



THE EFFECTIVENESS OF TALKING STICK STRATEGY ON STUDENTS SPEAKING ABILITY OF ASKING AND GIVING OPINIONS AT A STATE VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL IN MATARAM

Anggun Rahmawati Putri^{1*}, Baharuddin², Lalu Ali Wardana³

^{1 2 3} English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education,
University of Mataram, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author: anggunrhmptri@gmail.com

Abstract: Students can become more excited to learn English by engaging in interesting learning activities that the teacher implements. This study discusses one strategy that can enable teachers to teach speaking in interactive way. The talking stick strategy will be discussed in this study. In this strategy, a wooden stick is used to designate who may talk. The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of using the talking stick strategy on students' speaking ability of asking and giving opinion at eleventh grade students. The method that is used in this study was quantitative through quasi-experimental design. The total sample for this study was 49 students from 26 students of XI UPW 1 (Experimental class) and 23 students of XI UPW 2 (Controlled class) that were taken by using purposive sampling technique. The results showed that the post-test means score of the experimental class was 82.15 while the post-test of means score of controlled class was 73.39. It showed that there is a significant difference between the two classes post-test mean scores. In addition, the result of independent sample T-test showed that Sig. 2 tailed (p) was 0.006 which is lower than the sig. $\alpha = 0.05$ (5%). It means that H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted. In conclusion, it can be said that the use of the talking stick strategy is effective on students' speaking ability of asking and giving opinions at a state vocational high school in Mataram.

Keywords: Talking Stick Strategy, Speaking Ability, Teaching Speaking

INTRODUCTION

As social beings, people need to interact with one another in their daily lives. Interaction among people can be carried out by using language as a communication tool. The existence of language in human social life plays an important role as a means to convey information and arguments to others. Every country has its own language, which is used by its citizens to communicate with one another. Among the various languages in the world, English is considered to be one of the most well-known international languages in the world.

As an international language, English is used by people in almost every part of the world. Patel & Jain (2008) stated that this language is the mother tongue of nearly 320 million people, and another 200 million people use it as a second language. Hence, English has become a communication tool among people in the world. It is a known truth that having a high level of English proficiency increases a person's chances of getting hired, promoted, earning more money, and getting into a good school (Susanti, 2014). As a matter of fact, four language skills need to be mastered: speaking, reading, listening, and writing.

Among those four skills, speaking skill is one of the English language skills that should be mastered. According to Bahar (2007) speaking is a verbal activity in which speakers convey their thoughts, feelings, and ideas to listeners through a sequence of sounds, words, and sentences. Speaking includes the integration of language elements at the functional level, and functions employ language for both transactions and interactions (Sujana, 2016). Speaking is a crucial aspect of human interaction and communication. The mastery of speaking skills is a priority for many foreign language learners. Considering the current status of English as an international language, a large number of people learning English around the world show that they study English to develop proficiency in speaking (Richards & Renandya, 2002). Hence, speaking should be taught and practiced in the language classroom.

In fact, many students still find difficulties in speaking English. Based on the researcher's observation when doing teaching practice in SMKN 2 Mataram, many students were anxious and uncomfortable when speaking English for fear of making mistakes. Besides, the students cannot actively participate in expressing their opinions due to their lack of motivation and self-confidence, which leads students to remain quiet in the speaking class. In this case, the teacher has a responsibility to make the students active and confident in speaking English. Teachers and students are two distinct components that collaborate to support students learn and achieve their learning objectives (Nurtaat, 2022). Additionally, English teachers should foster a communicative environment in the classroom where students can engage in authentic activities that can enhance the use of oral language (Amrullah, 2020).

Based on the problems described above, the students need to be facilitated by the use of an effective teaching strategy that can help students to be more communicated actively during the learning process in the classroom. It is also stated by Rahmah and Adnan (2017) in order to engage students in actively communicating during teaching speaking processes in asking and giving opinions, the teacher should be able to decide and use an effective teaching strategy. The researcher believes that cooperative learning is an alternative way to engage students to become active learners.

Gupta & Pasrija (2012) stated that cooperative learning is an efficient way to convert students into active learners in classrooms and it makes teaching-learning more satisfying, momentous, enjoyable, and effective. The concept of cooperative learning, which gives priority to students' involvement and cooperation during the teaching and learning process gives benefits to students' improving their learning motivation. Motivation is an important aspect of success in the majority of study fields. Without motivation, it's quite likely that we will not engage in certain activities or exert the necessary effort to finish a task or reach a particular objective (Thohir, 2017). Additionally, cooperative learning provides some advantages, such as being able to uncover ideas and inspiration in learning and acquainting learners with the use of social and cognitive abilities (Ishaq, 2008).

Many cooperative learning strategies can be applied to improve students' speaking skills, such as Talking Stick, Jigsaw, Think Pair and Share, Group Investigation Go a Round, Make a Match, Pair Checks, Numbered Heads Together, Write Around, and Carousel. As there are many cooperative learning strategies available, the researcher decided to take a talking stick in this study. Suprijono (2015) states that the talking stick strategy is one of the cooperative learning strategies where students are encouraged to be brave in expressing their own opinions to others with the help of a stick.

According to Garret (2002), talking sticks can take the form of ordinary sticks of any kind or size. Since ancient times, Indians have listened to others with sincerity and objectivity by using talking sticks. Councils frequently decide who has the right to speak by using the talking stick. By the time the meeting's chairman begins speaking and discussing, he should be holding the stick. The talking stick will be passed from one person to another if anyone wants to express their opinion (Fujioka, 1998). Whoever carries the stick has the power to speak, and the others must be silent and listen.

The benefits of implementing the Talking Stick learning strategy include assessing students' preparedness for learning, having them read and comprehend lessons more quickly, and encouraging them to engage more in the classroom, all of which are projected to raise student accomplishment (Suprijono, 2009). Applying the talking stick strategy in class somehow can avoid students who are lazy or even anxious. This strategy would be ideal for teachers in search of fun ways to liven up the classroom. According to Wardana (2016) the talking stick is not only utilized by students to improve their speaking skills, but it also makes the classroom atmosphere more active, making the learning process more enjoyable. Teachers can motivate students to speak by using this strategy that hopefully can create a good circumstance and encourage students to play an active role in learning activities, especially in giving their opinions bravely.

This research was conducted with the aim to find out whether the talking stick strategy is effective to improve students' speaking ability in asking and giving opinions.

RESEARCH METHODS

This research was conducted using a quantitative method with a quasi-experimental design. According to Maciejewski (2020) a quasi-experiment is a prospective or retrospective study in which individuals or groups of individuals self-select into one of several different treatment groups in order to compare the effectiveness and safety of those non-randomized treatments in the real world. This research was carried out at a state vocational High School 2 Mataram in September 2022. There are two variables in this study; independent and dependent variables. According to Sugiyono (2018), Independent variables are variables that cause changes in the dependent variable. The independent variable of this study is the use of the talking stick strategy, while the dependent variable is students' speaking ability in asking and giving opinions.

The population of this study is the eleventh grade of SMKN 2 Mataram. There are sixteen classes, and the total number of students for this study is 564 students. The sample of this study is two classes the eleventh-grade students in the Academic Years 2022/2023. This study takes the XI UPW 1 class as a control group (26 students) and XI UPW 2 class as an experimental group (23 students). Hence, this study involved 49 students. In this research, The researcher uses purposive sampling in selecting the sample. According to Sugiyono (2018:128), purposive sampling is sampling by using certain considerations by the desired criteria to be able to determine the number of samples to be studied. In this study, sampling is based on several criteria, such as the students who learn the materials about asking and giving opinions and the recommendation from the English teacher.

This study uses a pre-test and post-test to collect the data and uses two classes the control and experimental classes. The experimental class is a class that is taught using a talking

stick strategy, while the control class is taught using a conventional teaching method. Both classes are given a pre-test before the teaching and learning activities, and the post-test is carried out after the treatment has been applied in the teaching and learning activities. The results of the pre-test and post-test from the two classes were compared and calculated to determine the effect of using the talking stick strategy on students' speaking ability in asking and giving opinions.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

1. Descriptions of Data

The data used in this study is an oral test obtained from students in experimental and control classes at the beginning and the end of the study. Additionally, the result of the test would be explained in the following explanation to find out whether the talking stick strategy is effective on students' speaking ability in asking and giving opinions at XI UPW students of SMKN 2 Mataram. The researcher analyzed students' mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum scores to determine the description scores obtained from the pre-test and post-test of the experimental and control classes, as shown in the table below.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

Class	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pre-test experimental	26	52	92	70.31	13.056
Post-test experimental	26	68	96	82.15	9.207
Pre-test kontrol	23	40	92	67.48	13.118
Post-test kontrol	23	48	92	73.39	11.854
Valid N (listwise)	23				

According to data from table 1 above, the students' pre-test score in the experimental class was 70.31, while their post-test score was 82.15. Additionally, in the controlled class, the students' pre-test score was 67.48 while the students' post-test score was 73.39. In addition, it also showed that the lowest score for the pre-test of the experimental class is 52 while the highest score is 92. Additionally, the lowest score for the post-test of the experimental class is 68 while the highest score is 96.

In addition, in the controlled class, the lowest score on the pre-test is 40 while the highest score is 92. Additionally, the lowest score for the post-test in the control class is 48 while the highest score is 92. So, it showed that there was an effect of using the talking stick strategy on students' speaking ability of asking and giving opinions.

1.1 Preliminary Data Analysis

The preliminary data analysis consisted of homogeneity and normality test. Both two tests have the function to see whether the data were distributed normally and also the data was homogeneous or not. To find out the normality and homogeneity of the data, this study used IBM SPSS Statistics 20. The result of the preliminary analysis can be seen as follows:

1.1.1 Normality of the Test

To measure the data of this study, I implemented Kolmogorov- Smirnov methods to test the normality of the data and to know if the data were distributed normally.

Table 2. Test of Normality

Class	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
pre-test exsperiment	.133	26	.200*	.922	26	.051
post-test exsperiment	.151	26	.130	.923	26	.053
pre-test control	.135	23	.200*	.971	23	.702
post-test control	.109	23	.200*	.952	23	.323

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Based on table 2 above, the normality test used in this study was Kolmogorov-Smirnov with a significance level of 0.05. It can be seen that the significant value of the normality test pre-test score in the experimental class was 0.200 while the normality test of pre-test control in the control class was 0.200. However, the data can be said distributed normally if the significance value is higher than significance α (significance level). Based on table 4.2, the data showed that $p \geq \alpha$ ($0.200 \geq 0.05$) and ($0.200 \geq 0.05$) which means that in this study, the pre-test data was distributed normally.

Additionally, based on table 4.2 above, it can be seen that the significant value (Sig.) of the normality test of the post-test in the experimental class was 0.130 while the normality test of the post-test in the control class was 0.200. In addition, the data can be said distributed normally if the significance value is higher than significance α (significance level). Based on table 4.2, the data showed that $p \geq \alpha$ ($0.130 \geq 0.05$) and ($0.200 \geq 0.05$) which means that in this study, the post-test data was distributed normally, because the significance value from both post-test from experimental and control class was higher than significance level which was 0.05.

1.1.2 Homogeneity of the Test

After the pre-test and post-test data were proved normally distributed, the next calculation was to test the homogeneity. The purpose of doing a homogeneity test was to test the similarity of the samples from the experimental class and control class. This test used the Levene statistic test in IBM SPSS Statistic 20 to calculate the homogeneity of the test. The results of the homogeneity of the test are presented as follows:

Homogeneity test of Pre-Test:

Table 3. Homogeneity test of Pre-Test

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.275	1	47	.602

Based on the data in table 3, the significant value (Sig.) of the pre-test between the experimental and control groups was 0.602. The data can be said homogeneous if the significance value is higher than significance α (significance level) which was 0.05. So, it can be concluded that the data of the pre-test of the experimental class and control class was homogeneous because it was higher than significance α ($0.602 > 0.05$), and also the students from both the experimental class and control class have similar traits to done pre-test.

Table 4. Homogeneity test of Post-Test

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
1.076	1	47	.305

Based on the data in table 4, it can be seen that the significance value (Sig.) of the post-test between the experimental class and control class was 0.305. The data can be said homogeneous if the significance value is higher than significance α (significance level) which was 0.05. So, it can be concluded that the data of the post-test of the experimental class and control class was homogeneous because it was higher than significance α ($0.305 > 0.05$) and also the students from both the experimental class and control class have similar traits to done post-test.

2. Research Hypothesis

After doing procedures in Preliminary Data Analysis which were doing normality test and homogeneity test and the data were proved distributed normally and homogeneous (the sample from experimental and control classes have similar characteristics). The next step of calculation was to test the hypothesis by using a t-test. The purpose of using the t-test was to check whether there is a significant difference between the students' speaking ability of asking and giving opinions in the experimental and control class. In this study, SPSS 20 was used to test the hypothesis, and conducted by using the formulation of both experimental class and control class mean scores. The next step is to determine the significance value or alpha (α) that will be used in the formula which is 5% or 0.05.

Table 5. Group Statistics

Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Experimental class	26	82.15	9.207	1.806
Control class	23	73.39	11.854	2.472

The results of the post-test from both the experimental and control classes were presented in table 5 above. It can be seen that there are 26 students in the experimental class and 23 students in the control class which is symbolized by N. Additionally, the column of mean showed the average score of post-test scores from both the experimental class and control

class. According to table 4.5, the mean score of the experimental class was 82.15 while the mean score of the control class was 73.39. So, it can be said that the experimental class has a higher average score rather than the control class.

Table 6. The Result of Independent Sample Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
								Lower	Upper	
Scores	Equal variances assumed	1.076	.305	2.907	47	.006	8.763	3.014	2.699	14.826
	Equal variances not assumed			2.863	41.377	.007	8.763	3.061	2.582	14.943

The results of the t-test analysis of post-test scores from both the experimental and control classes are presented in table 4.6 above. Based on the data in table 4.6, it can be seen that this study used the equal variances assumed that were on the table to read the result and also refers to the significant value of sig $\alpha = 0.05$ (5%). According to table 4.6, the result of the independent sample t-test in p-value or sig. (2-tailed) was 0.006 which is lower than the sig. $\alpha = 0.05$ (5%). It means that H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted. So, it means that there was a significant increase after applying the talking stick strategy to teaching and learning speaking asking and giving opinions.

Then, the researcher gave an interpretation to t_0 . First, the researcher considered the df, in here df is 47. Hence, the score of the t-table is 2.012. By comparing the "t" that the researcher has got the calculation t_{count} is 2.907 and the value of "t" on the t-table is 2.012. From the calculation above, it showed that t_0 (t-test) was higher than the t-table; $t_{test}(t_0) > t_{table} = 2.907 > 2.012$ which means that the alternative hypothesis (H_a) was accepted and the null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected. So, it indicates that the using talking stick strategy is effective on students' speaking ability of asking and giving opinions.

1.4 Measure the Effect Size

Cohen's formula was applied in this study to determine the level of effect of the talking stick strategy on students' speaking abilities.

$$d = \frac{M^1 - M^2}{\text{Pooled standart deviation}}$$

Mean Experimental Class = 82.15

Mean Control Class = 73.39

Mean Score Experimental Class-Mean Score Control Class = 8.76

Standard Deviation of Experimental Class = 9.207

Standard Deviation of Control Class = 11.854

Pooled Standard Deviation = $9.207 + 11.854$
= 21.061

$d = 8.84/20.954 = 0.415$

Whereas the criteria of the effect size level are:

0.00 – 0.20 : weak effect

0.21 – 0.50 : modest effect

0.51 – 1.00 : moderate effect

> 1.00 : strong effect

Based on the criteria above, it can be concluded that this study had a modest effect size as this can be seen from the d score that reached 0.415. So, it means that there is a modest effect of using the talking stick strategy on students' speaking ability of asking and giving opinions. This section consists of two sub-sections: Finding and Discussion. The finding and discussion should be at least 60% of the entire manuscript.

Findings may be presented in the forms of tables, graphs, verbal descriptions, or a combination of three. Tables, graphs, and images should not be too long or too large. Do not include too many figures in the manuscripts. The discussion section is intended to interpret the findings presented in the previous section. This section must be in accordance with the purpose of this writing and must be enriched by referring to the related theories and the results of previous studies published in scientific journals.

Discussion

This section presents the discussion based on the findings of the study. It is concerned with the effectiveness of applying the talking stick strategy to improve students' speaking ability of asking and giving opinions. Based on this study, the application of the talking stick strategy in the experimental group in teaching speaking is more effective than the control group who are not taught using the talking stick strategy.

Based on the data findings above, positive results have been indicated. It was proven by the results of students' post-test which have increased to 82.15 from 73.39. Also, the calculation of the t-test showed that the t-value was 2.907, which was higher than the t-table of 2.012. Therefore, based on the hypothesis, H_a is accepted and the H_0 is rejected, it means that the talking stick strategy is effective on students' speaking ability of asking and giving opinions.

During the treatment, students were also very interested. They confidently said their opinion. Suprijono (2015) states that the talking stick strategy is one of the cooperative learning strategies where students are encouraged to bravely express their own opinions to others with the help of a stick. Playing Talking Sticks in a group would encourage all of the participants to participate. The opportunity for the stick holder to speak will initiate group discussion activities

to practice each student's ability to speak. According to Murcia (2001), students who participate in discussion activities encourage other students to participate in discussions.

Furthermore, by applying the talking stick strategy, the atmosphere of English teaching and learning in the classroom became more pleasant and relaxed. The reason is that when applying the talking stick strategy, students are asked to sing together while passing the stick to practice their speaking skills and improve their understanding of some expressions for asking and giving opinions. Furthermore, the majority of students assumed that the Talking Stick Strategy was engaging, enjoyable and pleasant. It is because students easily understand the learning material and can apply it in class with their friends. Students also have the opportunity to practice and develop their speaking skills.

Based on the explanation above, it is proved that the talking stick strategy is effective on students' speaking ability of asking and giving opinions at XI UPW students of SMKN 2 Mataram in the academic year 2022/2023 with the effect size being a modest effect.

CONCLUSION

This study used a quasi-experimental design to determine the effectiveness of the talking stick strategy in class XI students of SMKN 2 Mataram. The results of the research analysis show that learning using the talking stick strategy has an impact on students' speaking abilities. It can be concluded that the use of the talking stick strategy has a significant effect on students' speaking ability of asking and giving opinions. Based on the mean score of the speaking post-test score of the experimental class with the score of 82.15 is getting better than the mean score of the speaking pre-test score of the experimental class with the score is 73.39. Moreover, the data analysis showed that the value of t_{test} (t_0) is 2.907 while the t_{table} is 2.012. So, it is clear that t_0 is higher than t_{table} it means that the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted and the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected. In conclusion, it can be said that the use of the talking stick strategy is effective on students' speaking ability of asking and giving opinions on XI UPW students of SMKN 2 Mataram.

REFERENCES

- Amrullah, A., Sahuddin, S., Fajri, M., & Apgriyanto, K. (2020, August). Learning to Speak English Through Task-Based Approach. In *1st Annual Conference on Education and Social Sciences (ACCESS 2019)* (pp. 9-12). <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200827.003>
- Bahar, A. K. (2007). *Let's Speak English Activity* (a comprehensive guiding book for prepare. STAIN prepare.
- Celle-Murcia, M. (2001). *Teaching English as a second language or foreign language* (2nd ed.). New York: Newbury House.
- Fujioka, K. (1998). The talking stick: An American Indian tradition in the ESL classroom. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 4(9), 1-6.
- Garret, J. T. (2002). *The Cherokee Full Chircle: A Practical Guide to Ceremonies and Traditions*. New York: Bear and Company Inc.
- Gupta, M., & Pasrija, P. (2012). Co-Operative learning: An efficient technique to convert students into active learners in classrooms. *MIER Journal of Educational Studies Trends and Practices*, 21-33.

- Ishaq, I. (2008). *Model-model pembelajaran mutakhir: perpaduan Indonesia-Malaysia*. Pustaka Pelajar.
- Maciejewski, M. L. (2020). Quasi-experimental design. *Biostatistics & Epidemiology*, 4(1), 38-47.
- Muijs, D. (2004). *Doing quantitative research in education: With SPSS*. Sage.
- Nurtaat, L., Fadjri, M., & Nanzah, Z. (2022). Student-Student Interaction in Online Learning during the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Case Study.
- Patel, M. F., & Jain, P. M. (2008). *English language teaching*. Sunrise Publishers and Distributors.
- Rahmah, A., & Adnan, A. (2018). ACTIVATING STUDENTS'SPEAKING ABILITY IN ASKING AND GIVING OPINION BY USING QUALITY QUESTIONING STRATEGY FOR SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 6(1), 307-313.
- Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge university press.
- Sujana, I. M. (2016). ASSESSING ORAL PROFICIENCY: Problems and Suggestions for Elicitation Techniques.
- Suprijono, A. (2015). *Cooperative learning: Teori & Aplikasi PAIKEM*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Chasanah, C. (2015). Pengembangan Permainan Tradisional Gotri untuk Pembelajaran Fisik Motorik Kasar Anak. *Jurnal PG-PAUD Trunojoyo*, 2(2): 87-89.
- Susanti, N. W. M. (2014, October). The use of paper-based TOEFL as a gate keeper for graduation: A case study at English department Universitas Mataram. In *International Conference 2014*.
- Thohir, L. (2017). Motivation in a Foreign Language Teaching and Learning. *Vision: Journal for Language and Foreign Language Learning*, 6(1), 20-29. doi:<https://doi.org/10.21580/vjv6i11580>
- Wardana, L. W. (2016). Paper airplane and talking stick learning methods to increase students understanding about management information system courses. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 18(9), 164-169.
- Sugiyono. (2018). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif-Kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.