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ABSTRACT
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The purposes of the study were to find out the significant difference between the students taught by using talking chips technique and those taught by using a conventional method in teaching writing analytical exposition text and to find out the effectiveness of talking chips technique in teaching writing of analytical exposition text in SMAN 7 Semarang.

The subject of this study was the eleventh grade students of SMAN 7 Semarang in the academic year of 2016/2017. There were two classes participated since this study used a true experimental research design. Those were XI IPS 1 as the experimental group and XI IPS 2 as the control group. The data were taken by administering a pretest and a posttest. This research was conducted in five meetings; one meeting was for the pretest, three meetings were for the treatments, and the last one was for the posttest.

The result of this research showed that the mean scores of the pretest from the two groups were nearly similar. The mean score of the experimental group was 56.43 and the control group was 56.79. After the treatment, the mean scores of both groups increased. The mean score result of the posttest in the experimental group was 74.14 which was higher than the control group that was 66.69. Furthermore, the t-test result of the difference of two means was 3.799 in which it was higher than the t-table (1.995) for α = 5% and df = 68.

Based on the data analysis, it could be concluded that talking chips technique is effective to improve students’ skill in writing analytical exposition text since there was a significant difference between two groups. The writer suggests the teachers to apply talking chips technique in teaching writing, especially in writing analytical exposition text.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Foremost, I would like to praise the name of Allah SWT, the Almighty, for the blessing upon me in the form of health, inspiration, spirit, and guidance during the completion of my final project.

I dedicate my deepest gratitude to my advisors, Dra. C. Murni Wahyanti, M.A., and Pasca Kalisa, S.Pd., M.A., M.Pd., for their indispensable advice, guidance, and support in finishing this final project. My honor also goes to my first examiner, Yusnita Sylvia N., S.S., M.Pd., for her meaningful feedback and advice in examining this final project. The countless appreciation also goes to all of the lecturers at the English Department of Faculty of Languages and Arts of Semarang State University for all guidance and lectures during my study in this university.

I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to my parents, brothers, and my big family for their support, pray, and love. My special thanks also go to my SIMPHONY for the beautiful and endless friendship. Lots of love and thanks are also delivered to all my friends in English Department of UNNES for the shared knowledge and support. Last but not least, thanks to all people who cannot be mentioned one by one for their great contribution during completing this study.

There is nothing perfect in this world and this final project is not an exception. Therefore, suggestions and criticisms are always needed for its betterment. I hope this study will be useful for all of the readers.

Mutiasari
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPROVAL......................................................................................... Error! Bookmark not defined.

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY ............................................... Error! Bookmark not defined.

MOTTO AND DEDICATION ................................................................ iii

ABSTRACT ............................................................................................ v

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT ....................................................................... vi

LIST OF TABLES ................................................................................. xi

LIST OF FIGURES ............................................................................... xii

LIST OF APPENDICES ....................................................................... xiii

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION ............................................................ 1

1.1 Background of the Study ............................................................ 1

1.2 Reasons for Choosing the Topic ............................................... 4

1.3 Research Questions .................................................................. 5

1.4 Purposes of the Study ............................................................... 5

1.5 Significance of the Study ......................................................... 5

1.6 Definitions of Key Terms ......................................................... 6

1.7 Outline of the Study ............................................................... 7

CHAPTER II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE ....................... 8

2.1 Review of the Previous Studies ............................................... 8

2.2 Review of the Theoretical Background .................................... 11

2.2.1 General Concept of Writing ............................................... 11

2.2.1.1 Characteristics of Good Writing .............................................. 12

2.2.1.2 Process of Writing ............................................................... 13

2.2.2 Analytical Exposition Text .................................................... 15
CHAPTER III METHODOLOGY .......................................................... 32
3.7 Method of Collecting Data ................................................................. 34

3.7.1 Pretest and Posttest ................................................................. 36
3.7.2 Questionnaire ................................................................. 36
3.8 Method of Analysing Data ................................................................. 36

3.8.1 Scoring Technique ................................................................. 37
3.8.2 Mean Scores ................................................................. 38
3.8.3 The Normality of Pretest and Posttest ........................................... 39
3.8.4 The Homogeneity of Pretest and Posttest ....................................... 39
3.8.5 T-test Statistical Analysis ............................................................ 39
3.8.6 Analysis of the Questionnaire ....................................................... 40

CHAPTER IV RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION ................. 43

4.1 Try Out Analysis .................................................................................. 43
4.1.1 Validity ...................................................................................... 43
4.1.2 Reliability .................................................................................... 44
4.2 General Description ........................................................................... 44
4.3 Research Findings ............................................................................ 46
4.3.1 The Pretest Result ......................................................................... 46
4.3.2 The Normality of the Pretest .......................................................... 48
4.3.3 The Homogeneity of the Pretest ....................................................... 48
4.3.4 The Posttest Result ......................................................................... 49
4.3.5 The Normality of the posttest .......................................................... 52
4.3.6 The Homogeneity of Posttest .......................................................... 53
4.3.7 The Comparison of the Pretest and the Posttest .................................. 53
4.3.8 T-test Analysis ............................................................................ 54
4.4 The Questionnaire Analysis ............................................................... 56
LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.1 The Guidelines of the Test</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.2 Questionnaire Guidelines</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.3 The Activities of the Research</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.4 Scoring Guide</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.5 Score of Instrument Items</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.6 The Highest Score of Criterion Score</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.1 The Schedule of the Research</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.2 The Pretest Result</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.3 Normality of the Pretest</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.4 Homogeneity of the Pretest</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.5 The Posttest Result</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.6 Normality of the Posttest</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.7 Homogeneity of the Posttest</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.8 The Independent Sample T-test of the Posttest</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.1 Theoretical Framework of the Study</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 3.1 Rating Scale</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.1 The Pretest Result</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.2 The Posttest Result</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.3 The Comparison of the Mean Score</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LIST OF APPENDICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. List of Try Out Group</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. List of Experimental Group</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. List of Control Group</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Validity of Try Out Test</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Table of Try Out Score</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Calculation of Reliability</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The Pretest Score of the Experimental Group</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The Pretest Score of the Control Group</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The Posttest Score of the Experimental Group</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The Posttest Score of the Control Group</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Lesson Plan for the Experimental Group</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Lesson Plan for the Control Group</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Instrument of the Test</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Rubric Score for Written Test</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Instrument of the Questionnaire</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Item Analysis of Questionnaire</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The Question Interpretation</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the introduction of the study. It covers background of the study, reasons for choosing the topic, research questions, purposes of the study, significances of the study, definition of key terms and the last is outline of the study.

1.1 Background of the Study

Writing is considered as a very useful skill because the writers are able to convey their needs, deliver their ideas, and express their thoughts. Glazier (1987: 208) said that writing is good for us because it can make us express our idea, feeling, emotion and opinion in the written form of sentence, paragraph, and composition or essay. In spite of its usage, writing is often marked as the toughest one. As stated by Schewelger in Fatmawaty (2009: 1) writing is one of the hardest things that people do because it requires thinking. He also stated that there are several components in writing that should be mastered such as grammatical structure, vocabulary, coherence, organization, and content. The absence of one of the components will cause a poor writing. Therefore, the writers need to pay attention to those components to obtain a good writing.

Writing also becomes one of the major problems in learning English for the students of SMAN 7 Semarang. The researcher found this problem based on the observation when she had her teaching training (PPL) in that Senior High
School. The students usually complained when they were asked to write something in English. They said that they do not know what and how to write in English. The problem is getting bigger when they are assigned to write analytical exposition text. In this context (Dülger, 2011; Herrera, 2002) indicated that the process of writing is not linear, as it requires a higher level ability than a mere recognition of certain stages and processes. A second language writer faces unique challenges in developing writing skills, as he has to improve special skills for planning the writing process, organizing, drafting, revising, and considering the audience.

Based on the interview with the teacher, it is known that most students of SMAN 7 Semarang found that writing analytical exposition text is more difficult than writing any other texts. They were weak on generating and organizing the ideas. As stated by Simbolon (2012), writing analytical exposition is a big problem for the students because the topic is usually controversial and needs logical as well as critical thinking about an issue. Further, they have serious problems in identifying main ideas inside an expository text. A study (Englert & Raphael, 1988) has shown that students have to deal with two main difficulties in expository reading and writing: the first is identification of text organization; the second concerns the effect of the reader’s knowledge of the topic that allows him/her to identify the author’s position, in other words, the intentions that made him/her follow a specific expository structure.

Regarding those difficulties, the researcher attempts to use talking chips technique to solve the problem. Actually, talking chips technique is usually used
to improve students’ speaking skill. As stated by Kagan and Kagan (2009) there is a technique in cooperative learning that can be used to solve problems in speaking; namely Talking Chips Technique. In the previous studies (Putra, 2015; Syafryadin, 2011; Manoj, 2011; Syaripudin, 2014), it was found that talking chips technique is effective to improve students’ speaking skill. The result is also proven by the significant improvement of the students’ speaking score.

However, few studies have been conducted to improve students’ skill in writing (Mandal, 2009; Yulianti, 2016). Therefore, the present study tries to investigate whether talking chips technique is effective to improve students’ skill in writing analytical exposition text or not. In other words, the researcher wants to figure out that talking chips is not only effective on speaking, but also on writing analytical exposition text.

The researcher wants to use the technique to improve students’ ability in writing analytical exposition in this study because talking chips technique is able to push the students to have a critical thinking and a better understanding of a topic. In addition, this technique facilitates the students to talk about what they write and have a discussion about it. Through this technique, the students can explore their ideas, give comments and even proofread each other texts by putting a chip on the table. They may edit and revise their texts while the activity is running. That might be very useful to assist the teacher to improve students’ skill in writing analytical exposition text because it will help the students to develop their ideas and discuss more about how to write analytical exposition text.
1.2 Reasons for Choosing the Topic

This research needs to be conducted because of the following reasons:

(1) In writing analytical exposition text, students need to understand about the generic structure and language features of the text. However, most students still make mistakes in identifying them. Through this technique, the students can discuss anything even the analytical exposition text itself and its components. Thus, the students will comprehend what analytical exposition text is.

(2) The common problem of writing is that the students do not know what they should write. They are difficult to generate and develop the ideas. That is why the students should be given more opportunities to explore their ideas using this technique. Moreover, the students will be triggered to think about what they should deliver in the discussion because this technique requires all of the students to speak and tell about their thoughts.

(3) Many students usually make some grammatical errors in their writing. While they are using this technique, the students in the group can help the other students to correct the grammar. This technique will help them cooperate each other to make a good analytical exposition.

(4) Talking chips technique is usually used to improve students’ speaking skill. In the previous studies (Putra, 2015; Syafryadin, 2011; Manoj, 2011; Syaripudin, 2014), it was found that talking chips technique is effective to improve students’ speaking skill. However, few studies have been conducted to improve students’ skill in writing (Mandal, 2009; Yulianti,
Therefore, the present study tries to investigate whether talking chips technique is also effective to improve students’ skill in writing analytical exposition text or not.

1.3 Research Questions

The research questions of this study are formulated as follows:

(1) is there any significant difference between the students taught by using talking chips technique and those taught by using conventional learning method in teaching writing of analytical exposition text?

(2) how effective is the use of talking chips technique in teaching writing of analytical exposition text?

1.4 Purposes of the Study

The purposes of the study are:

(1) to find out whether or not there is a significant difference between the students taught by using talking chips technique and those taught by using conventional learning method in teaching writing of analytical exposition text.

(2) to find out whether or not talking chips technique is effective to be implemented in teaching writing of analytical exposition text.

1.5 Significance of the Study

Dealing with the purposes which would be achieved, the result of the study hopefully will give some benefits. Those are presented below:
(1) Theoretically
The result of this study will give the teachers and the students a new understanding about the use of talking chips. For the other researchers, this study hopefully can be a beneficial reference to other similar studies using talking chips technique.

(2) Practically
For the students, the use of talking chips technique will give them great opportunities to share their idea and talk about it. It will make the learning process of writing analytical exposition text more enjoyable and help them learning English a lot. For the teachers, talking chips is expected to be an effective and interesting technique to assist them improve the students’ writing skill.

(3) Pedagogically
The result of the study may inspire the teachers to implement talking chips as an alternative strategy in teaching writing of analytical exposition text. For the students, this technique is expected to be able to improve their writing ability especially analytical exposition text.

1.6 Definitions of Key Terms
There are several terms in this study. Those are:

1) Talking Chips Technique
Talking chips is one of cooperative learning technique which is found by Spencer Kagan to facilitate language teaching (Arnold, 2003: 8).
2) Analytical Exposition Text

Djuharia (2007:13) defined analytical exposition as an argumentative text because the writer provides readers or listeners with point of view, ideas, or thoughts of topic or issue or problem needed to get attention or explanation without appeared efforts to persuade readers.

1.7 Outline of the Study

This final project consists of five chapters. The outline is as follows:

Chapter I is an introduction. It contains background of the study, reasons for choosing the topic, research questions, purposes of the study, significance of the study, definition of key terms, and outline of the study.

Chapter II presents review of related literature which consists of review of the previous studies, review of the theoretical background, and theoretical framework.

Chapter III deals with method of investigation which covers research design, population and sample, research variables, hypotheses, types of data, instrument for collecting data, method of collecting data, and method of analysing data.

Chapter IV contains research findings and discussion. It discusses general description, detail results, and discussion of the data.

Chapter V presents conclusion, which is derived from the whole discussion, and suggestions.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter consists of three sub-chapters. They are review of the previous studies, review of the related theories, and theoretical framework.

2.1 Review of the Previous Studies

A number of studies have been conducted related to the technique that the researcher does in this study. First, a research conducted to determine how the use of cooperative learning approach like talking chips affected the writing abilities (Baliya, 2013). The researcher used one-group pretest-posttest design in which she needed six weeks for the experiment using cooperative learning method. The result was the composition of talking chips groups enabled students to write a better paragraph than working alone. The score improvement could be explained by the fact that talking chips creates a comfortable non-stressful environment for learning and practicing English. Furthermore, the students have an opportunity to generate, discuss, analyze and synthesize ideas to determine their writing. This platform can lead to critical thinking and better understanding.

Further, there was also a research, which was conducted to know the difference of talking chips, numbered head together, and snowball throwing in the students’ achievement (Tanzil, 2014). The researcher used quasi experimental research method and comparative approach. The result of the study showed that the score of the students who were taught by using talking chips technique is
higher than the score of those who were taught by using numbered heads together and snowball throwing technique. Meanwhile, Arumugam (2011) investigated whether cooperative language learning affects students’ perception in ESL writing class or not. He used experimental study and concluded that the use of the cooperative language learning approach like talking chips technique in the ESL writing class had a positive impact on students’ perceptions about their learning both in terms of positively engaging with tasks assigned by the instructor as well as interacting in groups in order to learn in the classroom.

Shuhua et al. (2009) conducted a research to propose Genre Based Approach and cooperative learning so as to keep a balance between constrained model-essay instruction and communication oriented real world interaction. The researcher used experimental research design and concluded that cooperative learning technique like talking chips supported the genre-based approach so as to involve students’ participation positively and systematically. This would guarantee the partial applicability of the model essay approach commonly used by Chinese teachers, meanwhile offering opportunities for variation and diversification in students’ writing process.

Another research was also conducted in order to find out the effectiveness of implementing talking chips technique combined with quick on the draw to enhance students’ learning motivation and outcomes (Masikem, 2016). The researcher used a classroom action research with two cycles. Each cycle consists of two meetings and one additional meeting for final tests as well as through four stages: planning, action, observation, and reflections. The result of this study was
the enhancement of talking chips combined with quick on the draw, is very successful in improving students’ motivation and learning outcomes.

Further, to know the significant difference between students taught using talking chips technique and students taught using conventional technique in learning process, a research was conducted (Pardiani, 2013). It used a quasi experimental research design where the experimental class applied talking chips technique and the control class implemented conventional strategy. The researcher used post-test only control group design to measure students’ ability. It was concluded that there is a significant difference between groups of students taught using talking chips technique to group of students taught using conventional technique in their learning result.

Moreover, a study was conducted to investigate whether there are any significant differences between the students taught by using talking chips technique and those taught by using mind mapping technique (Yulianti, 2016). The researcher used quasi-experimental; non-equivalent control group research design. During the treatment, the experimental group was taught using talking chips while mind mapping was applied in the control group. The result of this study was talking chips technique is effective to be used in teaching writing recount text. The use of talking chips can help the students to express and explore their ideas.

Last, a research was done to find out whether the use of talking chips technique affects the students or not, and to find out the students’ responses about talking chips technique in speaking class (Syaripudin, 2014). The researcher used
quasi experimental design. He stated that by comparing the mean score of experimental and control class, it was found that talking chips technique is effective in teaching speaking. The result is also proven by the significant improvement of the students’ speaking score.

It is known that talking chips technique is effective to improve the students’ speaking skill. However, the researcher assumes that talking chips technique is not only effective for speaking ability, but also writing and some other subjects. Based on that reason, the study about talking chips technique for teaching writing of analytical exposition text will be conducted.

2.2 Review of the Theoretical Background
This subchapter reviews the general concept of writing, analytical exposition text, and the notion of cooperative learning.

2.2.1 General Concept of Writing
There are a number of definitions of writing by some experts. According to Rivers (1981: 294), writing is conveying information or expression of original ideas in a chronological way in the new language. Moreover, Brown (2001: 336) explained that writing is a thinking process. He stated that writing can be planned and given with an unlimited number of revisions before its release. Writing represents what on our mind is. Writing, as one of the four language skills, is considered as a productive skill beside speaking. As stated by Meyers (2005: 1), writing is a way to produce language, which you do naturally when you speak. Furthermore, Byrne (1998: 28) said that writing is an activity to produce a sequence of sentences
arranged in a particular order and linked together in certain ways. Thus, it is clear that writing plays an important role in the communication.

Regarding its importance, writing should be mastered by the students in learning English. Through writing, they can express their thought, ideas and feeling. Harmer (2004: 4) explained that writing process is the stage a writer goes through in order to produce something in its written form. To make an understandable writing product which is able to deliver their thought, they need to do many practices and exercises. Moreover, he added that writing encourages students to focus on the accurate language use. It is because students consider the language use when the students engage in their writing process. This activity will provoke language development because the students resolve problems what think on their writing.

Based on those definitions, it can be concluded that writing is a productive process that expresses ideas into written form and has some steps to do. In order to make a good writing, the writer needs to follow some rules of writing and practice a lot. Therefore, the writer needs to pay attention to the characteristics of good writing and the steps of writing process.

2.2.1.1 Characteristics of Good Writing

To make his writing easy to be understood by the readers, the writer needs to pay attention to the characteristics of good writing. This corresponds to a claim (Boardman & Frydenberg, 2008) that writing in English must also have the characteristics of coherence, cohesion and unity.
(1) Coherence

Coherence in writing a paragraph means that the supporting sentences should be ordered according to a principle so that the readers will understand the meaning of the paragraph easily.

(2) Cohesion

Cohesion itself means that all of the supporting sentences connect to each other in order to support the topic sentence.

(3) Unity

The final characteristic of a well-written paragraph is unity. In this stage, all supporting sentences in a paragraph have to relevant to the topic sentence.

According to the explanation above, it is clear that the writer needs to consider these to make a good writing. Moreover, teachers should lead their students to understand these characteristics so that they can be able to produce written form with good quality. After understanding the characteristics of good writing, the writer also need to learn about the writing process.

2.2.1.2 Process of Writing

Writing has several stages to do. A writer needs to understand the process of writing and consider the ways of making it well. As suggested in the previous literature (Boardman & Frydenberg, 2008), there are six steps in writing, those are analyzing the assignment, brainstorming, organizing your ideas, writing the first draft, rewriting the first draft, and writing the next (or final) draft.
(1) Analyzing the Assignment

The first step of writing is understanding the assignment. Before you start writing, you have to know what you should write. Thus, your writing will be relevant to what is asked for.

(2) Brainstorming

The second step of writing is called brainstorming. In this step, you need to write down all you have in your mind on a paper. You may write anything because in this stage all ideas are equal. You do not need to evaluate your thoughts. You will do that in the next stage.

(3) Organizing Your Ideas

After the ideas have been put into words, it is the time to organize them. There are three things that you have to do in this stage; write your topic sentence, eliminate irrelevant ideas, and make an outline and add relevant ideas.

(4) Writing the First Draft

In this stage, you can try to write the paragraphs by ignoring about being perfect because this draft is only for you. Therefore, do not worry about the grammar or punctuation, yet, try to write in a good paragraph format.

(5) Rewriting the First Draft

This stage consists of two parts: revising and editing. When revising a paragraph, you need to check the organization of your paragraph and look at your ideas. Meanwhile, editing a paragraph is looking at the grammar,
spelling, word forms, and punctuation. You need to do both of them after you have written a paragraph.

(6) Writing the Final Paper (or Next Draft)

The last step is to write a clean version of the paragraph by concerning all the revisions and editing. Be sure that you use good paragraph format.

Based on those explanations, it can be said that writing starts with designing and analyzing the ideas that will become the first draft. Then, the draft should be re-read and revised with appropriate changes to obtain a good final writing.

2.2.2 Analytical Exposition Text

In this part, the researcher presents the notion of analytical exposition text, the generic structure of analytical exposition text, and the language features of analytical exposition text.

2.2.2.1 Notion of Analytical Exposition Text

Analytical exposition is a type of text in which it is intended to persuade the readers that something is the case. Analytical exposition is an argumentative text because the writer provides readers or listeners with point of view, ideas, or thoughts of topic or issue or problem needed to get attention or explanation without obvious efforts to persuade readers (Djuharia, 2007: 13).

It should be learned by senior high school students based on curriculum 2013. It usually provides the readers with the surrounding phenomenon. In this text, the writer gives some arguments as the fundamental reasons why something
is the case. As stated by Diana et al., (2011: 197) analytical exposition text (cause and effect) is a piece of exposition that describes relationship between an event or circumstance and its effect. It guides the writer with an idea to develop.

2.2.2.2 Generic Structure of Analytical Exposition Text

As stated by Gerrot and Wignell (1994: 198), the most common used of analytical exposition’s generic structures consists of thesis, arguments, and reiteration.

(1) Thesis

It introduces the topic of the text and indicates writer’s position in the text. Thus, the writer has to show her/himself in clear position of the discussed topic.

(2) Arguments

Each of the argument consists of two divisions. The first one is point. It restates the main argument outlined in the preview. This means that each point is an idea that supports the statement of the thesis. The second one is elaboration. Elaboration is the part where the writer develops and support each point with evidence, prove or even analysis.

(3) Re-iteration

This last part of analytical exposition text is used to restate the writer’s position again to the reader. In this part, the writer sums up the arguments and reinforces the writer’s point of view.

Students need to understand the generic structure of analytical exposition text in order to make a good writing of the text. Therefore, before students begin
to write, it is necessary for them to understand about it. In the other hand, students are also required to know the language features of analytical exposition text.

2.2.2.3 Language Features of Analytical Exposition Text

According to Gerrot and Wignel (1994: 198), the significant lexicogrammatical features used in analytical exposition text are; focus on generic human and non-human participant, use of simple present tense, use of internal conjunction to stage argument, and reasoning through causal conjunction or nominalization.

In order to make a good analytical exposition text, students should follow some rules and consider the language features. This somehow is one of the factors which makes the students are reluctant to write. Therefore, teacher needs to use a strategy to make the teaching and learning process of writing becomes interesting for students. Hence, cooperative learning strategy is recommended to solve the problem.

2.2.3 General Concept of Cooperative Learning

This part focuses on the notion of cooperative learning, the notion of talking chips technique, the implementation of talking chips and the advantages of talking chips.

2.2.3.1 Notion of Cooperative Learning

Cooperative learning is considered as one of successfull teaching strategies that is used by the teacher in the classroom. This strategy facilitates the students to improve their understanding of a subject and enchance their ability. Kagan (1992)
explained that cooperative learning is more than traditional group work, it emphasizes the five basic components of positive interdependence, individual accountability, equal participation, simultaneous interaction and group processing. Furthermore, Brown (2001: 47) said that cooperative learning is defined as students work together in pairs and groups, they share information and come to each others’ get helps. Each member of a team is responsible not only for learning what is taught but also for helping teammates learn, thus creating an atmosphere of achievement.

There are various types of cooperative learning such as think-pair-share, three steps interview, jigsaw, round robin, team pair solo, numbered heads together, talking chips, etc. In this study, the researcher uses talking chips technique to improve students’ ability in writing analytical exposition text. The benefit of this technique is to make the students get easier in writing analytical exposition text by discussing with group. The students are also expected to conduct and manage the situation, they are required to think creatively and independently.

2.2.3.2 Notion of Talking Chips

Talking chips is kind of cooperative learning strategy in which it can make the students more creative, confidence, and communicative. Kagan (2009: 6.36) pointed out that talking chips is one of the teaching methods of cooperative learning in which students participate in a group discussion, and give a token when they speak. Talking chips can be used in all subjects and for all grades of
students, each member of the group gets a chance to contribute to and listen to the views and thinking of other members (Lie, 2010).

Talking chips technique can be used effectively during group discussion. As stated by Bowers and Keisler (2011: 138), talking chips is a strategy ensuring that everyone has an opportunity to share in a discussion. Thus, talking chips technique make the students’ participation equal in the class.

### 2.2.3.3 Implementation of Talking Chips Technique

Talking chips technique requires the students to work in a group and have a discussion. In implementing this technique, each student is given some chips to talk about something. Kagan (2009: 157) explained that there are four steps in applying talking chips: first, the teacher provides a discussion topic and provides time to think. Second, any student begins the discussion, placing one of his/her chips in the center of the table. Third, any student with a chip continues discussing using his/her chips. At last, when all chips are used, teammates each collect their chips and continue the discussion using their talking chips.

Related to this study, the researcher attempts to apply talking chips technique to teaching writing analytical exposition text. The procedures that are used are as follows: first, teacher divides the students into some groups of four. Second, teacher gives a topic to the students and asks them to make a thesis and some arguments of analytical exposition text from the topic. Third, all members in each group are given chips. Each member gets four chips. The chips can be used to share their idea and give comments to the other ideas. Then, a member who has ideas put his/her chip in the middle of the table and read his/her thesis of a topic.
After that, the other students should give comments whether there is any mistake or grammatical error in the thesis or not. After all students of the group deliver their theses, discussion continues to talk about the arguments they have made. The chips are given to the students again. This activity will run until the time is up.

The students are allowed to edit and revise their text during the discussion. However, they are not allowed to talk when they do not put their chips in the middle of the table. In the first meeting before they make an analytical exposition text, they may discuss about what analytical exposition is to get better understanding about it. Therefore, the students will really be helped to improve their writing ability by using talking chips technique.

### 2.2.3.4 Advantages of Talking Chips Technique

Kagan (2009: 14) pointed out that there are some advantages of using talking chips technique in teaching and learning process. First, talking chips improves the students’ interpersonal skills and academic competence. The students’ interpersonal skills are teambuilding, social skills, and communication skills. The students’ academic competences are knowledge building and processing info. Second, talking chips holds students’ accountability for participating. Third, talking chips was developed to solve the problem of one or two students dominating a team discussion.

Fourth, talking chips makes the students more active in listening, being honest, building on others’ ideas, contributing their ideas, disagreeing appropriately and encouraging contributions. Fifth, talking chips promotes task interdependence with a rule for regulating communication. No student may speak
twice before every teammate has spoken. Last, related to social skills, talking chips can develop students’ ability to understand and work successfully with others.

Based on those explanations, the researcher found that talking chips technique is not only able to improve the students’ speaking skill but also students’ writing skill. Through talking chips they can discuss about the text they have made and give some correction to the text. They can proofread each other texts as well. Therefore, talking chips technique makes the students easier in making analytical exposition text.

2.3 Theoretical Framework

Theoretical framework consists of both previous studies and theoretical background. Based on the previous studies, there are several researchers who have conducted a research related to the use of talking chips in improving students’ ability.

Writing analytical exposition text is considered to be a difficult subject since the students are required to develop a topic becoming a text by following some rules and elements in order to make a good writing of analytical exposition. Thus, the teacher needs to choose a suitable technique in which it can make the students easier to write analytical exposition text. Therefore, the researcher intends to analyze deeper about talking chips technique for teaching writing analytical exposition text.

As stated by Kagan and Kagan (2009: 6.15), talking chips, turn toss, and round robin are all examples of structures that equalize communication, giving
every student a chance to use and develop language skills. This study is an experimental research that uses two groups. They would be treated as the experimental group and control group. Pretest and posttest will be given to those group. The experimental group would be taught using talking chips technique, however, the control group would be taught without any strategy. The students’ achievement in experimental and control group would be compared to measure the effectiveness of talking chips technique. The theoretical framework of the study can be drawn as follows:
Cooperative Learning

- Students have problem in writing analytical exposition text.

- Talking chips makes the students more active in building ideas, contributing their ideas, disagreeing appropriately, elaborating and encouraging contributions (Kagan & Kagan, 2009)

- Cooperative learning helps the students develop high-level reasoning and critical thinking skills and the ability to see the perspective of others (Quarstein & Peterson, 2001)

- That happened because they are difficult to explore and develop their ideas.

Problem

Reason

Solution

Figure 2.1. Theoretical Framework of the Study
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This final chapter presents the conclusion and suggestion of this research. The conclusion is drawn based on the findings and discussion of the previous chapter. This chapter also contains some suggestions for the readers so that hopefully this research can be useful for everyone.

5.1 Conclusion
This study was conducted to find out the effectiveness of talking chips technique in teaching writing analytical exposition text and to figure out whether or not there was a significant difference between the students taught by using talking chips technique and those taught by using conventional method. According to the result of the research findings and discussion in the previous chapter, it can be concluded that talking chips technique is effective to be implemented in teaching writing of analytical exposition texts since there was an improvement of the students. It could be proven by the improvement of the writing aspects (idea, organization, grammar and vocabulary) of the experimental group which was higher than the control group. The study found that talking chips technique was more effective than the conventional learning method in improving students’ skill in writing analytical exposition text.

Based on the data analysis, the mean score of the experimental group was improving higher (from 56.43 to 74.14) than the control group (from 56.79 to
66.69). Furthermore, based on the t-test calculation, the result of the t-value (3.799) was also higher than the t-table (1.995). Since the t-value was higher than the critical value, it could be stated that there was a significant difference between the students taught by using talking chips technique and the students taught by using conventional method.

5.2 Suggestion

Based on the conclusion of the study, the researcher would like to offer some suggestions that could be a consideration to the readers. Those are:

1) For the teachers

The teachers can apply talking chips technique for teaching writing analytical exposition text since this technique is able to encourage the students to share their ideas and opinions. Through this technique, the students can talk about what analytical exposition texts is and another thing about it. This will help the students understand better about analytical exposition text. In addition, talking chips technique was also very useful to explore and develop their ideas, make a proper organization, correct their grammar, and also enrich their vocabulary.

2) For the students

Due to analytical exposition text is considered as a difficult material for the students, it is necessary for the students to enhance their writing skill and understand better about the text. By using talking chips technique, the students can explore deeply on an issue with the other group members.
3) For the next researchers

This study is limited to the period of the treatments which took only three meetings. Therefore, the development of the students’ writing skill was not too big. In addition, this study is limited to a big number of the students since it was conducted in a classroom consists of 35 students. The students have to follow the rules of talking chips technique in which they have to put the chips on the table before they speak. However, they sometimes speak randomly. That is why the teacher have to be able to control all students in the class. The next researchers hopefully can extend the time of the treatment and manage the number of the students so that the students’ ability can be fully developed.
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