INTEGRATED TALKING CHIPS WITH THINK PAIR SHARE TO PROMOTE STUDENTS' SPEAKING ACHIEVEMENT AND SELF-EFFICACY

A THESIS

By:

Ade Nurul Fadillah

MASTER OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING STUDY PROGRAM
LANGUAGE AND ARTS EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
FACULTY OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF LAMPUNG
2025

ABSTRACT

INTEGRATED TALKING CHIPS WITH THINK PAIR SHARE TO PROMOTE STUDENTS' SPEAKING ACHIEVEMENT AND SELF-EFFICACY

By

Ade Nurul Fadillah

The study aimed to (1) determine whether there was a significant difference in students' speaking achievement between those taught by using the Talking Chips strategy and those taught using the Integrated Talking Chips strategy with Think-Pair-Share (TPS), (2) identify which aspect of speaking improved the most in the experimental class, and (3) examine students' self-efficacy in speaking after the implementation of integrated strategy in the experimental class. The research used a true-experimental design with a pre-test and post-test, involving 72 tenth-grade students at SMKN 1 Bandar Lampung. The students were divided into a control group (Talking Chips) and an experimental group (Integrated Talking Chips with Think-Pair-Share). Data were analyzed using SPSS 16.0.

The results showed that (1) the difference between the two groups was not statistically significant ($p = 0.497$). However, both groups improved significantly in speaking achievement. The control group's mean score increased from 56.50 (pre-test) to 64.69 (post-test), resulting in a gain of 8.19 points with an N-Gain% of 18.83%. Meanwhile, the experimental group's mean score increased from 59.42 (pre-test) to 65.75 (post-test), with a gain of 6.33 points and an N-Gain% of 15.60%. (2) Among the five speaking aspects, comprehension showed the highest improvement, while fluency improved the least. (3) The self-efficacy questionnaire revealed that most students had moderate to high self-efficacy, though some still lacked confidence. These findings suggest that while the integrated strategy enhanced all speaking aspects—particularly comprehension and self-efficacy—it did not demonstrate a significant advantage over the original strategy in overall speaking achievement.

Keywords: **Talking Chips, Think-Pair-Share, Speaking Achievement, Self-efficacy**

INTEGRATED TALKING CHIPS WITH THINK PAIR SHARE TO PROMOTE STUDENTS' SPEAKING ACHIEVEMENT AND SELF-EFFICACY

By

Ade Nurul Fadillah

A Thesis

Submitted in a Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for S-2 Degree

in

Language and Arts Education Department
Teacher Training and Education Faculty

MASTER OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING STUDY PROGRAM
LANGUAGE AND ARTS EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
FACULTY OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF LAMPUNG
2025

Research Title	:	**INTEGRATED TALKING CHIPS WITH THINK PAIR SHARE TO PROMOTE STUDENTS' SPEAKING ACHIEVEMENT AND SELF-EFFICACY**
Student's Name	:	Ade Nurul Fadillah
Student's Number	:	2323042025
Study Program:	:	Master in English Language Teaching
Department	:	Language and Arts Education
Faculty	:	Teacher Training and Education

APPROVED BY

Advisory Committee

Advisor	Co-Advisor
Dr. Muhammad Sukirlan, M.A.	**Dr. Budi Kadaryanto, M.A.**
NIP 19641212 199003 1 003	NIP 19810326 200501 1 002

The Chairperson of the Department of Language and Arts Education	The Chairperson of Master in English Language Teaching
Dr. Sumarti, S. Pd., M.Hum.	**Mahpul, M.A., Ph. D.**
NIP 19700318 199403 2 002	NIP 19650706 199403 1 002

ADMITTED BY

1. **Examination Committee**

Chairperson	**: Dr. Muhammad Sukirlan, M.A**	.....
Secretary	**: Dr. Budi Kadaryanto, M.A.**	.....
Examiner	**: 1. Prof. Ujang Suparman, M.A., Ph.D**	.....
	: 2. Dr. Feni Munifatullah, M.Hum.	.....

2. **Dean of Teacher Training and Education Faculty**

Dr. Albet Maydiantoro, M.Pd.
NIP 19870504 201404 1 001

3. **Director of Postgraduate Program**

Prof. Dr. Ir. Murhadi, M.Si.
NIP 19640326 198902 1 001

Graduated on : March 10th, 2025

LEMBAR PERNYATAAN

Dengan ini saya menyatakan dengan sebenarnya bahwa:

1. Tesis dengan judul "Integrated Talking Chips with Think Pair Share to Promote Students' Speaking Achievement and Self-Efficacy" adalah hasil karya sendiri dan tidak melakukan penjiplakan atau pengutipan karya penulis lain dengan tidak sesuai dengan tata etika ilmiah yang berlaku dalam masyarakat akademik atau yang disebut dengan plagiarism.
2. Hak intelektual atas karya ilmiah ini diserahkan sepenuhnya kepada Universitas Lampung.

Atas pernyataan ini, apabila dikemudian hari ternyata ditemukan adanya ketidakbenaran, saya bersedia menanggung akibat dan sanksi yang diberikan kepada saya, saya bersedia dan sanggup dituntut sesuai hukum yang berlaku.

Bandar Lampung, 2 Mei 2025

Yang membuat pernyataan,

Ade Nurul Fadillah

NPM.2323042025

CURRICULUM VITAE

Ade Nurul Fadillah, born on February 9, 2000, in Bandar Lampung, is the second daughter of Ir. Akmad Rizal and Endang Widyastuti, S.T.

Her educational journey began at SD Al-Azhar 1 Bandar Lampung. She then continued her studies at MTsN 1 Tanjung Karang before completing her high school education at MAN 1 Bandar Lampung. In 2017, she was accepted into UIN Raden Intan Lampung, majoring in English Education.

She started her teaching career as a private English tutor in 2020 and has continued in this role ever since. In 2023, she expanded her professional experience by joining PT Ruang Raya Indonesia as a Master Teacher of English, where she remains actively involved in language education. After dedicating several years to teaching since earning her undergraduate degree, she further pursued her academic aspirations by enrolling in the Master of English Education Program at Lampung University in 2023.

DEDICATION

All praise and gratitude are solely for Allah SWT, whose infinite mercy and countless blessings continue to guide and strengthen His servant.

I proudly dedicate this thesis to the following:

- My deepest gratitude goes to my parents, Ir. Akmad Rizal and Endang Widyastuti, S.T., whose unwavering support, love, and encouragement have been the foundation of my journey. Your belief in me has given me the strength to keep moving forward.
- To my siblings, Latifah Ida Kurniati, S.M., and Widya Nurhasanah, S.P., thank you for your constant support and motivation, which have inspired me throughout this academic pursuit.
- To my esteemed mentors and lecturers, I am truly grateful for your invaluable guidance and dedication. Your insights and encouragement have played a significant role in shaping my knowledge and skills
- To my dearest friends, Fahri, Sasti and Saskia, your support, laughter, and companionship have made this journey so much more enjoyable. Thank you for always being there through every challenge and celebration.
- To my treasured friends Nada, Dwi, Aulia, Nur Azizah, Elany, and other friends of MPBI 23, thank you for your companionship and the memories we share.
- To my almamater, the University of Lampung, I extend my sincere appreciation for being the place where I have grown academically and professionally.

MOTTO

"*Indeed, with hardship comes ease."*

Surah Al-Insyirah (Verses 6)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer expresses her deepest gratitude to Allah SWT, the Most Gracious and Most Merciful, for His endless blessings, which have guided her throughout life and enabled her to complete this thesis. Shalawat and salaam are sincerely sent to the most noble of individuals, Prophet Muhammad SAW.

This thesis, entitled *"Integrated Talking Chips with Think Pair Share to Promote Students' Speaking Achievement and Self-Efficacy"*, is submitted to the Master in English Language Teaching Study Program of the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education at Lampung University, as a requirement for the fulfillment of the S2 degree.

The writer acknowledges that the completion of this thesis would not have been possible without the support, encouragement, and assistance of many kind and generous individuals. With heartfelt sincerity, she wishes to express her deepest gratitude and utmost respect to:

1. **Dr. Muhammad Sukirlan, M.A.**, the advisor, for his invaluable guidance, insightful advice, and continuous encouragement throughout the thesis writing process.
2. **Dr. Budi Kadaryanto, M.A.**, the co-advisor, for his constructive feedback, thoughtful input, and unwavering support, which played a crucial role in shaping this study.
3. **Prof. Ujang Suparman, M.A., Ph.D.**, the first examiner, for his valuable insights and critical suggestions that enriched this thesis significantly.
4. **Dr. Feni Munifatullah, M.Hum.**, the second examiner, for her detailed feedback and valuable recommendations, which enhanced the quality of this research.
5. **Mahpul, M.A., Ph.D.**, Head of the Master in English Language Teaching Study Program, for his guidance, motivation, and constructive feedback during the thesis defense.

6. **The lecturers of the Master in English Language Teaching Study Program at Lampung University**, for sharing their knowledge, experience, and continuous support throughout this academic journey.
7. **The writer's beloved parents and family**—Ibu, Bapak, Mba Nia dan Adek Wid—whose endless love, prayers, and unwavering support—both emotionally and financially—have been the greatest source of strength in completing this study.
8. **The students of SMKN 1 Bandar Lampung, particularly X MPLB 2 and X MPLB 3**, for their enthusiasm, participation, and cooperation in this study.
9. **The writer's closest friends**, **Sasti, Saskia, Fahri, Nada, Dwi, Aul, Nur Aziza, Elany, and MPBI batch 23**, for their unwavering support, prayers, encouragement, and companionship throughout this journey.
10. **Everyone who, in any way, has contributed to this research**, whose kindness and support, though not mentioned by name, are deeply appreciated.

The writer acknowledges the limitations within this study and welcomes constructive input and suggestions for improvements that can guide future research.

Bandar Lampung, 2 Mei 2025

The writer

Ade Nurul Fadillah

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter concerns with introduction of the research dealing with background of the problems, the research questions, the objectives of the research, uses of the research, scope of the research, and definition of terms.

1.1. Background

Speaking is a skill that involves the verbal exchange of thoughts and emotions (Safitri & Weda, 2022). However, students often find speaking challenging as it necessitates both accuracy and fluency. In communicative language classes, the pursuit of fluency and accuracy aims to guide students in focusing on the phonological, grammatical, and discursive aspects of their spoken output (Haryudin & Jamilah, 2018). Speaking is a directly observable productive skill, adding to the perceived difficulty some students face in learning English, especially in terms of speaking (Brown, 2004).

Speaking skill allow individuals to express their opinions and convey messages tailored to their listeners' needs. Students can share their ideas and build good relationships with others. The primary purpose of speaking skill is communication. Generally, speaking aims to inform, entertain, and persuade. In other words, the function of speaking is to communicate our ideas and feelings with others. It plays a crucial role in communication, enabling individuals to freely express their thoughts, feelings, and opinions.

On the other hand, speaking is a fundamental skill that students must master while learning English as a foreign language. Therefore, speaking is not just a means of communication but also enables students to demonstrate their proficiency in speaking specifically. To effectively develop speaking skills in students learning English as a foreign language, it is crucial to understand the challenges they face. (Farhana et al. 2018)

Prasetyaningrum and Azima (2021) illustrate that various factors contribute to students' difficulties in speaking, particularly when introducing themselves. These factors include a limited vocabulary, difficulty in articulating words accurately, a lack of confidence in self-presentation, and insufficient practice in English speaking. Students view speaking as more demanding than reading, writing, or listening for two primary reasons. Firstly, speaking is an inherent part of daily life, and the person engaged in the interaction typically expects an immediate initiation of the conversation. Secondly, unlike writing, speaking does not afford the opportunity of editing and rewriting to refine the intended expressions (Syafiq et al. 2021). According to Harmer (2007), in order to achieve fluency and clarity in English speaking, students must possess the ability to articulate words accurately and communicate without grammatical errors. Therefore, mastering speaking competency is essential not only for communication but also for demonstrating proficiency in English.

Krashen (1982) identifies both internal and external factors contributing to students' speaking challenges. Internal factors include talent, confidence, character, thinking style, and perceptions, while external factors involve teachers, environment, and habits. Senior high school students also face these issues, particularly with

confidence during speaking tasks and their interest in reading, which affects their ability to manage opinions and arguments. These challenges relate to self-efficacy, defined by Feist (2011) as the belief in one's ability to perform actions. According to Bandura (1995), self-efficacy is the belief in one's ability to successfully complete a task. This theory indicates that individuals will attempt tasks they believe they can accomplish and avoid those they fear they will fail. A person with high self-efficacy feels confident in handling challenging tasks, while someone with low self-efficacy doubts their capabilities. This suggests that when students are convinced that they can communicate effectively in spoken English spontaneously, they will perform the task to the best of their ability. Consequently, self-efficacy influences students to strive to fulfill their beliefs about their capabilities, leading them to put in maximum effort to achieve their goals.

Self-efficacy has three dimensions: level, generality, and strength (Bijl & Shortridge-Baggett, 2001). The level dimension concerns task difficulty perception, with high self-efficacy individuals tackling difficult tasks and persisting, while low self-efficacy individuals struggle with easier tasks. Generality pertains to confidence across various areas, with high self-efficacy individuals excelling in multiple fields. Strength refers to the effort put into achieving goals, with strong self-efficacy individuals persevering despite difficulties and weak self-efficacy individuals giving up easily.

Lisnawati et al. (2019) on their research, Student’s Self-Efficacy in Speaking Learning, states that the effort that can be done by lecturers to improve student self-efficacy is to internalize and develop student’s self-efficacy in an integrated manner in learning, both in pre-activity, core activities (preparation steps, presentation

practice steps, speech/presentation steps and step evaluation steps), and post-activity learning through various sources of self-efficacy, namely (1) mastery experience, (2) representative experience, (3) verbal persuasion or social persuasion, and (4) physiological conditions and affective in accordance with the conditions and needs of students.

Furthermore, Mohammed (2021) states that not only all the sources in Bandura's theory were found among Saudi EFL students, but also, they differ greatly according to each one's proficiency experience and social persuasion. Additionally, it was found due to other factors as self-employed strategies and intellectual ability. Thus, the study recommends that it is important to warm-up students with advance activities to ease the positivity and overcome their negativity towards speaking skill. Finally, the study recommends conducting further research targeting a largest number of students for the purpose of studying speaking skill preferences in relation to other English language skills.

Based on the previous studies related to students' speaking problems and self-efficacy, it is evident that students' confidence levels significantly impact their ability to effectively learn and use spoken English. In conducting research on speaking skills and self-efficacy among high school students, selecting the right institution is crucial for obtaining meaningful and reliable data. Therefore, the researcher chose SMKN 1 Bandar Lampung as the sample for her study for several compelling reasons. SMKN 1 Bandar Lampung is renowned for its strong academic and vocational programs, ensuring a high level of participation and commitment from both students and staff, which can lead to more reliable and meaningful research results. The school offers a variety of vocational programs, providing a

diverse sample of students from different fields of study, enriching the research with insights across various disciplines. With access to better resources, technology, facilities, and trained teachers, the implementation of research interventions will be smoother. The supportive environment from both administrative and teaching staff, coupled with the school's central location, makes it easily accessible for regular visits and data collection. Additionally, the large student population provides a substantial sample size, enhancing the validity and reliability of the findings. SMKN 1 Bandar Lampung's previous collaborations with educational research projects also suggest a familiarity with research protocols, further facilitating the study.

In fact, at SMKN 1 Bandar Lampung, there are seven majors namely Office Administration *(Perkantoran)*, Animation (*Animasi*), Visual Communication Design (*DKV*), Fashion (*Busana*), Culinary (*Kuliner*), Marketing (*Pemasaran*), and Computer and Network Engineering (*Teknik Komputer Jaringan*). The decision to focus on students from the Office Administration major at SMKN 1 Bandar Lampung was driven by several key reasons that highlight its importance within English language education and vocational training.

Firstly, Office Administration students often struggle with spoken English proficiency, a critical skill for roles requiring clear communication in offices and customer service. This challenge is distinct from majors like Animation and Visual Communication Design, which emphasize visual skills over verbal fluency. Secondly, addressing these challenges is crucial for global workplace readiness, particularly in administrative roles. Improving students' speaking skills prepares them for real-world communication scenarios and enhances their career prospects.

Thirdly, these students are motivated to improve practical English skills relevant to their career goals. Their coursework focuses on office tasks and interpersonal communication, making enhanced speaking proficiency directly applicable to their future roles. Lastly, studying speaking skills and self-efficacy among Office Administration students informs effective teaching strategies tailored to vocational contexts, enriching English education practices and curriculum development.

Focusing on Office Administration students at SMKN 1 Bandar Lampung is crucial because they face unique challenges with spoken English, essential for office roles compared to majors focusing on visual skills. Improving their speaking skills enhances readiness for global workplaces, particularly in administrative roles, and boosts career prospects. Studying their speaking skills informs tailored teaching strategies, benefiting both English education and vocational training.

To gain a deeper understanding of these challenges in a specific context, the researcher conducted an informal interview with one of the English teacher at SMKN 1 Bandar Lampung, who teaches first-grade students in the Office Administration major (now advancing to the second grade), provided valuable insights into the specific speaking problems her students encounter. At SMKN 1 Bandar Lampung, particularly in the Office Administration (*Perkantoran)* major, these students face several challenges in developing their speaking skills in English as highlighted by the teacher.

Firstly, many students lack confidence, feeling apprehensive and fearful of making mistakes when attempting to articulate sentences in English, often resulting in poor pronunciation. Secondly, there is a noticeable limitation in their vocabulary, which

hampers their ability to express themselves effectively. Additionally, they often find it challenging to maintain a coherent flow of ideas while speaking, leading to fragmented or disjointed speech. Another significant challenge is their difficulty in practicing English in real-life contexts or daily conversations, which prevents them from applying what they have learned in a practical setting.

Moreover, there is a lack of motivation among students, which further exacerbates their difficulties in mastering spoken English. These issues were intricately linked to their self-efficacy, as students with low self-efficacy were less likely to believe in their ability to successfully communicate in English. This lack of confidence and belief in their capabilities hinders their progress and willingness to engage in speaking tasks, ultimately affecting their overall proficiency in English. Furthermore, students struggle with comprehension, making it difficult for them to understand spoken English, respond appropriately in conversations, and follow discussions effectively. This low comprehension level affects their ability to process information in real-time, leading to hesitation and miscommunication.

Based on the challenges highlighted at SMKN 1 Bandar Lampung, particularly in the Office Administration major, there was a clear correlation between students' speaking problems and self-efficacy. Students who lack confidence in their speaking abilities (low self-efficacy) are more likely to experience difficulties in speaking tasks. This lack of confidence can stem from various factors such as limited vocabulary, difficulty articulating words, low comprehension skills and a fear of making mistakes.

On the other hand, students with high self-efficacy, as observed by their English teacher, are more likely to approach speaking tasks with confidence and are therefore better able to express themselves effectively. These students are more willing to take risks in their speaking, which can lead to greater fluency and proficiency over time. Overall, self-efficacy plays a crucial role in determining students' success in speaking English. Teachers can help improve students' self-efficacy by providing a supportive learning environment, giving constructive feedback, and encouraging students to practice speaking regularly.

Therefore, the researcher chose 10th grade students for her further research over 11th or 12th grade students due to their pivotal position in academic development. At this stage, students are transitioning from basic to more advanced cognitive skills, making it an ideal time to introduce and evaluate new teaching strategies. Targeting 10th graders allows the study to address foundational skills that are crucial for their future academic success. Implementing effective interventions now can build a strong base, improving their performance as they advance through high school. By focusing on this grade, the research aims to establish strategies that will positively impact their learning journey and prepare them for more complex concepts in subsequent years.

According to Koran (2017), teachers can assist students in learning to speak and overcoming language difficulty by taking on a range of roles, including feedback provider, organizer, facilitator, prompter, motivator, and participant. Teaching speaking skills requires innovative approaches to enhance students' fluency and clarity in their spoken language. Many research studies have explored various teaching strategies in the field of English language instruction. Among these

strategies is the Talking Chips approach, which falls under the category of cooperative strategies. This strategy is designed to enhance students' ability to collaborate within their groups and also develop their speaking proficiency. Moreover, the Talking Chips technique is regarded as a student-centered learning model that lends itself well to placing learners at the forefront of their educational experience as they actively seek and engage with the subject matter. Due to these benefits, this study aims to assess the impact of the Talking Chips strategy on enhancing students' speaking abilities.

This study seeks to implement the Talking Chips technique in speaking instruction to determine its effectiveness in improving students' speaking achievement. The Talking Chips Technique is a teaching method that captivates students' interest and aids in their speaking development (Kagan & Kagan, 2009). This approach achieves this by fostering three key aspects: (1) encouraging active participation in the classroom, (2) promoting collaborative learning in groups, and (3) providing opportunities for students to engage in spoken English.

Talking Chips is a speaking teaching strategy that facilitates group work among language learners. This strategy is effective in ensuring more equitable participation among team members, ensuring that all individuals have equal opportunities to engage in the discussion. In its implementation, the English teacher distributes an equal number of chips to each team member (typically, two chips per student). When a team member contributes an idea, they place a chip in the center of the table. Once all the chips have been used, the member must wait until others have also used their chips before contributing again. The chips are then redistributed, and

a new round begins. This strategy is designed to encourage students to collaborate and support one another while honing their problem-solving skills.

Nisa et al. (2015) find that the Talking Chips Technique significantly improved students' speaking ability, as evidenced by the increase in mean scores from 60 to 73.3 from the pre-test to the post-test. The most notable improvement was in comprehension, with scores rising from 12.6 to 15.8. The T-test confirmed the significance of these results ($p < 0.05$, $p = .000$). Therefore, they assume that the Talking Chips Technique is an effective method for enhancing students' speaking skills.

In line with that, Jasim (2017) in his research find that the Talking Chips technique significantly enhances students' speaking skills by fostering better interaction with both teachers and peers, especially during pair and group activities. This method maximizes opportunities for students to speak during English lessons, promoting beneficial student-student interactions. Additionally, it encourages students to practice the target language receptively through various tasks, focusing on communication rather than language forms. As a result, students learn to concentrate on conveying their intended meaning, making the learning process more effective and engaging.

Hence, the employment of the Talking Chips strategy is viewed as a suitable approach for enhancing students' speaking skills. However, it is important to note that, like many strategies, the Talking Chips approach does have its share of drawbacks. There are several disadvantages associated with this strategy (Gray et al. 2010). They note that, because the method regulates participation, it can

potentially disrupt the natural conversational flow. This can lead the discussions feeling forced and artificial. Additionally, effective time management is essential during both preparation and implementation to ensure the quality of learning, particularly when it comes to building students' understanding. Lastly, it is worth mentioning that the Talking Chips model demands somewhat intricate preparations.

In the other side, there is also other technique which is suitable for speaking skill that is Think Pair Share. The "Think-Pair-Share" technique, as introduced by Lyman (1981) in Barkley et al. (2014), is structured around three key steps: thinking, pairing, and sharing. This approach offers all students the opportunity to engage in discussions, which is crucial because it allows students to begin building their knowledge through these interactions. It also helps them identify what they do and do not know. The applicability of the Think Pair Share method extends to all subjects in the curriculum and is limited only by the teacher's creativity.

Think Pair Share is an instructional approach designed to customize learning experiences by allowing students both time and a structured framework for engaging in critical thinking about a particular subject. It empowers them to think independently before sharing their thoughts with a peer. This educational strategy encourages active classroom participation, fostering a high level of engagement among students. The Think Pair Share process begins with the teacher introducing a problem or topic, after which students are given time to contemplate the issue on an individual basis. Following this, they collaborate in pairs to tackle the problem, with pairing based on their seating arrangement. Those in pairs are tasked with sharing their ideas to collectively arrive at a comprehensive solution for the problem or topic presented by the teacher. Ultimately, students are expected to present their

thoughts to the entire class. Generally, one representative from each pair is given the opportunity to articulate and convey their ideas. This versatile strategy can be applied to various daily classroom activities, including concept reviews, quiz reviews, partner reading, topic development, and more.

Marhaeni et al. (2013) state that the Think Pair Share strategy significantly enhances students' self-confidence and speaking competency compared to conventional teaching methods. Students taught using TPS had a higher mean self-confidence score (145.81) and speaking competency score (23.64) than those taught with conventional strategies, which had mean scores of 109.31 and 19.34, respectively. Additionally, the statistical analysis using Pillai's Trace, Wilks's Lambda, Hotelling's Trace, and Roy's Largest Root confirmed that the effects of TPS on both self-confidence and speaking competency were significant ($p < 0.05$). Therefore, TPS effectively improves these aspects for second-grade students at SMPN 6 Singaraja.

In line with that, Sari et al. (2018) in their research, Incorporating Think Pair Share technique to improve students' participation and writing achievement, find that there was a positive effect in the students' writing achievement and their participation after the implementation of incorporating think pair share technique in teaching writing. The findings prove that the implementation of think pair share technique gave benefits succesfully in improving students' writing achievement and producing the constructive and promotive participation. According to Lyman in Berkeley et al. (2014), the disadvantages of Think Pair Share are difficulties in achieving equal participation, problem may arise when the number of students is not even, and time consuming.

Based on the explanation above, The Talking Chips strategy, while useful for regulating participation, can disrupt conversational flow and requires intricate preparations. Integrating the Think-Pair-Share strategy can address these drawbacks by allowing individual thinking, paired sharing, and group discussion, leading to more natural conversations and efficient time management. Think Pair Share, however, can lead to unequal participation and disorganized discussions, issues that Talking Chips mitigates by ensuring equal opportunity and structured turn-taking.

Together, these strategies balance participation and significantly enhance students' self-efficacy. By fostering deeper thinking through Think Pair Share and ensuring everyone's ideas are heard with Talking Chips, students gain confidence in their abilities to contribute meaningfully. This combination creates an engaging and inclusive classroom environment where students feel valued and capable, thus boosting their self-efficacy in academic discussions.

In line with the background above, it can be stated that this study is aimed to investigate whether the implementation of integrated Talking Chips with Think Pair Share technique in teaching can improve student’s speaking achievement or not, to know which aspect of speaking that improve the most after the implementation of an integrated Talking Chips strategy with Think Pair Share, and to explore how is the students’ self-efficacy in speaking after being taught using the Integrated Talking Chips strategy combined with the Think Pair Share strategy.

1.2. Research Question

Addressing the issues outlined in the background, this study aims to answer the following research questions:

1. Is there any significant difference of students' speaking achievement between those who are taught through Talking Chips strategy and those who are taught through Integrated Talking Chips strategy with Think Pair Share strategy?

2. Which aspect of speaking that improve the most after the implementation of an integrated Talking Chips strategy with Think Pair Share strategy?

3. How does the use of the Integrated Talking Chips and Think Pair Share strategy influence students' self-efficacy in speaking?

1.3. Objectives

In response to the problems mentioned above, this research aims to achieve the following objectives:

1. To find out wheter there is any significant difference of students' speaking achievement between those who are taught through Talking Chips strategy and those who are taught through Integrated Talking Chips strategy with Think Pair Share strategy.

2. To reveal which aspect of speaking that improve the most after the implementation of an integrated Talking Chips strategy with Think Pair Share strategy.

3. To investigate how is Integrated Talking Chips strategy with Think Pair Share strategy influence the students' self-efficacy in speaking.

1.4. Uses

There are two kinds of the uses in this research, they are:

1. **Theoritical Uses**

   Integrating the Talking Chips and Think-Pair-Share strategies theoretically improves students' speaking achievement by promoting balanced participation, collaborative learning, critical thinking, increased interaction, exposure to varied speaking situations, structured practice, active listening, and inclusivity. The combination offers a holistic approach to enhancing speaking skills in a classroom setting.

2. **Practical Uses**

   Practitioners in education can practically use Talking Chips and Think-Pair-Share (TPS) strategies to improve students' speaking skills. These strategies help create structured lessons, manage classrooms effectively, and offer varied speaking opportunities. They can be adapted for students with different language abilities, encourage collaboration, and improve listening skills. Educators can also use them to assess students' speaking achievement and provide personalized instruction. Additionally, these strategies make learning more engaging, enhance communication skills, and boost students' self-efficacy in speaking. In practical terms, they empower educators to create inclusive and effective learning environments.

1.5. Scope

This study explored language education, specifically examining the effectiveness of the Integrated Talking Chips strategy combined with Think-Pair-Share in improving students' speaking achievement and self-efficacy. The study revolved

around the application of these collaborative learning strategies in a classroom setting, with speaking ability as the targeted skill for improvement. Additionally, the research examined the impact of these strategies on students' self-efficacy, or their belief in their own abilities to succeed in speaking tasks.

The study concentrated on investigating the correlation between the Integrated Talking Chips strategy with Think-Pair-Share, speaking achievement, and self-efficacy among students, providing valuable insights into the potential benefits of these instructional approaches. Participants in the research were divided into experimental and control groups, where the experimental group received the combined strategies and the control group uses the Original Talking Chips strategy. The data were collected through pre-tests, post-tests, and self-efficacy questionnaires, and they were analyzed using quantitative methods in SPSS.

While the findings of this research offered insights for other educational contexts and teaching strategies, the study's scope was limited to the specific context and sample size examined. Therefore, the results needed to be interpreted and generalized with caution. However, this study served as a foundation for future research exploring the effectiveness of collaborative learning strategies in different educational settings. Future studies could have expanded the scope by incorporating larger sample sizes, investigating various collaborative learning techniques, and comparing their effectiveness with other language teaching methods.

1.6. Definition of Terms

To ensure a clear understanding of the research topic, the researcher provides definitions of key terms related to the study. The following terms are fundamental to this research:

1. **Speaking** is a dynamic and collaborative process of creating meaning that involves both productive and receptive language skills, with the productive aspect being the act of speaking and the receptive aspect being listening. It extends beyond the correct use of sounds, words, and grammar to include background knowledge and the ability to convey opinions and emotions, serving various functions based on context and significantly impacting human life. There are six types of speaking performance in the classroom. In this research, the focus is on extensive monologue, where each student will describe people, things, or places in front of the class according to the material in syllabus, which is Descriptive Text.
2. **Talking Chips** strategy is a method used in speaking instruction to promote balanced participation and equitable contributions within a group of language learners. In this strategy, each member of the group is given an equal number of "chips" (typically represented physically as tokens or markers). When a student contributes an idea or participates in the discussion, they place one of their chips into a designated space, such as the center of the table. Once a student has used all their chips, they must wait until others have also used their allotted chips before contributing again. This approach encourages cooperative learning, ensures that all students have an equal chance to participate, and promotes a more balanced and engaged group discussion.

3. **Think Pair Share** strategy is a teaching technique that aims to enhance student engagement and productive discussions. It encompasses three key steps. Initially, during the "Think" phase, students individually contemplate a specific question, issue, or topic, reflecting on their own ideas and potential solutions silently. Subsequently, in the "Pair" phase, students team up with a classmate to discuss their individual thoughts, ideas, or solutions. This step encourages interaction among peers and the exchange of diverse viewpoints. Finally, in the "Share" phase, students collectively present the main points of their discussions either to the entire class or within smaller groups. This not only allows students to articulate their ideas but also provides an opportunity to learn from their classmates. The Think-Pair-Share strategy is a versatile teaching method that promotes critical thinking, active participation, and collaborative learning, making it a valuable tool applicable across various subject areas for encouraging classroom involvement.
4. **Self-Efficacy** according to Bandura is a person's belief in his or her ability to perform an action related to the person himself or herself and events in the environment. Student self-efficacy in this study focuses on 3 aspects of self-efficacy, namely: level of difficulty (level), level of strength (strength) and generalization (generality). Measurement of student self-efficacy will be done by using a self-efficacy questionnaire.
5. **Integrate** means combining different parts or elements to form a unified whole, where each part works together seamlessly. Integration implies a thorough and

holistic merging, where the individual elements lose some of their distinctiveness as they become part of a cohesive system.

The background information, research questions, objectives, uses, limits, and specific terms' meanings form the core structure of this study. They give a solid starting point and guide our understanding of what the research is about. These elements will be explained more thoroughly in the next chapter, offering a deeper look into the study's foundation and ideas.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

This study aims to find out whether the implementation of integrated Talking Chips with Think Pair Share strategy in teaching can improve student's speaking achievement or not, to reveal which aspect of speaking that improve the most after the implementation of an integrated Talking Chips strategy with Think Pair Share, and to investigate how is the students' self-efficacy in speaking after being taught using Integrated Talking Chips strategy with Think Pair Share strategy. In line with that, this chapter covers an examination of various elements such as the understanding of the speaking concept, the strategy of talking chips, teaching speaking through talking chips, modifying talking chips strategy through think pair share strategy, procedure of teaching speaking through talking chips, procedure of teaching speaking through talking chips strategy modified with think-pair-share strategy, advantages and disadvantages of teaching speaking through talking chips modified with think pair share, self-efficacy, previous studies, the theoretical assumptions and research hypotheses.

2.1. The Concept of Speaking

Speaking is a dynamic process of creating significance, encompassing the generation, reception, and processing of information (Burns and Joyce, 1997). The structure and significance of this process are contingent upon the context in which it takes place and the intent behind the communication. Furthermore, Brown (2001) defines that speaking is a collaborative process of creating significance that encompasses the generation, reception, and handling of information.

According to Byrne (1986), speaking constitutes a reciprocal process involving both speakers and listeners, encompassing the productive language skills and receptive understanding skills. Davies (1979) aligns with this view, asserting that speaking entails both receptive and productive engagement. The receptive facet of speaking corresponds to the conventionally termed skill of "listening," while the productive aspect is identified as "saying." Essentially, speaking involves a productive element when an interaction participant takes on the active role of the speaker. In a similar vein, Nunan et al. (2003) contends that speaking, as a productive skill, entails the creation of systematic verbal expressions to convey meaning. The outcome of the speaking activity is verbal expressions produced with communicative intentions.

Speaking is categorized as a productive skill, and as articulated by Spratt et al. (2011), it requires the speaker to utilize speech for conveying meanings to others. Similarly, Nunan et al. (2003) asserts that speaking is an oral skill involving the production of verbal expressions to convey meaning. Castillo (2007) affirms that speaking, being a productive skill, encompasses various elements, extending beyond merely generating correct sounds, selecting appropriate words, or constructing grammatically accurate sentences. It may involve the background knowledge of speakers to formulate opinions or convey emotions to listeners. Consequently, listeners often assess others by scrutinizing and interpreting the content of their speech.

Speaking significantly impacts human life through which people can transform and enhance their lives, achieving their dreams. In various situations, individuals speak with specific purposes, conveying messages through their words. The functions of

speaking vary depending on the context, resulting in different forms of speech. Many efforts have been made to categorize the functions of speaking in human interactions, identifying interactional and transactional functions. Interactional functions aim to maintain social relationships, while transactional functions focus on the exchange of information. Additionally, Brown (2004) categorizes speaking into three functions and forms: speaking as interaction, speaking as transaction, and speaking as performance.

1. Speaking as Interaction

Speaking as interaction occurs when people speak to appear friendly and establish a comfortable zone of interaction. This includes exchanging greetings, engaging in small talk, and recounting recent experiences. The primary focus is on maintaining social relationships rather than exchanging information.

2. Speaking as Transaction

Speaking as transaction center on the message and the information that needs to be understood by the listener. This type of speaking is not concerned with the participants or their social relationships. For instance, during hands-on activities in a science lesson, students might discuss concepts like floating and sinking. In this context, the focus is on meaning and understanding rather than the participants.

3. Speaking as Performance

Speaking as performance involves speaking in public to convey information to an audience, such as during classroom presentations, public announcements, or speeches. This type of speaking focuses on both the information and the audience. It is usually planned and involves the use of written language. Speaking is not just

about producing sounds, words, and sentences in an understandable language; it is an activity where people express their feelings, thoughts, and beliefs. Everyone has different purposes in using language, which results in various functions and forms of speaking.

It can be stated that speaking is a dynamic and collaborative process of creating meaning that involves both productive and receptive language skills, with the productive aspect being the act of speaking and the receptive aspect being listening. It extends beyond the correct use of sounds, words, and grammar to include background knowledge and the ability to convey opinions and emotions, serving various functions based on context and significantly impacting human life.

2.1.1. Aspects of Speaking

Speaking is a complex skill that involves the simultaneous use of various sub-skills, which often develop at different rates. According to Harris (1969), speech processes generally consist of five key components: pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. These components are explained in detail as follows:

1. Pronunciation

Pronunciation refers to the way sounds, stress, rhythm, and intonation are produced in speech. It ensures that words are spoken clearly and correctly, making communication easier for listeners. Pronunciation involves phonological elements, including individual sounds (phonemes) and patterns of stress and intonation in a language.

Pronunciation is important because it affects how well a speaker is understood. Even if a speaker has a strong grasp of grammar and vocabulary, poor pronunciation

can lead to misunderstandings. Clear pronunciation helps listeners distinguish between similar-sounding words and comprehend the intended meaning of a message.

If pronunciation is weak or incorrect, it can create confusion. For example, mispronouncing "ship" as "sheep" changes the meaning of a sentence. A sentence like "The ship is sailing" might be misunderstood as "The sheep is sailing," which does not make sense.

2. Grammar

Grammar is the system of rules that governs how words are structured into sentences. It includes elements such as verb tense, subject-verb agreement, sentence structure, and word order. Grammar helps speakers organize their thoughts clearly and effectively.

Grammar is essential in speaking because it ensures that a speaker’s message is understood correctly. Proper grammar makes speech more structured and meaningful, preventing ambiguity. It also enables speakers to express different meanings accurately, such as indicating past, present, or future actions.

If grammar is incorrect or missing, communication can become unclear or misleading. For instance, saying **"He go to school yesterday"** instead of **"He went to school yesterday"** can cause confusion because the incorrect verb tense disrupts the intended meaning. Listeners may need extra effort to interpret what the speaker means, which can slow down communication.

3. Vocabulary

Vocabulary refers to the words a speaker knows and can use appropriately in conversation. It includes both active vocabulary (words a person uses in speech) and passive vocabulary (words a person understands but may not use frequently). A broad vocabulary allows speakers to express their ideas with greater precision and variety.

Vocabulary is important because it directly impacts communication. A speaker with a rich vocabulary can convey ideas clearly and choose words that fit the context of a conversation. Without an adequate vocabulary, a speaker may struggle to express thoughts, leading to vague or ineffective communication.

If vocabulary is limited, a speaker might not be able to fully express their thoughts. For example, if someone wants to describe an experience but lacks the right words, they may rely on basic or repetitive phrases like **"It was good"** instead of giving a more detailed explanation like **"It was a thrilling and unforgettable experience."** This limitation can make speech less engaging and informative.

4. Fluency

Fluency is the ability to speak smoothly and naturally without unnecessary pauses, hesitations, or interruptions. It involves maintaining a steady flow of speech and organizing thoughts in real time while speaking. A fluent speaker can express ideas confidently and maintain a conversation without excessive delays.

Fluency is important because it makes communication more efficient and engaging. Fluent speakers can interact naturally and respond quickly in conversations, making their speech more enjoyable to listen to. It also contributes to confidence in

communication, as hesitations or frequent pauses can make a speaker appear uncertain.

If fluency is lacking, speech may be slow, disjointed, or difficult to follow. For example, a speaker who frequently pauses or hesitates might say: **"Uh… yesterday… I… um… went to… um… the store."** This makes it harder for listeners to follow the message and may cause frustration.

5. Comprehension

Comprehension refers to a speaker's ability to understand spoken language and respond appropriately. It involves processing what others say, grasping the meaning behind words, and forming relevant responses. Comprehension is essential for meaningful interaction in conversations.

Comprehension is important because, without it, communication cannot be effective. A speaker must understand questions, statements, and conversations in order to reply accurately. Strong comprehension skills enable smoother interactions and prevent misunderstandings.

If comprehension is weak, conversations may break down. For instance, if someone asks, **"What do you think about the new policy?"** and the listener does not understand, they might give an unrelated or incorrect response. Misinterpretation can lead to awkward or ineffective communication.

Another theory of speaking, proposed by Heaton (1991), introduces a three-component model designed to assess and evaluate learners' speaking proficiency. This model identifies accuracy, fluency, and comprehension as the key components. A further explanation of these aspects is as follows:

1. Accuracy

Accuracy refers to the correctness of language use, including grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation. It ensures that the speaker conveys messages clearly and effectively, reducing misunderstandings. Accuracy is crucial because incorrect grammar, vocabulary misuse, or pronunciation errors can lead to confusion or miscommunication. If a speaker lacks accuracy, their sentences may be grammatically incorrect, making them difficult to understand. For example, saying **"She go to school every day"** instead of **"She goes to school every day"** affects the listener's comprehension and makes the speech sound unnatural.

2. Fluency

Fluency is the ability to speak smoothly and naturally without frequent pauses or hesitation. It allows speakers to communicate ideas effortlessly, maintaining a steady flow of speech. Fluency is important because it makes communication more engaging and helps speakers sound confident. If fluency is low, speech may be filled with long pauses, hesitation words like "um" and "uh," and difficulty forming sentences. For example, a non-fluent speaker might say, **"I… I… go… uh… to the market… um… yesterday"**, making it difficult for the listener to follow their message.

3. Comprehension

Comprehension is the ability to understand spoken language and respond appropriately. It involves recognizing meanings, following conversations, and providing relevant responses. This aspect is essential because a lack of comprehension leads to misinterpretation and ineffective communication. If

comprehension is weak, a speaker may struggle to respond appropriately in conversations. For example, if someone asks, **"What do you do in your free time?"**, and the response is, **"Yes, I like it,"** it shows a lack of understanding, making the conversation awkward and unclear.

Moreover, according to Brown (2004), there are five aspects of speaking skill namely vocabulary, grammar, fluency, comprehension, and pronounciation. These aspects are explained as follow:

1. Vocabulary

Vocabulary refers to the words a speaker knows and uses appropriately. It helps speakers express their ideas clearly and accurately. A rich vocabulary is important because it allows for precise communication and avoids ambiguity. If vocabulary is limited, speakers may struggle to find the right words, leading to unclear or repetitive speech. For example, instead of saying, **"The meeting was productive, and we came to a good agreement,"** a speaker with low vocabulary might say, **"The meeting was good, and we did a good thing,"** which sounds vague and less professional.

2. Grammar

Grammar refers to the rules governing sentence structure, verb usage, and word order in a language. It ensures clarity and coherence in communication. Grammar is crucial because incorrect usage can lead to misunderstandings or difficulty in conveying meaning. If a speaker has poor grammar, their sentences may not make sense, leading to confusion. For example, saying **"Yesterday I go to the store"**

instead of **"Yesterday I went to the store"** disrupts the sentence's accuracy and can confuse the listener.

3. Fluency

Fluency is the ability to speak smoothly and at a natural pace without unnecessary pauses. It enables effective communication and keeps conversations engaging. Fluency is important because it helps speakers sound confident and keeps the listener interested. A lack of fluency results in hesitation, repetition, and difficulty maintaining the flow of speech. For example, a fluent speaker would say, **"Last weekend, I went to the beach and had a great time,"** while a non-fluent speaker might say, **"Uh… last… um… weekend… I go… uh… to beach… and it was… um… good..".**

4. Comprehension

Comprehension is the ability to understand spoken language and respond appropriately. It ensures effective interaction and prevents miscommunication. Strong comprehension skills allow speakers to follow conversations and provide meaningful responses. If comprehension is weak, the speaker may not understand the question or respond incorrectly. For example, if someone asks, **"How was your weekend?"** and the response is **"Yes, I like books,"** it shows a lack of understanding, making the conversation disjointed.

5. Pronunciation

Pronunciation is the way words are spoken, including articulation, stress, and intonation. It ensures that speech is clear and easily understood by listeners. Proper pronunciation is important because incorrect pronunciation can change the meaning

of words or make speech difficult to understand. If pronunciation is poor, even well-structured sentences may not be comprehensible. For example, mispronouncing **"ship"** as **"sheep"** in the sentence **"I saw a ship in the ocean"** could confuse the listener, as they might think the speaker is talking about an animal instead of a boat.

Harris (1969) identifies pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension as key aspects of speaking. Heaton (1990) simplifies them into accuracy, fluency, and comprehension, grouping pronunciation and grammar under accuracy. Brown (2004) uses the same five aspects as Harris but emphasizes vocabulary and pronunciation. Despite differences, all three theories stress clarity, correctness, fluency, and comprehension as essential for effective speaking.

In this study, the researcher chose Brown's (2004) model over those proposed by Harris (1969) and Heaton (1991) due to its newer, more comprehensive, and detailed framework for evaluating speaking skills. While Harris and Heaton provide valuable insights, Brown's model offerred a more holistic approach by addressing both linguistic (vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation) and communicative (fluency, comprehension) aspects in greater depth.

Harris (1969) identifies five fundamental components, but his model lacks explicit emphasis on the interplay between these aspects in communicative settings. Heaton (1991) simplifies speaking evaluation into accuracy, fluency, and comprehension, which, while useful, may not fully capture the complexities of spoken language.

By including vocabulary, grammar, fluency, comprehension, and pronunciation, Brown's model allows for a more precise assessment of students' speaking abilities. This detailed framework makes it particularly suitable for evaluating the impact of

the Integrated Talking Chips strategy combined with Think-Pair-Share, as it enables a nuanced understanding of how different speaking components improve through collaborative learning.

2.1.2 The Difficulties in Speaking

For many students, speaking English can be challenging, especially if it is not their first language. The difficulty can vary depending on factors such as their level of exposure to English, their confidence in speaking, and their proficiency in the language. According Ur (2003), four common difficulties or problems in speaking activities include:

1. Inhibition: Speaking requires real-time exposure to an audience, unlike reading, writing, or listening activities. Learners often feel inhibited due to concerns about making mistakes, fear of criticism, or shyness in the spotlight.

2. Lack of Content: Some learners, even if not inhibited, may struggle to think of things to say. They may lack the motivation to express themselves beyond a sense of obligation to speak.

3. Limited Participation: In group settings, only one participant can talk at a time to be heard. In larger groups, this results in minimal talking time for each individual. Additionally, some learners may dominate the conversation, leaving others with little or no opportunity to speak.

4. Mother Tongue Use: When learners share the same native language in class, there's a tendency to use it because it feels easier and more natural. Encouraging the use of the target language, especially in less disciplined or motivated groups, can be challenging, particularly in small group discussions.

Creating a supportive atmosphere for learners to overcome inhibition and discover motivation is crucial for improving speaking activities. In group settings, promoting equal participation and encouraging the use of the target language can effectively address common challenges in speaking sessions.

Ur (2003) identifies four common difficulties in speaking activities: inhibition, lack of content, limited participation, and mother tongue use. These difficulties are closely related to the real-life problems faced by students at SMKN 1 Bandar Lampung in the Office Administration major, as highlighted by their teacher that already mentioned in the background. Inhibition manifests in students' fear of making mistakes and poor pronunciation. Lack of content is driven by limited vocabulary and motivation, making it challenging for students to express themselves effectively. Limited participation occurs in larger group settings, where many students hesitate to speak up. The tendency to use their mother tongue in class further hampers their practice and application of English in real-life contexts.

Furthermore, low comprehension affects students' ability to grasp spoken English, leading to confusion, misinterpretation, and reluctance to engage in conversations. These issues, which are compounded by low self-efficacy, significantly inhibit their progress in developing proficiency in spoken English. These issues, which are compounded by low self-efficacy, significantly inhibit their progress in developing proficiency in spoken English. Addressing these challenges requires targeted strategies to boost confidence, expand vocabulary, and create more opportunities for meaningful practice and participation.

2.2. Teaching Speaking

In language teaching, cultivating proficient speakers is a cornerstone of the learning process. Speaking is often regarded as the most direct form of communication, making it a fundamental skill to master. The ability to articulate thoughts clearly and effectively in a foreign language is essential for successful communication. This skill not only enables individuals to express themselves accurately but also fosters meaningful interactions and connections with others. As such, teaching speaking involves more than just language proficiency; it is about equipping students with the skills and confidence to communicate effectively in diverse linguistic and cultural contexts. In the world of teaching languages, helping students become good speakers is a crucial and dynamic aspect of the learning journey. Speaking is often seen as the most direct way of communicating, making it a key skill to develop. Being able to express thoughts effectively in a foreign language is fundamental for effective communication.

Teaching principles play a crucial role in enhancing speaking skills within the classroom setting. To maintain an intentional communicative class, educators should adhere to these principles, which also guide the creation of suitable teaching materials. Consequently, focusing on teaching speaking comprehension becomes imperative for achieving the objectives of the teaching and learning process. Brown (2001) outlines specific principles for developing speaking techniques, they are:

1. Use teaching techniques that consider what students need, covering both accuracy in language and the ability to express ideas and interact fluently. Strive for a balance between getting things right, expressing ideas clearly, and communicating meaningfully.

2. Choose activities that naturally motivate students. Sometimes, students may not see the point of tasks or understand why language skills matter. Teachers should help students see the purpose and benefits, connecting lessons to their interests and needs to keep them engaged and interested in learning.

3. Include real-life language in lessons. Learning becomes more interesting when teachers use materials that relate to what students already know and care about. This means creating interactions that feel genuine and meaningful to encourage students to use the language naturally.

4. Give feedback and corrections that make sense. Since many students depend on teachers for helpful feedback, it's important for teachers to provide feedback at the right moments in a way that helps students learn and improve.

5. Understand the link between speaking and listening. Recognize that focusing on speaking can naturally follow listening skills, as understanding what you hear often leads to being able to express yourself.

6. Allow students to start conversations. Activities should give students plenty of chances to use the language on their own initiative, promoting confidence and independence in speaking.

7. Support the development of speaking strategies. Students do not have to worry too much about their skill level. Instead, they can build their own ways of speaking that work for them in different situations. This principle encourages students to feel capable and confident in their oral communication skills.

Achieving effective language instruction involves maintaining a balance between accuracy and fluency, incorporating engaging activities tailored to students'

interests, integrating real-life language use, providing constructive feedback, recognizing the interdependence of speaking and listening, empowering students to initiate conversations, and supporting the development of personalized speaking strategies. Embracing these principles helps create a dynamic and supportive environment that enhances students' confidence and proficiency in oral communication.

2.2.1. Types of Classroom Speaking Performance

Classroom speaking performance refers to the various ways in which students practice and demonstrate their speaking skills in a classroom setting. These performances can range from simple drills and repetition exercises to more complex interactions and presentations. The aim is to develop students' oral communication abilities, including pronunciation, fluency, accuracy, and the ability to convey and exchange information effectively. According to Brown (2001) there are six types of speaking performance in the classroom:

Imitative

In this type, students are asked to repeat words or phrases for clarity and accuracy. For example, they might repeat phrases like "Excuse me" or "Can you help me?"

Intensive

This performance focuses on practicing phonological and grammatical aspects of language. Students often work in pairs or groups on tasks like reading aloud, reading paragraphs, dialogues, or information from charts.

Responsive

Responsive tasks involve short interactions that test comprehension through brief

conversations, greetings, small talk, requests, and comments. These tasks typically use spoken prompts and may include follow-up questions.

Transactional

Transactional dialogue aims to convey or exchange specific information. This extended form of responsive language includes activities like information-gathering interviews, role plays, or debates and is often used in group work.

Interpersonal

Interpersonal dialogue focuses on maintaining social relationships rather than exchanging information. This type includes interviews, role plays, discussions, conversations, and games.

Extensive

In extensive monologues, students deliver oral reports, summaries, storytelling, or short speeches. These tasks are typically performed individually.

To assess speaking, several aspects must be considered, including vocabulary, grammar, fluency, comprehension, and pronunciation. Depending on whether the task involves monologues, dialogues, or other types of speaking, students need to be prepared to use the language appropriately. In this research, the focus was on intensive monologue, where each student described people, things, or places in front of the class shortly and individiaully. This method allows students to demonstrate their speaking skills individually, providing a comprehensive assessment of their ability to use the language effectively.

In the context of a vocational high school, specifically in the Office Administration major, this approach is particularly relevant. Students in this major need to develop strong speaking skills to perform various office tasks, such as presenting reports,

describing office procedures, and communicating effectively with colleagues and clients. By focusing on extensive monologues, the study aimed to enhance these students' ability to present their ideas clearly and confidently in professional settings. This method was not only assess their proficiency in spoken English but also prepare them for real-world office scenarios where effective communication is crucial. With adequate preparation, students could present their descriptions confidently and accurately, showcasing their proficiency in spoken English and their readiness for professional environments.

2.2.2. Materials in Teaching Speaking

In the context of the Merdeka Curriculum for senior high school especially tenth grader, teaching speaking skills involves a mix of engaging materials. From classic textbooks and lively audio resources to the latest digital tools, educators blend various materials to make language learning enjoyable. These resources cover essential language rules and practical communication skills needed in everyday life. By incorporating a diverse range of materials, the curriculum caters to different learning styles, ensuring that students not only excel in speaking but also adapt to the demands of effective communication in our dynamic world.

One of the materials in teaching speaking at tenth grader of junior high school is Descriptive Text. This material is in accordance with the Learning Outcomes in Phase E of the Merdeka Curriculum, namely: By the end of Phase E, students use spoken, written, and visual texts in English to communicate according to the situation, purpose, and audience. Various types of texts, such as narratives, descriptions, procedures, expositions, recounts, reports, and authentic texts, serve as the main references in learning English at this phase. Students use English to

express desires/feelings and discuss topics that are familiar to their daily lives or current issues relevant to their age group in this phase. They read written texts to learn something or obtain information. Implicit inference skills in understanding information in English begin to develop. Students produce more diverse written and visual texts, with awareness of the purpose and target audience.

Descriptive Text

Descriptive text is a type of text that provides a detailed portrayal of a particular object, person, or place. In Indonesian, descriptive text, or "*teks deskripsi*," is used to vividly depict specific characteristics of an object, person, or place. This involves describing sensory details such as size, color, shape, texture, smell, and sound, as well as any notable features or attributes.

Purpose of Descriptive Text

The purpose of descriptive text is to describe an object in detail. The goal of descriptive text is to describe or depict an object in detail. These objects can be people, animals, things, or places.

Structure of Descriptive Text

Every text consists of several parts that make it up. The structure of descriptive text consists of two parts: identification and description. The identification section contains an introduction to the object that will be described. For example, 'What is the object?' or 'Where does the object come from?'. The description section contains a more specific explanation of the object being described. In this part, you can describe the appearance or personality of the object.

Language Features of Descriptive Text

In writing descriptive text, there are language features that you need to use. The language features of descriptive text consist of three main elements: Adjectives, Simple Present Tense, and Adverbs of Frequency.

Adjective

Descriptive text heavily relies on adjectives. When describing an object, we definitely use adjectives, such as big, small, tall, short, smart, friendly, and so on. Example:

"Hanni is so pretty. She has an oval face, rounded eyes, a pointed nose, and long hair. She is smart and friendly."

Simple Present Tense

Simple Present Tense is commonly used to state facts or general truths, as well as habits. When describing an object, we use this tense because what we describe about the object is a fact.

Adverb of Frequency

Adverb of frequency is an adverb that indicates how often an activity is performed. In descriptive text, we can describe the habits of the object using this. Example:

"Hevi is a helpful and polite person. She often helps me to do my homework and always respects the elders."

Example of Description Text:

My Best Friend, Hanni

Identification:
Let me introduce you to my best friend. Her name is Hanni. She is my classmate in Junior High School. She is thirteen years old.

Description:
Hanni is so pretty. She has an oval face, rounded eyes, pointed nose, and beautiful black long hair. Her skin color is fair. Also, she has a slim body and is quite tall. She is 155 centimeters tall. Hanni really loves to sing and dance. She joins the dance club as her extracurricular activity at school. She is smart and friendly. She often helps me to do my homework and always respects the elders. Everyone loves her.

(source: https://www.ruangguru.com/blog/bahasa-inggris-kelas-7-pengertian-tujuan-ciri-ciri-dan-struktur-descriptive-text)

It can be stated that incorporating descriptive text activities into language learning significantly enhances students' speaking achievement and self-efficacy. By practicing the use of adjectives, simple present tense, and adverbs of frequency, students improve their vocabulary, grammar, and fluency, leading to clearer and more confident communication. Moreover, structured descriptive text exercises provide a supportive framework that boosts students' belief in their speaking abilities, fostering positive self-perception and reinforcing learning outcomes.

2.2.2 Scoring System of Speaking

No language skill is more challenging to evaluate accurately than speaking ability. Additionally, many issues related to assessing speaking are similar to those in other forms of language testing but tend to be less severe. Speaking is a productive skill that can be directly observed through experience; however, these observations are influenced by the test taker's listening ability, which affects the reliability and validity of oral production assessments. As mentioned in the previous section,

speaking consists of multiple components. In this study, the researcher used Brown's speaking scoring system to evaluate students' speaking performance for each component.

Table 2. 1. Brown's Speaking Rubric Scoring (2010)

Rating	Vocabulary	Grammar	Fluency	Comprehension	Pronounciation	Task
5	Uses a wide range of vocabulary appropriately and effectively. Shows mastery of topic-related vocabulary with minimal errors.	Uses complex grammatical structures accurately. Errors are rare and do not impede comprehension.	Speaks smoothly with natural pacing and minimal hesitation. Speech is coherent and easy to follow.	Fully understands and appropriately responds to the prompt. Demonstrates deep comprehension of the topic.	Pronounces words clearly and accurately with native-like or near-native pronunciation.	Speaking proficiency equivalent to that of an educated native speaker.
4	Uses a good range of vocabulary appropriately with occasional errors. Topic-related vocabulary is mostly accurate.	Uses a variety of grammatical structures with some errors that do not significantly affect meaning.	Speaks with some hesitation but maintains overall coherence. Occasional pauses do not significantly disrupt communication.	Understands the prompt and responds appropriately with minor misunderstandings or omissions.	Pronounces most words clearly with occasional errors that do not impede understanding.	Would rarely be taken for a native speaker but can respond appropriately even in unfamiliar situations. Can handle informal interpreting from and into language.
3	Uses an adequate range of vocabulary with some noticeable errors. Topic-related vocabulary is somewhat limited but understandable.	Uses simple grammatical structures with noticeable errors. Errors occasionally impede comprehension.	Speaks with noticeable hesitation and occasional pauses that disrupt the flow of speech.	Partially understands the prompt with some incorrect or incomplete responses.	Pronounces words with some errors. Errors occasionally impede understanding.	Can participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, and professional topics.
2	Uses limited vocabulary with frequent errors. Topic-related vocabulary is	Uses basic grammatical structures with frequent errors. Errors often impede comprehension.	Speaks with frequent hesitation and pauses, making speech difficult to follow.	Struggles to understand the prompt and responds with significant errors or omissions.	Pronounces words with frequent errors. Errors often impede understanding.	Able to satisfy routine social demands and work requirements; needs help in handling any

	often incorrect or inadequate.					complication or difficulties.
1	Uses very limited vocabulary with numerous errors. Lacks necessary vocabulary to adequately describe the topic	Uses very basic or incorrect grammatical structures consistently. Errors significantly impede comprehension.	Speaks with constant hesitation and very little flow. Communication is severely disrupted and hard to understand.	Fails to understand the prompt and provides an irrelevant or incorrect response.	Pronounces words with numerous errors. Errors significantly impede understanding	Can ask and answer questions on topics very familiar to him. Able to satisfy routine travel needs and minimum courtesy requirements. (Should be able to order a simple meal, ask for shelter or lodging, ask and give simple directions, make purchases, and tell time.)

2.3. Talking Chips Strategy

Talking chips, a cooperative learning strategy introduced by Kagan in 1992, involves students participating in group discussions by using tokens when they speak (Kagan and Kagan, 2009). The primary goal of this approach is to ensure fair involvement by regulating the frequency of each group member's contributions. By emphasizing equal participation, the strategy encourages reserved students to express themselves confidently. Talking chips is proved valuable for facilitating discussions on controversial topics and addressing communication or group dynamic issues, such as dominant or conflicting group members.

Kagan and Kagan (2009) states that the use of talking chips, a strategy in cooperative learning, plays a significant role in teaching and learning speaking skills. Firstly, it enhances students' achievement and fosters interaction among

group members, promoting confidence in speaking and encouraging communication. Additionally, it improves higher-level thinking skills by requiring students to evaluate others' opinions, thereby increasing their ability to think critically. According to Based Education Broadcasting Corporation (2004) in "What are the benefits of cooperative and collaborative learning?", small group learning in cooperative settings, such as in talking chips, offers several advantages:

1) Celebrating diversity: Students learn to work with others and respect differences, adding unique perspectives based on their backgrounds.

2) Acknowledging individual differences: Each student's response contributes to a more comprehensive result, reflecting all group members' opinions.

3) Interpersonal development: Structured interactions help students, especially those lacking social skills, to engage with peers.

4) Active student involvement: Every member has an equal opportunity to contribute, promoting participation.

5) More personal feedback opportunities: Increased exchanges allow for more feedback on ideas and responses, facilitated by the use of grid sheets in talking chips.

The implementation Talking Chips Strategy involves a small class discussion of three or four students, one student serves as the moderator, oversees and manages the activity's time. The teacher provides each student with a chip, and they have approximately two minutes per chip to convey information to their peers. Following their turn, the teacher evaluates the students based on time management and speaking skills, including pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, and fluency. After

sharing their insights, students return their chips to the moderator, ensuring an orderly transition back to their seats without further speaking.

Several research studies have explored the effectiveness of the Talking Chips strategy in enhancing students' speaking achievement. Firstly, Buchori & Cintang (2018) state that students' that taught with Talking Chips model is better than the class with conventional learning. It can be stated that Talking Chips learning models have a positive influence on students' creative thinking ability.

Secondly, Manurung (2020) carries out a research to know if there was a significant difference in speaking skill between the students taught using Talking Chips technique referred as experimental group, and the students taught using discussion method referred by control group. The results of data processing on the experimental post-test and control groups show very significant results where the experimental group's score is higher than the control group. It can be stated that there is a significant effect of the application of Talking Chips.

Thirdly, Kartini & Jubhari (2021) conduct a study that aim to enhance speaking skills through the Talking Chips strategy. The findings suggested that while the strategy was expected to improve speaking skills, factors such as the unfamiliarity of the strategy, unclear instructions, and students' unreadiness affected its implementation.

In line with Kartini & Jubhari (2021), Gray et. al. (2010) state that there are several disadvantages associated with this strategy. He notes that, because the method regulates participation, it can potentially disrupt the natural conversational flow. This can lead to discussions feeling forced and artificial.

2.4. Teaching Speaking Through Talking Chips Strategy

As an aspect of cooperative learning, this approach is aligned with the theory supported by various experts, including Jacobs (2004). Cooperative learning involves organizing students into small groups to enhance their collaborative learning. Jacobs further assert that the principles and techniques of cooperative learning contribute to more effective group work.

In the implementation of teaching speaking through the Talking Chips method, students are divided into small groups consisting of three to four individuals with diverse capabilities, considering factors such as previous grades, gender, religion, and race. The teacher assigns a topic or issue for the students to discuss among themselves. Each student is given approximately two minutes to express their thoughts during each turn. While the activity is in progress, the teacher evaluates students based on factors like time management and speaking skills, including pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, and fluency.

Following the students' contributions, the chips are placed on their group table. This process continues until all students have used their chips to speak. This method ensures that no student dominates the discussion, and every student actively expresses their opinions in an equitable manner. The Talking Chips implementation aligns with a student-centered learning model, emphasizing the centrality of students in the learning process through activities that involve seeking and understanding the subject matter independently.

2.5. Think Pair Share Strategy

Think Pair Share is a cooperative discussion strategy developed by Frank Lyman (1981) and his colleagues in Maryland. The strategy's name reflects its three stages, each highlighting a specific student action. Think Pair Share has been widely adopted by experts in cooperative learning. It introduces the concept of "wait or think" time into peer interactions, which has been shown to significantly enhance students' responses to questions.

Think Pair Share is a relatively low-risk and brief collaborative learning structure, making it ideal for instructors new to collaborative learning. The Think Pair Share framework allows all students to discuss their ideas, which is crucial for helping them construct knowledge and identify gaps in their understanding. This active learning process is typically not available in traditional lectures.

Think Pair Share provides students with the chance to carefully consider and discuss what they have learned. The strategy requires minimal effort from the teacher while encouraging extensive student participation, even from those who are usually reluctant to engage. It accommodates various learning styles, resulting in greater involvement and interaction from more students.

Think Pair Share is an effective, simple method that is applicable from early childhood through all educational stages, including tertiary education and beyond. It is a highly versatile structure, adaptable for numerous uses. In this strategy, students can process information, listen and ask questions, summarize others' ideas, and paraphrase them. This forms a foundation for developing a cooperative classroom.

Think Pair Share encourages active participation from all students by providing processing time and fostering thoughtful responses. By allowing students to discuss answers with a partner before sharing with the class, it reduces fear and emphasizes learning. Working in pairs also promotes participation, encourages contributions, and facilitates team building.

Several research studies have explored the effectiveness of the Think Pair Share strategy in enhancing students' speaking achievement. Firstly, Singh et al. (2020) conducts a study that aimed to improve weak ESL learner's speaking abilities using Think Pair Share. The study intends to find out the difficulties faced by the learners in speaking, how Think Pair Share of Cooperative learning can improve speaking skills and ESL learner's perception on the use of TPS in speaking activities. The study employed an action research design. Twenty-four Form 4 ESL learners participated in this study. Data collection included teacher's reflective entry and focus group interviews with the ESL learners. The results show that Think Pair Share improves learners speaking abilities and has a huge impact in boosting learner's confidence level to speak in English.

Secondly, Bunaya (2018) suggests that TPS could improve students' speaking confidence proven by the increasing number of confident students from Cycle 1 (26.6%), Cycle 2 (46.6%) and Cycle 3 (66.6%). Findings from the self-esteem questionnaire also reveal that students show positive responses. Therefore, it can be stated that the Think Pair Share teaching strategy could help teacher to improve students' speaking confidence.

Hence, the employment of the Think Pair Share strategy is viewed as a suitable approach for enhancing students' speaking skills. However, it is important to note that, like many strategies, Think Pair Share does have its share of drawbacks. According to Lyman in Berkeley et al. (2014), the disadvantages of Think Pair Share are difficulties in achieving equal participation, problem may arise when the number of students is not even, and time consuming.

It can be stated that Think-Pair-Share strategy enhances student engagement and speaking skills by introducing "wait or think" time and promoting active participation. Research by Singh et al. (2020) and Bunaya (2018) confirm their effectiveness in boosting confidence and speaking abilities. However, challenges such as achieving equal participation, managing uneven student numbers, and being time-consuming (Lyman in Barkley et al., 2014) need to be addressed to fully utilize its potential in improving students' speaking skills.

2.6. Teaching Speaking Through Think Pair Share Strategy

Think-Pair-Share (TPS) is an instructional strategy that promotes student engagement and collaborative learning, introduced by Lyman (1981) and later developed by various educational experts. This approach involves three key stages: individual thinking, partner discussion, and group sharing.

In teaching speaking through the Think-Pair-Share method, students are initially given time to think individually about a question or topic provided by the teacher. This individual reflection encourages them to organize their ideas and prepare for meaningful interaction. Subsequently, students pair up with a classmate to exchange ideas, listen to different perspectives, and engage in focused conversation.

Lastly, the pairs share their discussions with the larger group, offering students the opportunity to practice speaking publicly and to broaden their understanding by hearing diverse viewpoints.

Think-Pair-Share is particularly effective in teaching speaking skills because it encourages active participation from all students, provides sufficient processing time before speaking, and helps build learners' confidence. Unlike traditional whole-class discussions where only a few students may participate, TPS ensures that every student has the chance to speak and be heard. By incorporating Think-Pair-Share into speaking activities, teachers can foster a supportive and inclusive classroom environment that significantly enhances students' speaking competence and overall learning experience.

2.7. Integrating Talking Chips Strategy with Think Pair Share

As mentioned earlier, it is noteworthy that Talking Chips still comes with its drawbacks. Given the identified drawbacks of the Talking Chips strategy, the integration of the Think-Pair-Share strategy becomes essential for several reasons. Firstly, while Talking Chips regulate participation, the Think-Pair-Share strategy introduces a more natural conversational flow by allowing students to think individually, share their thoughts in pairs, and then contribute to the whole group discussion. This modification aims to mitigate the potential disruption of the conversational flow and enhance the authenticity of discussions.

Secondly, effective time management is crucial for both the preparation and implementation of the Talking Chips strategy. By integrating the Think-Pair-Share approach, students have the opportunity for individual contemplation (Think),

paired sharing (Pair), and group discussion (Share), allowing for a more structured and time-efficient process. This modification addresses the need for well-managed time during the learning activity.

Lastly, the Talking Chips model's demand for intricate preparations can be alleviated by integrating the Think-Pair-Share strategy. The Think-Pair-Share method offers a more straightforward and flexible structure, reducing the complexity of preparations and making the overall implementation more manageable for both teachers and students.

It can be stated that integrating the Talking Chips strategy with the Think Pair Share strategy addresses the identified limitations, fostering a more natural conversational flow, optimizing time management, and simplifying the preparation process.

Think Pair Share is the strategy that was developed by Lyman in 1981. This strategy shortly as known as Think Pair Share. It is a type of cooperative learning that allows students to think, pair up and work with partners and share where those all are reflected by the name of the strategy with three steps, think-pair-share. This strategy makes the students listen the question or presentation, then they are given the time to think, after that pair and discuss their thought with their partner and last share those thought with the class.

Think Pair Share has weaknesses like unequal participation, where some students talk more while others stay quiet, which can be fixed by Talking Chips. Talking Chips ensures everyone speaks by using a chip each time they contribute and solves the issue of pair dynamics in Think Pair Share by involving the whole group, promoting diverse interactions, and ensuring all voices are heard. While Think Pair

Share allows some students to rely on their partners, Talking Chips requires everyone to use their chips to speak, ensuring active participation and structured turn-taking. Engagement in Think Pair Share can vary, but Talking Chips boosts it with a game-like approach. Monitoring participation in Think Pair Share can be challenging, especially in large classes, but Talking Chips makes it easier for teachers to see who has and hasn't spoken. By using Talking Chips, teachers can overcome Think Pair Share's drawbacks, creating a balanced, inclusive, and engaging classroom. Combining these strategies helps students prepare and confidently share their ideas, with Think Pair Share allowing deep thinking and pair discussions, while Talking Chips ensures these ideas are heard in a structured group setting. This mix improves student engagement and communication skills, creating a classroom where every student is engaged, heard, and valued.

From the explanation above, it can be stated that, together, Think Pair Share and Talking Chips create a balanced cooperative learning approach: Think Pair Share fosters deep idea development, while Talking Chips ensures equal participation, structured discussions, and accountability, complementing each other for a more inclusive and engaging classroom.

The integration of Think Pair Share and Talking Chips supports the communicative language teaching approach by promoting meaningful interaction and communication in the classroom. Think Pair Share encourages students to engage in authentic pair discussions, fostering fluency and confidence in using the target language. Talking Chips ensures that all students participate actively in group discussions, promoting inclusivity and providing additional speaking practice. Together, these strategies help create a communicative and student-centered

learning environment, aligning with the principles of CLT and enhancing the overall language learning experience for students.

2.8. Teaching Speaking Through Integrated Talking Chips with Think Pair Share

Teaching English using integrated strategies like Talking Chips and Think Pair Share involves a student-centered and collaborative approach. Start by introducing a speaking topic, and state learning objectives clear. Moreover, encourage individual reflection by letting students think about the topic independently. Following this, pair students up for collaborative sharing, allowing them to discuss and refine their thoughts with a partner.

Transition to group discussions, where pairs join larger groups. Guiding these discussions to ensure each student has a chance to contribute. Throughout the activity, provide feedback on pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, and fluency. Encourage peer feedback to create a supportive learning environment.

Conclude with a reflection session, where students assess their own speaking performance. Discuss the learning process and strategies used, emphasizing their individual learning needs. Offer additional activities for extended practice and continuous improvement.

Regularly assess on the effectiveness of these integrated strategies, making adjustments based on student feedback and outcomes. This student-centered and collaborative approach ensures a comprehensive development of English speaking skills.

2.9. Procedure of Teaching Speaking Through Talking Chips Strategy and Think Pair Share

In implementing the Talking Chips and Think-Pair-Share strategies for teaching speaking, it is essential to understand the specific steps involved in each approach. The procedures provide a structured framework that guides students through participation, idea development, and discussion. The following subsection explains the original procedure of the Talking Chips strategy as the foundation before integrating it with Think Pair Share.

2.9.1 The Original Procedure of Talking Chips

The specific steps of the Talking Chips procedure, proposed by Kagan & Kagan (2009) are as follows:

1. The teacher introduces a discussion topic, provides certain themes for the groups to discuss, aids students in maintaining their ideas for sharing.
2. The discussion commences, with any group member starting by placing their chip in the middle of the table.
3. The discussion continues as students take turns using their chips, waiting for the previous speaker to finish.
4. When all chips are used, teammates collect them and continue the discussion, utilizing their Talking Chips.
5. Throughout the students' discussion, their fluency is observed, and the evaluation considers factors such as fluency.

It can be stated that the Talking Chips procedure, as suggested by Kagan (2009), provides a systematic method for guiding discussions. By following these steps,

educators can promote fair participation and effective communication among students, leading to a more inclusive and engaging learning experience.

2.9.2. The Original Steps of Think Pair Share:

There are three steps of Think Pair Share that proposed by Lyman in Barkley et. al. (2014):

1. Pose the question to the class, giving students a few minutes to think about the question and devise individual responses.

2. Ask students to pair with another student nearby.

3. Ask Student A to share his or her responses with Student B and then Student B to share ideas with Student A. Suggest that if the two students disagree, they clarify their positions so that they are ready to explain how and why they disagree. If useful, request that pairs create a joint response by building on each other's ideas.

The Think-Pair-Share technique involves students thinking about a question, discussing it with a partner, and then sharing their ideas with the class. It helps students organize their thoughts, improves the quality of their responses, and encourages participation in whole-class discussions.

2.10. Procedure of Teaching Speaking Through Integrated Talking Chips with Think Pair Share Strategy

To integrate Talking Chips and Think Pair Share in the classroom, it is crucial to establish a structured environment that promotes meaningful interaction and equal participation for all students. By merging these two strategies, teachers can capitalize on their strengths, encouraging deeper thinking and active student engagement. Here is a step-by-step guide to effectively combine Talking Chips and

Think Pair Share, thereby enhancing communicative language teaching principles and fostering a balanced and inclusive classroom environment:

Table 2. 2. Procedure of Teaching Speaking Through Talking Chips Integrated with Think-Pair-Share Strategy

No	Steps in Talking Chips *(Kagan & Kagan, 2009)*	Steps in Integrated Talking Chips with TPS
1.	The teacher introduces a discussion topic, provides certain themes for the groups to discuss, aids students in maintaining their ideas for sharing.	**1.** The teacher introduces a discussion topic and provides specific themes for groups to discuss.
2.	The discussion commences, with any group member starting by placing their chip in the middle of the table.	**2. Think:** Students individually think about the topic for a few minutes. **3. Pair:** Students then pair up to discuss their thoughts and ideas with a partner. **4. Share:** Students share their ideas with their pairs. **5.** The teacher brings the class back together for a group discussion. **6.** The teacher explains the **Talking Chips** procedure and provides each student with a set number of chips (e.g., two or three) **7.** The group discussion begins with any student placing their chip in the middle of the table to speak.
3.	The discussion continues as students take turns using their	**8.** Students take turns speaking by placing their chips in the middle,

	chips, waiting for the previous speaker to finish.	waiting for the previous speaker to finish.
4.	When all chips are used, teammates collect them and continue the discussion, utilizing their Talking Chips.	**9.** When all chips are used, students collect their chips and continue the discussion, following the same procedure.
5.	Throughout the students' discussion, their fluency is observed, and the evaluation considers factors such as fluency.	**10.** Throughout the discussion, the teacher observes students' fluency and participation. **11.** The evaluation considers factors such as the fluency of students' contributions and the balance of participation.

2.11. Advantages and Disadvantages of Teaching Speaking Through Talking Chips Integrated with Think Pair Share

There are several advantages and some disadvantages that might be occurred in implementing this integrated strategy in teaching speaking skill. The advantages of teaching speaking through Talking Chips integrated with Think Pair Share strategy are describe as follow:

1. Enhanced Participation

The combination of Talking Chips and TPS promotes increased student engagement, ensuring that each student actively contributes to the discussion.

2. Sequential Communication Skills

The Talking Chips strategy, when integrated with TPS, reinforces sequential speaking, allowing students to express themselves in an organized and structured manner.

3. Deeper Understanding

Think Pair Share encourages students to think individually and discuss in pairs before the group discussion. This process leads to a more profound comprehension of the topic.

4. Balanced Inclusivity

Talking Chips ensure that every student has a fair chance to speak, fostering an inclusive environment where diverse voices are heard.

5. Comprehensive Learning

By combining these strategies, students benefit from both individual reflection and collaborative exchange, promoting a more comprehensive learning experience.

However, this integrated strategy might also have several disadvantages in teaching speaking that are explained as follow:

1. Time Constraints: Integrating both strategies might extend the duration of the speaking activity, potentially posing time constraints, especially in limited class time.

2. Complexity for Implementation: The integration of two strategies requires effective classroom management, and some students may find the process initially confusing.

3. Varied Student Preferences: Students have different learning preferences, and while some may thrive in this integrated approach, others might prefer a more straightforward strategy.

Overall, the effectiveness of integrating Talking Chips with TPS depends on factors such as class dynamics, time constraints, and the specific learning objectives of the speaking activity.

2.12. Self-Efficacy

The belief that a person has that he is able to do something or solve problems under certain conditions and he believes he will succeed in completing something is known as self-efficacy. Individuals will be strong, resilient, and not easily stressed in solving their problems, when individuals have strong self-efficacy. In other words, individuals who have strong self-efficacy will feel lower pressure than individuals who have low self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997).

Albert Bandura in the book "Self-efficacy: The Exercise of Control" (1997) defines the concept of self-efficacy as the belief an individual has in their ability to organize a series of actions needed to achieve their goals. Self-efficacy in students means the belief or self-confidence of individuals in their ability to complete assigned tasks and their confidence when facing mid-semester exams or final semester exams, so they can overcome obstacles and achieve satisfactory grades. Therefore, self-efficacy is an individual's assessment of their own ability to perform certain behaviors or achieve certain goals.

Self-efficacy is a key concept in motivation theory and refers to an individual’s belief in their capacity to execute behaviors necessary to produce specific performance attainments. According to Bandura (1997), self-efficacy influences the goals people set, their level of perseverance, and the emotional states they experience during tasks. The concept is based on four main components:

1. Mastery Experiences: The most effective way to build self-efficacy is through mastery, or successful performance. Successes build a robust belief in one's abilities, while failure can diminish self-efficacy, especially if it occurs early or without the opportunity to recover.

2. Vicarious Experiences: Observing others perform tasks successfully can also influence one's self-efficacy, especially if the person observing is perceived as similar to themselves. If someone sees a peer succeed at a task, they are more likely to believe they can succeed as well.

3. Verbal Persuasion: Encouragement from others can boost self-efficacy, particularly when it comes from trusted figures such as teachers, mentors, or peers. Positive feedback helps individuals believe they have the capacity to succeed.

4. Emotional States: How individuals interpret their emotional reactions can affect their self-efficacy. Stress or anxiety can lower self-efficacy, while positive emotions can enhance it.

A person will generally feel confident in the ability in a particular skill or area, but for other areas may not be the case. A person is more aware of his or her ability to accomplish this. This is what is meant by self-efficacy which distinguishes it from self-esteem. While self-efficacy is specific to a particular skill, self-esteem has a broad concept and is a description of a person's ability to perform a variety of skills over a long period of time. This explanation is the reason why self-efficacy and self-esteem are said to be conceptually similar (Engko, 2008).

It can be stated that self-efficacy is the belief that a person can successfully complete tasks and solve problems under specific conditions. Strong self-efficacy

leads to resilience and lower stress when facing challenges. Unlike self-esteem, which is a broad and enduring sense of one's abilities, self-efficacy is specific to particular skills. Therefore, while both concepts are related, self-efficacy focuses on confidence in specific areas, whereas self-esteem encompasses a general sense of self-worth across various activities.

2.12.1. Dimensions of Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy in practice is divided into 3 dimensions, namely level, generality, and strength (Bandura, 1997).

a) Level

Each individual has a different level of task difficulty. A task may be considered difficult by other individuals, but for certain individuals it is considered easy. In general, individuals will have high self-efficacy when working on easy problems or tasks. However, individuals who have high self-efficacy do not give up easily and will even try to find solutions or other effective ways to complete difficult tasks.

b) Generality

The breadth of individual self-efficacy can be seen from the number of fields that are mastered. Generally, a person has a tendency to excel in one or several specific fields. Individuals who have high self-efficacy tend to have good abilities in several fields, so they are able to complete various tasks. In contrast to individuals who have low self-efficacy, generally only one field is mastered, so that when the individual is given a different task, the individual is unable to complete it.

c) Strength

The strength of individual self-efficacy can be seen from the way individuals strive for success in completing tasks. If the individual is serious and exerts all his abilities to complete the task, this indicates that the individual's self-efficacy is strong. Conversely, if in facing a problem or task the individual does not make a wholehearted effort, it means that his belief in himself is weak.

It is clear that self-efficacy is characterized by three dimensions: level, generality, and strength (Bandura in Bijl and Shortridge-Baggett, 2001). These dimensions reflect the perceived difficulty of tasks, the range of skills across different fields, and the intensity of one's belief in their ability to succeed. Individuals with high self-efficacy are persistent, versatile, and determined, while those with low self-efficacy may struggle with challenges and exhibit less confidence and effort.

2.12.2. Measurement of Self Efficacy

The concept of self-efficacy, as proposed by Albert Bandura, is crucial in understanding and enhancing students' belief in their abilities to succeed in specific tasks. Bandura (1997) develops a comprehensive framework for measuring self-efficacy, emphasizing its importance in various domains, including education.

Self-efficacy has three dimensions: level, generality, and strength. These dimensions collectively contribute to an individual's overall self-efficacy and are critical in educational settings.

In the context of this study, self-efficacy is measured using a questionnaire based on Bandura's framework. The questionnaire includes items that assess students' confidence in their speaking abilities, influenced by their experiences, observations,

feedback, and emotional states. The responses are categorized into four levels: Strongly Disagree (SD), Disagree (D), Neutral (N), Agree (A), Strongly Agree (SA). The total score for each student is calculated by summing the scores for each item.

This categorized data will help determine the impact of the Original Talking Chips Strategy and the modified Talking Chips Strategy with Think-Pair-Share on students' self-efficacy.

Addressing, developing, and reinforcing self-efficacy in the educational process is essential for enhancing students' learning outcomes. Teachers' awareness of the relationship between self-efficacy and academic performance can provide a framework for implementing more effective and supportive teaching methods.

2.13. Previous Studies

Research on Talking Chips strategy, Think Pair Share strategy, and student's Self-Efficacy have been carried out by many previous researchers. Researchers must know similar research that has been done before as reference material to support the research to be carried out. The review of previous research shows the differences and similarities with this research.

Firstly, research on the effectiveness of the Talking Chips technique conducted by Junaedi, (2020) shows that the implementation of Talking Chips significantly improved students' vocabulary, pronunciation, grammar, and fluency in speaking English. Additionally, the technique enhances classroom participation and

motivation to speak English, providing equal opportunities for all students to participate and interact in the class.

Then the research conducted by Silvia et al. (2021) about The Use of Talking Chips Technique in Teaching Speaking Skill observe a significant improvement in students' speaking abilities, leading to increased confidence and fluency in speaking English. The research finding highlights a more motivating classroom environment for English speaking practice, with a steady enhancement in students' speaking skills observed throughout the research cycles.

Kusrini (2012) also examines the effectiveness of using Think Pair Share compared to traditional presentation methods in teaching speaking skills to senior high school students. The results indicates that Think Pair Share was more beneficial in improving students' speaking competence and confidence. The study recommends the use of Think Pair Share over presentation for enhancing overall speaking skills based on t-test results and student performance in the experimental group.

Furthermore, Brillianzha A. (2020) also discuss about Think Pair Stratrgy to enhance eighth-grade students' speaking skills, resulting in increased confidence, fluency, vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, and intonation. Positive outcomes are observed in both cycles, emphasizing the benefits of using more English in the classroom, vocabulary practice, pronunciation feedback, and student motivation through rewards. The study successfully improves students' speaking skills by providing more speaking opportunities and enhancing active participation.

Moreover, the researcher also finds some discussion related to student's self-efficacy in speaking. Melyati et al. (2019) on their research state that the self-efficacy of students in speaking English, both in each dimension and as a whole, show that the level of self-efficacy was in the moderate category. Researchers also find that the level dimension is the most dominant dimension in student self-efficacy

Pramerta (2021) also conduct a research that shows that mostly, the students had average and high category of self-efficacy as shown by 22.7% and 38.7% respectively. Moreover, it was found that $F(1, 72) = 17.950$, $p < 0.001$. It means that statistically there is an impact of students' self-efficacy toward students' speaking performance. Based on the results, it can be stated that the students had good potential to enhance their speaking skills and their Self-Efficacy have significant contribution to their speaking performance.

This research aims to integrate the Talking Chips and Think-Pair-Share strategies to enhance students' speaking achievement and self-efficacy, building on previous studies that evaluated these strategies separately. Earlier research by Junaedy (2020) and Silvia et al. (2021) demonstrated improvements in vocabulary, pronunciation, grammar, and fluency through the Talking Chips technique, while studies by Kusrini (2012) and Brillianzha (2020) highlighted increased speaking competence and confidence using the Think-Pair-Share method. Additionally, studies on self-efficacy, such as those by Melyati et al. (2019) and Pramerta (2021), revealed a significant correlation between students' self-efficacy and their speaking performance. This study seek to explore the combined effect of these strategies,

assessing whether their integration can provide even greater benefits in terms of speaking achievement, classroom participation, and self-efficacy. The goal was to determine if this combined approach can enhance overall student motivation and self-efficacy in speaking English, thereby fostering a more engaging and effective learning environment.

2.14. Theoretical Assumption

Speaking is a dynamic process that involves creating, receiving, and processing information, influenced by the context and purpose of communication. The integration of Talking Chips and Think Pair Share is expected to create an engaging and supportive environment that encourages active participation and enhances the speaking process. Both strategies foster collaborative and interactive learning, which is anticipated to lead to improved speaking skills as students engage in meaningful dialogues and discussions.

It is assumed that this integrated approach will positively impact multiple aspects of speaking, including pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension, as the interactive nature of the strategies provides ample opportunities for practice and refinement. Furthermore, the structured and supportive framework of Talking Chips and Think Pair Share is expected to reduce common speaking difficulties such as inhibition, lack of content, limited participation, and reliance on the mother tongue. These strategies promote equal participation and reduce anxiety associated with speaking.

Additionally, it is assumed that integrating these strategies will boost students' self-efficacy in speaking, as the structured yet flexible approach to speaking practice helps students feel more confident in their ability to express themselves and

participate in conversations. The strategies aim to balance accuracy (correct usage of language) and fluency (smoothness and flow of speech), leading to overall improvement in speaking skills. Finally, the strategies are assumed to enhance the practical utility of speaking skills by making learning more relevant and applicable to real-life situations. Engaging students in tasks that mimic real-life interactions and communications is expected to further enhance their speaking proficiency. These assumptions form the basis for investigating the effectiveness of the integrated Talking Chips and Think-Pair-Share strategies in improving students' speaking achievement and self-efficacy.

2.15. Hypothesis

The hypothesis that used to propose the research by using statistic formula, as follow:

1) There is no significant difference in students' speaking achievement between those taught through the Talking Chips strategy and those taught through the Integrated Talking Chips strategy with Think Pair Share.
2) There is a significant difference in students' speaking achievement between those taught through the Talking Chips strategy and those taught through the Integrated Talking Chips strategy with Think Pair Share.

The hypothesis presented by the researcher is substantiated by relevant theories and previous studies.

This chapter extensively details theories extracted from diverse books and reputable journal articles. The components above including understanding of the speaking concept, the strategy of talking chips, teaching speaking through talking chips,

modifying talking chips strategy through think-pair-share strategy, procedure of teaching speaking through talking chips, procedure of teaching speaking through talking chips strategy integrated with think-pair-share strategy, advantages and disadvantages of teaching speaking through Integrated Talking Chips with Think Pair Share, Self-Efficacy, previous studies, the theoretical assumptions and research hypotheses. Further elaboration on the methods will be discussed in the next chapter.

III. METHODS

This section covers various aspects of the research process, including research design, the selection of the study population and sample, the use of research instruments, considerations of validity and reliability, techniques for collecting data, the procedures followed in the research, methods for analyzing data, and the testing of hypotheses.

3.1. Research Design

This study employed a quantitative approach to examine improvements in students' speaking achievement between two groups: the experimental group and the control group. A quasi-experimental design was applied to address the research questions, as participants were not randomly assigned to groups. Instead, existing class groups were used. To address the third research question, descriptive analysis was applied.

In this study, for the first research question, the control group was taught using the Talking Chips strategy, while the experimental group used the integrated Talking Chips strategy with Think Pair Share. Both groups took a pretest to establish a baseline of their speaking skills, followed by three treatment sessions, and a post-test to measure any improvements. Quantitative data from these tests were analyzed using an Independent Group T-test in SPSS to determine if there were statistically significant differences in speaking achievements between the two groups.

By employing a quasi-experimental approach, this study provides insights into the effectiveness of integrating the Think Pair Share strategy with Talking Chips while accounting for the limitations of non-randomized educational settings.

The design of the experiment can be described as follows:

G1 : T1 X T2
G2 : T1 O T2

Where:
G1: Experimental class.
G2: Control class.
T1: Pre-test
X: Treatment
T2: Post-test

(Setiyadi, 2018)

Independent Group T-tests enabled comparison of the mean speaking achievements between the two groups to determine if the Integrated Talking Chips with TPS strategy led to statistically significant improvements over the Talking Chips strategy alone.

Moreover, to address the second research question, the gain scores were calculated using Excel, which helped the researcher to determine which aspect of speaking showed the most improvement after the intervention. The focus was on the experimental group, with pre-tests and post-tests measuring specific aspects of speaking such as fluency, pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar. By calculating gain scores in Excel for the second research question, researchers statistically analyzed and interpreted the improvements in different aspects of speaking following the implementation of the Integrated Talking Chips with Think Pair Share strategy, contributing to evidence-based practices in language education. The gain score calculation allowed the assessment of significant changes from pre-test to

post-test for each aspect, helping to identify which aspect showed the most improvement due to the intervention.

For the third research question, which aimed to investigate students' self-efficacy in speaking, a quantitative approach was also employed. After the intervention, students in the experimental group completed a self-efficacy questionnaire. The data were analyzed using SPSS to determine the levels of self-efficacy, categorizing students as having high, moderate, or low self-efficacy based on predetermined criteria. This approach provided a clear understanding of the impact of integrated teaching strategies on students' self-efficacy in speaking.

3.2. Population and Sample

The population on this research was all tenth-grade students of SMKN 1 Bandar Lampung in the academic year 2023/2024, totaling 213 students. The sample in this study consisted of students from Class X Office Administration Major (*Perkantoran*) 2 as the control group, and X Office Administration Major (*Perkantoran*) 3 as the experimental group, with a total of 72 students. The sampling technique in this study was taken from the population using purposive sampling technique.

3.3. Data Source

The study centered on tenth-grade students at SMKN 1 Bandar Lampung, specifically those in classes X Office Administration Major (*Perkantoran*) 2 and X Office Administration Major (*Perkantoran*) 3, chose as the study's sample. The selection of these classes were based on the students' speaking challenges, as identified by the teacher. Recognizing the need for a fresh learning approach to enhance speaking skills, the researcher established two groups, X Office

Administration Major (*Perkantoran*) 2 as the control class and X Office Administration Major (*Perkantoran*) 3 as the experimental class, comprising both 36 students each class.

3.4. Data Collection Procedure

The objective of this study was to determine the effectiveness of using the Integrated Talking Chips strategy with the Think-Pair-Share strategy on students' self-efficacy and speaking comprehension. The primary tools utilized for data collection were a speaking test and a self-efficacy questionnaire. The research involved conducting both pre-tests and post-tests for the control and experimental groups to gather data on students' achievement scores in speaking comprehension before and after the treatment. The study spanned five meetings: a pre-test, three treatment sessions, and a post-test. The procedures were outlined as follows:

1. Pre-test

The pre-test was conducted to assess the students' speaking skills prior to the treatment. The teacher provided an explanation of the tasks and the scoring criteria. Students were given ten minutes to prepare a speech (extensive monologue) on describing a person, place, or object that the picture will be provided by the researcher. The pre-test sessions involved students performing their speeches in 2 sessions. The researcher divided the students into odd and even group based on their order on absent. The performances were sent through Voice Notes in WhatsApp to the researcher’s number on real time under the supervision of the researcher. Some of their performances were transcripted. (*see appendix 12*)

2. Treatment

The treatment phase consisted of three meetings. The experimental class received instruction using the Integrated Talking Chips strategy with Think Pair Share, while the control class followed the original Talking Chips strategy. Each meeting followed a detailed lesson plan designed by the researcher, focusing on enhancing speaking skills through interactive and collaborative activities.

3. Post-test

The post-test conducted after the treatments. It was aimed to measure the students' speaking ability in describing a person, place, or object that the picture provided by the researcher. The post-test sessions involved students performing their speeches in 2 sessions. The researcher divided the students into odd and even group based on their order on absent. The performances were sent through Voice Notes in WhatsApp to the researcher’s number on real time under the supervision of the researcher. The performances were evaluated and transcribed for the analysis. The results compared with the pre-test results to assess improvements in speaking abilities.

4. Administering Questionnaire (Post-treatment)

After the post-test, students in the experimental class completed a follow-up questionnaire to evaluate their self-efficacy. This assessment provided insights into their perceived confidence after experiencing the Integrated Talking Chips strategy with Think Pair Share. However, since no pre-test for self-efficacy was conducted, the study did not compare changes in self-efficacy over time but rather examines students' self-efficacy level at the end of the intervention. This structured approach allowed for a comprehensive assessment of the impact of the Integrated Talking

Chips strategy with Think Pair Share on students' speaking achievement and their perceived self-efficacy.

3.4.1. Treatment in Control and Experimental Class

a. Control Class

The treatment sessions were structured to engage students in collaborative learning to enhance their speaking skills. Each session provided opportunities for students to practice descriptive speaking and participate in group discussions to improve fluency, vocabulary, and confidence. The control class used the Talking Chips strategy as follows:

In the **first meeting** during the pre-activity phase, the teacher initiated the lesson with greetings, attendance checks, and a warm-up discussion on physical features noticed when meeting someone. This question introduced students to the concept of descriptions. The teacher then explained the lesson objectives and the Talking Chips strategy, ensuring students understood the structured turn-taking process.

During the whilst-activity, the teacher provided direct instruction on descriptive text, covering its definition, generic structure, and language features (e.g., present tense, adjectives). To model the concept, a descriptive text about Vina Muliana was analyzed as a class. Students were then divided into small groups (6 members) and tasked with presenting a description of Raffi Ahmad, focusing on structure, vocabulary, and linguistic elements. Each student received a Talking Chip, which they placed in the center before speaking, ensuring equal participation. Before speaking and placing their chips in the center, each student took a moment to think individually. This reflection time allowed them to organize their thoughts, ensuring that they could contribute to the individual presentation in their group in a clear and

structured way. The individual thinking phase is essential to allow students to carefully formulate their ideas before taking their turn to speak.

Throughout the process, students practiced describing physical features, improving sentence formation and vocabulary use. Before presenting, students conceptualized their ideas, focusing on sentence structure, vocabulary, and key descriptive elements. After the individual presentation in group, students re-presented their findings to the teacher, and the teacher provided feedback on fluency, pronunciation, and descriptive accuracy. The post-activity phase involved reflections on the effectiveness of Talking Chips and a brief overview of the next meeting.

In the **second meeting**, the theme was "places." Building on the first meeting, the pre-activity phase followed a similar structure but introduced a new warm-up question: “Can you describe a favorite place of yours in detail? What makes it unique?” This helped students transition from describing people to places. The teacher then briefly reviewed the previous material on descriptive text to reinforce key concepts.

The whilst-activity focused on applying descriptive text structures in a new context. The teacher first provided a sample text about Tokopedia’s Office, analyzing its structure, vocabulary, and linguistic features. Students sat back again with their previous small groups and tasked with discussing the description of PT Pertamina Headquarters Office using an image. The Talking Chips strategy was reintroduced, ensuring structured turn-taking.

In each group discussion, students first think individually before placing their chip in the center to speak. This gives them time to conceptuliaze and organize their ideas before sharing with the group. After discussions, each group presented a summary of their descriptions, followed by teacher feedback on vocabulary, grammar, comprehension, pronunciation, and fluency. In the post-activity phase, students reflected on their progress, and the teacher provided a brief preview of the next lesson.

In the **third meeting**, the pre-activity introduced the topic of describing objects, with a guiding question on how to describe something to someone. The teacher explained the objectives and reminded students about Talking Chips rules.

In the whilst-activity, students analyzed a sample text about a Canon Printer before working in groups to describe a Ricoh IM Printer, focusing on generic structure, vocabulary, and language features. Students first think individually before placing their chip in the center to speak. This gives them time to conceptualize and organize their ideas before sharing with the group. The Talking Chips method continued to promote structured speaking, turn-taking, and fluency development. Students demonstrated greater confidence, richer vocabulary use, and improved pronunciation compared to previous meetings.

In the post-activity, the teacher reflected on students' progress, emphasized the effectiveness of Talking Chips in improving speaking fluency, and announced the upcoming post-test.

Across the three meetings, Talking Chips proved effective in enhancing structured speech, fluency, and linguistic accuracy, gradually building students' confidence and descriptive abilities.

b. Experimental Class

In the **first meeting** of the experimental class, the teacher introduced the lesson on descriptive text, focusing on its generic structure, language features (such as the use of adjectives, present tense, and vocabulary related to physical descriptions), and its application in speaking activities.

In the pre-activity, the teacher greeted the students, checked attendance, and asked a warm-up question to relate the lesson to students' personal experiences: “What are some physical features you notice when you first meet someone?” Afterward, the teacher explained the lesson's objectives and introduced the integrated Talking Chips with Think Pair Share strategy.

During the whilst-activity, the teacher began by explaining the concept of descriptive text, using an example of Vina Muliana to illustrate the text structure and language features. The teacher then showed a picture of Raffi Ahmad, which would be used as the subject of the students' descriptions.

At this point, the Think-Pair-Share strategy was introduced. The teacher divided the students into small groups of six members. In the Think phase, each student first thought individually about the task and jotted down their ideas on how they would describe Raffi Ahmad. This phase was critical because it allowed students to reflect on their ideas independently before sharing them with others.

Next, in the Pair phase, students paired up within their small groups. They discussed their thoughts with their partner, comparing descriptions and refining their vocabulary and sentence structures. This interaction gave students the chance to hear different perspectives and helped them enhance their linguistic accuracy before moving on to the next stage.

Following the Think-Pair-Share activity, the teacher implemented the Talking Chips strategy. Each student in the group was given a Talking Chip (a coin) to ensure equal participation. Before speaking, students thought individually again, organizing their ideas. They then took turns speaking by placing their chips in the center of the group, ensuring a structured discussion about their descriptions of Raffi Ahmad. This method helped students stay on topic, practice fluency, and improve pronunciation.

After the Talking Chips discussion, each group presented their summary to the class, allowing the teacher to provide feedback on content, structure, pronunciation, and fluency. In the post-activity, the teacher reflected on the effectiveness of combining Think-Pair-Share with Talking Chips in improving students' speaking fluency and discussed the next steps in the learning process. The combination of individual reflection, peer discussion, and structured turn-taking allowed students to improve their speaking skills while refining their linguistic performance.

In **the second meeting**, the theme was "places”. The pre-activity began with the teacher greeting the students, checking attendance, and engaging them with a warm-up question: “Can you describe a favorite place of yours in detail? What makes it unique?" This prompted students to think about descriptive language, which was

connected to the lesson's main topic. The teacher then explained the lesson's objectives and the use of the Talking Chips strategy integrated with Think Pair Share to practice descriptive speaking.

In the whilst-activity, the teacher re-explained the key elements of a descriptive text, such as the generic structure and language features, including the use of adjectives and present tense. The teacher used an example about the Tokopedia Office and analyzed it with the class before presenting a new topic: the PT. Pertamina Headquarter's Office.

The teacher then guided the class through the Think Pair Share strategy and the class returned to their previous small groups from the first meeting. In the Think phase, students were given time to individually think and jot down their ideas about the office. This phase encouraged personal reflection and organization of their thoughts before engaging in discussion. In the Pair phase, students worked with their previous partner in the group, sharing their ideas and refining their descriptions. This peer interaction allowed them to practice their vocabulary and sentence structures in preparation for the group discussion.

Before starting the group discussions, the teacher re-explained the Talking Chips strategy to ensure students remembered the rules and understood the importance of taking turns in the discussion. As before, students would place their Talking Chip in the center of the group to indicate when it was their turn to speak. The students continued to practice their descriptions of the Pertamina Headquarter's Office, using their chips to take turns and ensure every student participated.

During the group discussions, the teacher monitored the students to offer guidance and assess their fluency and pronunciation. Afterward, each group presented a summary of their discussion to the class. The teacher provided feedback on the students' content, structure, vocabulary, and fluency, helping them refine their descriptive speaking skills.

In the post-activity, the teacher reflected on the effectiveness of the integrated Talking Chips and Think Pair Share strategy in improving speaking fluency. The lesson was summarized, and any remaining questions were answered. Finally, the teacher informed the class about the learning plan for the next meeting, continuing to support their development in speaking skills.

This second meeting allowed students to build on their previous work, using both individual reflection and collaborative discussion to improve their fluency, vocabulary use, and descriptive accuracy.

In the **third meeting**, the theme was "object". The students continued developing their descriptive speaking skills using the integrated Talking Chips and Think Pair Share strategy.

The lesson began with students engaging in a warm-up discussion after greeting and attendance. They responded to the question, “Can you describe something to someone?”, prompting them to recall previous lessons on descriptive text. This discussion helped them connect their prior knowledge to the day’s topic, which focused on describing objects in detail. The learning objectives were introduced, emphasizing the continued use of Think Pair Share to support structured discussions before transitioning into Talking Chips for deeper engagement.

To build understanding, students analyzed a sample descriptive text about a Canon Printer together with the class, identifying its generic structure, language features, and grammatical aspects. A new image of the Rihco IM Printer was then introduced as the subject of discussion.

Moving into Think Pair Share, students first individually thought about the topic and jotted down their ideas. This phase encouraged independent thinking and helped them organize their thoughts before sharing. They then paired up with their previous partner in group, exchanging and refining descriptions, discussing vocabulary, and structuring their responses. In the Share phase, they actively listened to each other's ideas, preparing for the next collaborative task.

Moreover, students continued their discussions using Talking Chips. Before starting, the strategy was reviewed, ensuring that everyone understood the importance of taking turns and contributing equally. Each student participated by placing their chip in the center before speaking, maintaining a structured and fair discussion. Through this process, students practiced their fluency, pronunciation, and confidence in describing objects effectively.

Throughout the discussions, students received guidance and support as needed while being observed for their language use and fluency. After completing their group discussions, they presented summaries of their descriptions to the class, reinforcing their understanding. Feedback was provided on content, structure, vocabulary, pronunciation, and fluency, helping them refine their descriptive skills.

To close the lesson, students reflected on the effectiveness of integrating Think Pair Share with Talking Chips in improving their speaking fluency. The key points of

the lesson were summarized, and any remaining questions were addressed. Before leaving, students were informed about the next learning activity, keeping them engaged in their progress. This meeting ensured students' active participation, structured communication, and a deeper understanding of descriptive text, fostering both individual and collaborative learning.

At the end of the final session, the researcher distributed a self-efficacy questionnaire to gather data on students' belief in their capability to complete tasks (Level), confidence in handling tasks of varying difficulty (Strength), and ability to generalize their learning to other tasks (Generality) in speaking after experiencing the integrated Talking Chips and Think-Pair-Share strategy.

This approach reinforced collaborative learning, individual reflection, peer sharing, and equal participation to enhance students' descriptive speaking skills. Each meeting built progressively on vocabulary use, fluency, and accuracy, while the questionnaire assessed how the strategy influenced students' self-efficacy in speaking

3.5. Research Instrument

A research instrument is a tool or method used by researchers to gather data for examining a specific phenomenon or addressing research questions. The instruments used in this study were as follows:

3.5.1. Speaking Test

The speaking test served as the performance assessment in this study. According to Brown (2004), a test is a tool used to assess students' knowledge and skills in a particular subject. Initially, a pre-test measured the students' baseline speaking

skills, followed by a post-test that were conducted after the treatment. The researcher used a speaking test to assess whether students' speaking skills improved. Their abilities were evaluated based on their performance in delivering a monologue to describe something in front of the class. This method allowed students to demonstrate their speaking skills individually, providing a comprehensive assessment of their ability to use the language effectively. According to Brown (2010), the five aspects of speaking skills, namely vocabulary, grammar, fluency, comprehension, and pronunciation, are essential for a comprehensive assessment of speaking abilities. A well-structured scoring rubric based on these aspects can effectively evaluate students' performance. The researcher employed a scoring rubric developed by Brown (2004) to assess these aspects of speaking skill.

Table 3. 1. Brown's Speaking Rubric Scoring (2010)

Rating	Vocabulary	Grammar	Fluency	Comprehension	Pronounciation	Task
5	Uses a wide range of vocabulary appropriately and effectively. Shows mastery of topic-related vocabulary with minimal errors.	Uses complex grammatical structures accurately. Errors are rare and do not impede comprehension.	Speaks smoothly with natural pacing and minimal hesitation. Speech is coherent and easy to follow.	Fully understands and appropriately responds to the prompt. Demonstrates deep comprehension of the topic.	Pronounces words clearly and accurately with native-like or near-native pronunciation.	Speaking proficiency equivalent to that of an educated native speaker.
4	Uses a good range of vocabulary appropriately with occasional errors. Topic-related vocabulary is mostly accurate.	Uses a variety of grammatical structures with some errors that do not significantly affect meaning.	Speaks with some hesitation but maintains overall coherence. Occasional pauses do not significantly disrupt communication.	Understands the prompt and responds appropriately with minor misunderstandings or omissions.	Pronounces most words clearly with occasional errors that do not impede understanding.	Would rarely be taken for a native speaker but can respond appropriately even in unfamiliar situations. Can handle informal interpreting

						from and into language.
3	Uses an adequate range of vocabulary with some noticeable errors. Topic-related vocabulary is somewhat limited but understandable.	Uses simple grammatical structures with noticeable errors. Errors occasionally impede comprehension.	Speaks with noticeable hesitation and occasional pauses that disrupt the flow of speech.	Partially understands the prompt with some incorrect or incomplete responses.	Pronounces words with some errors. Errors occasionally impede understanding.	Can participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, and professional topics.
2	Uses limited vocabulary with frequent errors. Topic-related vocabulary is often incorrect or inadequate.	Uses basic grammatical structures with frequent errors. Errors often impede comprehension.	Speaks with frequent hesitation and pauses, making speech difficult to follow.	Struggles to understand the prompt and responds with significant errors or omissions.	Pronounces words with frequent errors. Errors often impede understanding.	Able to satisfy routine social demands and work requirements; needs help in handling any complication or difficulties.
1	Uses very limited vocabulary with numerous errors. Lacks necessary vocabulary to adequately describe the topic	Uses very basic or incorrect grammatical structures consistently. Errors significantly impede comprehension.	Speaks with constant hesitation and very little flow. Communication is severely disrupted and hard to understand.	Fails to understand the prompt and provides an irrelevant or incorrect response.	Pronounces words with numerous errors. Errors significantly impede understanding	Can ask and answer questions on topics very familiar to him. Able to satisfy routine travel needs and minimum courtesy requirements. (Should be able to order a simple meal, ask for shelter or lodging, ask and give simple directions, make purchases, and tell time.)

The criteria of scoring:

5 : Excellent
4 : Very Good
3 : Good

2 : Fair
1 : Poor
0 : Very Poor

However, to ensure consistency with percentage-based evaluation systems, each aspect originally scored on a 1–5 scale was converted into a 10–100 scale. This proportional conversion allows for clearer interpretation and finer differentiation of learners' speaking performance.

Here is the conversion of the criteria of scoring:

Original Scale	**Description**	**Converted Scale**
5	Excellent	90-100
4	Very Good	70-89
3	Good	50-69
2	Fair	30-49
1	Poor	10-29
0	Very Poor	0

To convert the original scale (e.g., 1, 2, 3, etc.) into a more detailed range (e.g., 10-29, 30-49), a proportional scaling method is used. The original score range were redistributed evenly across the new intervals to maintain fairness and consistency. The formula to adjust each range can be applied by calculating proportional increments or defining new boundary values for each category according to the expanded range. This ensures that scores reflected a more nuanced grading system without altering the original scoring rubric's intent.

3.5.2. Questionnaire of Self-Efficacy

The questionnaire used in the study was adopted from Hifni (2022) that developed from Bandura's theory (*see appendix 5).* The distribution of the self-efficacy scale in the form of a questionnaire was carried out after students taking the post-test in

experimental class. This self-efficacy questionnaire consists of questions that were developed based on the theory of 3 aspects of self-efficacy, namely: level, strength, generality.

Table 3. 2. Self-Efficacy Scale Grid

Aspect	Indicator
Level	Optimistic when facing difficulties
	Level of task difficulty
	Task completion rate
Strength	Consistent in achieving goals as a student
	Persistent in learning
	Persistent in doing assignments
Generality	Able to use English in different settings (school, work, public)
	Can adapt English use in unexpected situations
	Can learn effectively across different subjects

Table 3. 3. Self-Efficacy Questionnaire Specification

No	Aspect	No Item	Total
1	Students' belief in capability of completing the task (Level)	1, 8, 17, 19	4 Items
2	Students' confidence at completing various levels of difficulty (Strength)	2, 4, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 16	8 Items
3	Students' understanding on how one task generalizes to other tasks (Generality)	14, 15, 18, 20	4 Items

Each item was carefully categorized under the appropriate dimension based on its focus and content, ensuring consistency with Bandura's self-efficacy framework and supporting the internal validity of the measurement.

Assessment of the self-efficacy scale by modifying the Likert scale which has four response options, namely Strongly Disgree (SD), Disagree (D), Neutral (N), Agree

(A), Strongly Agree (SA). The respondents gave a check mark (√) in the column provided in accordance with his/her situation. The scores for each answer were as follows:

Table 3. 4. Self-Efficacy Likert Scale

Strongly Disagree	1
Disagree	2
Neutral	3
Agree	4
Strongly Agree	5

The self-efficacy assessment data was obtained through a questionnaire using a modified Likert scale with four response options: Strongly Disagree (SD), Disagree (D), Neutral (N), Agree (A), and Strongly Agree (SA). Each learner's total score was determined by summing the scores from all questionnaire items. The data analysis involved categorizing scores based on three dimensions of self-efficacy: level, strength, and generality. Scores for each aspect were summed to obtain a total self-efficacy score for each learner. The percentage scores were then calculated using SPSS by dividing each obtained score by the total possible score and multiplying by 100.

The percentage of responses for each indicator will be classified using the following criteria:

Table 3. 5. Answer Percentage Interval

Interval	**Category**
80.1% - 100%	Very High
60.1% - 80%	High
40.1% - 60%	Moderate
20.1% - 40%	Low
0.0% - 20%	Very Low

This categorized data helped the researcher to determine the impact of Integrated Talking Chips Strategy with Think-Pair-Share on students' self-efficacy.

3.6. Validity and Reliability

The validity and reliability of the test must be assessed to ensure it meets high-quality standards. These are as follows:

3.6.1. Validity of The Speaking Test

Test validity refers to the extent to which a test accurately measures what it is intended to measure and nothing else (Heaton, 1989). To evaluate its validity, the researcher analyzed it based on content validity and construct validity.

A. Content Validity

A test is deemed to possess content validity if its contents constitute a representative sample of the language skills and structures it aims to assess. To determine content validity, it is essential to specify the skills or structures being tested. In creating this test, the researcher aligned it with the course objectives outlined in the English syllabus of SMKN 1 Bandar Lampung.

Content validity revolves around whether the tests effectively reflect the materials that need to be examined. Achieving content validity involves organizing the material based on the teaching objectives specified in the school's syllabus for the tenth grade of Vocational Senior High School, aligning with the learning outcome criteria.

Learning Outcome
Ath the end of Phase E, learners use spoken, written and visual texts in English to communicate according to the situation, purpose and audience/reader. Various types of texts such as narrative, **description**, procedure, exposition, recount, report, and authentic texts are the main references in learning English in this phase. Learners use English to convey desires/feelings and discuss topics that are close to their daily lives or hot issues according to the age of the learners in this phase. They read written texts to learn something/get information. Implicit inference skills when understanding information, in English, begin to develop. Learners produce more diverse written and visual texts, with awareness of the purpose and target readers.

Element Learning Outcome
Listening and Speaking
By the end of Phase E, students use English to communicate with teachers, peers and others in a range of settings and for a range of purposes. They use and respond to questions and use strategies to initiate and sustain conversations and discussion. They understand and identify the main ideas and relevant details of discussions or presentations on youth-related topics. They use English to express opinions on youth-related issues and to discuss youth-related interests. They give and make comparisons. They use non-verbal elements such as gestures, speed and pitch to be understood in some contexts.

B. Construct Validity

Construct validity centers on the type of test employed to assess a particular ability, specifically in the context of speaking skills. Heaton (1991) states that construct validity is determined by a test's ability to measure a specific characteristic in accordance with a theory of language behavior and learning. Essentially, it ensures that tests are based on relevant concepts and theories to accurately assess abilities, particularly speaking skills. In this study, an oral test was utilized, drawing on the framework proposed by Brown (2004). This framework outlines the aspects of speaking that should be measured, encompassing vocabulary, grammar, fluency, comprehension, and pronunciation. Additionally, to assess the construct validity of

the test, the researcher used experts judgment to determine if the speaking test was consistent with the theory of the speaking element as provided in Appendix 1.

To validate the speaking test instrument, two experts were engaged in a detailed evaluation process aligned with the Expert Validation Form in *Appendix 1*. Firstly, the experts reviewed the test items to ensure they align with the theoretical framework proposed by Brown (2004), which includes vocabulary, grammar, fluency, comprehension, and pronunciation. They checked if each item accurately measures these components and fits the theoretical constructs of speaking skills.

Next, the experts assessed the test's structure, format, and instructions for consistency with the theory and appropriateness for the students' level. They evaluated the content validity by examining if the test represents both general and specific learning objectives, assesses basic competences, language functions, learning topics, and genre-based texts.

For construct validity, the experts ensured that the test measures students' overall speaking ability, fluency, accuracy in word use, grammar, pronunciation, and their ability to engage in both monologues and dialogues. The face validity was evaluated by checking if the test includes tasks that require students to express ideas in monologues, interact with others, and if the activities are understandable and varied.

Additionally, the experts assessed the test procedure, ensuring that instructions are clear, the duration is reasonable, and the difficulty level is appropriate. They documented their evaluations, feedback, and suggestions for the revisions. This comprehensive feedback used as guide for the necessary revisions to the test

instrument, ensuring it effectively measures the intended speaking skills in line with established theories and practices.

The expert validation questionnaire was adopted from Kadir & Zaim (2019) that consist of 19 items that utilized a 5-point likert scale to measure the degree to which each test item aligns with the theoretical framework and the intended speaking skills (*see appendix 2)*. To analyze the results, Aiken's V was employed as a statistical method to calculate the content validity coefficient. This method was chosen because it quantifies the degree of agreement among experts regarding the relevance of each item to the evaluation criteria.

Aiken's V is calculated using the formula:

$$V = \frac{\sum s}{n(c-1)}$$

Where:

- ∑s is the score given by the experts minus the lowest score on the scale,
- n is the total number of experts,
- c is the number of categories on the Likert scale.

(Aiken, 1980)

The resulting V coefficient ranges from 0 to 1, where a higher value indicates stronger agreement among experts about the validity of an item. For this study, a threshold value of V ≥ 0.75V was used to determine if an item is valid. Items with a lower V value were considered for revision based on the experts' qualitative feedback. This process ensures that the instrument's items are not only theoretically sound but also practically relevant to assessing students' speaking skills.

Here are the criteria of scoring:

- 0,8-1 Veri High Validity
- 0,6-0,79 High Validity
- 0,40-0,59 Moderate Validity
- 0,20-0,39 Low Validity
- 0,00-0,19 Very Low Validity

Table 3. 6. Results of Speaking Test Validity

Item	Validator		S_1	S_2	∑s	n(c-1)	V	Ket
	I	II						
Item 1-19	95	89	76	70	146	152	0.960526	Very High Validity

The results of the validity analysis for items 1–19 of the speaking test instrument indicated a very high validity based on the Aiken's V coefficient. Two validators provided scores of 95 and 89, respectively, which were summed to produce a total score of 146. The denominator n(c−1), calculated as 152, reflects the two validators and the four-point range of the 5-point Likert scale. Using these values, the Aiken's V coefficient was determined to be 0.96053. According to the criteria for validity, where values between 0.8 and 1.0 are classified as Very High, this result confirmed very strong agreement between the validators on the validity of the test items. This indicated that the instrument was highly valid, aligns well with the theoretical framework, and effectively evaluates the intended speaking skills. Therefore, no major revisions to the test items are necessary (*see appendix 3)*.

3.6.2. Validity of The Questionnaire of Self-Efficacy

To ensure the validity of the questionnaire, the researcher first examined the wording of Hifni's original items by carefully comparing them with Bandura's theoretical framework (*see appendix 14).* This step aimed to verify that each item

accurately reflected one of the three core dimensions of self-efficacy proposed by Bandura, namely: level, strength, and generality.

After this theoretical validation, the researcher conducted an empirical validation by testing the questionnaire with a different group of students from a class similar to the research sample. The questionnaire was administered to this group to evaluate whether the items effectively measured self-efficacy across different respondents.

This approach involved administering the questionnaire to the new group and analyzing the results to ensure the items accurately measure self-efficacy as intended. This method provided practical evidence of the questionnaire's effectiveness across different groups. To check the validity of the questionnaire using previously collected results, the researcher employed Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation in SPSS. This involved calculating the correlation between each questionnaire item and the total score. High and significant correlations indicate that the items were valid measures of the intended construct. Specifically, the researcher entered the data into SPSS, computed the total score for each respondent, and then run a bivariate correlation analysis. Items with a Pearson correlation coefficient above 0.3 and a p-value less than 0.05 were considered valid.

Based on the explanation above, it can be assumed that the self-efficacy questionnaire was valid if the Pearson correlation values are above 0.3 and statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). To determine the result of the coefficient, the researcher used Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation.

Table 3. 7. Results of Questionnaire Validation Test

Item	P-Values	Item	P-Values	Item	P-Values	Item	P-Values
1	0.016	**6**	0.000	**11**	0.814	**16**	0.006
2	0.000	**7**	0.835	**12**	0.011	**17**	0.026
3	0.071	**8**	0.000	**13**	0.006	**18**	0.026
4	0.006	**9**	0.000	**14**	0.000	**19**	0.029
5	0.516	**10**	0.007	**15**	0.000	**20**	0.000

According to the pilot test's results, 16 out of the 20 items were found to be valid. Pearson correlation coefficients with p-values below 0.05 showed that these items are self-efficacy measurement instruments of high validity. Nonetheless, 4 items− item 3, 5, 7, 11− were deemed invalid as their correlation coefficients were higher than 0.05 or were not statistically significant. As a result, these four questions were taken out of the questionnaire. The researcher decided to keep the 16 remaining items for the main study. This was how the researcher made sure that the questionnaire did its job properly by asking the participants its questions in a correct way and that our questionnaire is valid. (*see appendix 8)*

3.6.3. Reliability of The Speaking Test

A quality test should possess not only high validity but also high reliability. Fraenkel and Wallen (2012) define reliability as the consistency of scores, indicating how consistent they are for each individual across different administrations of an instrument and from one set of items to another. If a test is reliable, one would expect a student who achieves a high score the first time to similarly achieve a high score on subsequent attempts.

Additionally, Setiyadi (2018) explains that reliability is measured statistically through correlation calculations, with a coefficient ranging from 0 to 1. A

coefficient closer to 1 indicates higher reliability. To evaluate score reliability, the researcher used inter-rater reliability, with the researcher as Rater One (R1) and the English teacher as Rater Two (R2). R1 is the researcher which is a student in the Magister program of English Education at the University of Lampung, conducting research at SMKN 1 Bandar Lampung, while R2 is one of the English Teacher at SMKN 1 Bandar Lampung. This choice of raters is deemed appropriate for evaluating students' work. Inter-rater reliability gauges the consistency of scores assigned by two or more raters simultaneously, in this case, the teacher and the researcher. The researcher is the first rater in this research, and the second rater is an English teacher.

After collecting the data, the researcher analyzed the coefficient value between the two raters using the reliability criteria provided by Setiyadi (2018), as follows:

1. Very low reliability ranges from 0.000 to 0.200.
2. Low reliability ranges from 0.200 to 0.400.
3. The average reliability ranges from 0.400 to 0.600.
4. High reliability ranges from 0.600 to 0.800.
5. Very high reliability ranges from 0.800 to 1.00.

Based on the explanation above, the students' speaking ability test can be considered reliable if the coefficient falls within the range of 0.600 to 0.800 (high reliability). Before assessing students' speaking abilities, both raters must use the same scoring criteria. To determine the coefficient value, the researcher applied the Rank-Order Correlation formula:

$$R = 1 - \frac{6(\Sigma d^2)}{N(N^2 - 1)}$$

Notes:

R: Reliability
D: the difference of rank correlation
N: Number of students
1-6: Constant Number

(Hatch & Farhady, 1981)

The test could be considered reliable if the test reaches the range of 0.60 – 0.79 (high reliability). From the analysis of the scores from the two raters, the coefficient rank orders gained are as follows:

Table 3. 8. Result of Reliability Speaking Test

Test Results	Coefficient Rank Order	Criteria
Pre-Test of Control Class	0.925	Very High Reliability
Post-Test Control Class	0.966	Very High Reliability

It could be seen from the table above that all the coefficient rank order resulted from the scores are all above 0.800 which belongs to high reliability standard. It means that the speaking test instrument that was used in this research was highly reliable.

3.6.4. Reliability of The Questionnaire of Self-Efficacy

The researcher used Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient to evaluate the reliability of the questionnaire items, as it is a widely recognized method for assessing internal consistency. The alpha coefficient ranges from 0 to 1, with higher values indicating greater reliability. The researcher analyzed the collected responses to calculate Cronbach's Alpha and assess the questionnaire's reliability. Additionally, the researcher categorized reliability based on the following scale:

a. 0.800 to 1.00 = very high reliability
b. 0.600 to 0.800 = high-reliability
c. 0.400 to 0.600 = moderate reliability

d. 0.200 to 0.400 = low-reliability

e. 0.000 to 0.200 = very low reliability.

To further confirm the reliability of the questionnaire items, the researcher performed a reliability analysis using Cronbach's Alpha in SPSS. The analysis yielded a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.8, indicating high internal consistency. This result suggests that the 16 valid items effectively measure the self-efficacy construct and can consistently produce reliable results across different respondents.

Table 3. 9. Result of Questionnaire Reliability Test

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.800	20

A Cronbach's Alpha value above 0.7 is considered acceptable. It could be seen from the table that the result is 0.800 which belongs to high reliability standard. It means that the questionnaire instrument that was used in this research was highly reliable.

3.7. Data Analysis

The data in this study were analyzed quantitatively using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 17.0 for Windows. Before conducting statistical analyses, the normality and homogeneity of the data were tested using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and Levene's test, respectively.

a. Normality Test

Table 3.10. Normality of the data

Tests of Normality

		Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Group	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
PreTest	Control	.082	36	.200*	.987	36	.932
	Experimental	.121	36	.200*	.962	36	.248
PostTest	Control	.126	36	.159	.957	36	.176
	Experimental	.108	36	.200*	.962	36	.249

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

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

It could be seen from the table that the sig. values of the pre-test and post-test of the control and experimental class were greater than 0.05. Since the significant level (Sig.) is > 0.05 (α), it means that H1 was accepted. In conclusion, the data on this research had a normal distribution.

b. Homogenity Test

Table 3.11. Homogenity of the data

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Pre_Test	Based on Mean	.288	1	70	.593
	Based on Median	.262	1	70	.611
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.262	1	68.606	.611
	Based on trimmed mean	.303	1	70	.584
Post_Test	Based on Mean	1.372	1	70	.245
	Based on Median	1.295	1	70	.259
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	1.295	1	65.548	.259
	Based on trimmed mean	1.298	1	70	.258

In assessing the equality of variances in the test of homogeneity of variances in the column Levene Statistics, it could be seen that the significant level (Sig.) were higher than α = 0.05. Therefore, it can be stated that both the pre-test and post-test data have homogeneity of variances.

The results indicated that the data were normally distributed and had homogeneous variances, as the significance values were greater than 0.05.

Furthermore, the data obtained from the pre-tests, post-tests, as well as the data from self-efficacy questionnaires, were analyzed as follows:

1. Analyzing Pre-test and Post-test Scores in the Control Group.

   The researcher analyzed the pre-test and post-test scores in the control group to determine the mean scores. This analysis provided a baseline for comparison with the experimental group.

2. Analyzing Pre-test and Post-test Scores in the Experimental Group.

   The researcher analyzed the pre-test and post-test scores in the experimental group to determine the mean scores. This analysis helped the researcher to evaluate the impact of the Integrated Talking Chips strategy combined with Think-Pair-Share on speaking achievement.

3. Conducting Independent-Sample T-test.

   The researcher conducted an independent-sample t-test twice. Firstly, to compare the post-test scores in both control and experimental groups in order to find that each strategy would have significant difference or not. Secondly, the independent-sample t-test used to compare the pre-test and post-test from the control class and experimental class. This test determined the effectiveness of the Integrated Talking Chips strategy combined with Think-Pair-Share in improving speaking achievement compared to the Original Talking Chips strategy used in the control group.

4. Analyzing Improvements in Specific Aspects of Speaking.

   The researcher analyzed the pre-test and post-test scores for specific aspects of speaking (such as fluency, coherence, vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation) in the experimental group. This analysis identified which aspect of speaking shows the most improvement after the implementation of the Integrated Talking Chips strategy combined with Think-Pair-Share.

5. Analyzing Self-Efficacy Questionnaire Results.

   The researcher analyzed the post-test self-efficacy questionnaire results for the experimental group to determine the level of self-efficacy. This analysis helped the researcher to assess the impact of the treatment on students' self-efficacy.

This structured approach to data analysis will provide a comprehensive assessment of the impact of the Integrated Talking Chips strategy with Think-Pair-Share on students' speaking achievement, improvements in specific aspects of speaking, and self-efficacy.

3.8. Hypothesis Testing

The hypotheses are tested at a significance level of 0.05, where a hypothesis is accepted if the p-value (Sig) is less than the chosen significance level (α). This implies that the probability of making an error in the hypothesis is only approximately 5%.

The first research question regarding the difference of English-speaking achievement was formulated into a hypothesis:

H1: There is a significant difference in students' speaking achievement between students who are taught through Original Talking Chips Strategy and students who are taught through Talking Chips Strategy that integrate with Think-Pair-Share.

H0: There is no significant difference in students' speaking achievement between students who are taught through Original Talking Chips Strategy and students who are taught through Talking Chips Strategy that integrate with Think-Pair-Share.

In short, this chapter discusses research design, population and sample, data collection technique, research procedures, research instruments, validity and reliability, scoring criteria, data analysis, data treatment and hypothesis testing.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

This chapter focuses on drawing conclusions and providing suggestions according to the result and discussion of the research. The suggestion would be for teachers, students, and other researchers.

5.1. Conclusions

Based on the finding and discussion in this study, there are several conclusions that could be taken. They are:

1. The integration of the Talking Chips strategy with the Think-Pair-Share (TPS) strategy did not result in a statistically significant difference in students' speaking achievement compared to the original Talking Chips strategy. This finding suggested that while both strategies effectively promote active participation and collaborative learning, their combination might not necessarily yield additional benefit within a short intervention period.

2. The implementation of the integrated strategy demonstrated varying degrees of improvement across the five aspects of speaking. Comprehension showed the most notable gains, attributed to the structured, interactive, and peer-supported nature of the strategy. However, fluency showed the least improvement, likely due to the limited opportunities for spontaneous, unstructured speech. This highlighted a potential limitation of the strategy

in fostering more natural conversational abilities, suggesting the need for complementary activities targeting fluency development.

3. The majority of students demonstrated moderate to high self-efficacy in speaking, suggesting a positive influence from the integrated Talking Chips and Think-Pair-Share strategies. However, a significant portion still showed moderate to low self-efficacy, highlighting ongoing challenges such as anxiety and lack of confidence. Despite their confidence, students' actual speaking achievement did not fully reflect these beliefs, with many still performing at a moderate level in the post-test. This gap may be due to external factors like test anxiety, task difficulty, or limited practice opportunities. To bridge this gap, future interventions should focus on reducing anxiety, providing more speaking practice, and enhancing students' self-confidence through sustained support and targeted strategies.

In conclusion, while the integration of the Talking Chips and Think-Pair-Share strategies offers meaningful opportunities for collaborative learning and partial improvement in speaking skills, its full potential remains unrealized within the scope of this study. More comprehensive approaches and adjustments are necessary to achieve significant and sustained enhancements in students' speaking performance and self-efficacy.

5.2. Suggestions

There are some suggestions that the researcher of this study provide. The suggestions are aimed for teachers and future researchers.

1. **For Teachers**
    a. Incorporate self-assessment and reflective activities: To help students align their self-efficacy with actual performance, teachers can integrate structured self-reflection or self-assessment exercises regularly.
    b. Create a low-pressure speaking environment: To reduce test anxiety, use informal speaking activities like group discussions or casual conversations before formal assessments.
    c. Extend exposure to integrated strategies: A longer implementation period for the integrated Talking Chips and Think-Pair-Share strategies may lead to more noticeable improvements in fluency and grammar.
    d. Modify talking chips: Giving time to think during the talking chips strategy before presenting students' ideas so they can organize their thoughts, choose appropriate vocabulary, and structure their sentences more clearly. This leads to more meaningful and coherent contributions during discussions.
2. **For Future Researchers**
    a. Increase sample size and diversity: For more generalizable results, future studies should consider a larger sample size and include participants from various backgrounds.
    b. Conduct longitudinal studies: Explore the long-term effects of using integrated speaking strategies over extended periods to better understand their sustained impact on students' speaking abilities.

c. Use mixed-methods approaches: To gain a deeper understanding of the students' experiences, future research could incorporate qualitative methods such as interviews or classroom observations.

d. Examine external influencing factors: Investigate how factors like students' motivation, classroom environment, and peer interactions might affect speaking performance.

e. Refine the questionnaire validation process: Ensure that the self-efficacy questionnaire undergoes expert judgment and factor analysis before use. This will improve its validity in measuring unobservable constructs like self-efficacy. Additionally, a more suitable method for validating psychological constructs should be considered, such as using factor analysis or expert evaluation rather than relying solely on Pearson's correlation.

f. Incorporate scaffolding techniques in TPS: Future researchers should consider integrating scaffolding strategies within the Think-Pair-Share process to better support students during discussions and task completion. This could involve providing guided prompts, modeling tasks, or offering real-time feedback to help students build their responses and achieve higher levels of participation and learning.

g. Future studies are encouraged to examine the use of descriptive text material in speaking tasks, particularly within the framework of intensive monologue. Since TSE includes tasks such as "describing something physical" and "giving a personal description," this type of material aligns well with TSE-based assessments and could provide

more focused insights into students' speaking performance using Brown's five aspects.

In conclusion, these suggestions aimed to guide teachers in improving speaking instruction and assisted future researchers in building upon the findings of this study. Both groups played a pivotal role in enhancing students' speaking skills and self-efficacy in EFL contexts.

REFERENCES

Aiken, L. R. (1980). Content Validity and Reliability of Single Items or Questionnaires. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 40*(4), 955-959. https://doi.org/10.1177/001316448004000419

Alfi, I. (2015). *Improving students' speaking skill through communicative games for grade VIII at MTSN Ngemplak* (Master's thesis). Yogyakarta State University.

Bahadorfar, M., & Omidvar, R. (2014). Technology in Teaching Speaking Skill. *Acme International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 9-13.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: W.H. Freeman.

Barkley, E. F., Major, C. H., & Cross, K. P. (2014). *Collaborative learning techniques: A handbook for college faculty* (1st ed.). Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Bijl, J. J., Shortridge-Baggett, L. M. (2001). The Theory and Measurement of the Self-efficacy Construct. *Journals Scholarly Inquiry for Nursing Practice*. Vol 15 (13): 189-207.

Brillianzha, A. (2020). A study of Think-Pair-Share technique to improve speaking skills of the eighth-grade students in Kupang. *Lectio*, ISSN 2775-507X.

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy Second Edition.* Longman: San Fransisco.

Brown, H. D. (2010). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices*. Longman, San Francisco.

Buchori, A., & Cintang, N. (2018). The Influence of Powtoon-Assisted Group to Group Exchange and Powtoon-Assisted Talking Chips Learning Models in Primary Schools. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE), 7*(3), 221. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v7i3.14378

Bunaya, M. S., & Basikin. (2018). Improving speaking confidence by using Think Pair Share (TPS) teaching strategy to high school students. In *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research* (Vol. 326). Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Current Issues in Education (ICCIE 2018). Yogyakarta State University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia.

Burns, A & Joyce, H. (1997). Focus on Speaking. National Center for English Language Teaching and Research, Sydney.

Byrne, D. (1986). *Teaching oral English*. Longman, London.

Castillo, C. (2007). *Improving eleventh graders' oral production in English class through cooperative learning strategies*. Editorial Universidad del Rosario. Colombia.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.

Davies, N. F. (1979). Teaching Language as Communication. Widdowson, Henry George, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978, XI + 168 pp., £ 3.50. In *System* (Vol. 7, Issue 3, pp. 228–230). https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(79)90008-3

Educational Broadcasting. (2004). What are the Benefits of Cooperative and Collaborative Learning? Thirteen ed. Online. https://www.thirteen.org/edonline/concept2class/coopcollab/index.html/ Accessed on 13th June 2024

Farhana, S., Flora, & Supriyadi, D. (2018). The Influence of Retelling Story Technique in Improving Students' Speaking Skill By Using Picture Series At the First Grade Students of Sman 3 Bandar Lampung. *UNILA Journal of English Teaching*, *7*(1).1-6. https://doi.org/10.30812/humanitatis.v7i2.1248

Feist, J., & Feist, G. J. (2011). *Theories of Personality* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill, Boston.

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill Higher Education, New York.

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2012). Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application. Tenth Edition. Perason. http://repositorio.unan.edu.ni/2986/1/5624.pdf%0Ahttp://fiskal.kemenkeu.go.id/ejournal%0Ahttp://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cirp.2016.06.001%0Ahttp://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.powtec.2016.12.055%0Ahttps://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfatigue.2019.02.006 %0Ahttps://doi.org/10.1

Gray, D., Brown, S., Macanufo, J. (2010). *Game Storming*. O'Reilly Media, Sebastopol.

Hatch, E., & Farhady, H. (1981). Research Design and Statistic for Applied Linguistics. California: Rahnama Publication.

Hadfield, J., and Hadfield, C. (1999). *Simple speaking activities*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Hanifah S. (2018). The Influence of Retelling Story Technique in Improving Students' Speaking Skill by Using Picture Series at The First Grade Students of SMAN 3 Bandar Lampung. *U-JET, Unila Journal of English Teaching. University of Lampung*.

Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (4th ed.). Pearson Longman, New York.

Harris, D. P. (1969). *Testing English as a Second Language*. McGrawHill, New York.

Haryudin, A., & Jamilah, S. A. (2018). Teacher's Difficulties in Teaching Speaking Using. *Eltin*, *6*(2), 59–68.

Heaton, J. B. (1991). *Writing English language tests* (1st ed.). Longman Group UK Limited.

Heaton, J. B. (1998). *Writing English language tests* (2nd ed.). Longman.

Hifni, H**.** (2022). *The relationship of students' self-efficacy, linguistic intelligence, and speaking ability: A correlational study at the seventh-grade bilingual students of Islamic junior high school of Madrasah Pembangunan UIN Jakarta* (Master's thesis). Graduate Program of English Education, Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University, Jakarta.

Jacobs, G. (2004). Cooperative learning: Theory, principles, and techniques. Paper presented at the First International Online Conference on Second and Foreign Language Teaching and Research. ERIC. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED573881.pdf.

Jasim, A. F. (2017). The Effect of Talking Chips Technique on Iraq EFL Students' Achievement in Speaking Skill. *Journal of Misan Researches*, *13*(25), 295–329. https://www.iasj.net/iasj/download/a6a346b7801a8a3f

Junaedi, A. (2020). The Use of Talking Chips Technique in Teaching Speaking Junaedi. *ELITE Journal*, *2*(1), 9–22. https://www.elitejournal.org/index.php/ELITE

Kadir, J. S., & Zaim, M. (2019). *Developing Instruments For Evaluating Validity , Practicality , And Effectiveness Of The Authentic Assessment For Speaking Skill At Junior High School*. *276*(Icoelt 2018), 98–105.

Kagan, S., & Kagan, M. (2009). Why Do We Need Cooperative Learning? In *Kagan Cooperative Learning*.

Kartini, M., & Jubhari, R. R. (2021). Improving Student's Speaking Skill Through Talking Chips Strategy: A Pilot Study. *Jurnal Ilmu Budaya*, *9*(2), 81–87.

Koran, S. (2017). The Role of Teachers in Developing Learners' Speaking Skill. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(35), 201-206.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Pergamon Press, Oxford.

Kusrini, E. (2012). Teaching Speaking for Senior High School Students using Cooperative Learning "Think-Pair-Share." *Jurnal Aktif*, *XVIII*(3), 1–8.

Lander, J. A., & Brown, H. D. (1995). Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. In *Language* (Vol. 71, Issue 4, p. 843). https://doi.org/10.2307/415773

Lisnawati, I., Yuniawati, Y., & Kartadireja, W. N. (2019). Student's Self-Efficacy

in Speaking Learning. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research: Proceedings of the International Symposium on Social Sciences, Education, and Humanities (ISSEH 2018)*, (306).255–261. https://doi.org/10.2991/isseh-18.2019.59

Lyman, F. (1981). *The Responsive Classroom Discussion*. College Park, MD: University of Maryland College of Education

Manurung, Y. H. (2020). The Effect of Applying Talking Chips Technique on the Students' Speaking Skill. *Journal of English Language Learning*.

Marhaeni, I. M. P., Putra, A. A. I. N., & Jaya, I. N. A. (2013). The Effect of Think Pair Sahre Teacing Strategi to Student' Selft-Confidence and Speaking Competency of The Second Grade Students of SMPN 6 Singaraja. *Program Pascasarjana Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris*, *1*.

Mohammed, A. (2021). Students' Speaking Proficiency and Self-efficacy Theory. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, *8*(2), 318–325. https://doi.org/10.14738/assrj.82.9660

Nisa, K., Raja, P., & Nainggolan, F. (2015). the Use of Talking Chips Technique To Improve Students' Speaking Ability. *UNILA Journal of English Teaching*, *4*(1), 1–13.

Nunan, D., Higgins, C., & Edge, J. (2003). The impact of language learning on curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 35*(2), 157-169.

Pramerta, I. G. P. A. (2021). The impact of self-efficacy towards speaking performance. *Journal of Psychology and Instruction*, 5(3), 101-108. https://doi.org/10.23887/jpai.v5i2

Prasetyaningrum, A., Jaelani, S. R., & Azima, M. F. F. (2021). An Analysis on Students' Difficulties in Speaking. *Humanitatis: Journal of Language and Literature*, 7(2), 187-192.

Richards, J. C. (2008). *Teaching Listening and Speaking*. Cambridge University Press.

Safitri, R., & Weda, S. (2022). Analysis of Verbal and Non-Verbal Communication in Barack Obama'S Farewell Address Speech. *Journal of English Literature and Linguistic Studies*, *1*(1), 39-49.

Sari, D. S., Raja, P., & Suparman, U. (2018). Incorporating Think Pair Share technique to improve students' participation and writing achievement. *Ujet: Unila Journal of English Teaching*, 7(2).

Setiyadi, Ag. B. (2018). Metode Penelitian Untuk Pengajaran Bahasa Asing (Pendekatan Kualitatif dan Kuantitatif). Edisi 2. Graha Ilmu

Silvia, M., Sunarmo, & Harimurti, E. R. (2021). The use of Talking Chips technique in teaching speaking skill. *Proceedings of the National Seminar on Education STKIP Kusuma Negara III*.

Spratt, M., Pulverness, A., & William, M. (2011). *Teaching knowledge test couse-Modules 1-2-3* (p. 261).

Singh, C. K. S., Ramachandran, A., Singh, T. S. M., Tek, O. E., Yunus, M. M., & Mulyadi, D. (2020). The use of Think Pair Share of cooperative learning to improve weak students' speaking ability. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 24*(05). ISSN: 1475-7192.

Suwono, H., Maulidia, L., Saefi, M., Kusairi, S., & Yuenyong, C. (2022). The Development and Validation of an Instrument of Prospective Science Teachers' Perceptions of Scientific Literacy. *EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 18(1), em2068. https://doi.org/10.29333/ejmste/11505

Syafiq, A. N., Rahmawati, A., Anwari, A., & Oktaviana, T. (2021). Increasing Speaking Skill through YouTube Video as English Learning Material during Online Learning in Pandemic Covid-19. *Elsya : Journal of English Language Studies*, *3*(1), 50–55. https://doi.org/10.31849/elsya.v3i1.6206

Ur, P. (2003). *A Course in Language Teaching Practice and Theory*. Cambridge University Press: Great Britains

Utama, I. M. P., Marhaeni, A. A. I. N., & Putra, I. N. A. J. (2013). The effect of Think Pair Share teaching strategy on students' self-confidence and speaking competency of the second grade students of SMPN 6 Singaraja. *e-Journal Program Pascasarjana Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha, Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris*, 1. Ganesha University of Education.