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**ABSTRACT**

**Siti Mariyam**. 142301674. 2014. *The Effect of Time Token Technique Toward Students’ Speaking Ability (An Experimental Research at the Eighth Grade Students of MTs Negeri 2 Kabupaten Serang).*

This research designed to find out the effect of time token technique toward students’ speaking ability. The research conducted based on the main problem: 1) How is the students’ ability in speaking at the eighth grade students of MTs Negeri 2 Kabupaten Serang? 2) How is the effect of using time token technique in teaching speaking at eighth grade students of MTs Negeri 2 Kabupaten Serang?. The aims of this research are: 1) To investigate the students’ ability in speaking at the eighth grade students of MTs Negeri 2 Kabupaten Serang. 2) To identify the effect of using time token technique in teaching speaking at eighth grade students of MTs Negeri 2 Kabupaten Serang.

The researcher used quasi experiment. To answer the question, the researcher collected the data from 50 students by divided two classes, one class as experimental class by applying time token technique and another class as control class without applying time token technique. The population in this research is the eighth grade students of MTs Negeri 2 Kabupaten Serang year 2017/2018, while class VIII I as experimental class and clas VIII J as control class.

The result of this research show that the hypothesis null is rejected, it showed from the significant statistical value 5% = 1,67 and significant 1% = 2,40 and the result of $t\_{o}$ = 3,91. Based on the data calculating of t-test can be conclude that time token technique is effective in teaching speaking at VIII I of MTs Negeri 2 Kabupaten Serang.
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**CHAPTER I**

**INTRODUCTION**

1. **Background of the Study**

Speaking is one of the important ability in life because by speaking human can express their idea. In other word, speaking can be explained by exchange of information or knowledge and agreement in interaction. Most of people appreciate that speaking can be looked from their ability in mastering a language because language is a tool in communicating. In study English, speaking ability also becomes an important than other abilities such as reading, writing and listening.

Speaking is a productive skill that can be directly and empirically observed, those observations are invariably colored by the accuracy and effectiveness of a test – taker’s listening skill, which necessarily compromises the reliability and validity of an oral production test[[1]](#footnote-1). From this statement by speaking the people can judge directly their abilities. Sukmayati said that speaking is an interaction between the speaker and listener where the aims are to deliver speakers’ information or intention during the conversation[[2]](#footnote-2). In Indonesia, English as EFL that make learners have difficulty in speaking English. This is due to several factors are the learner lack in vocabulary, lack of understanding in the grammar structure and also lack of confidence in speaking English.

In speaking the learners must understand about the speaking ability. According to David Nunan in Sari’s book they are consisting three fields in speaking. First is mechanic (pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary) use of words that match the correct order and pronunciation. Second is function (transaction and interaction) know when the messages are regarded or not. Third is norm and social – cultural rules are understanding of who is speaking, in what situation, what about and what for[[3]](#footnote-3). But Indonesian learners as EFL in English have difficulty of it which is caused by some common problems faced by learners in learning English.

Based on the result of observations by interviewing teacher in MTs Negeri 2 Kabupaten Serang. There are many problems facing students in speaking. First, most of them were lazy and felt difficult in speaking. This is due to lack of vocabulary thus making them lazy to speak. The second problem is grammar, most of learners do not want to speak because they felt lack in grammar. They feel afraid of making mistakes due to lack of knowledge of English structure. The third problem is to practice their speaking skill in English whether inside the class or outside the class. Some school that do not familiarize their students to speak English will find it difficult to speak because their lack of self-motivation and strong influence of their environment. Fourth, lack of self-confidence and felt shy. Most of EFL learner felt shy when they try to speak and sometimes their friends mock or laugh when one of them speak. It makes them shy and not confidence. Actually if they have high self-confidence, they can talk anything out of their ideas. These are some of problems that English EFL faced in speaking.

Many technique can be used by teacher to make the student brave and confidence in speaking. For example time token technique. Time token technique can help distribute participation more equitably. Each student is given several tokens that are worth ten or fifteen second of talk time[[4]](#footnote-4). According to Aris Shoimin “Time token is one of type cooperative learning. The students are formed into study groups, which in this lesson teach social skills to deal with students dominating speech or avoiding silent students altogether in discussion.”[[5]](#footnote-5) This technique is one of type cooperative learning which have been developed by Arrends in 1998.

By using cooperative learning, students can share their ideas to their friends. Because cooperative learning is a teaching model or strategy that is characterized by cooperative task, goal, and reward structure, and requires students to be actively engaged in discussion, debate, tutoring, and teamwork.[[6]](#footnote-6) And it was developed to achieve at least three important instructional goals are academic achievement, tolerance and acceptance of diversity, and social skill development.[[7]](#footnote-7) It can be explain that by using cooperative learning the students not only learn to think, but they also learn how to share and socialize with friends. As well as using time token technique, this technique use small group and the teacher gives them the material which must they discuss, after that they was given the coupon about the material and explain it. Then this technique force students to speak and invites the student who just silent and felt shy to speak in front of his friend and make him confidence. By this technique the teacher can solve the problem in teaching speaking like researcher writes above are the students lazy to speak, the student can practice their speak inside the class so give them self-motivation and the last make student confidence.

Regarding to previous study written Sukmayati by the tittle “*Improving Speaking Ability Of The Eleventh Year Students Of SMA Laboratorium Unsyiah Banda Aceh By Using Time Token Arends Technique*” has the difference result between speaking performance which taught use by time token technique and not with the following results of the mean of the post-test of the experimental group was 48,97 while the mean of the control group was 38,10. The mean score of the pre-test of the experimental group was 35,52 and the mean score of the control group was 48,97. In order to prove the hypothesis, the t-test score of the experimental group was compared with t-table score, it shows that the result of t-test of the post-test of experimental group was 2,279 while the result of t-table at a level of significance with a = 0,05 is 2,048. It indicates that the t-test score is higher than the t-table 2,048. It means that the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted and the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected.[[8]](#footnote-8)

From the previous study above, the researcher found two research questions which is aimed to describe the implementation of Time Token Arends 1998 for teaching speaking use an experimental research in MTs Negeri 2 Kabupaten Serang by the title *The Effect of Time Token Technique Towards Students’ Speaking Ability.*

1. **The Identification of Problem**

Based on the identification of the problem above, the researcher drawn the identification of the research as follow :

1. Students of the eighth grade of MTs Negeri 2 Kabupaten Serang have bored with conventional method in learning speaking subject.
2. Students of the eighth grade of MTs Negeri 2 Kabupaten Serang have needed interest method teaching.
3. Students of the eighth grade of MTs Negeri 2 Kabupaten Serang have found the difficult to speak English.
4. Students of the eighth grade of MTs Negeri 2 Kabupaten Serang are shy in speaking activity.
5. **Limitation of the Problem**

Based on the identification of problem, the researcher limits them as follow :

1. The researcher focuses on using Time Token Technique in teaching speaking to solve the identification problem.
2. The object of research is students of the eighth grade of MTs Negeri 2 Kabupaten Serang.
3. The research methodology uses in this research is experimental research.
4. **Statement of the Problem**

Based on the background of the study above, the research problem can be formulated as follows :

1. How is the students’ ability in speaking at the eighth grade students of MTs Negeri 2 Kabupaten Serang?
2. How is the effect of using time token technique in teaching speaking at eight grade students of MTs Negeri 2 Kabupaten Serang?
3. **The Objectives of the Research**

Based on the statement of problem, the objectives of the research are:

1. To investigate the students’ ability in speaking at the eighth grade students of MTs Negeri 2 Kabupaten Serang.
2. To identify the effect of using time token technique in teaching speaking at eighth grade students of MTs Negeri 2 Kabupaten Serang.
3. **Assumption and Hypothesis**
4. Assumption

Based on this research using time token technique in teaching speaking, the researcher assumes that it will improve students’ speaking ability at the eighth grade students of MTs Negeri 2 Kabupaten Serang. This assumption investigates with the experimental research by using test before and after treatment for collecting the data about students’ speaking ability and it will be analyzed by using t-test.

1. Hypothesis

The hypothesis has determined to realize the assumption of this research is :

1. The null hypothesis ($H\_{0}$) : there is no significant influence between students’ taught by using time token technique without it.
2. The experimental hypothesis ($H\_{a}$) : there is the influence between students’ taught by using time token technique.
3. **Previous Study**
4. Jumayah, Sukmawati and Sugiyono. *The Influence Of Co-Operative Learning Time Token Technique To Result Learning Of Students Of Social Science The Fifth Grade SDN 07 Sungai Pinyuh*. The research is experiment method by using nonequivalent control group designmethod. The population are 46 students. Based on statistic calculation post-test average value of control class in the amount of 69,86 and experiment class in the amount of 76,61 obtained 𝑡𝑡𝑒𝑠𝑡 is 2,027 and 𝑡𝑡𝑎𝑏𝑙𝑒 (α = 5% and dk = 44) is 2,017 it means 𝑡𝑡𝑒𝑠𝑡 (2,027) >𝑡𝑡𝑎𝑏𝑙𝑒 (2,017), there by Ha is accepted. From the calculation effect size is 0,95 (high criteria). It means learning by using co-operative time token technique has an effect to students learning result of fifth grade of SDN 07 Sungai Pinyuh.[[9]](#footnote-9)
5. Dewidya Isna Safitri and Ririn Pusparini, S.Pd., M.Pd. *Time Token Arends 1998 as a Technique to Teach Speaking Factual Report Text to the Students of Ninth Grade of SMPN 3 Peterongan.* This research used qualitative method. The population are the students of the eighth graders of SMPN 3 Peterongan the total number are 23 students. As the result, it could be concluded that dominantly the students agree that Time Token Arends was able to help them in speaking. It could be seen that almost of them answered yes in every questions. It could be explained as most of the students like learning English. Most of them were triggered to speak in front of the class. They can ease the fear of negative evaluation and judged negatively by teacher or other students while implementing Time Token Arrends 1998 during speaking class (Horwitz, et all in Chen, 2005). They also feel confident when they were in turn of speaking.[[10]](#footnote-10)

From the previous studies above there some differences with this research. The differences are as follow. They are using time token technique to influence the result of social science the fifth *geej.stkipgetsempena.ac.id* *geej.stkipgetsempena.ac.id* grade. By using experiment research as method and using pre-test and post-test as technique collecting data and using time token technique to teach speaking factual report text to the students of ninth grade. This study use qualitative research as method, the researcher relied on the teacher’s performance in implementing Time Token Arends 1998.

In this research, the researcher uses the title the effect of time token technique towards students’ speaking ability at eighth grade students. It uses experimental research as the method and pre-test and post-test for collecting the data.

1. **Organization of Writing**

Chapter I : Introduction, consist of Background of the Study, The Identification of Problem, Limitation of the Problems, Statement of the Problem, The Objectives of the Research, Assumption and Hypothesis, Previous Study and Organization of Writing.

Chapter II : Theoretical Foundation, consist of review of Speaking, Classroom Speaking Activities, Speaking Difficulties Faced by Students in Learning Speaking, Teaching Speaking for EFL Students, Speaking Assessment, Time Token Technique.

Chapter III : Method of The Research, consist of Research of Method, Research Variable, The Place and Time of Research, Population and Sample, The Research Instrument, The Technique of Data Collecting, The Technique of Analysis Data and Research Procedure.

Chapter IV : Result And Discussion, consist of The Processing of Pretest Score, The Processing of Posttest Score, Hypothesis Testing, Progress of Student’s Achievement, Discussion of Research Finding and The Strength and Weaknesses of The Research.

Chapter V : Conclusions and Suggestion, consist of Conclusions and Suggestion.

The final part of this paper consists of a list of references, attachments and list biography of the researcher.

**CHAPTER II**

**THEORETICAL FOUNDATION**

1. **Speaking**
2. **Definition of Speaking**

Speaking is the activities that express the ideas in our minds. In other word speaking can be explained by exchange of information or knowledge to people. It means when we share information to other people it called by speaking. Many people though that speaking is one of ability which have difficulties from others because speaking is directly it cannot be edited like writing. This is also corroborated by according to David Nunan there are two reasons that speaking harder than other, first speaking happens in real time: usually the person you are talking to is waiting for you to speak right then. Second, when you speak, you cannot edit and revise what you wish to say, as you can if you are writing.[[11]](#footnote-11)

According to Brown speaking is a productive skill that can be directly and empirically observed, those observations are invariably colored by the accuracy and effectiveness of a test – taker’s listening skill, which necessarily compromises the reliability and validity of an oral production test.[[12]](#footnote-12) It means when we speech something it can be directly measured by the listener. So when we speak it needs clarity to make other people understood what we say. It is different with Nunan who says that speaking is the productive skill. It consists of producing systematic verbal utterances to convey meaning.[[13]](#footnote-13) Although about them say that speaking is productive skill, but the different is according to Brown that every person who speaks it can be observed directly by the listener while Nunan expressed how the process of the utterance can have meaning which corresponds to linguistic element in speaking.

In speaking there are process to be utterance. It consists of linguistic element involved speaking. First is phoneme, phoneme is a small unit of language which has not meaning. It can be consonants like p or b. Second is morpheme, morpheme is a unit of language it can stand alone and has a meaning like hat, already, etc. Third is phrase and clause, phrase is consists two or more words but do not have subject or verb marked for tense. Clauses are two or more words do contain a verb marked for tense. Fourth is utterance, utterance is fully formed grammatical sentence.[[14]](#footnote-14) But these element will be difficult for the leaners who use English as foreign language. Especially learners in Indonesia, they will feel difficult if must to speak by linguistic elements. This is corroborated by Kang Shumin in Richard’s book that speaking a language is especially difficult for foreign language learners because effective oral communication require the ability to use the language appropriately in social interactions.[[15]](#footnote-15) Than they can speak by completely but it is not perfect.

From the explanation above it can be conclude that speaking is making a sound in the form of words or sentences that come from our minds to be expresses or shared with people. Speaking also be a productive skill which can be measure by the listener therefore it is one of ability which have difficulties from others because speaking is directly it cannot be edited like writing.

1. **Types of Speaking**

According to Brown there are five types of speaking[[16]](#footnote-16)

1. **Imitative**

Imitative is the ability to imitate a word or phrase or a sentence. This type is like parrot which imitate the sounds. This used to assess the oral production and the kind of it is phone pass test.

1. **Intensive**

Intensive is the type of speaking that assessment the context of production in competences grammatical, phrasal, lexical and phonological. And the kind test of this types is directed response tasks, sentence or dialogue completion tasks and oral questioner and picture cued tasks.

1. **Responsive**

The responsive types is assessing tasks interactions, it such as question and answer, paraphrasing, giving instructions and directions, test of spoken English (TSE).

1. **Interactive**

This type is including the tasks that involve long stretches of interactive discourse it such as interviews, role play, discussion, games. And this type has long duration but less interaction such as speeches, telling longer stories, and extended explanation.

1. **Extensive (monologue)**

Extensive speaking tasks involve complex and relative stretches of discourse. The variations of this type on monologues, it such as oral presentation, picture-cued storytelling, retelling a story, new event and translation.

All the types above can be used in the classroom. However researcher will only use interactive type because this type suitable by the technique which the researcher used in this research. Time token technique uses discussion in learning process. After that each students must explain or tell what he understands from the discussion.

1. **Speaking Difficulties Had by Students In Learning Speaking**

Students in Indonesia study English as foreign language make them feel difficult to master it and need a process. According to Cambridge 1996 there are some problem or difficulties in learning speaking are[[17]](#footnote-17) :

1. Inhibition, speaking activities is unlike listening, writing and reading. Especially English be a foreign language it makes students difficult to speak English. In this inhibition is due to many factors are learners fell afraid to making mistake in speak, they fell shy to speak.
2. Nothing to say, many students can not speak anything when they asked to speak, it caused there is not motivate them to speak or to express their idea.
3. Low or uneven participant, in a large group just a little participant to speak because limited time. Than some learners speak dominate and the other speaks very little.
4. Mother-tongue use, this often happens when students engage in a conversation. Many of them use mother tongue when speak foreign language. Because it is not used to speaking foreign language.
5. **Teaching Speaking for EFL Students**

In Indonesia, English as EFL that make learners have difficulty in speaking and it becomes an important ability. This is due to several factors faced by learners like the learner lack in vocabulary or grammar or confidence to speak.

According to Richard interaction as the key to improve EFL learners.[[18]](#footnote-18) It must be understood for teacher to do the interactive in the class. First teacher look the speaking ability of students’. So teacher must adjust whatever students need in terms of material or communication because communication in the classroom is embedded in meaning.

Second, teacher invites the students to practice English in their dialogue, although it is meaningless dialogue. This purpose to make them familiar with language and honing their ability to speak.

Third, interactive activities. English as foreign language make students more difficult because there is not habit in their life to practice. So it be responsible to the teacher for making their students interactive in the classroom. Teacher need some effective technique or strategy in teaching speaking so make student enthusiasm. Some of activities which can be used by teacher are aural: oral activities, by listening a news from radio so teacher ask to the students for making group and listen to the radio and every one must speak from the news.

Visual: oral activities, the ability of every students in the class is different. Other activities which can used by the teacher is visual learning. Giving some picture or film to the students it make them interest. So after finishing the watching everyone must take the conclusion the moral value.

Material aided: oral activities, by providing reading to students and then asking questions to them. This activity also make students productive in speaking or it could be by asking the students for storytelling or oral report or taking summary of what they read.

It can be concluded the most important to makes students effective in EFL learners is teacher pay attention to factors, conditions and components are inside. Teacher also must to have a good technique or method to make students fun and easy in learning English.

1. **Speaking Assessment**

The component which must be assessed in speaking are accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension.

1. Accent
2. Pronunciation frequently unintelligible.
3. Frequent gross errors and very heavy accent make understanding difficult, require frequent repetition.
4. ‘Foreign accent’ requires concentrated listening, and mispronunciation lead to occasional misunderstanding and apparent errors in grammar or vocabulary.
5. Marked ‘Foreign accent’ and occasional mispronunciations which do not interfere with understanding.
6. No conspicuous mispronunciations, but would not be taken for a native speaker.
7. Native pronunciation with no trace of ‘Foreign Accent’.
8. Grammar
9. Almost entirely in accurate a phrases.
10. Constant errors showing control of very few major patterns and frequently preventing communication.
11. Frequent errors showing some major pattern uncontrolled and causing occasional irritation and misunderstanding.
12. Occasional errors showing imperfect control of some patterns but no weakness that causes misunderstanding.
13. Few errors, with no patterns of failure.
14. No more than two errors during the interview.
15. Vocabulary
16. Vocabulary inadequate for even the simplest conversation.
17. Vocabulary limited to basic personal and survival areas (time, food, transportation, family, etc).
18. Choice of words sometime inaccurate, limitations of vocabulary prevent discussion of some common professional and social topics.
19. Professional vocabulary adequate to discuss special interests general vocabulary permits discussion of any non-technical subject with some circumlocutions.
20. Professional vocabulary broad and precise general vocabulary adequate to cope with complex practical problems and varied social situations.
21. Vocabulary apparently as accurate and extensive as that of an educated native speaker.
22. Fluency
23. Speech is so halting and fragmentary that conversation is virtually impossible.
24. Speech is very slow and uneven except for short or routine sentences.
25. Speech is frequently hesitant and jerky: sentences may be left uncompleted.
26. Speech is occasionally hesitant. With some unevenness caused by rephrasing and groping of word.
27. Speech is effortless and smooth, but perceptibly non-native in speech and evenness.
28. Speech on all professional and general topics as effortless and smooth as a native speaker’s.
29. Comprehension
30. Understand too little for the simplest type of conversation.
31. Understand only slow, very simple speech on common social and touristic topics; requires constant repetition and rephrasing.
32. Understand careful, somewhat simplified speech when engaged in a dialogue, but may require considerable repetition and rephrasing.
33. Understand quite well normal educated speech when engaged in a dialogue. But requires occasional repetition and rephrasing.
34. Understand everything in normal educated conversation except for very colloquial or low; frequency items, exceptionally rapid or slurred speech.
35. Understands everything in both formal and colloquial speech to be expected of an educated native speaker.

The components which measure in this research are grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension. The rating sheet of speaking test as the follow :

*Table 2.1*

**Conversational English Proficiency Weighting Table**[[19]](#footnote-19)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Proficiency Description**  | **->** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **Total** |
| Grammar  |  | 6 | 12 | 18 | 24 | 30 | 36 |  |
| Vocabulary |  | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 24 |  |
| Fluency |  | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 12 |  |
| Comprehension  |  | 4 | 8 | 12 | 15 | 19 | 23 |  |
| Total  |  |

*Adapted from the FSI Proficiency Rating (as cited in Higgs &*

*Clifford, 1982).*

To interpret the students score, the researcher identifies the total of the students score based on level as follow :

*Table 2.2*

**The level of students’ speaking**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Total Score** | **Level** |
| 16 – 25 | 0+ |
| 26 – 32 | 1 |
| 33 – 42 | 1+ |
| 43 – 52 | 2 |
| 53 – 62 | 2+ |
| 63 – 72 | 3 |
| 73 – 82 | 3+ |
| 83 – 92 | 4 |
| 93 – 99 | 4+ |

1. **Technique Speaking**
2. **Definition of Time Token Arrends 1998**

Before knowing about the definition time token Arrends 1998, we must know that time token Arrends 1998 is one of cooperative learning. Many techniques or methods in cooperative learning that can be used by teachers. Because study by using cooperative learning it can make student be fun and enjoy while teacher taught speaking by using repetition drill technique and used the dialogue in the book, the teacher asks his students to repeat what he says. It makes student bored in learning speaking. Bruton and Samuda (1980) found contrary to popular belief, learner in small groups were capable of correcting one another successfully.[[20]](#footnote-20) According to Johnson and Johnson (1994) and Sutton (1992) there are five essential elements in cooperative learning. First, positive independence among students. Second, interaction among students is increasing. Third, responsible to their self. Fourth, interpersonal and small group and the last the process in learning.[[21]](#footnote-21) Cooperative learning not just teach the students how to think, but also teach students how to socialize and respect the others. As well as time tokens included in cooperative learning.

Time token technique is one of cooperative learning that was developed by Arrends in 1998. This technique teaches that make student to be active in speaking. According to Arrends that time token technique can help distribute participation more equitably. Each student is given several tokens that are worth ten or fifteen second of talk time.[[22]](#footnote-22) While according to Aris Shoimin that “time token is one of type cooperative learning. The students are formed into study groups, which in this lesson teach social skills to deal with students dominating speech or avoiding silent students altogether in discussion.”[[23]](#footnote-23) And Istarani (2011:194) in Sukmayati defines Time Token Technique as a structure that can be used to teach social skills, to avoid talking domination of particular students or to avoid the students silence during class activities.[[24]](#footnote-24)

Time token technique means the way to help teacher for solving the students silence during class activities. In studying English half of students in the class they prefer to be silent. This is due to several factors which faced by students as EFL. Then the teacher need technique to solve it, and it can be use time token technique.

1. **The Steps Involved in Time Token**

According to Suprijono the steps to use time token technique are:

1. Make condition the class to carry out the cooperative learning or discussion. In this section, after explaining the material the teacher divided class to 7 groups for discuss about the theme which given by the teacher.
2. Every students being given the talking token with time thirty seconds and they being given the points depending the time. In the middle they discuss, the teacher gives token to every group. This token uses by the student when he speaks about his task which has discussed and the teacher gives the point according to the talk time he uses.
3. If the students finish to speak they must give the talking token. And who has run out the token then should not talk anymore, etc.[[25]](#footnote-25) After the student speak about his task, he must give the token to teacher. Who has finished the token he should not talk anymore
4. **The Advantages of Time Token Technique**

Many the advantages from this technique. First, make the students increase their participative during study. Second, make the students to be active in the learning process then no one student be silent and they must to speak because it can increase students communication gradually. Third, train students to express their opinions. In this technique the students share their opinion to their friends and each other hope to listen also openness to criticism. Then it teach to the students how to appreciate the opinions of others. Fourth, teachers can play role to invite students to find the solutions to the problem. And the last because this technique is simple technique it does not require much the instructional media.[[26]](#footnote-26)

1. **The Disadvantage of Time Token Technique**

Beside having advantages, this technique also has the disadvantages. First, can only used for certain subjects. Second, not for the class that has many students. And the last student who has many idea can not express all her idea because the time is limited.

**CHAPTER III**

**METHOD OF THE RESEARCH**

1. **Research of Method**

Method of the research is a quantitative method. According to Creswell that quantitative research is testing objective theories by examining the relationship among variables by using research instruments that produce data with analyzed by statistics.[[27]](#footnote-27) It means the variable of the research can be measured and analyzed to see the effect among variables. In this research there are two variables, variable X and variable Y. Time token technique as (X) variable while speaking ability as (Y) variable.

Moreover, in this research uses experimental research the researcher choose an experimental research because this research using treatment by the purpose to search the effect of certain treatment on others with controlled conditions.[[28]](#footnote-28) Then, the researcher wants to know the effect time token technique on student speaking ability. In addition, this research using Quasi Experimental by using the pre-test and post-test design by taking one of class as an experimental class which given pre-test, the treatment by time token technique and given post-test to measure the treatment is influence or not. And the researcher take second class as a control class, the class is given pre-test, treatment without time token technique and post-test.

1. **The Place and Time of Research**

This research was conducted in MTs Negeri 2 Kabupaten Serang. The time for this research on March 2018. The researcher chooses this school because there are some problems facing students in speaking like the students were lazy and felt difficult in speaking it caused lack of vocabulary, grammar and confidence.

1. **Population and Sample**
2. Population

The population in this research is students of eight grade in MTs Negeri 2 Kabupaten Serang that consists 313 students divided into ten classes.

1. Sample

The sample consists of two classes from the second grade. Class VIII I consist of 25 students as experimental class and Class VIII J consist of 25 students as a control class.

1. **The Research Instrument**
2. **Observation**

Before doing the research, the researcher does the observation directly to the school which become the place of this research and the population who becomes the object of this research. The researcher uses observation to identify the condition of students in the class and investigate their problem and difficulties in study by asking to the teacher. The purpose of this observation is to get information about teaching learning of students in English subject.

1. **Scoring Sheet**

Scoring sheet is used to make the researcher know about the ability of students in speaking. After giving test to the students the researcher has measured and score the result of them by the purpose to analyze the test that was given by researcher. Based on FSI Proficiency Ratings (as cited in Higgs & Clifford, 1982)[[29]](#footnote-29) the scoring sheet as follow:

The rating sheet of speaking test

Name : ………………

Class : ………………

*Table 3.1*

**The Criteria of Students’ Score**

**Conversational English Proficiency Weighting Table**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Proficiency Description**  | **->** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **Total** |
| Grammar |  | 6 | 12 | 18 | 24 | 30 | 36 |  |
| Vocabulary |  | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 24 |  |
| Fluency |  | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 12 |  |
| Comprehension  |  | 4 | 8 | 12 | 15 | 19 | 23 |  |
| Total |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Letter**  | **Score** | **Description** |
| A | 83 – 99 | Very Good |
| B | 63 – 82 | Good |
| C | 43 – 62 | Enough |
| D | 26 – 42 | Less |
| E  | 16 – 25 | Low |

1. **Tape Recorder**

Recording was used to record the students’ voice when they speak during the test. The researcher used a tape recorder like hand phone. The purpose this recording is to analyzing the scoring rubric of speaking.

1. **The Technique of Data Collecting**

The collecting of data is a systematic procedure and standard obtain the necessary data. For collecting the data in this research, the researcher uses test (pre-test and post-test) and documentation.

1. **Pre-test**

Before applying the time token technique in experimental class, the researcher gives the pre-test to experiment and control class in the first meeting to know the initial students’ speaking ability.

1. **Post-test**

Both experiment and control class have the post-test after giving the treatment for experimental class. It is used to measure the effect of time token technique toward students’ speaking ability.

1. **Documentation**

Documentation was collecting data to see a report that is available. This method is taken some pictures, record video and audio.

Both the test are assessed by two raters ; by the researcher herself and the English teacher. It is doing to keep the validity and reliability.

1. **The Technique of Analysis Data**

The technique of analysis data in this research uses t-test. According to Anis Sudijono t-test is used for testing the null hypothesis of the mean differences of two samples.[[30]](#footnote-30) Because the quasi experiment use pre-test and post-test then the researcher uses this test to measure the final test between experiment class and control class.

The steps for statistic analyze that are[[31]](#footnote-31) :

1. Determining mean of variable X1 with formula :

$$M\_{1= \frac{\sum\_{}^{}X\_{1}}{N\_{1}}}$$

1. Determining mean of variable x2 with formula :

$$M\_{2= \frac{\sum\_{}^{}X\_{2}}{N\_{2}}}$$

1. Determining derivation score variable x1 with formula :

$$x\_{1= X\_{1- M\_{1}}}$$

1. Determining derivation score variable x2 with formula :

$$x\_{2= X\_{2- M\_{2}}}$$

After collecting the data from pre-test and post-test, the researcher analyze it by using statistic calculation of t-test by using fisher formula with significance degree 5% and 1%. The formula is as follow :

$$t= \frac{M\_{1}-M\_{2}}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\sum\_{}^{}x\_{1}^{2}+\sum\_{}^{}x\_{2}^{2}}{N\_{1}+N\_{2}-2}\right) \left(\frac{N\_{1}+N\_{2}}{N\_{1}.N\_{2}}\right)}}$$

Notes :

$M\_{1}$ = Mean score of the experiment class

$M\_{2}$ = Mean score of the control class

$\sum\_{}^{}x\_{1}^{2}$ = Sum of square deviation score in experiment class

$\sum\_{}^{}x\_{2}^{2}$ = Sum of square deviation score in control class

$N\_{1}$ = Number of students of experiment class

$N\_{2}$ = Number of students of control class

$2$ = Constant number

df = Degree of Freedom (df = $N\_{1}+N\_{2}-2$)

1. **Research Procedure**

In general, the procedure of this research can be described as follows:

1. Observation the English teaching activity.
2. Provide pre-test of the experimental class and control class.
3. Provide treatment to the experimental class using time token technique and control class without time token technique as follow :
4. **Experimental Class**
5. Preparation
6. Preparing the lesson plan
7. Preparing the material
8. Preparing the token for students’ speaking
9. Implementation
10. Teacher explain the material
11. Teacher gives the example
12. Teacher guide students to make group and discuss the material and give them the token
13. Teacher guide students to speak the result of discussion by using the token
14. **Controlled Class**
15. Preparation
16. Preparing the lesson plan
17. Preparing the material
18. Implementation
19. Teacher explain the material
20. Teacher gives the example
21. Teacher ask the students to speak in front of class
22. Provide post-test of the experimental class and control class.
23. Analyzing the data from pre-test and post-test
24. Drawing the interpretation based on the result of test and making conclusion.

**CHAPTER IV**

**RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

1. **Description of Data**

In this chapter the researcher would like to present the description of data obtained. As the researcher explained in the previous chapter that the population in this research were students of eight grade in MTs 2 Negeri Kabupaten Serang and the sample were 25 students of VIII I as experimental class and 25 students of VIII J as control class. In this research, the researcher identified some result to find out the effect of time token technique. They are the score of students before treatment, the score students after treatment, the differences between pre-test and post-test score of students and the differences of students’ condition between who are taught by time token technique and who are not in the learning process. The researcher also gave test to students in experimental class and control class. The test divided two types are pre-test and post-test. Pre-test was given before treatment and post-test was given after treatment. On the test, students should speak in front of the class according the theme prepared by the researcher. The researcher describes the data in experimental and control class as below :

1. **Experimental Class**

The researcher describes the result of pre-test in the experimental class by the table as follow :

*Table 4.1*

*The Students' Score of Pre-Test at the Experimental Class*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Respondent | Criteria | Score |
| G | V | F | C |
| 1 | AFA | 18 | 16 | 8 | 12 | 54 |
| 2 | AR | 12 | 12 | 8 | 12 | 44 |
| 3 | DAF | 12 | 8 | 8 | 12 | 40 |
| 4 | EN | 12 | 12 | 8 | 15 | 47 |
| 5 | FKN | 24 | 20 | 10 | 19 | 73 |
| 6 | FA | 12 | 12 | 8 | 12 | 44 |
| 7 | GZS | 18 | 16 | 8 | 15 | 57 |
| 8 | HS | 12 | 12 | 6 | 12 | 42 |
| 9 | IS | 12 | 12 | 6 | 12 | 42 |
| 10 | Kh | 12 | 12 | 6 | 12 | 42 |
| 11 | Ko | 12 | 12 | 6 | 12 | 42 |
| 12 | LRJ | 18 | 12 | 8 | 15 | 53 |
| 13 | MPS | 12 | 12 | 8 | 12 | 44 |
| 14 | NS | 18 | 12 | 8 | 12 | 50 |
| 15 | NIS | 18 | 12 | 8 | 12 | 50 |
| 16 | NK | 12 | 12 | 8 | 12 | 44 |
| 17 | NSH | 12 | 8 | 8 | 12 | 40 |
| 18 | PR | 18 | 16 | 10 | 15 | 59 |
| 19 | Ri | 12 | 12 | 6 | 12 | 42 |
| 20 | RD | 12 | 12 | 8 | 15 | 47 |
| 21 | SM | 18 | 12 | 6 | 12 | 48 |
| 22 | SMD | 12 | 8 | 8 | 12 | 40 |
| 23 | TZJ | 18 | 12 | 8 | 15 | 53 |
| 24 | WAN | 18 | 12 | 8 | 15 | 53 |
| 25 | YS | 12 | 8 | 8 | 12 | 40 |
| N = 25 | TOTAL | $\sum\_{}^{}X$= 1190 |
| AVERAGE | M = 47.6 |

Note :

G : Grammar

V : Vocabulary

F : Fluency

C : Comprehension

Mean of Pre-test :

X = $\frac{\sum\_{}^{}X}{N}= \frac{1190}{25}=47.6$ (the mean of pre-test experimental class is 47.6)

From the table 4.1 above showed that the result of students’ pre-test score at the experimental class. The data showed the maximum score was 73 and the minimum score was 40. There was one student who got maximum score and there were four students who got minimum score. The average score of pre-test in experimental class was 47.6. While the result of post-test in experimental class got better score. The result of post-test in experimental class described by table bellow :

*Table 4.2*

|  |
| --- |
| *The Students' Score of Post-Test at the Experimental Class* |
| No | Respondent | Criteria | Score |
| G | V | F | C |
| 1 | AFA | 24 | 16 | 8 | 15 | 63 |
| 2 | AR | 24 | 20 | 8 | 15 | 67 |
| 3 | DAF | 24 | 16 | 8 | 15 | 63 |
| 4 | EN | 24 | 20 | 10 | 19 | 73 |
| 5 | FKN | 30 | 20 | 10 | 19 | 79 |
| 6 | FA | 24 | 20 | 10 | 19 | 73 |
| 7 | GZS | 30 | 20 | 10 | 15 | 75 |
| 8 | HS | 24 | 20 | 8 | 15 | 67 |
| 9 | IS | 24 | 16 | 8 | 15 | 63 |
| 10 | Kh | 24 | 20 | 10 | 15 | 69 |
| 11 | Ko | 24 | 20 | 8 | 15 | 67 |
| 12 | LRJ | 24 | 16 | 8 | 15 | 63 |
| 13 | MPS | 24 | 16 | 10 | 15 | 65 |
| 14 | NS | 24 | 16 | 8 | 15 | 63 |
| 15 | NIS | 24 | 16 | 8 | 15 | 63 |
| 16 | NK | 24 | 20 | 10 | 15 | 69 |
| 17 | NSH | 24 | 16 | 8 | 15 | 63 |
| 18 | PR | 24 | 20 | 10 | 19 | 73 |
| 19 | Ri | 24 | 16 | 8 | 15 | 63 |
| 20 | RD | 24 | 20 | 10 | 19 | 73 |
| 21 | SM | 24 | 16 | 8 | 15 | 63 |
| 22 | SMD | 24 | 16 | 8 | 15 | 63 |
| 23 | TZJ | 24 | 20 | 10 | 19 | 73 |
| 24 | WAN | 30 | 20 | 10 | 19 | 79 |
| 25 | YS | 24 | 16 | 8 | 15 | 63 |
| N = 25 | TOTAL | $\sum\_{}^{}X$= 1695 |
| AVERAGE | 67.8 |

 Note :

G : Grammar

V : Vocabulary

F : Fluency

C : Comprehension

Mean of Post-test :

X = $\frac{\sum\_{}^{}X}{N}= \frac{1695}{25}=67.8$ (the mean of post-test experimental class is 67.8)

*Table 4.3*

*The Difference Score Between Pre-Test and Post-Test at Experimental Class*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Respondent | Pre-test  | Post-test  |
|
| 1 | AFA | 54 | 63 |
| 2 | AR | 44 | 67 |
| 3 | DAF | 40 | 63 |
| 4 | EN | 47 | 73 |
| 5 | FKN | 73 | 79 |
| 6 | FA | 44 | 73 |
| 7 | GZS | 57 | 75 |
| 8 | HS | 42 | 67 |
| 9 | IS | 42 | 63 |
| 10 | Kh | 42 | 69 |
| 11 | Ko | 42 | 67 |
| 12 | LRJ | 53 | 63 |
| 13 | MPS | 44 | 65 |
| 14 | NS | 50 | 63 |
| 15 | NIS | 50 | 63 |
| 16 | NK | 44 | 69 |
| 17 | NSH | 40 | 63 |
| 18 | PR | 59 | 73 |
| 19 | Ri | 42 | 63 |
| 20 | RD | 47 | 73 |
| 21 | SM | 48 | 63 |
| 22 | SMD | 40 | 63 |
| 23 | TZJ | 53 | 73 |
| 24 | WAN | 53 | 79 |
| 25 | YS | 40 | 63 |
| N = 25 | TOTAL | $\sum\_{}^{}X$ =1190 | $\sum\_{}^{}X$ = 1695 |
| AVERAGE | M = 47.6 | M = 67.8 |

From the table 4.2 above showed that the result of students’ post-test score at the experimental class. The data showed the maximum score was 79 and the minimum score was 63. There was one student who got maximum score and there were eleven students who got minimum score. The average score of post-test in experimental class was 67.8.

From the table 4.3 showed the difference result of pre-test and post-test at the experimental class. It got the significant improvement after giving treatment using time token technique, it was seen from the average of the post-test better than pre-test 47.6 < 67.8.

1. **Control Class**

The researcher describes the result of pre-test in the control class by the table as follow:

 *Table 4.4*

|  |
| --- |
|  *The Students' Score of Pre-Test at the Control Class* |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| No | Respondent | Criteria |
| G | V | F | C | Score  |
| 1 | AM | 24 | 16 | 8 | 15 | 63 |
| 2 | Ar | 6 | 12 | 6 | 12 | 36 |
| 3 | AWS | 18 | 16 | 6 | 15 | 55 |
| 4 | DIM | 18 | 20 | 8 | 12 | 58 |
| 5 | DR | 18 | 12 | 6 | 12 | 48 |
| 6 | FH | 18 | 16 | 10 | 15 | 59 |
| 7 | IM | 18 | 12 | 8 | 8 | 46 |
| 8 | IRP | 18 | 16 | 6 | 12 | 52 |
| 9 | HIS | 30 | 12 | 10 | 9 | 61 |
| 10 | MMR | 18 | 12 | 6 | 12 | 48 |
| 11 | MRF | 18 | 12 | 8 | 12 | 50 |
| 12 | MM | 18 | 12 | 8 | 8 | 46 |
| 13 | MRA | 18 | 20 | 8 | 12 | 58 |
| 14 | NPB | 18 | 16 | 8 | 12 | 54 |
| 15 | NAP | 18 | 16 | 8 | 12 | 54 |
| 16 | NM | 18 | 16 | 8 | 12 | 54 |
| 17 | NR | 18 | 16 | 10 | 12 | 56 |
| 18 | NA | 18 | 20 | 8 | 12 | 58 |
| 19 | OS | 12 | 8 | 6 | 12 | 38 |
| 20 | RH | 18 | 16 | 10 | 12 | 56 |
| 21 | RSA | 18 | 16 | 6 | 12 | 52 |
| 22 | SN | 12 | 12 | 6 | 12 | 42 |
| 23 | Su | 12 | 8 | 6 | 12 | 38 |
| 24 | SUH | 18 | 16 | 8 | 12 | 54 |
| 25 | WP | 12 | 16 | 8 | 8 | 44 |
| N = 25 | TOTAL | 1280 |
| AVERAGE | M = 51.2 |

Note :

G : Grammar

V : Vocabulary

F : Fluency

C : Comprehension

Mean of Pre-test :

X = $\frac{\sum\_{}^{}X}{N}= \frac{1280}{25}=51.2$ (the mean of pre-test control class is 51.2)

From the table 4.3 above showed that the result of students’ pre-test score at the control class. The data showed the maximum score was 63 and the minimum score was 36. There was one student who got maximum score and one student who got minimum score. The average score of pre-test in control class was 51.2. While the result of post-test in control class got better score. The result of post-test in control class described by table bellow :

*Table 4.5*

|  |
| --- |
| *The Students' Score of Post-Test at the Control Class* |
| No  | Respondent | Criteria | Score |
| G | V | F | C |
| 1 | AM | 24 | 16 | 10 | 19 | 69 |
| 2 | Ar | 18 | 16 | 8 | 15 | 57 |
| 3 | AWS | 24 | 16 | 8 | 15 | 63 |
| 4 | DIM | 24 | 20 | 10 | 15 | 69 |
| 5 | DR | 18 | 16 | 8 | 15 | 57 |
| 6 | FH | 18 | 20 | 8 | 15 | 61 |
| 7 | IM | 24 | 16 | 8 | 15 | 63 |
| 8 | IRP | 24 | 20 | 8 | 15 | 67 |
| 9 | HIS | 24 | 16 | 8 | 19 | 67 |
| 10 | MMR | 18 | 16 | 8 | 15 | 57 |
| 11 | MRF | 18 | 16 | 8 | 15 | 57 |
| 12 | MM | 18 | 16 | 8 | 15 | 57 |
| 13 | MRA | 24 | 16 | 10 | 15 | 65 |
| 14 | NPB | 24 | 20 | 10 | 19 | 73 |
| 15 | NAP | 18 | 16 | 8 | 15 | 57 |
| 16 | NM | 24 | 20 | 10 | 15 | 69 |
| 17 | NR | 18 | 20 | 8 | 15 | 61 |
| 18 | NA | 18 | 20 | 8 | 15 | 61 |
| 19 | OS | 18 | 16 | 8 | 15 | 57 |
| 20 | RH | 18 | 16 | 10 | 15 | 59 |
| 21 | RSA | 18 | 20 | 8 | 15 | 61 |
| 22 | SN | 24 | 16 | 8 | 15 | 63 |
| 23 | Su | 18 | 16 | 8 | 15 | 57 |
| 24 | SUH | 18 | 16 | 8 | 15 | 57 |
| 25 | WP | 24 | 20 | 8 | 15 | 67 |
| N = 25 | TOTAL | $\sum\_{}^{}X$= 1551 |
| AVERAGE | M = 62.04 |

 Note :

G : Grammar

V : Vocabulary

F : Fluency

C : Comprehension

Mean of Post-test :

X = $\frac{\sum\_{}^{}X}{N}= \frac{1551}{25}=62.04$ (the mean of post-test control class is 62.04)

*Table 4.6*

 *The Difference Score Between Pre-Test and Post-Test at the Control Class*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Respondent | Pre-test  | Post-test  |
|
| 1 | AM | 63 | 69 |
| 2 | Ar | 36 | 57 |
| 3 | AWS | 55 | 63 |
| 4 | DIM | 58 | 69 |
| 5 | DR | 48 | 57 |
| 6 | FH | 59 | 61 |
| 7 | IM | 46 | 63 |
| 8 | IRP | 52 | 67 |
| 9 | HIS | 61 | 67 |
| 10 | MMR | 48 | 57 |
| 11 | MRF | 50 | 57 |
| 12 | MM | 46 | 57 |
| 13 | MRA | 58 | 65 |
| 14 | NPB | 54 | 73 |
| 15 | NAP | 54 | 57 |
| 16 | NM | 54 | 69 |
| 17 | NR | 56 | 61 |
| 18 | NA | 58 | 61 |
| 19 | OS | 38 | 57 |
| 20 | RH | 56 | 59 |
| 21 | RSA | 52 | 61 |
| 22 | SN | 42 | 63 |
| 23 | Su | 38 | 57 |
| 24 | SUH | 54 | 57 |
| 25 | WP | 44 | 67 |
| N = 25 | TOTAL  | 1280 | 1551 |
| AVERAGE | M = 51.2 | M = 62.04 |

From the table 4.4 above showed that the result of students’ post-test score at the control class. The data showed the maximum score was 73 and the minimum score was 57. There was one student who got maximum score and there were nine students who got minimum score. The average score of pre-test in control class was 62.04.

From the table 4.6 above showed the difference result of pre-test and post-test at the control class got the significant improvement after giving treatment without using time token technique, it was seen from the average of the post-test better than pre-test 51.2 < 62.04.

1. **Data Analysis**
2. **Experimental Class**

The researcher analysis the data by comparing students’ score in pre-test and post-test in the experimental class. The students’ improvement score caused the researcher used time token technique in teaching speaking. If seen from the students improvement score, it means that used time token technique was success in improving students’ speaking ability. The researcher describes the students’ improvement score of pre-test and post-test at the experimental class by the table below:

|  |
| --- |
| *Table 4.7**The Difference Score Between Pre-Test and Post-Test Result of Experimental Class* |
| No | Respondent | Pre-test ($X\_{1}$) | Post-test ($X\_{2}$) | Difference($X\_{2}-X\_{1}$) |
|
| 1 | AFA | 54 | 63 | 9 |
| 2 | AR | 44 | 67 | 23 |
| 3 | DAF | 40 | 63 | 23 |
| 4 | EN | 47 | 73 | 26 |
| 5 | FKN | 73 | 79 | 6 |
| 6 | FA | 44 | 73 | 29 |
| 7 | GZS | 57 | 75 | 18 |
| 8 | HS | 42 | 67 | 25 |
| 9 | IS | 42 | 63 | 21 |
| 10 | Kh | 42 | 69 | 27 |
| 11 | Ko | 42 | 67 | 25 |
| 12 | LRJ | 53 | 63 | 10 |
| 13 | MPS | 44 | 65 | 21 |
| 14 | NS | 50 | 63 | 13 |
| 15 | NIS | 50 | 63 | 13 |
| 16 | NK | 44 | 69 | 25 |
| 17 | NSH | 40 | 63 | 23 |
| 18 | PR | 59 | 73 | 14 |
| 19 | Ri | 42 | 63 | 21 |
| 20 | RD | 47 | 73 | 26 |
| 21 | SM | 48 | 63 | 15 |
| 22 | SMD | 40 | 63 | 23 |
| 23 | TZJ | 53 | 73 | 20 |
| 24 | WAN | 53 | 79 | 26 |
| 25 | YS | 40 | 63 | 23 |
| N = 25 | TOTAL | $\sum\_{}^{}X$ =1190 | $\sum\_{}^{}X$ = 1695 | $\sum\_{}^{}=$ 505 |
| AVERAGE | M = 47.6 | M = 67.8 |

Table 4.5 above showed that the difference score between pre-test and post-test at the experimental class. The difference score was the result from the post-test scores reduced pre-test score. There was significant difference score between pre-test and post-test at the experimental class by the higher score was 29 and the lowest was 6. The graphic describes the table as follow:

*Graphic 4.1*

*The Different Score Between Pre-Test and Post-Test of Experimental Class*

From graphic 4.1 above showed the results of the students’ pre-test and post-test scores on the criteria in speaking at the experimental class. Data showed that the maximum score in pre-test was 73 and the minimum score was 40. While in post-test the maximum score was 79 and the minimum score was 63.

1. **Control Class**

The researcher analysis the data by comparing students’ score in pre-test and post-test at the control class. This result describes by the table below:

*Table 4.8*

|  |
| --- |
| *The difference score between Pre-test and Post-test result of* *control class* |
| No | Respondent | Pre-test ($X\_{1}$) | Post-test ($X\_{2}$) | Difference($X\_{2}-X\_{1}$) |
|
| 1 | AM | 63 | 69 | 6 |
| 2 | Ar | 36 | 57 | 21 |
| 3 | AWS | 55 | 63 | 8 |
| 4 | DIM | 58 | 69 | 11 |
| 5 | DR | 48 | 57 | 9 |
| 6 | FH | 59 | 61 | 2 |
| 7 | IM | 46 | 63 | 17 |
| 8 | IRP | 52 | 67 | 15 |
| 9 | HIS | 61 | 67 | 6 |
| 10 | MMR | 48 | 57 | 9 |
| 11 | MRF | 50 | 57 | 7 |
| 12 | MM | 46 | 57 | 11 |
| 13 | MRA | 58 | 65 | 7 |
| 14 | NPB | 54 | 73 | 19 |
| 15 | NAP | 54 | 57 | 3 |
| 16 | NM | 54 | 69 | 15 |
| 17 | NR | 56 | 61 | 5 |
| 18 | NA | 58 | 61 | 3 |
| 19 | OS | 38 | 57 | 19 |
| 20 | RH | 56 | 59 | 3 |
| 21 | RSA | 52 | 61 | 9 |
| 22 | SN | 42 | 63 | 21 |
| 23 | Su | 38 | 57 | 19 |
| 24 | SUH | 54 | 57 | 3 |
| 25 | WP | 44 | 67 | 23 |
| N = 25 | TOTAL  | $\sum\_{}^{}X$ = 1280 | $\sum\_{}^{}X= $1551 | $\sum\_{}^{}= $271 |
| AVERAGE | M = 51.2 | M = 62.04 |

Table 4.5 above showed that the difference score between pre-test and post-test at the control class. The difference score was the result from the post-test scores reduced pre-test score. There was significant difference score between pre-test and post-test at the control class by the highest score was 23 and the lowest was 2. The graphic describes the table as follow:

*Graphic 4.2*

*The Different Score Between Pre-Test and Post-Test of Control Class*

From graphic 4.2 above showed the results of the students’ pre-test and post-test scores on the criteria in speaking at the control class. Data showed that the maximum score in pre-test was 63 and the minimum score was 36. While in post-test the maximum score was 73 and the minimum score was 57. After getting the data from score of two classes, then the researcher analyzed it by using t-test. The formula as follow:

$$t\_{0}= \frac{M\_{1}-M\_{2}}{\left(\frac{\sum\_{}^{}x\_{1}^{2}+ \sum\_{}^{}x\_{2}^{2}}{N\_{1}+ N\_{2}-2}\right) \left(\frac{N\_{1}+ N\_{2}}{N\_{1} . N\_{2}}\right)}$$

Notes :

 $t\_{0}$ = t observation

 $M\_{1}$ = Mean score of the experiment class

$M\_{2}$ = Mean score of the control class

$\sum\_{}^{}x\_{1}^{2}$ = Sum of square deviation score in experiment class

$\sum\_{}^{}x\_{2}^{2}$ = Sum of square deviation score in control class

$N\_{1}$ = Number of students of experiment class

$N\_{2}$ = Number of students of control class

$2$ = Constant number

df = Degree of Freedom (df = $N\_{1}+N\_{2}-2$)

*Table 4.9*

*The Result Calculation of Post-Test at the Experimental Class (*$X\_{1}^{2}$*) and Control Class (*$X\_{2}^{2}$*)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | $X\_{1}$  | $X\_{2}$  | $x\_{1}$  | $x\_{2}$  | $x\_{1}^{2}$  | $x\_{2}^{2}$  |
| 1 | 63 | 69 | -4.8 | 6.96 | 23.04 | 48.4416 |
| 2 | 67 | 57 | -0.8 | -5.04 | 0.64 | 25.4016 |
| 3 | 63 | 63 | -4.8 | 0.96 | 23.04 | 0.9216 |
| 4 | 73 | 69 | 5.2 | 6.96 | 27.04 | 48.4416 |
| 5 | 79 | 57 | 11.2 | -5.04 | 125.44 | 25.4016 |
| 6 | 73 | 61 | 5.2 | -1.04 | 27.04 | 1.0816 |
| 7 | 75 | 63 | 7.2 | 0.96 | 51.84 | 0.9216 |
| 8 | 67 | 67 | -0.8 | 4.96 | 0.64 | 24.6016 |
| 9 | 63 | 67 | -4.8 | 4.96 | 23.04 | 24.6016 |
| 10 | 69 | 57 | 1.2 | -5.04 | 1.44 | 25.4016 |
| 11 | 67 | 57 | -0.8 | -5.04 | 0.64 | 25.4016 |
| 12 | 63 | 57 | -4.8 | -5.04 | 23.04 | 25.4016 |
| 13 | 65 | 65 | -2.8 | 2.96 | 7.84 | 8.7616 |
| 14 | 63 | 73 | -4.8 | 10.96 | 23.04 | 120.1216 |
| 15 | 63 | 57 | -4.8 | -5.04 | 23.04 | 25.4016 |
| 16 | 69 | 69 | 1.2 | 6.96 | 1.44 | 48.4416 |
| 17 | 63 | 61 | -4.8 | -1.04 | 23.04 | 1.0816 |
| 18 | 73 | 61 | 5.2 | -1.04 | 27.04 | 1.0816 |
| 19 | 63 | 57 | -4.8 | -5.04 | 23.04 | 25.4016 |
| 20 | 73 | 59 | 5.2 | -3.04 | 27.04 | 9.2416 |
| 21 | 63 | 61 | -4.8 | -1.04 | 23.04 | 1.0816 |
| 22 | 63 | 63 | -4.8 | 0.96 | 23.04 | 0.9216 |
| 23 | 73 | 57 | 5.2 | -5.04 | 27.04 | 25.4016 |
| 24 | 79 | 57 | 11.2 | -5.04 | 125.44 | 25.4016 |
| 25 | 63 | 67 | -4.8 | 4.96 | 23.04 | 24.6016 |
| ∑ | 1695 | 1551 |   |   | 704 | 592.96 |
|  |  |

Note :

$X\_{1}$  = Score Post-test (Experimental Class)

$X\_{2}$  = Score Post-test (Control Class)

$x\_{1}$  = $X\_{1}$ - $M\_{1}$(Mean $X\_{1}$)

$x\_{2}$  = $X\_{2}$ - $M\_{2}$ (Mean $X\_{2}$)

$x\_{1}^{2}$  = The Squared Value of $x\_{1}$

$x\_{2}^{2}$  = The Squared Value of $x\_{2}$

From the table above, the researcher got the data $\sum\_{}^{}X\_{1}$ = 1695, $\sum\_{}^{}X\_{2}$ = 1551, $\sum\_{}^{}x\_{1}^{2}$ = 704, $\sum\_{}^{}x\_{2}^{2}$ = 592.96 where as $N\_{1}$ = 25 and $N\_{2}$ = 25. After that the researcher calculated them based on the t-test formula, the steps as follow :

1. Determine mean of variable $X\_{1}$ and $X\_{2}$

Variable $X\_{1}$ $M\_{1}$ = $\frac{\sum\_{}^{}x\_{1}}{N\_{1}}$ = $\frac{1695}{25}$ = 67.8

Variable $X\_{2}$ $M\_{2}$ = $\frac{\sum\_{}^{}x\_{2}}{N\_{2}}$ = $\frac{1551}{25}$ = 62.04

1. Determine t-test

$\sum\_{}^{}x\_{1}^{2}$ = 704

$\sum\_{}^{}x\_{2}^{2}$ = 592,96

df = $N\_{1}+N\_{2}-2$ = 25 + 25 – 2 = 48

$$t\_{o}= \frac{M\_{1}-M\_{2}}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\sum\_{}^{}x\_{1}^{2}+ \sum\_{}^{}x\_{2}^{2}}{N\_{1}+ N\_{2}-2}\right) \left(\frac{N\_{1}+ N\_{2}}{N\_{1} . N\_{2}}\right)}}$$

 = $\frac{67,8-62,04}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{704+592,96}{25+25-2}\right)\left(\frac{25+25}{25 . 25}\right)}}$ = $\frac{5,76}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{1296,96}{48}\right)\left(\frac{50}{625}\right)}}$

 = $\frac{5,76}{\sqrt{27,02 × 0,08}}$ = $\frac{5,76}{\sqrt{2,1616}}$ = $\frac{5,76}{1,47}$ = 3.91

So after the researcher calculates this data based on the formula t-test, the obtained $t\_{o}$ or $t\_{observation}$ was 3,91.

1. **Hypothesis Testing**

The data obtained from experiment class and control class were calculated with the assumption as follow :

If $t\_{0}> t\_{t}$ : the alternative hypothesis was accepted. It means there was significant effect of teaching speaking using time token technique than without using time token technique. If $t\_{0}< t\_{t}$ : null hypothesis was rejected. It means there was no significance effect of teaching speaking using time token technique than without it.

From the result of calculation above, it is obtained that the value of $t\_{o} (t\_{observation})$ was 3.91, the degree of freedom (df) = 48. In the degree significance 5% = 1,67 in degree of significance 1% = 2,40. After that the researcher compared the data with $t\_{t}$ (t table) both in degree significance 5% and 1%. Therefore $t\_{o}:t\_{t}$ = 3,91 > 1,67 in degree of significance 5% and $t\_{o}:t\_{t}$ = 3,91 > 2,40 in degree significance 1%.

The statistic hypothesis states that if $t\_{o}$ is higher than $t\_{t}$, it shows that $H\_{a}$(alternative hypothesis) of the result is accepted and $H\_{o}$(null hypothesis) is rejected. It means that there was an effect of teaching speaking using time token technique.

1. **Interpretation Data**

Based on the finding data of the research, the implementation of teaching speaking by using time token technique was found that the students taught by this technique have been improved in speaking ability than the students taught without using time token technique. The students who taught by this technique can speak easily and be active in speaking because they studied by cooperative than they must share their idea to their friend also the teacher can play role to invite students to find the solutions to the problem. Then, it can motivate students to speak in front of their friends.

From the result of the research that the mean of pre-test score obtained by students of MTs 2 Negeri Kabupaten Serang in the class VIII I (experimental class) 47,6 was smaller than class VIII J (control class) 51,2. The highest score of pre-test in VIII I (experimental class) was 73 and in the class VIII J (control class) was 63. The lowest score of pre-test in class VIII I (experimental class) was 40 and in the class VIII J (control class) was 36. It means that the distribution of score in experimental score was smaller than control class.

The mean of post-test score in experimental class was 67.8 was greater than in control class was 62.04. The highest score in experimental class was 79 and in control class was 73. The lowest score in experimental class was 63 and in control class was 57. It means that the distribution of score post-test in experimental class was greater than class control. It can be seen in teaching process in the experimental class the teacher taught speaking using time token technique, it made students more active in speaking because they forced to speak in learning process. The students also can discuss with their friend to share their idea in the classroom. It made the silent student be active in speak because everyone in the group of discuss must share their idea. When the teacher asked them to speak in front of the class using token by the time 30 seconds, the students did it with fun.[[32]](#footnote-32) While in the control class the teacher only explain the material without using time token technique, the students less interested. They got bored and they fell confused when the teacher asked them to speak in front of the class.

**CHAPTER V**

**CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION**

1. **Conclusion**

Based on the researcher’s research about “The Effect of Time Token Technique Toward Students’ Speaking Ability” at the eighth grade students of MTs Negeri 2 Kabupaten Serang, the researcher can conclude :

1. The students speaking ability at the eighth grade of MTs Negeri 2 Kabupaten Serang before given the treatment are low. It can be seen from the result of the pre-test at the experimental class, the lowest score was 40 and highest score was 73 and students’ average score was 47,6. The result of the pre-test at the control class, the lowest score was 36 and the highest score was 63 and students’ average score was 51,2.
2. Using time token technique in teaching speaking was effective in improving students’ speaking ability. It can be seen from the result of students’ post-test which is bigger than pre-test. The average score of experimental class in pre-test was 47,6 while the post-test was 67,8. While the average scores of control class was 51,2 in pre-test and 62,04 in post-test. From the result of the calculation above, it was obtained that the value of t-observation was 3,91. The degree of freedom was 48, with level significance 5% = 1,67 and with level significance 1% = 2,40. So $t\_{o}> t\_{t}$ = 3,91 > 1,67 or $t\_{o}> t\_{t}$ = 3,91 > 1,67. It means the researcher reject $H\_{0} : t\_{o}< t\_{t}$ that there was no significant influence between students’ taught by using time token technique without using time token technique and accept $H\_{a} : t\_{o}> t\_{t}$ there was the influence between students’ taught by using time token technique without it. Based on explanation above shows that the difference treatment makes difference result in experimental class which using time token technique and in control class without it, it means using time token technique was more effective than not use it.
3. **Suggestion**

Dealing with the conclusion above, the researcher would like to give some suggestions which may be useful in improving students in speaking skill as follow :

1. For the teacher
2. The teacher should be more creative in teaching English subject.
3. The teacher should give interesting method or technique to improve students’ speaking ability.
4. The teacher should give more motivation to the students to make them more enthusiastic in learning English, especially in speaking ability because most of them still feel shy and afraid to speak English.
5. For the researcher

For the next researchers, the researcher hopes they would conduct to investigate of other teaching technique in speaking ability and could use this study as a reference, develop the implementation of concept this technique, or combine with other strategy to get better result.
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