



The Effect of Time Token Strategy on Students' Speaking Ability at the Eighth Grade of SMP Negeri 1 Sogaeadu

Hasrat Sozanolo Harefa M.Pd¹, Delima Kristiani Buaya²

¹ (English Education Study Program, IKIP Gunungsitoli, Gunungsitoli).

² (English Education Study Program, IKIP Gunungsitoli, Gunungsitoli).

E-mail: ¹sozanolo@gmail.com, ²delimabuaya@gmail.com

Receive: 18/05/2021

Accepted: 23/08/2021

Published: 01/10/2021

Abstrak

Berbicara dapat didefinisikan sebagai kegiatan produktif dimana seorang siswa berkomunikasi dengan siswa lain untuk mencapai tujuan tertentu atau mengungkapkan pendapat, maksud, harapan dan sudut pandang, dengan skor Minimum Criterion Competence (MCC) adalah 65. Pada kenyataannya, siswa dapat tidak mencapai PKS karena siswa kekurangan kosa kata, siswa tidak dapat mengungkapkan pendapatnya dengan menggunakan ekspresi bertanya dan memberi pendapat, dan guru bahasa Inggris masih menggunakan metode konvensional dalam proses belajar-mengajar. Berdasarkan kondisi di atas, peneliti melakukan penelitian dengan menggunakan Strategi Time Token dalam pembelajaran berbicara. Populasi penelitian ini adalah siswa kelas VIII SMP Negeri 1 Sogaeadu tahun 2020. Peneliti mengambil sampel sebanyak 40 siswa dengan menggunakan Teknik Cluster Sampling. Instrumen yang digunakan dalam pengumpulan data adalah Tes Lisan. Tes tersebut divalidasi oleh tiga validator dan dinyatakan valid dan reliabel. Kemudian peneliti memberikan pre-test dan post-test pada kelas eksperimen dan kelas kontrol untuk mengetahui normalitas data dan homogenitas sampel. Setelah melakukan penelitian, peneliti menganalisis data dan hasilnya menunjukkan: (1) Nilai rata-rata kemampuan siswa pada pre-test kelas eksperimen adalah 43 dan pada kelas kontrol adalah 41. (2) Nilai rata-rata dari kemampuan siswa pada post-test kelas eksperimen adalah 75 dan pada kelas kontrol adalah 60. (3) Hasil pengujian hipotesis, peneliti menemukan bahwa $t_{hitung} = 9,2308$ sedangkan $t_{tabel} = 3,841$. Karena $t_{hitung} > t_{tabel}$ ($3.841 < 9.2308$), maka disimpulkan H_0 diterima. (4) Terdapat pengaruh yang signifikan dalam kemampuan berbicara khususnya dalam bertanya dan memberikan pendapat dengan menggunakan Strategi Time Token

Kata Kunci: Strategi Time Token, Keterampilan Berbicara

Abstract

Speaking can be defined as a productive activity which a student communicate with the other students to achieve certain goals or express opinions, intentions, hopes and point of view, with the Minimum Criterion Competence (MCC) score is 65. In reality, the students could not achieve the MCC since the students were lack of vocabulary, the students were unable to express their opinion by using expression asking and giving opinion, and the English teacher still used conventional method in teaching speaking skill. Based on conditions above, the researcher conducted a research by using Time Token Strategy in teaching speaking. The population of the research was the eighth grade of SMP Negeri 1 Sogaeadu in 2020. The researcher took samples which consisted of 40 students by using Cluster Sampling Technique. The instrument used in collecting the data was oral test. The result shows: (1) The mean score of the students' ability in pre-test of experimental class was 43 and in control class was 41. (2) The mean score of the students' ability in post-test of experimental class was 75 and in

control class was 60. (3) The result of testing hypothesis, the researcher found that $t_{count} = 9,2308$ while $t_{table} = 3,841$. Because $t_{table} < t_{count}$ ($3,841 < 9,2308$), it is concluded that H_0 is accepted. (4) Briefly, there is an effect of time token strategy on students' speaking ability at the eighth grade of SMP Negeri 1 Sogaeadu

Keywords: Time Token Strategy, Speaking Skill

INTRODUCTION

Speaking is the productive, oral skill to share the idea or feelings with others more. Speaking is a productive skill. It involves using speech to express other meanings to other people. Interaction is effectively. According to Aguilera (2012:163) states two-way communication that involves using language and body language to keep our listener involved in what we are saying and to check that they understand our meaning,

It means that the speaker ensure that the listener understand and involve in the communication. The listener must give the response or reaction for speaker. From the explanation, it can be implied that speaking is an ability to share and convey sense, knowledge, feelings to others. Moreover, according to Koşar and Bedirre (2014:13), "Speaking is an interactive process of constructing meaning which is comprised of producing and receiving information". In other words that, speaking gives opportunity to think, discuss, and extend ideas and point of view based on the topic that discuss.

Based on the syllabus of school curriculum at the eighth grade of SMP Negeri 1 Sogae'adu, the core competence of speaking is understanding knowledge (factual, conceptual and procedural) based on curiosity about science, technology, arts, culture and events related to the phenomenon of the visible. While the basic competence is responding to the meaning contained in transactional conversations (to get things done) and simple short interpersonal (socializing) accurately, smoothly and acceptable to interact with the nearest environment which involves speech acts, requesting, giving, rejecting

goods, and asking, giving, denying information, asking for and rejecting opinions and offering / accepting / rejecting things with the closest environment by involving speech acts: thanking, apologizing, and providing information. The minimum competence criterion which is decided in the school is 65.

Based on researcher observation in the field at the eighth grade of SMP Negeri 1 Sogaeadu, the researcher found some problems that affected the students ability in speaking namely: The students were lack of vocabulary, the students were unable to express their opinion used expression asking and giving opinion, the English teacher still used conventional method in teaching- learning process. Based on the problems, the researcher used time token particular strategy in classroom teaching.

Time token strategy is strategy that is used by a teacher in teaching speaking to make the students to be active and comprehend the speaking material well. According to Arends (2012: 384), "Time Token Strategy is cooperative learning model where the students do cooperatives activities and help each other in understanding particular topic". Concerning with the statement previously, the researcher concludes that Time Token Strategy provides helps to the teacher to attract the students to brave speaking in the class and can interest to participate in the speaking activity.

Time Token Strategy

The Definitions of Time Token Strategy

There are strategy out of there to solve the students' problem in speaking. In this research, the researcher use Time

Token Strategy as the appropriate strategy to solve the students' problem in speaking.

According to Arends in Parlian (2016:24), Time Token Strategy is cooperative learning model where the students do cooperatives activities and help each other in understanding particular topic. Besides, Huda (2014:239) stated the time token strategy is a democratic teaching instruction with put students as the subject. During the instructional process, the activities of the students become the main focus, the students are involved actively. On the other words, this strategy is used to solve the problems of students in speaking.

Furthermore, according to Istarani in Parlian (2016:24) Time Token Strategy is very usefull to promote students' social skill and to avoid the active students dominate the class. It means that, by using Time Token there will be time of talking which have been set and the chance for each student to speak. In other words, there is no quiet student, but only the active students. Since every students has the same chance to speak and deliver their ideas, it will promote a good class atmosphere and create a democratic class. In addition, Time Token Strategy can improve students' skill in speaking in front of others nor in public, so they have a skill to deliver their idea in front of many people. Since Time Token Strategy is good to promote students' social skill and speaking skill the researcher is interested in applying the Time Token strategy to find out the significant effect of Time Token strategy on the students' speaking ability.

The Procedures of Time Token Strategy

According to Suprijono (2013:133) several steps of how a time token activity can be administered. It starts by arranging

the students' seating arrangement into a discussion form. Then each student is given talking tokens. Each student will be given points depending on the time they spend in speaking or expressing opinion.

Furthermore, Istarani (2011:194)) says that there are some steps in applying Time Token Strategy , they are : 1)Prepare the time token coupon to be spread to the students, 2) Arrange the students's eating into a discussion form, 3) Every students is given a coupon to talk around 30 seconds, 4) If the student have finished their speak, it must be given to the teacher. One coupon once speaking chance, The students who have run out their coupon, have no chance to speak anymore.The chance is only for those who still hand their coupon.

According to Flores (2018:36) this activity you can adapt for a variety of grammar points and modify in teaching - learning process. Or you can use it for trivia, to check students' knowledge of a topic, and simply to check students' comprehension of questions being asked. The teacher can adapt and re-designed this activity to satisfy the teaching objectives and to make students are comfortable, (Shi, 2013:68) In briefly, the sentence auction can be use as a strategy to teach the students, and the teacher gets the chance to modify and accommodate to implementing in teaching- learning process.

Based on the opinion above, the researcher modify Time Token strategy, there are some activities as follows: 1) The researcher asks student to naming some expressions of asking and giving opinion. 2) The researcher explained Time Token Strategy to the students. 3) The researcher arranged the students' into five group. 4) The researcher distributed coupon for the students. Each student get 2 coupons, one coupon talk around 30 seconds. 5) The researcher read the statement and gives

the students opportunity to give their opinion and to comment their friends' opinion. 6) The researcher asked students to submit coupons before speak or comment, one coupon once speaking chance. When the students state their opinion they will get one point. 7) The researcher records the oral communication activity of the students to be transcribed.

In conducting the research, the researcher compare the use of conventional method which is usually implemented by the English teacher in teaching speaking to the students with Time Token Strategy. According to Sellers, et al., (2007: 67) "Conventional Teaching Method as speaking from the chalkboard".

In the research the researcher implements one of conventional method, namely lecture method. According to Horgan (2003: 77), "lectures are popular with organizing university education as they provide a cost-effective means of teaching large groups of students.

Definition of Speaking

According to Kayi (2006) speaking refers to the gap between linguistic expertise and teaching methodology. Linguistic expertise concerns with language structure and language content. Teaching speaking is not like listening, reading, and writing. It needs habit formation because it is a real communication and speaking is a productive skill. So, it needs practicing as often as possible. Speaking also require students to share in personal experience, directions, participate in conversation and discussion and the students also learns to express ideas.

Speaking is an interactive process of constructing meaning that involves producing, receiving and processing information. Its form and meaning are depending on the context in which it occurs, including the participants themselves, their experiences, the physical

environment, and the purposes for speaking. It is often spontaneous, open-ended, and evolving. However, speech is not always unpredictable.

Teaching Speaking

Teaching speaking is necessary to be organized in the English learner classroom. Pawlak and Klimczak (2015:233) assert, "Teaching speaking is a nessential aspect of developing students' sociolinguistic competence in a foreign language at any level". It means that the elements of spoken language should be introduced and taught to the student show to use the conversation

METHOD

In conducting the research, the researcher used Quantitative Research with the general type is experimental method. According to Kothari (2004:3), "Quantitative research is based on the measurement of quantity or amount. It is applicable to phenomena that can be express in term of quantity". Regarding to the definition, the researcher use quasi experimental design because it is more flexible and use previously in teaching learning process. Anderson (2005:263) says, "Quasi experimental is a form of research that examines differences between research groups based on some natural characteristic using treatments or interventions, but not randomization".

In applying quasi experimental design, the researcher divided the sample into two groups. They were experimental group and control group. Pretest was conducting for both of them. The researcher treat Time Token Strategy in experimental group while for control group the researcher used conventional teaching method. After that, the researcher conducted posttest for both groups to found the effect of Time Token Strategy on the students' ability in speaking. For more understanding, the

research design can be shown in the table on the next page.

Table 1
 RESEARCH DESIGN

| Class | Pretest | Treatment | Posttest |
|--------------------|---------|-----------|----------|
| Experimental Group | T1(e) | X(e) | T2(e) |
| Control Group | T1(c) | X(c) | T2(c) |

In which:

T1 (e) = Giving the pretest to the experimental group

T1 (c) = Giving the pretest to the control group

X (e) = Teaching by using Time Token Strategy

X (c) = Teaching by using Conventional Teaching Method

T2 (e) = Giving the posttest to experimental group.

T2 (c) = Giving the posttest to control group

There were two variables in this research. This variables were Time Token Strategy as independent variable (X) and the students' ability in speaking as the dependent variable (Y). The two variables are used by the researcher in conducting the research to know the effect of Time Token Strategy on the students' ability in speaking at the eighth grade of SMP Negeri 1 Sogae'adu in 2018/2019.

In conducting the research, the researcher needed the population. According to Wirodikromo (2001:3) defines the population as all objects of a defined group that study for collecting the information on data driven decision. In addition, Anggoro, et al., (2011:53) assert that the population is the total numbers of individuals which their characteristics would be searched. Furthermore, Herhyanto, et al, (2014:1.10) confirm that population is covering all the members of the defined group as the target of the research. Briefly, the researcher has to

determine the population based on the researcher's observation.

The population of the research was the eighth grade of SMP Negeri 1 Sogae'adu in 2018/2019 that consists of 40 students.

In conducting the research, the researcher also needed the sample. Sample is a part of the population that will represent the characteristic of population. According to Herhyanto, et al., (2014:1.10), sample as amount of partly members of population. The existence of sample in research takes a very important role because basically it determines the quality of the researcher itself. In choosing sample of the research, the researcher used the cluster random sampling to decide the sample. As Anggoro, et al. (2011:4.7) say that on cluster random sampling, the sample was not selected individually directly, but it is select through random groups. Therefore, the researcher used lottery to random for selecting control and experimental group. The researcher made the lottery as many the classroom with makes number 1 to 2, then asked the representation from each classroom to take one lottery. So, the classroom which got number 1 as a control group while the class which gets number 2 as an experimental group.

Procedures of Collecting the Data

In conducting the data collection, the researcher determined a control group and an experimental group. Then, the researcher followed some procedures of collecting data, as followed: 1) Finding the location. The location of the research was SMP Negeri 1 Sogae'adu, 2) Selecting the population. The population of the research was the eighth grade of SMP Negeri 1 Sogae'adu, 3) Selecting sample. The sample in the research are control group and experimental group, 4) Holding the pretest on experimental group and control group.

5) Holding the treatment by using different strategy in which Time Token Strategy will be used to the experimental group and conventional teaching method or traditional method will be use to control group, 6) Holding the post test on experimental group and control group, 7) Analyzing the students answer sheet, 8) Analyzing the data, getting the conclusion.

In analyzing the students' ability in speaking, the researcher first made the phonetic transcription to find out whether the students pronounce the words correctly or not.

The researcher followed the aspect of scoring of Hughes (2003) state that there are five criteria levels should be pay attention, they are: accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.

Score: Accent + Grammar + Vocabulary + Fluency + Comprehension =

$$value = \frac{\text{obtained score}}{\text{maximum score}} \times 100$$

After that the researcher described the level of the students' ability in speaking as Cartier says in Nurgiyantoro (2010:363) classifies that 0-39 is fail, 40-59 is less, 0-74 is enough, 75-84 is good, 85-100 is very good.

In getting the mean score and standard deviation of the students' test result even in experimental group and control group, the researcher seek used the formula from Sudjana (2005:109) as follows.

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$

In which:

\bar{X} = Mean

$\sum X$ = The sum of all scores

N = The numbers of sample

Based on formula above, the researcher used formula of mean score in pretest and posttest.

Besides, to get the standard deviation, the researcher seeks used the formula from Sudjana (2005:114):

$$S = \frac{\sqrt{\sum(X-\bar{X})^2}}{N-1}$$

In which:

S = Standard deviation of the sample

X = The score of item

\bar{X} = The mean of the data

N = The number of the sample

Based on formula above, the researcher used formula of deviation in pre test and post test.

Variance is the quadrate from standard deviation. To determine the variant, the researcher used the formula suggested by Djiwandono (2008:217):

$$S^2 = \frac{\sum(X - \bar{X})^2}{N}$$

Which:

S^2 = Variance

X = The score of item

\bar{X} = The mean for data

N = The number of the sample

Based on formula above, the researcher used formula of variance in pre test and post test.

In examining the normality in functions to know whether the sample comes from population which has the normal distribution or not, the researcher seek by using Liliefors' formula as Herhyanto, et al., (2014:8.17) suggest as follows.

- 1) Make the work table as give next.
- 2) Input the data or score in the table.
- 3) Find the Z score by using the formula:

$$Z_i = \frac{X_i - \bar{X}}{S}$$

In Which.

Z_i = the standard score

X_i = the score of i

S = the standard deviation

\bar{X} = the mean score

- 4) Determine the F (z_i) through Table Standard Normal based on the Z score.

- 5) Determine the $S(z)$ by using the formula: $S(z) = \frac{F \text{ cummulative}}{N}$
- 6) Count the quarrel between $F(z)$ and $S(z)$ by using the formula.
 $L_c = |F(z) - S(z)|$ (decide the highest one as Liliefors count (L_0)).
- 7) Determine the score of Liliefors table (L_t) with $\alpha = 0,05$.
- 8) Compare Liliefors count and Lilieforstable, then take the conclusion like as.
 - (a) If $L_0 < L_t$, so the data is normal and the population has the normal distribution.
 - (b) If $L_0 > L_t$, so the data is not normal and the population has not normal distribution

Result And Discussion

The location of the research was SMP Negeri 1 Sogaeadu. It is located in Saitagaramba Village. It is around 24 km from the center of Gunungsitoli. This school had some rooms, such as teacher's room, classrooms, and library. This school consisted of one headmaster, three vice of headmaster, 30 teachers, and two officials. Meanwhile, the total numbers of the class were 12 in three different grades. The seventh grade consisted of two classes, the eighth grade consisted of two classes and the ninth grade consisted of two class. The total numbers of the students were 120 persons.

The population of the research was the eighth grade which consisted of two classes. The total numbers of the students of population were 40 persons. That consisted of two classes. The researcher selected samples through cluster sampling; they were; VIII-A class as experimental group that consisted of 20 students, and VIII-B as control group that consisted of 20 students.

Table 2 The Mean of Pre-Test And Post-Test Scores of Experimental And Control Group

| Group | The Number of Students | MCC Score | Mean of Pre-Test | Mea n of Post -Test |
|---------------------|------------------------|-----------|------------------|---------------------|
| Experim ental Group | 20 | 65 | 43 | 75 |
| Control Group | 20 | 65 | 41 | 60 |

Standard Deviations

According to the calculation result, the standard deviation of the pre-test for experimental group was 7.72, while in post-test was 6,. Besides, the standard deviation of the pre-test for control group was 6.43 while in post-test was 8,72 To make easy for understanding, the standard deviation of students' marks is stated in the following table.

Table 3 The Standard Deviation of Pre-Test And Post-Test Scores of Experimental And Control Groups

| Group | The Number of Students | Standar d Deviatio n of Pre-Test | Standard Deviatio n of Post-Test |
|---------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Experim ental Group | 20 | 7.72 | 6,63 |
| Control Group | 20 | 6.43 | 8,72 |

Variance

In pre-test, the variance of experimental group was 59. while the variance of control group was 41.32 Yet, in post-test, the variance of experimental group was 43.95, while the variance of control group was 76.16. The next table is

made to make the point of variance be easily for understood.

Table 4 The Variance of Pre-Test And Post-Test Scores of Experimental And Control Groups

| Group | The Number of Students | Variance of Pre-Test | Variance of Post-Test |
|--------------------|------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Experimental Group | 20 | 59,57 | 43,95 |
| Control Group | 20 | 41,32 | 76,16 |

Normality

As the prerequisite of determining the samples of the research, the researcher sought the normality of the data when conducting the research. To make sure that the samples of the research was representative, so the researcher focused on knowing the students' prior knowledge of each group.

To test the normality, the researcher used Liliefors' formula as suggested by Sudjana (2002:466-467). From the calculation of pre-test data, the researcher noticed that L_{count} of experimental group was lower than L_{table} ($0.1517 < 0.1900$) Meanwhile L_{count} of control group was also lower than L_{table} ($0.1283 < 0.1900$).

As the conclusion, both of group had normal distribution before treatment. It meant that the students had equal prior knowledge. This condition promoted that both samples were representatives' samples and ready to be treated.

Furthermore, based on the result, of pre-test that the samples of the data less than (≤ 30 students). Thus, for the data of post-test the researcher did not calculate the normality of the data because when the samples less than 30, so it just

focused on hyptheses testing by Chi Square (X^2) test.

Homogeneity

To know the homogeneity of the sample, the researcher used formula as suggested by Irianto, et al., (2007:276). Based on the pre-test data computation (See Appendix 12), it indicated $F_{count} = 1.44$, while $F_{table} = 2.17$. Since $F_{count} (1.44) \leq F_{table} (2.17)$, so it can be concluded that the samples of the research were homogeny.

Besides, because the sample of the data was less than 30, so the researcher did not calculate the homogeneity. The researcher just focused on hyptheses testing by using Chi Square (X^2) test after getting the mean score, standard deviation and variance (Sugiyono).

Hypotheses Testing

Based on the computation of hypotheses testing in Appendix 13, it was noted that $X^2_{count} = 9.2308$ while $X^2_{table} = 3.841$ (It was confirmed with $dk = k - 1$ which the level of significance 0.05). Since $X^2_{count} (9.2308) > X^2_{table} (3.841)$, it can be concluded that H_a was accepted and H_0 was rejected. In other words, the result of the computation data of post-test on the research shown that there was significant effect of Time Token Strategy on the students' in Speaking Ability at the Eighth grade of SMP Negeri1 Sogaeadu in 2020

The researcher has found the result of the research and it concluded that there is a significant effect of Time Token Strategy on the students' Speaking Ability at the Eighth grade of SMP Negeri 1 Sogaeadu in 2020. The following is some important discussion related to the research finding to make the research more meaningful.

The common response of the main problem of the research is that there is a significant effect of Time Token Strategy on

the students' Speaking Ability at the Eighth grade of of SMP Negeri 1 Sogaeadu in 2020. The response is based on the formulation of the problem as discussed in Chapter I.

The progression of the students' learning outcome through implementation of Time Token Strategy on teaching Speaking is the most expectation of the researcher in conducting the research. At the very beginning, when pre-test was held, the researcher noticed that the mean of students' score of both groups (either experimental or control group) was lower than MCC score and included on very bad criterion. The students were not able to convey their opinion to others, the students were lack of expressions of asking and giving opinion and the students were not able to organize their opinion.

Afterwards, the researcher decided to treat both of group in teaching but with different method of teaching. The researcher taught the students of experimental group by applying Time Token Strategy while the students of control group had been taught through Conventional Teaching Method. The researcher taught the students in two meetings only. After the last teaching, the researcher conducted post-test to the both group. Surprisingly, the result of post-test data computation showed the progression of the students' ability for both groups with significant differentiation. The mean of students' score of experimental group was higher than MCC score and included on good criterion, while the mean of the students' score of control group was lower than MCC score and included on enough criterion. This condition promoted value that there was significant effect of Time Token Strategy on the students' Speaking Ability.

Furthermore, based on the computation of hypotheses testing, it shows that X^2_{count} is higher than X^2_{table}

($8.6400 > 3.841$). In summary, it can be said that H_0 is rejected and H_a is **ACCEPTED**

Conclusion

After analyzing the data as described in the previous chapter, so the conclusion can be drawn as follows.

1) The pre-test data computation, it was counted that $F_{count} = 1.44$, while $F_{table} = 2.17$ since $F_{count} = (1.44) < F_{table} (2.17)$, so it was concluded that the students of both experimental and control group were homogeny or had equal prior knowledge. It showed that the researcher should continue the research by giving treatment to both groups.

2) After the computation of the data for pre-test, it showed that the sample of the research was 20 students or less than ≤ 30 students, so after getting the mean score, standard deviation and variance for post-test it is continued to the data of hypotheses testing by using Chi Square Test.

3) Based on the data analysis, it was known that X^2_{count} is 9.2308 then consulted to the X^2_{table} rate with the significant level 0.05 where $X^2_{count} > X^2_{table}$ is $9.2308 > 3.841$ which means there is a significant effect of Time Token Strategy on Students' Speaking Ability at the Eighth grade of SMP Negeri1 sogaeadu in 2020. The problems can be minimized or reduced by giving a significant effect on students' speaking ability.

Bibliography

- Aguilera, Lucia Careland Filologia, Lienciada En, 2012. *Productive Language skills learning and teaching: Speaking and Writing*, Publicaciones Didacticas, Ingles
- Arends, Richard I. *Central Connecticut State University, 2012. Learning to teach.*
- Bashir, dkk, 2011, *Factor Effecting Students' English Speaking Skills*, Vol. 2, No. 1, 34-50, University of Education, UK.

- Budiyanto, Agus. 2016. *Sintaks 45 Metode Pembelajaran dalam Student centered learning (SCL)*
- Ferrance, Eileen. 2010. *Action Research. Themes In Education*. Northeast and Islands Regional Educational Laboratory At Brown University. New England, New York, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
- Fentari, Retno, 2016. Speaking skill. *Premise Journal* 5 (1)
- Harefa, Hasrat. 2021. Using Video in Teaching Speaking: An Action Research. *Jurnal Intelektium*. Available at <https://journal.neolektura.com/index.php/intelektium/article/view/170>.
- Harmer, J. 2011. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Edinburgh: Pearson Education limited
- Koşar & Bedirre. 2014. *Speaking Skill. Working the American Way: How to Communicate Successfully with Americans At Work*, UK.
- Manktelow, J . 2010. *The Mind Tools E-book*. Excellent skills for an excellent career. UK
- Professional Development Services for Teacher. 2011. *Active Learning Methodologies (Revised Edition)*.
- Proctor, Tony, 2014, *Creative Problem Solving for Managers*. Developing Skills For Decision Making and Innovation. Fourth Edition. Florence Production Ltd, Stoodleigh, Devon, UK
- Premise Journal* Volume 5 No 1 , April 2016
ISSN: 2442-482x (printed) ISSN: 977244248DD3 (electronic).
- Richard, Jack C, 2008. *Teaching Listening and Speaking: From theory to Practice*, Cambridge University Press, USA

Author Profile

¹HASRAT SOZANOLO HAREFA, S.Pd., M.Pd
Lecturer of English Education Study Program of IKIP Gunungsitoli

²Delima Kristiani Buaya
The Student of English Education Study Program of IKIP Gunungsitoli