-test, but the raising percentage happen on criteria

Based on the entire table above, it can be concluded that each speaking skill aspect have increased from pre-test to post-test. It is shown by the difference percentage of each criterion. Moreover it is also showed the similar improvement on pre-test in the field note. In pre-test most of the students had some problems like less self confidence, nervous, some pronunciation and grammatical errors and limited vocabulary so it

made them fear to tell the things in the card in front of the class. When they were asked to tell it, most of them felt nervous and liked to memorize words and sometime their eyes looked at to the ceiling, they were more smile than told the things so it made them couldn't speak well so that sometime they told the things haltingly. Beside that, they also often repeated the same words and most of them often wrong in pronounce the words like saying "color, function, and such as ", moreover sometime they also often wrong in grammar like pronounce "modal + to" and after "to + Ving". May be it was their first time for speaking directly so they felt clumsy to speak in front of the class and they were also seldom asked by their teacher to do speaking activity.

During the treatment, the researcher also found many problems, they were as follows: In the first meeting, the researcher found that there were a few problems especially their feeling of nervous and shy and limited vocabulary in speaking English. But in the second meeting, the researcher found that the students in general have tried to dare speak in front of the class although their vocabulary was limited. Meanwhile, there were still a few students who needed to give extra attention to motivate them to dare speak English in front of the class. In fact, by applying the second section, it could minimize their feeling of shyness to speak in front of the class, although there were some pronunciation and grammatical errors but they had

tried to pronounce as well as they could. After the third and the last meeting, the researcher found that the students in general had good self confidence although a few students still needed extra attention because sometimes they were not serious to do the activity. Fortunately in the last meeting they have tried to pronounce as well as they could and they wanted to improve it be better than before.

After the treatment and based on the field note, the researcher found that most of the students have shown their interest in conducting speaking activity. Most of the students had been motivated to express their idea, although they only expressed their idea based on the topic given. Beside that, they also had shown that by using this treatment their speaking achievement had increased in terms of pronunciation, grammar, fluency and vocabulary. It could be known from the speaking achievement tendency in pretest and post-test.

Therefore, there were positive effects from that learning. Most of the students had more words although with limited time. In elaborating the topics, the idea that was discussed was also developed. They seemed to be more encouraged themselves to speak English in front of the class. They looked more confidence to speak English although in beginning they felt nervous and shy to speak, it was showed with change of their performance when the action applied. In post-test they looked more enjoy because by using this

technique they had trained to speak English so they could produce some words to speak English little by little. They had known how the way to tell or describe the things. So, it added their vocabulary and trained them to speak more fluently than before. Beside that after they told the things, the teacher corrected their performance when they spoke including pronunciation, grammar, fluency and vocabulary. If there was mistake in pronunciation and grammar, she noted the mistakes and after the students finished telling the thing, the teacher explained the correct one. So that it could help them to improve their pronunciation, grammar, fluency and vocabulary and made inactive students be more active in speaking.

Conclusion

It can be concluded that the time token technique is effective toward English speaking achievement of second year nursing students of University of Adiwangsa Jambi. There is significant effect of using this technique. It is proven with the value of "t-test" is bigger than "t-table" and there is raising students' speaking achievement percentage that involve pronunciation, grammar, fluency and vocabulary from pre-test to post-test. This technique also can motivate the students to speak English everyday, increase self confidence, vocabulary and improve pronunciation and grammar to be better than before so it can help inactive student to be more active in speaking.

Based on the explanation above, teachers can use the time token technique in teaching speaking. This technique can practice the students to be more active in speaking so the student can be motivated to speak English everyday either in the class or outside of the class so it can improve students' speaking ability. Then, the teachers should improve their teaching to make the students be more motivated in learning. Based on the explanation above, it is better for the teacher to use time token technique in teaching learning process, especially in teaching speaking.

REFERENCES

- Arikunto, S. 2007. *Dasar-dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- _____. *Manajemen Penelitian*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Cresswell, J.W. 1994. *Qualitative and Quantitative Approach*. London: SAGE Publication.
- Gay, R.L. 1992. *Educational Research for analysis and application*. New York. Mac millan Publishing Company.
- Harmer, Jeremy. 2003. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Edinburgh: Longman.
- Heaton, J.B. 1990. *Classroom Testing*. London: Longman.

- Ibrahim, Muslimin. 2000. *Pengajaran Berdasarkan Masalah*. Surabaya: University Press.
- Liang, Tsailing. 2002. *Implementing Cooperative Learning in EFL Teaching*. . Unpublished doctor thesis, National Taiwan Normal University.
- Salkind, N.J. 1994. *Exploring Research*. New York: Mac Millan Publishing Company
- Slavin, E. 2008. *Cooperative learning. Theory, Research and Practice*. Bandung: Nusa Aksara
- Sudjana. 2005. *Metode Statistik*. Bandung: Alfabeta
- Sugiyono. 2008. *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Tashakkori and Teddlie. 2003. *Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed Research*. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.southalabama.edu/coe/bset/johnson/lectures/ec2.pdf> (Accessed from the internet on 04 October 2019)