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Abstract
This research aimed to determine whether the talking stick technique fosters the learners’ Arabic speaking skills. The research design used a quasi-experimental method. The participants of this research were the eleventh graders of Madrasah Aliyah Negeri (MAN) Palopo, consisting of 40 learners. The sampling technique was purposive sampling. The research instrument was an oral test. The writer conducted the test for learners before and after the treatments. The research results show a significant improvement in the learners’ speaking skills using the talking stick technique. The average score of the last test for the experimental group was higher than the controlled group (74.70 > 56.55), and the standard deviation for the experimental group was 8.355 and for the controlled group was 15.753. Meanwhile, the probability value was lower than alpha (0.000 < 0.05). The null hypothesis (H0) was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (H1) was accepted. This research is hoped to benefit the development of Arabic language teaching.
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Abstrak
Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menentukan apakah teknik tongkat bicara dapat meningkatkan kemampuan berbicara dalam bahasa Arab para pelajar. Desain penelitian menggunakan metode kuasi-eksperimental. Partisipan dalam penelitian ini adalah siswa kelas sebelas Madrasah Aliyah Negeri Palopo, yang terdiri dari 40 pelajar. Teknik pengambilan sampel yang digunakan adalah purposive sampling. Instrumen penelitian adalah tes lisan. Penulis melakukan tes untuk para pelajar sebelum dan setelah perlakuan. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan peningkatan yang signifikan dalam kemampuan berbicara para pelajar yang menggunakan teknik tongkat bicara. Skor rata-rata pada tes terakhir untuk kelompok eksperimen lebih tinggi dibandingkan dengan kelompok kontrol (74.70 > 56.55), dan deviasi standar untuk kelompok eksperimen adalah 8,355 sedangkan untuk kelompok kontrol adalah 15,753. Sementara itu, nilai probabilitas lebih rendah daripada alpha (0,000 < 0.05). Hipotesis nol (H0) ditolak, dan hipotesis alternatif (H1) diterima. Penelitian ini diharapkan dapat memberikan manfaat bagi pengembangan pengajaran bahasa Arab.

Kata Kunci: Pembelajaran Bahasa Arab, kemampuan berbicara, teknik tongkat bicara
Introduction

Speaking is considered an essential skill in learning foreign languages, including Arabic. This matters because a person’s primary goal in learning a foreign language is to speak by using the language they learn in daily communication. The primary function of language is to communicate orally, so mastering the ability to speak in a language means mastering the language.

Speaking (kalām) is a productive skill that demands learners pronounce sounds well and apply grammatical rules (nahwiyah-sharfiyah), especially in the form of a sentence (amount) that can help them express what they want to convey verbally in communication settings. The purpose of speaking (kalām) is to transfer the existing meaning within a person into messages conveyed orally (Ahmed, 2019; Smith, 2020). Thus, some activities such as imitating sentence patterns and practicing dialogue (hiwār) are not yet considered speaking (kalām) activities (Khalaf, 2016; Arafat & Al-Hawamdeh, 2019). This is because speaking (kalām) is at-ta’bīr ‘an al-afkār or verbal disclosure of the thoughts inside a person. A student is considered to have good speaking (kalām) proficiency if he can convey ideas, thoughts, and desires directly to the other party through verbal or nonverbal communication (using Arabic).

In Arabic language teaching, there is an obstacle faced by the Arabic teacher and learners, namely how to deal with speaking. Sometimes, the learners can speak well at school, but after they have finished their studies, they lose many Arabic words, and only limited numbers are remembered (Al-Wer, 2015; Mousa & Al-Tamimi, 2017; Al-Zubi, 2018). This phenomenon happens when speaking in the senior high school, belonging to the learners of Madrasah Aiyah Negeri Palopo. Only 28% of learners can speak Arabic well. Lack of interest in learning Arabic is also one of the reasons for the decline in learning Arabic at school (Marni & Yusuf, 2015).

Seeing the conditions that occurred in MAN Palopo, we needed a learning method that allows it to be interesting for the learners to become more active in doing activities. So, they do not feel bored in their study. They could improve their confidence in Arabic class. One of the cooperative learning methods that may be applied to teach speaking is the talking stick technique.

According to Marni and Yusuf (2015), Garrett & Garrett (2002), Wijaya & Syarifuddin (2020), and Sakti et al. (2016), the talking stick technique was developed by Frank Lyman in 1985. It is a learning technique in which a teacher prepares a stick and then conveys the material to be taught. After the explanation ended, the teacher gave one of the learners a stick. The student who has held the stick was obliged to speak and explain the material he had understood in his language to his friends. When he finished explaining, he had to give the stick to another friend to explain the material as he did before. Suprijono (2009) argued that a stick-assisted learning technique encourages learners to dare to express their opinions.

Arabic language proficiency, particularly in speaking or Kalām, is critical for learners aiming to navigate the globalized world effectively. The ability to communicate in Arabic enriches cultural understanding and opens doors to various professional opportunities (Al-Shboul & Mahadin, 2016; Abdullah & Ismail, 2017; Al-Khasawneh & Alzyoud, 2019). In the pursuit of enhancing Arabic-speaking skills among learners, educators and researchers have explored various pedagogical approaches (Khalid, 2017; Hassan & Ibrahim, 2018). One innovative method recently gaining traction is the "Talking Stick Technique". This technique, rooted in interactive and communicative language teaching, fosters learners’ oral proficiency through active engagement and structured conversations.

Several scholars have researched the effectiveness of the talking stick technique in teaching Arabic. The results of research conducted by Marni & Yusuf (2021) show that the use of the talking stick method is proven effective in increasing the maharah al-kalām of class X3 MAN 2 Makassar Model learners in the Arabic subject. Meanwhile, Syamsul et al. (2021) concluded that using a talking stick effectively speaking Arabic skills in class X MA Putri DDI Mangkoso Kab. Barru. Wijaya & Syarifuddin (2020) concluded that the talking stick effectively increases the learners’ speaking skills. Rahmawati et al. (2021) found that after teaching the learners using the
talking stick technique, they showed positive behavior toward Arabic learning, increasing their language performance. Based on the explanation above, the writer formulated a research question: “Does the talking stick technique foster the learners’ speaking skills of the eleventh graders of Madrasah Aliyah Negeri Palopo?

**Method**

The research conducted employed a quasi-experimental method to investigate the impact of the talking stick technique on Arabic language proficiency among eleventh-grade students at MAN Palopo during the academic year 2021/2022. The study focused on two classes, namely XI MIA 1 and XI MIA 2, with a total of 40 learners. XI MIA 1 was designated as the experimental class, where the talking stick technique was implemented, while XI MIA 2 served as the control group, receiving instruction through the traditional lecture method. The researchers employed the purposive sampling technique to ensure a representative sample, considering each student as a potential sample to represent the population effectively. This method aimed to capture the diversity within the classes and enhance the generalizability of the findings to the broader student population.

The research instrument utilized for data collection was an oral test, specifically focused on describing pictures orally. The test comprised two sections: an initial assessment before the intervention and a final evaluation after the treatment phase. The choice of an oral test aligns with the objective of assessing the impact of instructional methods on students' Arabic speaking skills, providing a direct measure of their proficiency in expressing themselves in the target language. During the treatment stage, the experimental class received instruction using the talking stick technique, emphasizing the exclusive use of Arabic in the classroom. On the other hand, the control class underwent traditional instruction through the lecture method. This clear distinction in instructional approaches allowed for a comprehensive comparison of the outcomes between the two groups, shedding light on the effectiveness of the talking stick technique in fostering Arabic language proficiency.

To analyze the data, the researchers collected initial and final scores from both groups, categorized the scores, calculated average scores and standard deviation, and conducted a t-test using SPSS 22.0. This statistical analysis aimed to provide a quantitative assessment of the differences in language proficiency between the experimental and control groups. The utilization of SPSS 22.0 ensured a rigorous and systematic analysis of the data, contributing to the reliability and validity of the research findings. The transparency and clarity of the materials and methods are crucial to facilitating the reproducibility of the experiment. By detailing the selection of classes, the sampling technique, the research instrument, and the statistical analysis, the researchers enable other educators and scholars to replicate the study in different settings or with variations that may be relevant to their specific contexts.

In conclusion, this research, employing a quasi-experimental design, contributes valuable insights into the effectiveness of the talking stick technique in enhancing Arabic language proficiency among eleventh-grade students. The methodological choices, including purposive sampling, the use of oral tests, and statistical analysis using SPSS 22.0, collectively contribute to the rigor and validity of the study. The clear distinction between the experimental and control groups, along with the detailed reporting of materials and methods, ensures the replicability of the experiment and provides a foundation for future research in the realm of language education.

**Results**

**Scoring classification of the learners’ initial test in both groups**

Learners’ last test scores were classified into five classifications: excellent, good, satisfactory, poor, and fail. The frequency and the rate percentage of the learners’ scores on initial tests in the experimental and controlled groups are presented in the following:
Table 1. The rate percentage and frequency of learners’ scores on initial tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
<th>Controlled Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>90-100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>80-89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern</td>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginner</td>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>0-59</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the data shown in Table 1 above, the result of the initial test of both groups is none or 0% of learners classified as expert and competent. In comparison, there were 5 or 25% of learners classified as an intern, 3 or 15% of learners classified as a beginner, and 12 or 60% of learners classified as a novice. Meanwhile, in the controlled group, 3 or 15% of learners were classified as an intern, 1 or 5% of learners were classified as a beginner, and 16 or 80% of them were categorised as a novice.

Based on the data presented in Table 1, it is evident that neither of the two groups initially had any learners classified as experts or competent, representing 0% in both cases. In contrast, most learners fell into the novice category, constituting 60% of the experimental and 80% of the controlled groups. This could potentially be attributed to several factors, such as the complexity of the subject matter, the teaching methods employed, or the learners' prior knowledge and experience.

Furthermore, in the experimental group, 25% of learners were categorized as interns and 15% as beginners, whereas in the controlled group, 15% were interns and 5% were beginners. These differences may be influenced by various factors, including the instructional approach used in each group, the quality of resources available, or the individual learning pace and adaptability of the students. It is essential to explore these factors further to gain a comprehensive understanding of the observed disparities in learner classification.

The comparison between the initial test and the last test results showed no significant difference in learners speaking skills in both groups.

Scoring classification of the learners’ last test in both groups

Learners’ scores on the last test were classified also into five classifications. The frequency and the rate percentage of the learners’ scores on the initial test and last test in the experimental group are presented in the following:

Table 2. The rate percentage and frequency of learners’ scores on the last test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
<th>Controlled Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>90-100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>80-89</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern</td>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginner</td>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>0-59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the data shown in Table 2 above, the initial test result of both groups is none or 0% of learners classified as an expert and 8 or 40% of learners classified as competent. In comparison, 6 or 30% of learners classified as an intern, 3 or 15% classified as a beginner, and 12 or 60% classified as novices and beginners. Meanwhile, in the controlled group, 8 or 40% of learners were classified as an intern, 1 or 5% of learners were classified as a beginner, and 11 or 55% of them were categorized as a novice.

The comparison of the last test scores in the experimental and controlled groups shows that there was a significant difference in the last test results of both groups. It was proved by the result of the last test in both groups in which most of the learners in the experimental group were categorized as "competent" and some of them were in the "intern" category. While in the controlled group, most of the learners were categorized as "novice" and none of them was categorized as "expert" even though some of them were still categorized as "interns". It means that overall, it indicated a significant difference in the learners' test results in the last test of both groups.

Based on the data presented in Table 2, the initial test results for both the experimental and controlled groups showed a lack of learners classified as experts, with 0% in both cases. However, 40% of learners in the controlled group were classified as competent, while in the experimental group, none fell into this category initially. Additionally, 30% of learners in the experimental group were classified as interns, 15% as beginners, and 60% as novices and beginners. In contrast, the controlled group had 40% of learners classified as interns, 5% as beginners, and 55% as novices.

The comparison of the final test scores between the experimental and controlled groups revealed a significant disparity. This was evident from the final test results, where most learners in the experimental group were classified as "competent," and some were still in the "intern" category. In contrast, in the controlled group, most learners were categorized as "novice," with none classified as "expert," although some remained in the "intern" category. These findings indicate a significant difference in learners' test results between the two groups.

Several factors may contribute to this observed difference. It could be attributed to variations in the teaching methods employed in the experimental and controlled groups, the quality and effectiveness of the instructional materials used, or differences in the learners' prior knowledge and learning experiences. Further investigation is necessary to understand comprehensively the factors influencing these divergent outcomes.

The Results of Learners’ Initial and Last Tests

The results of the student’s scores on the initial and last tests in the controlled and experimental groups are shown in the tables below.

| Table 3. The average score and standard deviation of the initial test score |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Group           | Sample | Average score | Standard Deviation |
| Experimental    | 20     | 52.50          | 18.405            |
| Controlled      | 20     | 44.90          | 18.172            |

According to Table 3, the controlled group's mean initial test score was 44.90, whereas the experimental group was 52.50. The experimental group's average score was the same as the control groups since both groups were in the same category, as seen in the table above. As a result, we can deduce that the experimental and controlled groups had the same baseline knowledge of speaking abilities.

Based on the data presented in Table 3, it is evident that the mean initial test score for the controlled group was 44.90, while the experimental group had an average score of 52.50. Interestingly, the average score of the experimental group was equivalent to that of the control
group, as indicated in the table above. Consequently, we can infer that both the experimental and controlled groups had a similar baseline level of speaking abilities.

Several factors may contribute to this finding. Firstly, the initial test scores suggest that the two groups started at a comparable level of proficiency in speaking skills. This could be attributed to the random assignment of participants or a similar selection process for both groups, ensuring that they had a similar skill level at the outset.

Secondly, it’s important to consider that the teaching or intervention methods applied to both groups during the study may have effectively maintained the initial balance of speaking abilities. The instructional strategies used could have helped bridge any potential gaps in skill levels, leading to similar average scores after the intervention.

In conclusion, the data from Table 3 indicates that the experimental and controlled groups had a similar baseline knowledge of speaking abilities, suggesting that any differences in their later performance may be attributed to the specific interventions or treatments they received during the study. Further analysis is needed to understand the impact of these interventions on the final outcomes.

Furthermore, the writer describes the differences in the learners' speaking skills after both the experimental and controlled groups received treatment. The outcome of the last test is as follows.

Table 4. The average score and standard deviation of the last test score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Average score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>74.70</td>
<td>8.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56.55</td>
<td>15.753</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 reveals that after receiving treatments, the learners’ average scores in the experimental and controlled groups were different. The experimental group's mean test score was greater than the controlled group's (74.70 > 56.55), and the experimental group's standard deviation was 8.355 while the controlled group’s standard deviation was 15.753. Each group's mean last test score also indicates that they were in distinct categories. It signifies that the experimental group's average score was greater than the controlled group. It was proven that employing the talking stick technique fostered learners’ speaking performances.

As per the data presented in Table 4, it is evident that after receiving treatments, there was a noticeable difference in the average scores between the experimental and controlled groups. The mean test score for the experimental group was significantly higher than that of the controlled group (74.70 > 56.55). Additionally, it is worth noting that the experimental group had a lower standard deviation (8.355) compared to the controlled group (15.753), indicating less variability in the experimental group's scores.

The mean scores in the final test for each group further confirm that they fell into distinct categories. The experimental group's average score was notably higher than the controlled group's. This significant difference strongly suggests that the implementation of the talking stick technique positively impacted the learners' speaking performances.

Several factors may have contributed to these results. Firstly, the talking stick technique itself may have proven to be an effective method for enhancing speaking skills among the learners in the experimental group. This technique may have encouraged active participation, improved communication, and created a supportive learning environment.

Secondly, the lower standard deviation in the experimental group may indicate that the treatment had a more consistent and predictable impact on learners' scores, whereas the higher standard deviation in the controlled group suggests greater variability in outcomes, possibly due to the absence of the specific intervention.
In conclusion, the data from Table 4 clearly demonstrates that the experimental group, which received the talking stick technique as a treatment, outperformed the controlled group in terms of speaking skills. These findings provide strong evidence that the implementation of this technique had a positive and beneficial effect on learners' speaking performances.

**Test of significance (t-test)**

Inferential analysis was used to examine the hypotheses. The writer utilized a *t*-test (test of significance) for the paired sample test in this case, which is a test to determine whether there is a significant difference between the results of learners’ scores in the initial and last tests in the controlled and experimental groups. The degree of freedom (*df*) = 38 and the threshold of significance (0.05). The outcome of the calculation is shown in the table below.

**Table 5. t-test value for the initial test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Probability Value</th>
<th>(α)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial test of controlled and experimental groups</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the result of data analysis as summarized in Table 5 above in the initial test of the controlled and experimental group, the writer found that the probability value is higher than *alpha* (0.325 > 0.05) which means that there is no significant difference in the initial test of both groups, while the *p*-value of the last test can be seen in Table 6.

**Table 6. The value of the t-test for the last test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Probability Value</th>
<th>(α)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Last test of controlled and experimental groups</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The writer found that the probability value is lower than alpha (0.001 < 0.05) and the degree of freedom was 38, which suggests that there is a significant difference in the last test, based on the results of the data analysis summarized in Table 6. The null hypothesis (H1) was accepted, while the alternative hypothesis (H0) was rejected. It was discovered that using the talking stick technique increases learners' speaking skills. The writer, therefore, concluded that using the talking stick technique can help learners speak more fluently.

Based on the results of the data analysis summarized in Table 6, the writer observed that the probability value (*p*-value) obtained was lower than the predetermined significance level, represented by *alpha* (0.001 < 0.05). This outcome and a degree of freedom of 38 signifies a statistically significant difference in the last test scores between the experimental and controlled groups. Consequently, the null hypothesis (H0), which likely posited no difference between the groups, was accepted, while the alternative hypothesis (H1), which suggested that the talking stick technique has a positive impact on learners' speaking skills, was rejected. These findings collectively indicate that the implementation of the talking stick technique led to a statistically significant improvement in learners' speaking abilities. As a result, the writer confidently concludes that the utilization of the talking stick technique can effectively enhance learners' fluency in speaking Arabic.

**Discussion**

Based on the writer's observation during research, some factors hindered the learners to speak Arabic fluently, namely (1) because of the large number of learners who are new to Arabic in junior high, some learners find it challenging to learn and understand Arabic. This issue is a significant
barrier for learners to remain more engaged in learning and adding *mufradat*; (2) a lack of enthusiasm in learning Arabic causes learners to be less interested and enthusiastic about learning Arabic. This becomes one of the barriers to learners learning Arabic, (3) a lack of familiar vocabulary. One of the most significant aspects of Arabic is vocabulary. Learners become more fluent in Arabic as their vocabulary grows. Teachers might use the talking stick in the teaching-learning process to solve these issues.

Regarding Arabic teachers, Al-Hudaibi in Haris et al. (2021) identifies three-competency that every Arabic teacher should possess: Academic Competence is a set of experiences describing what teachers need to know in terms of knowledge and abilities in a specific professional field. This competency relates to the Arabic language teacher's understanding of Arabic and literature and their Arabic language skills, including listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Arabic teachers must be familiar with the history and peculiarities of the Arabic language and the differences between it and their native speech.

Professional competence is the following competency, which refers to a set of experiences that characterize what all teachers should know and be able to do, regardless of their expertise. It could take the form of knowledge and abilities associated with successful learning. The capacity to organize, manage, implement, and evaluate the Arabic language learning process is included in this capability. Arabic teachers should be able to construct successful learning environments (Al-Hazmi, 2017; Al-Yahya & Al-Gharibi, 2020). They should be able to set appropriate learning objectives, select appropriate and relevant materials to learners' learning objectives and circumstances, select appropriate learning methods and strategies to support learning objectives, create a pleasant learning environment, and adequately evaluate the learning process and outcomes.

The teachers are needed to have cultural competence. This cultural competence refers to understanding Arab social and cultural situations and their interactions with other cultures (Mahmoud & Al-Hosni, 2018; Salman & Al-Abdulwahhab, 2018). Arabic teachers must be aware of Arab traditions and conventions when instructing learners on how to use Arabic in their daily lives. this is because each language has its own culture, which varies from one language to the next.

The researchers found that the talking stick technique was beneficial in teaching speaking and can improve learners' speaking performances (Al-Qarawi, 2018; Suseno et al., 2020). Using a talking stick encourages learners to voice their thoughts and opinions (Sartipa, 2017). Aside from that, this technique can also be used to create amusing situations. The benefits of using the talking stick learning paradigm, according to Huda (2015), include measuring learners' readiness to answer questions, practicing reading skills and understanding materials, and motivating learners always to be eager to learn. However, the talking stick also had some weaknesses; by employing talking sticks, the learners became panicked and agitated since they had not prepared to answer the teacher's inquiry.

Wijaya and Syarifuddin (2020) stated that the talking stick is a creation-oriented learning model that conditions an atmosphere of active learning from learners because of the game's elements in the learning process. The main reason for choosing the talking stick model is because the learning process takes place after the teacher presents the material learning; learners are given a few moments to study the subject matter has been given to be able to answer the questions asked by the teacher during the talking stick.

**Conclusion**

Utilizing a talking stick in language education has proven valuable in fostering communication among learners and addressing communication challenges. This technique is particularly beneficial when teaching speaking skills, offering educators an effective means to engage students in conversations while simultaneously aiding them in overcoming communication difficulties. The significance of the talking stick lies in its ability to create an interactive and inclusive learning environment. In teaching Arabic, the talking stick emerges as a viable option for educators seeking to enhance their students' speaking proficiency. By incorporating this method
into language instruction, teachers can provide learners with a unique and interactive experience that promotes effective communication. The talking stick serves as a conduit for students to express themselves in Arabic, encouraging them to articulate their thoughts and ideas in the target language. This not only contributes to the development of their speaking skills but also fosters a sense of confidence and fluency in Arabic communication. Arabic teachers are encouraged to adopt a resourceful approach in organizing materials for teaching speaking skills, and the inclusion of the talking stick technique is a valuable addition to their toolkit. The method's effectiveness lies in creating a structured and participatory learning environment. As a result, educators can facilitate meaningful conversations among learners, allowing them to practice and refine their speaking abilities in a supportive setting.

To optimize the benefits of the talking stick approach, Arabic teachers must ensure that learners have ample opportunities to develop their speaking skills in diverse ways. This may include group discussions, role-playing scenarios, or language exchange activities. The versatility of the talking stick allows for its integration into various speaking exercises, making it a versatile and adaptable tool for language educators. Furthermore, there is potential for future research endeavors to explore the applicability of the talking stick technique in teaching other Arabic language skills beyond speaking. Researchers can investigate its effectiveness in listening comprehension, vocabulary acquisition, or even writing skills. Expanding the scope of research would contribute valuable insights to the broader field of Arabic language education, offering educators a comprehensive understanding of the potential benefits of the talking stick technique across diverse language competencies. Using a talking stick to teach Arabic speaking skills is a valuable strategy for educators. Its ability to engage learners in communication, address communication difficulties, and enhance speaking proficiency makes it a resourceful tool in language instruction. Arabic teachers are encouraged to incorporate the talking stick technique into their teaching methodologies, providing students with a dynamic and interactive platform to develop their language skills. Moreover, the potential for further research on its application in other language competencies highlights the ongoing relevance and versatility of the talking stick in Arabic language education.
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