THE EFFECTIVENESS OF TALKING STICK METHOD IN TEACHING SPEAKING

Sitti Fitriawati

Abstract: This study aimed to find out the effectiveness of Talking Stick Method in teaching speaking at second semester students of FKIP UNSIMAR Poso. This research is pre-experimental design (*One Group Pretest Posttest).* The techniques of data collection are interview and multiple choices written tests. The population of this study is 37 students and the sample is 19 students. The results are discussed furthermore.
Keywords: *Talking stick method, Teaching speaking, Effectiveness*

English is a foreign language that important in education world. Because, the students in this period are required to able confront the era globalization that develop rapidly like now. In English learning, there are four skills that are taught. Those are reading skill, writing skill, listening skill, and speaking skill. Usually in learning English, students have to speak what they have read, written or listened in form of giving examples or giving conclusion. The purposes are to measure students' ability about the material that have been taught, train students to be brave in exploring their opinions and to train students to familiarize themselves with speaking English.

Method

This research was descriptive quantitative with pre experimental design (*One Group Pretest Posttest*) as design. This research took place in Sintuwu Maroso University, located at P. Timor Street, from April to May, 2017. Population was the second semester students at English Study Program of Sintuwu Maroso University in academic year 2016/2017 and the sample size was 19 students. Since the researcher wanted to find out find out the teaching and learning process and the problems that happened in the class, the data were taken not only by test but also by documentation and interview. The data were analysis to test the researcher's hypothesis, which is that the talking stick method is effective to be used in teaching speaking for second semester students at English Education Department of UNSIMAR Poso.

Findings and Discussions
Results of Interview

Based on the result of interview with one of the lecturers in Speaking II class on April 14th, 2017, the researcher found out that before midterm test the speaking learning carried out 4 topic discussions. Every topic do two meetings, the first meeting to explanation and example, the second meeting to practice by pairs. In the classroom, all students were active in class. To achieve the learning objectives, the lecturer used the following techniques: explanation method, giving example, questioning and answering, and drilling. The lecturer did not use media in the class.

Tests Results
1. Pre-test score

Before learning process by using talking stick method, the students do pre-test inform of multiple choice. The detail information about the distribution of the students' scores in the pre-test is provided in Table 1.

Table 1. The pre-test score

No.	Initial	Total of items	Students' score obtained	Final score
1.	SY	25	24	96
2.	RZ	25	21	84
3.	KS	25	21	84
4.	MA	25	16	64
5.	AR	25	13	52
6.	MH	25	19	76
7.	OV	25	23	92
8.	AG	25	22	88
9.	KR	25	19	76
10.	ID	25	23	92
11.	UM	25	16	64
12.	RD	25	17	68
13.	VA	25	16	64
14.	DF	25	18	72
15.	IR	25	20	80
16.	NM	25	13	52
17.	WD	25	21	84
18.	RI	25	15	60
19.	MR	25	25	100
TOTAL SCORE				1448

Based on Table 1, since total items were 25, the highest score had to be 25 (100 for final score. As seen in Table 1, only 1 student got the perfect final score (100) and the lowest final score was 52 as the lowest score. The total score of the students in the pretest is 1448.

2. Treatment

After pre-test, the researcher gave treatment to the students. The source of the material was taken from Function in English book, written by Jon Blundell, Jonathan

Higgens and Nigel Middlesmiss. The treatment was held three times and divided into three activities: pre, while, and post activities.

Pre-activities

Firstly, the lecturer greeted the students and checked the students' attendance list. Then, the lecturer gave apperception about the material, motivated the students, and explained about the learning objectives.

Whilst activities

In this session, the lecturer told the students about main topic and gave chance for them to read and learn the topic material. After that the students have to close their material book. Then, the lecturer gave a stick to students one by one and who held the stick had to answer the question from the lecturer. And also the lecturer asks to students to make a short dialog about the material.

Post activities

In post activities, the lecturer and students concluded the material togother. After that, the lecturer evaluated the students in form of multiple choice test.

3. Post-test

In third meeting, the researcher gives post-test. The number of students take the post-test are 19 students. It intend to know whether the talking stick method in speaking II class is effective.The detail information about the students' scores in the post-test provide clearly in table 4.3.

Table 2. The Post-test score

No.	Initial	Total of items	Students' score obtained	Final score
1.	SY	25	24	96
2.	RZ	25	20	80
3.	KS	25	20	80
4.	MA	25	22	88
5.	AR	25	19	76
6.	MH	25	20	80
7.	OV	25	16	64
8.	AG	25	20	80
9.	KR	25	18	72
10.	ID	25	23	92
11.	UM	25	11	44
12.	RD	25	13	52
13.	VA	25	18	72
14.	DF	25	22	88
15.	IR	25	23	92
16.	NM	25	18	72
17.	WD	25	23	92
18.	RI	25	21	84
19.	MR	25	25	100
TOTAL SCORE				1504

From Table 2, it can be seen that the highest score was 100 obtain by MR and lowest score is 44 by UM. The total score of post-test is 1504 and higher than the total score of pre-test.

Table 3. The comparison of pre-test and post-test scores

No.	Initial	Pre-test (O1)	Post-test (O2)	Gain (d)	d2
1.	SY	96	96	0	0
2.	RZ	84	80	-4	16
3.	KS	84	80	-4	16
4.	MA	64	88	24	576
5.	AR	52	76	24	576
6.	MH	76	80	4	16
7.	OV	92	64	-28	784
8.	AG	88	80	-8	64
9.	KR	76	72	-4	16
10.	ID	92	92	0	0
11.	UM	64	44	-20	400
12.	RD	68	52	-16	256
13.	VA	64	72	8	64
14.	DF	72	88	16	256
15.	IR	80	92	12	144
16.	NM	52	72	20	400
17.	WD	84	92	8	64
18.	RI	60	84	24	576
19.	MR	100	100	0	0
		ΣO1 = 1448	ΣO2 = 1504	Σd = 56	Σd2 = 4224

Based on Table 3, the score (d) gained from calculate of value of post-test (O1) minus the value of pre-test (O2). Then the gain quadrate (d2) gained from the value of gain that quadrated. After the researcher counted the value of students' gain and gain quadrate of post-test and pre-test, the researcher found out that the total score of posttest 1504 is higher than pretest, 1448. After that, the total gain of pretest and posttest that was 56 and the total of gain quadrate was 4224.

Table 5. The deviation in every subject and total of deviation quadrate

No.	Initial	d	xd (d – Md)	x2d
1.	SY	0	-2,94	8,64
2.	RZ	-4	-6,94	48,16
3.	KS	-4	-6,94	48,16
4.	MA	24	21,06	443,52
5.	AR	24	21,06	443,52
6.	MH	4	1,06	1,12
7.	OV	-28	-30,94	957,28
8.	AG	-8	-10,94	119,68
9.	KR	-4	-6,94	48,16
10.	ID	0	-2,94	8,64
11.	UM	-20	-22,94	526,24
12.	RD	-16	-18,94	358,72
13.	VA	8	5,06	25,60
14.	DF	16	13,06	170,56
15.	IR	12	9,06	82,08
16.	NM	20	17,06	291,04
17.	WD	8	5,06	25,60
18.	RI	24	21,06	443,52
19.	MR	0	-2,94	8,64
		56 (Σd)		Σx2d = 4.058,88

Based on Table 5, total of deviation quadrate is 4.058,88.

Table 2 showed that from the 19 students, the total result score of pre-test was 1448 and the average was 76,21. There are two students who g0t the lowest score (52). Table 3 showed that from the 19 students, the total result score of post-test was 1504 and the average was 79,15. One student got the lowest score (44). The total gain of pre-test and post-test was 56 and the total of quadrat deviation was 4.058,88.

After calculating the total result score of pre-test and post-test, the average of pre-test and post-test, the total gain and the total of quadrat deviation, the researcher calculated the t-count using t-test formula and compared the value of t-count with t-table α5% significance level. The value of t-count was 0,85 and the value of t-table with α5% significance level is 2,10. It means that t-count (0,85) was lower than t-table (2,10). In other words, the researcher's hypothesis (Ha: talking stick method is effective in speaking II class) was rejected. It can be interpreted that the talking stick method when used in speaking class for the second semester at English Study Program is not effective.

From the result of t-count calculate and t-table above, it is found that the talking stick method is not effective in speaking II class. However, this method has made the students got more interested. The researcher found that there were some causes of this ineffectiveness, for example, the researcher did not consider the appropriateness between the age of students with the method used, time allocation, and probably other factors.

Conclusions and Suggestions

Based on the result of analysis the data about the effectiveness of talking stick method in speaking class for the second semester at English Study Program gained conclusions that the result of statistic test with t-test formula gained value of t-count is 0,85 < value of t-table 2,10 with α5% significant level and degrre of freedom (18), it means that the talking stick method is not effective in Speaking class for the second semester at English Study Program. It is because the method that applied by researcher in the class, such as game, does not suitable with the students' character.

In this section some suggestion was put forward as contribution to improve the teaching-learning English. Based on this research the researcher suggested that Talking Stick Method is not suitable to apply in speaking class in university level. However, Talking stick method gave new atmosphere in the classroom while every student got chance to speak English so it is still recommended to use this method to teach English to students with appropriate age and level. Thus, based on this research, the researcher suggested to the next research to explore the use of Talking stick method in teaching young learner students or junior high students.

REFERENCES

Arikunto, (2014). *Prosedur Penelitian.* Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Bungin, B. (2011). *Metodologi penellitian Kuantitatif*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Group.

Erita B. P. (2012). *Improving The Speaking Skill of The Tenth Grade Students at SMA Berbudi Yogyakarta by Using Videos in the academic year of 2011/2012.* Yogyakarta State University. Retrieved on January 21, 2017.

May. (2015). *The Effect of Talking Stick to the Students' Speaking Ability at the Eleventh Grade in SMKN 1 Kediri in Academic Year 2014/2015.* Kediri: Bung Hatta University. Retrieved on January 21, 2017.

Mega. (2016). *Komparasi Strategi Talking Stick dengan Think Talk Write (TTW) Terhadap Hasil Belajar Matematika.* Surakarta: Universitas Muhammadiyah. Access on 13 February 2017. Rerieved on March 04, 2017.

Mukrimaa. (2014). *53 Metode Belajar dan Pembelajaran.* Bandung: Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia. Retrieved on March 15, 2017.

Noviasari, R, Ernawati, & Welya, R. (2014). *Teaching Speaking Through Talking Stick Method.*. Bung Hatta University. Retrieved on January 21, 2017.

Suci. (2016). *The Effectiveness of Using Talking Stick StrategyToward Students' Speaking Skill at SMPN 5 Tulungagung.* Tulunggung: IAIAN. Access on February 13, 2017.

Suryana. (2010). *Metodologi penelitian.* Bandung: Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia. Access on January 21, 2017.

Sugiono. (2011). *Metode Penelitian Kombinasi.* Bandung: Penerbit AlfabetaWidiya 2015. *The Influence of Using Talking Stick Technique to The Speaking Ability of Eleventh Grade Students at SMAN 1 Gondang Nganjuk in Academic Year 2014/2015.* Kediri: Nusantara PGRI Kediri University. Retrieved on January 21, 2017.

Yunita. (2014). *The Effect of Talking Stick on the Eighth Grade Students'Speaking Ability at SMP Muhammadiyah 9 Watukebo inThe 2013/2014 Academic Year.* Jember : Muhammadiyah University. Retrieved on March 13, 2017.

About the Author

Sitti Fitriawati is a lecturer at English Education Department of Sintuwu Maroso University, Poso. She graduated from Tadulako University and her interest is in English Language Teaching. She can be contacted at sittifitriawati@yahoo.co.id.