

# **The Effectiveness Of Talking Chips To Teach Speaking Viewed From Students' Self-Esteem**

**Siti Khusnul Faizah**  
*sitikhusnulfaizah@gmail.com*

## **Abstract**

This research is aimed at finding out whether: (1) talking chips is more effective than direct instruction to teach speaking; (2) students who have high self-esteem have better speaking skill than those who have low self-esteem; and (3) there is an interaction between teaching methods and students' self-esteem in teaching speaking.

The research method used was an experimental study. The research was conducted at Institut Agama Islam Riyadlatul Mujahidin (IAIRM) Ponorogo in the academic year of 2019/2020. The population was the first semester students of Institut Agama Islam Riyadlatul Mujahidin (IAIRM) Ponorogo in the academic year of 2019/2020 which consisted of three faculties. The sample was taken by using cluster random sampling. There were two classes used as samples, namely tarbiyah faculty as the experimental class taught by using talking chips and syariah faculty as the control class taught by using direct instruction. The data of the research were collected using a questionnaire and a speaking test. After the normality and homogeneity tests were conducted, the hypothesis test was done. The data of speaking test were analyzed by using multifactor analysis of variance 2 x 2 and Tukey test.

Based on the data analysis, there are some research findings that can be drawn. First, talking chips is more effective than direct instruction to teach speaking. Second, the students who have high self-esteem have better speaking skill than those who have low self-esteem. Third, there is an interaction between teaching methods and students' self-esteem in teaching speaking.

*Keywords: Teaching Speaking, Talking Chips, Direct Instruction, Self-esteem.*

## **Introduction**

Students' speaking skill must be developed. Students must be motivated to speak, or need to speak in order to complete the activity, for instance, to share their thoughts and contribute in possible any way. Teachers have duties to help them in developing their skill and ability, but most of students learn to speak English at school. They generally develop to explore their ideas in spoken language. Teachers must develop to stay focused, and provide students with self-learning skills. The effective teaching and learning process requires a two-way interaction between teacher and student. Teacher should be creative in creating an enjoyable classroom atmosphere and students have to be involved actively in teaching learning activity.

Speaking is a productive skill that can be directly and empirically observed and those observations are colored by the accuracy and effectiveness of test-takers listening skill, which necessarily compromises the reality and validity of oral production test.

In teaching speaking, increasing the students' speaking skill is generally considered to be an important part. In simple description, speaking is one component of language skills. Achieving speaking skill may contribute to the whole language learning. In teaching speaking, the students are expected to have certain linguistic skills, such as understanding linguistic signs and their meanings, and finding information from text. They are also expected to have social skills such as cooperative skills. It deals with the fact that language is the medium through which people communicate and cooperate with others. In teaching speaking, it needs strategy which is appropriate with students' characteristic and the class condition. One of the methods that can be used to teach speaking is talking chips.

Talking Chips is a way of placing the students in cooperative learning situation. This method is essentially applied in increasing their social skill in which they may develop relationship among them. Talking Chips Technique is a technique in teaching speaking which makes the students work in group. Then, in holding Talking Chips Technique, students will be given chips and the chips are used for every time they speak, they must put the chips in the center of table. It is done until the chips are over. If the chips are over, the students may not speak until chips of all members of group are over too. If all chips have been used, while the task has not been finished. The students can be given the chips again.

But, many teachers still use "Direct Instructional Method" to teach speaking. In this method, the activity is teacher-centered and students lack of opportunities in the class. They just become the followers and depend on the teacher during the teaching and learning process. Usually, teacher asks the students to practice some dialogues with their classmate but they still read the text of the dialogue. But in this method, students are divided into several group and uncontrolled.

Besides the methods, the other thing that can affect the students' speaking skill is the students' self-esteem. Self-esteem is how we think and feel about ourselves. It refers to how we think about the way we look our abilities, our relationship with others, and our hopes for the future. In the learning environment, it provides a platform for a learner to develop the skills to achieve success in life. High self-esteem children have such characteristics like confident, positive, independent, and happy which will carry them through as they grow up. The students' self-esteem has the crucial thing to improve the students' speaking skill. It means that the students who have high self-esteem will have high skill in speaking activity, while the students who have low level of self-esteem will have low speaking skill. Self-

esteem is considered as one of the important affective factors because success or failure of a person depends mostly on the degree of one's self-esteem.

Based on the background of the problems above, the researcher uses the talking chips in teaching speaking on the consideration that it can improve the students' speaking skill. In this study, the researcher is interested in conducting an experimental research entitled: "The Effectiveness of Talking Chips Method to Teach Speaking Viewed from Students' Self-esteem" (An Experimental Study at the First semester Students of Institut Agama Islam Riyadlatul Mujahidin (IAIRM) Ponorogo in the Academic Year of 2019/2020).

From the description above, the problems formulated in this research are: (1) is talking chips more effective than direct instruction method to teach speaking?; (2) do the students having high self-esteem have better speaking skill than those having low self-esteem?; (3) is there any interaction between teaching methods and students' self-esteem to teach speaking?

Based on the formulation of the problem above, the objectives of the research are: (1) talking chips method is more effective than direct instruction method to teach speaking; (2) students who have high self-esteem have better speaking skill than those who have low self-esteem; (3) there is an interaction effect between teaching methods and students' self-esteem on the students' speaking skill.

Speaking is an interactive process of constructing meaning that involves producing, receiving, and processing speech of sound as the main instrument (Brown, 1994: 4). According to Hornby (1995: 140) speaking is producing words or talking to somebody. Byrne (1997: 8) defines oral communication as a two-way process between speaker and listener (or listeners) which involves the productive skill of speaking and the receptive skill of understanding (or listening with understanding). According to Widdowson (1996: 59) speaking is an instance of use, therefore, is a part of reciprocal exchange in which both reception and production play a part. In this sense, the skill of speaking involves both receptive and productive participation.

According to Chaney and Burke (1998: 13) speaking is the process of building and sharing meaning through the use of verbal and non-verbal symbols, in a variety of contexts. Bailey (2005: 2) states that speaking is an interactive process of constructing meaning that involves producing and receiving and processing information. It is often spontaneous, open-ended, and evolving but it is not completely unpredictable. Speaking is such a fundamental human behavior that we don't stop to analyze it unless there is something noticeable about it.

Brown (2004: 140) states that 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 compromises the reliability and validity of an oral production test.

Bygate (1997: 5-6) states that there are two basic ways in which something can be seen as skill: (1) Motor-perceptive skills involve perceiving, recalling, and articulating in the correct order sounds and structures of the language; and (2) Interaction skills involve making decisions about communication, such as: what to say, how to say it, and whether to develop it, in accordance with one's intentions, while maintaining the desired relations with others.

Brown (2004: 157) states there are five components of speaking. They are grammar, vocabulary, comprehension (content), fluency, and pronunciation. From definition above, it can be concluded that speaking skill is productive skill where there is process of constructing meaning and sharing information through the use of verbal and non-verbal symbols in it. The indicators of speaking skill are: pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.

Talking chips is one method applied in cooperative learning. Lie (2005: 65) points out that this method was developed by Spencer Kagan. The purpose is to give students an opportunity to share information each other. This method also allows students to complete academic tasks with their classmates. In this way, students may increase their communication skill. Talking Chips is one method applied in cooperative learning. Lie (2005: 65) points out that this method was developed by Spencer Kagan. The purpose is to give students an opportunity to share information each other. This method also allows students to complete academic tasks with their classmates. In this way, students may increase their communication skill.

The goal of this strategy is to promote equal participation and develop discourse abilities. Each member of a group gets different chips that they must use whenever they want to speak. These chips include different strategies to use in conversation and could include: (a) Express a doubt; (b) Answer a question; (c) Ask a question; (d) Give an idea; (e) Ask for clarification/clarify an idea; (f) Respond to an idea; (g) Summarize; (h) Encourage participation; (h) Say something positive about someone's idea.

According to Kagan (2009: 6.36) there are some steps of Talking Chips: (a) The teacher provides a discussion topic and provides think time. (b) Any student begins the discussion; placing one of his/her chips in the center of the table. (c) Any students with a chip continues discussing, using his/her chip. (d) When all chips are used, teammates each collect their chips and continue the discussion using their talking chips.

Talking chips compare with direct instruction. This meyhod includes methods such as lecture, didactic questioning, explicit teaching, practice and drill, and demonstrations. The

direct instruction strategy is effective for providing information or developing step by step skills. This strategy also works well for introducing other teaching methods, or actively involving students in knowledge construction.

In this method the teacher becomes the decision maker. Person, Hinson, and Brown (2001: 11) say the teacher will be engaged in many planning decisions, such as deciding what he/she would like to teach, he/she wishes to teach, about and how he/she will go about the speaking process. It is highly structured and teacher directed. The teacher control occurs when the teacher selects and directs the learning tasks.

According to Alan (2003: 11) direct instruction/teacher-centered instruction generally put in “teacher-centered instruction” the teacher’s role is that of a knowledge expert whose major job is to pass knowledge directly to students. The student’s job is to absorb or otherwise assimilate the new knowledge.

Arend (2012: 318) states that the steps for using Direct Instruction Method are: (a) Providing objectives and establishing set; (b) Demonstrating or explaining the materials to be learned; (c) Providing guided practice; (d) Checking for students understanding and providing feedback; (e) Providing for extended practice and transfer.

From the definition above, the researcher takes the following procedures to conduct the research: (1) Teacher delivers the objective of material studied; (2) Teacher gives detail information related to the material; (3) Teacher guides students through initial practice; (4) Teacher gives some feed back after students finish practicing; (5) Teacher gives chance to students to practice independently if they have mastered the material.

Besides the methods, the other thing that can affect the students’ speaking skill is the students’ self-esteem. Self-esteem is a person’s judgement of their own worth or value, based on a feeling of “efficacy”, a sense of interacting effectively with one’s own environment. Efficacy implies that some degree of control exists within oneself. Self-esteem is an affective variable in language learning and low self-esteem may negatively influence second language learning (Richards and Schmidt, 2010: 517).

Lawrence (2006: 5-6) states that self-esteem is the individual’s evaluation of the discrepancy between self-image and ideal self. From the discussion on the development of self-image and ideal self it can be appreciated that the discrepancy between the two is inevitable and so can be regarded as a normal phenomenon.

Self-esteem can be either global or specific and there is a relationship between these two facets of self-esteem. Global self-esteem refers to an allround feeling of self-worth and

confidence. Specific self-esteem refers to a feeling of self-worth and confidence with regard to a specific activity or behaviour.

From definition above it can be concluded that self-esteem is the way people respect themselves to be happy, worthy, respectful, efficacy, and confident in their ability to think and to cope with the challenges of life which are expressed in the activity or behavior.

The indicators of self-esteem are: believing to be successful, believing to be worthy, having high aspiration, believing to be capable, having great effort, and having persistence.

Based on the theoretical description, the hypotheses can be formulated as follows: (1) Talking chips method is more effective than instructional method to teach speaking at the first semester students of Institut Agama Islam Riyadlatul Mujahidin (IAIRM) Ponorogo; (2) The students who have high self-esteem have better speaking skill than the students who have low self-esteem at the first semester students of Institut Agama Islam Riyadlatul Mujahidin (IAIRM) Ponorogo; (3) There is an interaction effect between teaching methods and students' self-esteem on the students' speaking skill of the first semester students of Institut Agama Islam Riyadlatul Mujahidin (IAIRM) Ponorogo.

### Research Methodology

This research was conducted in Institut Agama Islam Riyadlatul Mujahidin (IAIRM) Ponorogo. This school is located in Ngabar Siman Ponorogo with phone number (0352) 311882, FAX. 312484.

Experimental study is chosen in conducting this research. The purpose of experimental study is to determine cause-and-effect relationship. Through experimentations, cause and effect relationship can be identified. Because of this ability to identify caution, the experimental approach has come to represent the prototype of scientific method for solving problems (Johnson and Christensen, 2000: 23).

The most appropriate experimental design of this research is a simple factorial design 2x2. This research design allows a researcher to study the interaction of an independent variable with one or more variables. This design is possible to assess the effect or interaction (Tuckman, 1978: 135). The factorial design is illustrated as follows:

Table 1. Factorial Design

		Main Effect	
		A <sub>1</sub>	A <sub>2</sub>
Simple Effect	B <sub>1</sub>	A <sub>1</sub> B <sub>1</sub>	A <sub>2</sub> B <sub>1</sub>
	B <sub>2</sub>	A <sub>1</sub> B <sub>2</sub>	A <sub>2</sub> B <sub>2</sub>
		A <sub>1</sub>	A <sub>2</sub>

The population of this research is the first semester students in Institut Agama Islam Riyadlatul Mujahidin (IAIRM) Ponorogo. The sample of this research came from two classes of first semester students in the academic year of 2019/2020. Then, the researcher assigned the two classes of the sample into the experimental group and the control group by using lottery.

The writer uses cluster random sampling to get the sample. Wiersma (2000: 279) states that cluster random sampling is a procedure of selection in which the unit of selection, called the cluster, contains two or more population members.

In this research, the writer uses cluster random sampling. There are 3 classes in this population. Each group in population has an equal chance of being included in the sample so that this sampling method can be used to produce representative samples. The writer chooses two classes, one as experimental class and the other one is control group by using lottery. The result is that X-D as the experiment group and X-A as the control group. In choosing the two classes, the classes are written in 3 piece of papers. Then, the three pieces of paper are put in a cup and two pieces of paper are taken from the cup. The first piece of paper that is taken from the cup is experimental group and the second one is control group.

There are two types in collecting the data namely, questionnaire and speaking test. The questionnaire is used to get the data of the students' self-esteem. The test is used to obtain the data of the students' speaking skill.

The writer uses a descriptive analysis and inferential analysis in this research. The descriptive analysis is used to know the mean, median, mode, and standard deviation of the score of speaking test. Normality and homogeneity test are used before testing the hypothesis. The data are analyzed using multifactor analysis of variance 2X2.  $H_0$  is rejected if  $F_0 > F_t$ . If  $H_0$  is rejected the analysis is continued by using Tukey test. The design of multifactor analysis of variance is as follows:

Table 2. Design of Multifactor Analysis of Variance

Method Self-esteem	Talking chips (A <sub>1</sub> )	Direct Instruction (A <sub>2</sub> )	
B <sub>1</sub>	A <sub>1</sub> B <sub>1</sub>	A <sub>2</sub> B <sub>1</sub>	B <sub>1</sub>
B <sub>2</sub>	A <sub>1</sub> B <sub>2</sub>	A <sub>2</sub> B <sub>2</sub>	B <sub>2</sub>
	A <sub>1</sub>	A <sub>2</sub>	

## The Result of the Study and Discussion

Hypothesis test is done after the result of normality and homogeneity test are fulfilled. The data analysis is done by using multifactor analysis of variance 2 x 2.  $H_0$  is rejected if  $F_o > F_t$ . It means that there is a significant difference and interaction. If  $H_0$  is rejected, the analysis is continued using Tukey test. The multifactor analysis of variance 2 x 2 and Tukey test are described below:

Table 3. Summary of Anova test (Multifactor Analysis of Variance)

Source of variance	SS	df	MS	$F_o$	$F_t(0.5)$
Between columns	148.23	1	148.23	5.862	4.08
Between rows	216.23	1	216.23	8.551	4.08
Column by rows (interaction)	1071.22	1	1071.22	42.364	4.08
Between groups	1435.67	3	478.558		
Within groups	910.30	36	<b>25.29</b>		
Total	2345.98	39			

Based on the table above, it can be interpreted that: (a) Because  $F_o$  between columns (5.862) is higher than  $F_t$  at the level of significance  $\alpha = 0.05$  (4.08),  $H_0$  is rejected and the difference between columns is significant. Because the mean of  $A_1$  (81.2) is higher than that of  $A_2$  (77.35), it can be concluded that Talking chips is more effective than Direct Instruction to teach speaking; (b) Because  $F_o$  between rows (8.551) is higher than  $F_t$  at the level of significance  $\alpha = 0.05$  (4.08),  $H_0$  is rejected and the difference between rows is significant. It can be concluded that the speaking skill of students who have high and those who have low self-esteem are significantly different. Then, because the mean of  $B_1$  (81.60) is higher than that of  $B_2$  (76.95), it can be concluded that the students having high self-esteem have better speaking skill than those having low self-esteem; (c) Because  $F_o$  columns by rows (42.364) is higher than  $F_t$  at the level of significance  $\alpha = 0.05$  (4.08),  $H_0$  is rejected and there is an interaction between teaching methods and students' self-esteem to teach speaking. Thus, it can be concluded that the effect of teaching methods on speaking skill depends on the degree of students' self-esteem.

The discussion of the theories is described in the following section:

- a. Talking chips is more effective than Direct Instruction.

The use of talking chips in teaching speaking helps students to practice speaking effectively. In Talking chips students not only learn and receive whatever the teacher teaches in the teaching learning process, but also learn from other students. Thus, Talking chips is suitably used in teaching speaking skill because the goal of teaching speaking is to make students able to communicate using English effectively. Talking chips makes students actively engaged in thinking with different questions and different partners, encourages community building among students while incorporating movement and interaction, and makes students feel safer or easier to enter into a discussion with another classmate rather than with a large group (Bennett, 2001:26). For whole class activity talking chips is best practices because using cooperative learning strategies involves smaller groups in a whole class activity. Provide students with opportunities to work collaboratively as a whole class. Encourage students to build on each others' ideas and strengths. This builds a sense of community in the classroom as students learn that everyone has something to contribute. Model and teach skills through student interactions with each other. Introduce different questioning strategies to help students learn to ask meaningful questions and understand what effective responses can provide (Alberta, 2001: 72-73). In addition, Barkly, et al. (2005: 23) put forward that talking chips makes students have better reasoning and communication skills than those taught in Direct Instruction. Therefore, it is undeniable that Talking chips makes students learn more actively and successfully in speaking class.

On the other hand, Direct Instruction is a teacher centered learning method. In this method, the teacher talks much about material to the class. The class listens, takes note of the facts and ideas worth remembering, and thinks over them. Carnine in Wisconsin (2001: 3-4) state that Direct Instruction is an approach to teaching. It is skills-oriented, and the teaching practices are teacher-directed. It emphasizes the use of small-group, face-to-face instruction by teachers and aides using carefully articulated lessons in which cognitive skills are broken down into small units, sequenced deliberately, and taught explicitly. Therefore, it can be concluded that talking chips is more effective than Direct Instruction to teach speaking.

- b. The students who have high self-esteem have better speaking skill than those who have low self-esteem

In speaking class, the students having high self-esteem are more active in the class discussion. They can work cooperatively and feel that they are worthy and able to give contribution to others. They have so high self-confidence that they face the task in learning

speaking with rationality, creativity, independence, flexibility, and optimism to be successful. Coopersmith in Brown (2000:103) confirms that one who has high self-esteem believes himself to be capable, significant, successful, and worthy. Page & Page in Baylor University's Community Mentoring for Adolescent Development (1992: 195) add that students who have high self-esteem: (1) are active, curious about surroundings; makes wide variety of contacts; (2) makes friends easily, talks and laughs; gets in trouble now and then; (3) have a sense of humor, is a good sport, can laugh at themselves; (4) asks questions, defines problems, willingly does his part in planning for solutions and carrying out plans; (5) are willing to take risks in a classroom, contributing to discussions, and is able to stand up for what they think; (6) take modest pride in own contributions; is not overbearing, and do not cheat; (7) work and play well with others, cooperate easily and naturally; and (8) are usually happy, confident; do not whine for what cannot be had.

On the contrary, the students who have low self-esteem have the opposite characteristics. They are reluctant to take great effort, pessimistic to be successful, tend to be passive, not creative, and having low aspiration. Page & Page in Baylor University's Community Mentoring for Adolescent Development (1992: 175) state that students having low self-esteem: (1) are mildly passive, tend to avoid new experiences, has limited contacts; (2) are shy, bashful, quiet, and withdrawn; (3) tend to be overly serious, hypersensitive; afraid to be laughed at; (4) avoid getting to the problem, grumbles that what is wanted is not clear, plans in terms of wishful thinking; (5) are unsure, backs down easily, frequently asks others: "Do you think this is right?" "What do you think?"; (6) are aggressively asserts own ability and contributions, finds it difficult to share; undermines others when possible; (7) are overly competitive, finds it difficult to share. Undermines others when possible; (8) are usually gloomy and fearful, worries as a matter of course, complains a lot. They often face the tasks in learning with fear, complaint, and tend to be passive, not creative, and less motivated. Lawrence (2006: 8-9) state that the child with low self-esteem, will lack confidence in his/her ability to succeed. Consequently, he/she may try to avoid situations which he/she sees as potentially personally humiliating. In the words of the famous philosopher and psychologist. Are explained why some students prefer doing nothing even though knowing they are likely to incur the teacher's displeasure. To be punished and perhaps be seen as something of a hero by their peers is better than to be seen to be foolish. The child is more likely to withdraw and demonstrate the shy, timid behaviour which common sense immediately tells us is an indication of low self-esteem. It is very hard for the students who have low self-esteem to improve their

speaking skill successfully. Therefore, it can be concluded that the students having high self-esteem have better speaking skill than those having low self-esteem.

c. There is an interaction between teaching methods and students' self-esteem

Teaching method used by the teacher gives a big influence on the success of the teaching and learning process. In teaching speaking, the teacher also needs to find a suitable method that can motivate the students to join the class actively. Unlike direct instruction, which tends to be teacher-centered and makes the students passive in learning process, talking chips encourages student-centered activities and the student are more active in acquiring the academic content.

Cooperative activities in Talking chips require the students to be actively involved in the discussion, to show their competence and responsibility to find out and share the ideas, to learn to help each other and to be accepted by others in order to achieve a success together. Stenlev (2003: 34-36) state that the foundation of cooperative learning is structures. They are: team building, class building, mastery, thinking skills, information sharing, and communication skills. The structures constantly clarify the task of each student in the interaction with the team. And they make each student indispensable. This completely changes the patterns of activity in a class. Situations no longer arise where students can feel his or her contribution is irrelevant. Everyone is listened to and taken seriously. This enhances self-esteem and self-esteem enhances motivation. To accomplish such activities successfully requires the students who have high self-esteem. They believe themselves to be capable of finishing the task, to be successful people, to be worthy for others. They also have high aspiration in their lives, make great effort, and have high persistence in their daily activities. Bandura in Cloninger (2009: 355) states that high self-esteem leads to effort and persistence at a task and setting high goals. Atwater (1990: 155) states that students having high level of self-esteem expect to do well in their accomplishments and try to be successful. Therefore, talking chips is effective to teach speaking to the students having high self-esteem.

On the contrary, the direct instruction is highly teacher directed and is among the most commonly used. This strategy includes methods such as lecture, didactic questioning, explicit teaching, practice and drill, and demonstrations. In this method the teacher becomes the decision maker. Person, Hinson, and Brown (2001: 11) say the teacher will be engaged in many planning decisions, such as deciding what he/she would like to teach, he/she wishes to teach, about and how he/she will go about the speaking process. It is highly structured and teacher-directed. The teacher's control occurs when the teacher

selects and directs the learning tasks. The direct instruction is effective for providing information or developing step by step skills. Such a method of teaching is preferred by students who have low self-esteem because they are reluctant to take a great effort, pessimistic to be successful in learning. They also don't have strong confidence to cope with the given tasks, often face the tasks in learning with fear, and tend to be passive. Biggs and Watkins (1995: 75) state that people having low self-esteem tend to produce the expected poor results or failure, cease to try, feel helpless, and even produce high anxiety and depression. Lawrence (2006: 14) states that on common-sense grounds one would expect children with high self-esteem to do better in class than children with low self-esteem. Obviously, ability is an essential factor in the achievement equation. However, it is clear that children will not use their full ability if their self-esteem is low. Since direct instruction and students having low self-esteem have a suitable characteristic, direct instruction is suitable to teach speaking for students who have low self-esteem.

Therefore, there is an interaction between teaching methods and self-esteem toward students' speaking skill. Talking chips is more effective than direct instruction to teach speaking for students having high self-esteem. In the other words, talking chips is suitable for students having high self-esteem. Meanwhile, direct instruction is more effective than talking chips to teach speaking for students having low self-esteem. In the other words, direct instruction is suitable for students having low self-esteem.

### **Conclusion and Implication**

Based on the description of the data analysis, some findings are as follows: (1) Talking chips is more effective than Direct Instruction to teach speaking to the students of the first semester students of Institut Agama Islam Riyadlatul Mujahidin (IAIRM) Ponorogo in the academic year of 2019/2020; (2) The students having high self-esteem have better speaking skill than those having low self-esteem to the students of the first semester students of Institut Agama Islam Riyadlatul Mujahidin (IAIRM) Ponorogo in the academic year of 2019/2020; (3) There is an interaction between teaching methods and the students' self-esteem to teach speaking to the students of the first semester students of Institut Agama Islam Riyadlatul Mujahidin (IAIRM) Ponorogo in the academic year of 2019/2020.

Based on the above findings, it can be concluded that Talking chips is an effective method to teach speaking to the first semester students of Institut Agama Islam Riyadlatul Mujahidin (IAIRM) Ponorogo in the academic year of 2019/2020. The effectiveness of the methods is influenced by the students' level of self-esteem.

Based on the conclusion above, Talking chips is proved as an effective method to teach speaking. In order to achieve a good result, it must be applied properly in the teaching-learning process. The procedures of Talking chips are: (1) the class is divided into several groups in which the group members stand in pairs in two concentric circles with the inside circle facing out and the outside circle facing in; (2) all pairs, the original pairs, work cooperatively as the expert pairs to prepare the answers to share with their new partners in the next rotation; (3) after the original pairs finish their tasks, the outside partners rotate to their right or to their left to form a new pair with the inside partners who remain in their position, then they share each other's answers got from their own original pairs; (4) rotation is done repeatedly until they meet their own original partners again, which means that each member gets the whole answers to the given tasks/question; (5) they discuss in their group to check their answers; and (6) each group presents the answers in the class discussion. Here, the teacher facilitates the discussion and gives confirmation on the answers presented by the groups so that the conclusion can be made.

## References

- A. L. Chaney and T. L. Burke. 1998. *Teaching Oral Communication in Grades K-8*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Alan, Colburn. 2003. *The lingo learning*. USA: Viction Graphics.Inc.
- Anita Lie. 2005. *Cooperative Larning: Mempraktikkan Pembelajaran Kooperatif di Ruang-ruang Kelas*. Jakarta: Grasindo.
- Arends, Richard I. 2012. *Learning to Teach Ninth Edition*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Atwater, Eastwood. 1990. *Psychology of Adjustment: Personal Growth in a Changing World*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Bailey, Kathleen M. 2005. *Practical English Language Teaching Speaking*. New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Barkly, Elizabeth F., Cross, K. P., and Major, Claire Howell. 2005. *Collaborative Learning Techniques*. San Fransisco: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Baylor University's Community Mentoring for Adolescent Development. 1992. *SELF-AWARENESS Emotional Well-Being, Self-Esteem, and Self-Actualization*.
- Bennet, B and C Rolheiser. 2001. *Beyond Monet: The Artful Sience of Intructional Integration*. Toronto, Ontario: Bookation.

- Biggs, John and Watkins, David. 1995. *Classroom Learning*. Sydney: Prentice Hall of Australia Pty. Limited.
- Brown, H. Douglas. 2000. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New York: Longman.
- Brown, H. Douglas. 2004. *Language Assessment Principle and Classroom Practice*. New York: Longman
- Brown, H. Douglas. 2001. *Teaching by Principle (An interactive Approach to language pedagogy)*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Brown, H. Douglas. 1994. *Principle of Language Teaching and Learning*. San Francisco: Practice Hall Regents.
- Bygate, M. 1997. *Speaking*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Byrne, Donn. 1997. *Teaching Oral English*. Harlow England: Longman Group.
- Christensen, Larry and Johnson Burke. 2000. *Educational Research Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. USA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Cloninger, Susan C. 2009. *Theories of Personality: Understanding Person 5<sup>th</sup> Ed.* New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Gower, R., Philips, D., Walter, S. 1995. *Teaching Practice*. Oxford: Heineman.
- Gunter, Estes, Schwab. 2003. Instruction, a models approach, 4<sup>th</sup> edition, [http://www.lifeisastoryproblem.org/lesson/mdl\\_dir\\_instr.html](http://www.lifeisastoryproblem.org/lesson/mdl_dir_instr.html)
- Hornby. 1995. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Howard, C.C. 2003. *Inside Outside Circle. TIPS: Section 4 – TIPS for Teachers © Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2003 Page 14* (Online). Retrieved from <http://www.howardcc.edu/profdev/resources/learning/groups1>. Html, accessed 9 January 2012.
- Kagan, Spencer., and Kagan, Miguel. 2009. *Kagan Cooperative Learning*. Kagan Publishing.
- Kotzen, Richie S. 1991. *Inside Outside Circle: West Virginia Department of Education* (Online). Retrieved from <http://wvde.state.wv.us/strategybank/>. Html, accessed 8 June 2012.
- Lawrence, Denis. 2006. *Enhancing Self-Esteem in the Classroom Third Edition*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Mayer, J.D. 1991. *Cooperative Problem Solving: Shared Pair Circle (Inside Outside Circle)* (Online). Retrieved from <http://www.clcrc.com/pages/overviewpaper>. Html, accessed on 6 June 2012.

- Richards, Jack C., and Schmidt, Richard. 2010. *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics First Edition*. London: Pearson Education Limited.
- Schug , Mark C., Tarver, Sara G., Western., Richard D. 2001. *Direct instruction and the teaching of early reading, Wisconsin's Teacher-Led Insurgency*. Volume 14, Number 2.
- Stenlev, Jette. 2003. *Cooperative Learning in foreign language teaching*. Sprogforum nummer 25.
- Tuchman, Bruce W. 1978. *Conducting Educational Research*. New York: Harcourt Brace Javanovich, inch.
- Widdowson, H. G. 1996. *Teaching Language as Communication*. Hong Kong: Oxford University press.
- Wiersma, William. 2000. *Research Methods in Education: An Introduction. Seventh edition*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.