The Effect of Round Robin Technique Toward Students' Speaking Performance at MTS. Muhammadiyah Pulau Punjung

Mona Desnita[1], Irwandi[2], Eliza[3], Loli Safitri[4]*

[1,2,3,4]Institut Agama Islam Negeri Bukittinggi, Bukittinggi, Indonesia

Article Informations

A B S T R A C T

This research is triggered by students' speaking performance problems. The first problem is related to the fact the srudents still cannot speak fluently and accurately. Secondly, students still have low confidence in practicing speaking skills. Thirdly, students did not have an English mastery strategy. This study aims as finding do not significant effect of the round robin technique to improve students' speaking performance in terms of their fluency and accuracy in practicing interpersonal dialogue. This research was an experimental research. In collecting data researcher used pretest-posttest control control design. The experimental group was VIII.A (23 students) and control group that was VIII.B (23 Students). The sample was selected by using total sampling technique. The data was got through pre-test and post-test to experimental and control groups. The research findings indicates that,the result of post-test in experimental class has t-obtained (59.25) was higher than t-table (1.6802) with degree of freedom (df) = 0.05. Thus, the alternative hypothesis (ha) was accepted which means that there was significant effect of using Round Robin Technique toward students speaking performance. Thus, it can be concluded that the intire hypothesis was accepted. It was proved that Round Robin Technique could help students in improving and enggaging their speaking and Round Robin Technique is recomended to be lesed by english lesson in teaching speaking.

Abstrak

Latar belakang penelitian ini dipicu oleh masalah kinerja berbicara siswa. Masalah pertama adalah siswa tidak dapat berbicara dengan lancar , kedua siswa masih memiliki kepercayaan yang rendah dalam melatih kemampuan berbicara, yang ketiga siswa tidak memiliki strategi penguasaan bahasa inggris. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menemukan pengaruh yang signifikan dari teknik Round Robin untuk meningkatkan kinerja berbicara siswa dalam kefasihan dan ketepatan mereka dalam mempraktikan dialog interpersonal. Penelitian ini menggunakan penelitian eksperimen. Dalam pengumpulan data peneliti menggunakan pretest-posttest control design. Terdapat kelompok eksperimen VIII.A (23 siswa) dan kelompok kontrol yaitu VIII.B (23 siswa). Sampel dipilih dengan menggunakan teknik total sampling. Data diperoleh melalui pre-test dan post-test pada kelompok eksperimen dan control. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa dari nilai pre-test dan post-test kelas eksperimen, t-hitung (59,25) lebih besar dari t-tabel (1,6802) dengan derajat kebebasan (df) = 0,05. Oleh karena itu, hipotesis alternatif (ha) diterima yang berarti bahwa ada pengaruh yang signifikan dari Teknik Round Robin terhadap kinerja berbicara siswa. Dengan demikian dapat disimpulkan bahwa hipotesis inti diterima. Terbukti bahwa Teknik Round Robin dapat membantu siswa meningkatkan dan melibatkan berbicara mereka dan Teknik Round Robin lebih baik daripada Teknik konvensional.

1. Introduction

Speaking is an important skill that must be learned by students when learning English. Through speaking, learners can convey both information or ideas and maintain social relationships with others. They can have social interactions with each other, express their thoughts and respond directly to what other people say to them. Speaking can help students use and transmit knowledge in an effective way. Additionally, speak by giving instructions and making the interaction more understandable. Thus, speaking is an important skill since it interacts with other people.

Speaking is a way for the students to express their knowledge, share their feelings, and show their performance. The students can make social contact with others when interacting. They can express their thoughts and even respond directly to what the people say to them, so the students learn to understand what they say. According to Richards, there are three main functions of speaking: talking as interaction, talking as a transaction, and talking as performance. It means that those functions of speaking will help the students to understand about what is said. Moreover, Brown states, there are six categories that apply to the kinds of oral production that students are expected to carry out in the classroom.

The categories are imitative, intensive, responsive, transactional, interpersonal and extensive. Imitative performance includes the ability to practice intonation, and Intensive is focused on practising on the grammatical. Then, Responsive performance has interaction and test comprehension(Lestari et al., 2022). The transaction is carried out to convey or exchange specific information. Fifth, interpersonal is carried out more to maintain a social relationship. Last, extensive monologue includes an oral presentation, speech, and storytelling. Thus, the students must know are six categories in Speaking.

Furthermore, to improve students' speaking performance, the teacher guides the students to speak in the classroom. The current English conversation and learning system must prioritize students' performance since this way is hoped students, in this hope, can express themselves is to follow the rules of the English language when communicating. In addition, the teacher requires them to talk more, or to select the best techniques to teach students more fluently in oral skills. Bahrani stated that the students' speaking should build up a stock of minimal response that they can use ineffective English speaking in teaching are discussion, storytelling, information gap, Round-Robin and role play. It is assumed that these techniques can encourage students to practice speaking fluently, and accuracy.

The students' speaking ability is the students' process on how their performance results in the learning process of education. Therefore, their speaking process to get better results of performance is important. Moreover, in the learning process, they can get a chance to improve their speaking. In addition, according to Urs, one of the characteristics of successful speaking activity is learners talk a lot. It means that in their process to get good results, the students are pushed by their teacher to speak a lot. Thus, the result of students being able to speak depends on how they receive treatment and their learning activity in their learning process.

There are also contributions to communication performance to improve students ease of communication. The students can add knowledge and get new information. They can communicate and interact with each other easily. In addition, the students can understand and comprehend what the English teacher says about the English materials, and they can give feedback and respond to the teacher, such as asking and giving questions. Thus, performance in speaking has some contributions in easily the communication.

When the students express their knowledge and share their feelings with others, they must speak fluently and accurately. Speaking fluency and accuracy are two factors that can determine the success

of speaking. Accuracy is the performance to produce grammatically and lexically accurate sentences. Meanwhile, fluency is the performance to produce it effortlessly. Indeed, fluency and accuracy are important in speaking English well.

Based on preliminary researcher interviews with English teachers at MTs. Muhammadiyah Pulau Punjung on 21 September 2020/2021, the first problem was that as the teacher said in general students had difficulty speaking fluently and accurately. The students were difficult to speak fluently because they were often confused about what they wanted to say in English. While, the difficulty of students accuracy in due to they students were slow to respond when they were talking with others.

The second problem was that the students had a lack of confidence when talking to their friends. Some students looked embarrassed, uncomfortable, and not confident in practicing speaking English. Most of the students were shy to speak English, but they were also afraid to make mistakes in speaking. It happened because they were laugh when their friends make mistakes.

The third problem was that the students did not have strategies to master English speaking. Generally, strategy in learning is necessary, especially for speaking English. Without using strategy, it is difficult to master English speaking. Many students thought that speaking is a difficult skill, but it could be mastered if they have good strategies, such as practising speaking English. In fact, in learning process, the students did not have strategies in speaking.

Moreover, there are many kind of techniques that can improve students speaking performance, such as role-play, information gap, storytelling, reporting, and Round Robin. One of the techniques that can be used to teach speaking is the Round Robin technique. Therefore, this technique is useful in helping the students to understand the different activities that make up creative thinking.

Round Robin technique is a technique used in teaching speaking to improve students' performance in terms of fluency and accuracy. This technique is more easily applied in the classroom. In the round-robin technique, students have to construct their own sentences based on the question or statement that has been given by the teacher. According to Ferrer, the Round Robin technique means that each group member contributes an idea to the group in a systematic round-the-group fashion, which means that the Round Robin technique gives each student an opportunity to use their own word or sentence in group discussion. Beverly said that the Round Robin technique is discussions a good way to share ideas, and in this technique, the students learn to express ideas clearly and sufficiently in an open forum.

Besides, the purpose of the technique of to provide students with an opportunity to share ideas, express opinions, and create spoken text in a quick and efficient. Therefore, the Round robin technique is a technique that can improve students' speaking performance by speaking in turns. Thus, the round robin technique is effective technique to improve students speaking.

Based on the situations above, to solve the students' problems in mastering speaking performance, the researcher proposes applying the round-robin technique in teaching speaking skills. Round Robin is primarily a brainstorming technique in which the students generation ideas are elaborated, explained, and evaluated by a group of members who take turns responding to a question with words, phrases, or short statements (Elizabeth F. Barkley et al., 2005). It means that the Round Robin gives each students the opportunity to speak up. The round-robin technique is defined as a method by which ideas are generated and developed in brainstorming sessions. The Round Robin interaction process builds on consecutive contributions from each participant, either orally or verbally. It means that the round-robin technique provides students with an opportunity to speak in English.

Since round robin technique is proposed to be used to solve the students' problems in mastering speaking skills, but its effect is still questionable, it is a scientific reason for the researcher to research The Effect of Round Robin Technique Towards Students Speaking Performance

2. Research Method

2.1. Design of the Research

This research used experimental quantitative research since the data form as numeral data and needs to be quantified by statistical formula. In another word, the research gave numeral data (students' marks) and used statistical formulas in analyzing it. There were many types of quantitative research. Based on the problem of the study previously, the researcher used quasi-experimental research types in this research. According to Gay, experimental research was the only method of research that can truly test a hypothesis concerning cause-effect relationships.(L. R. Gay et al., 2012).

Many kinds of experimental research that can be used, but in this research, the researcher used pre-test post-test design in both experimental and controlled classes. This research aimed to find out of using Round Robin technique toward students speaking. It was the most important to get the significant effect by comparing the pre-test and post-test both of experimental and controlled class. It could be seen as follows:

Table 1. Design of Pre-test and Post-test

	Pre-test	Treatment	Post-test
Experimental Class	T1	X	T2
Control Class	T1	-	T2

Where :

T1 : the pre-test for the experimental calss.

T2 : the post-test for the experimental class.

X : the treatment

T1 : the pre-test for the control class

T2 : the post-test for the control class

Based on the table above, both of the classes were experimental class and control class where there are pre-test and post-test. The treatment was only given to the experimental class. While the control class, there was no treatment but only using the conventional method. The treatment was given after the pre-test in the experimental class. The post-test is given to both of the classes which were experimental class and control classes.

2.2. Population and Sample

2.2.1. Population

Population was the important elelment of the research. Related to Gay, population was the group of interest to the research, the group to wich she or he would like the result of the study to be generilized (Lorraine R. Gay, 2012). In line with Gay, Margono said that the population was the totality of research object as a source of the date that has specific characters in a research or study (Margono, 2007).

It means that population was the whole of the research object that have interst character in research. The population this research were all of the second grade students (VIII class) at Mts. Muhammadiyah pulau punjug. The population of the research was as follow :

Table 2. The population of the Eight Grade Students of
MTs.Muhammadiyah Pulau Punjung 2020/2021 Academic Year

No	Classes	Total Number of Students
1	VIII A	23
2	VIII B	23
	Jumlah	46

Source: Administration Office of Mts. Muhammadiyah Pulau Punjung.

From the table above, the population of this research was 46 students who were the totality of the students in the Eight Grade students of Mts. Muhammadiyah Pulau Punjung 2020/2021 Academic year.

2.2.2. Sample

Sample represented of quality and characteristics of a population. Gay stated that sampling was the process of selecting a number of individuals for study in such a way that the individuals represent the larger group from which they selected (Margono, 2007). It means that sample was part of the population which was selected to be the target of experiment.

Based on the research problem and the research design used, there were experimental class and control class. This research chosed the second grade as the research example. Based on the same considerations, such as the number of students, all categories had the same performance in speaking English. That matter. justified by the daily test of speaking students in the study obtained from the teacher. Then, all classes had the same English teacher.

The researcher used a s technique called total sampling which was a technique of selecting a sample when all members of the population were used as samples. This was done when the population was relatively small.

2.2.3. Instrumentation

The instrument of the research was an oral test. The test was conducted twice. The first test was as a pre-test which was given at the beginning of the test, while the last one was as a post-test which was taken at the end of the test.

The pre-test was aimed to know whether both groups hade the same ability in speaking. While, the post-test was used to determine how well the treatment had an effect on their speaking. To make the researcher was easy an assess and score the data, the test was recorded. The tests were used to get information about the students speaking. They were five components of speaking to be scored such as pronoun, Grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.

The test was created by considering the validity and reliability according to Arikunto, the requirements of the test were validity and reliability, as explained below :

1. Validity

Validity in testing has been understood to discover whether a test measured accurately what was intended to measure or it measuresd what was purposed to measure. Arikunto stated that a test can be said as a valid if it test can measure what was purposed to measure (Arikunto, 1997).

In this research, the researcher used the expert validity. In expert validity, the researcher gave to the three lecturers to validate the test. Test was used after being declared valid by the expert. From the result of validation, the validator stated that the instrument of this research was valid.

2.2.4. Technique of the Data Collection

The procedure of data collection techniques, researcher prepared :

2.2.4.1. Pre test in the experimental and control class

The researcher gave the pre-test to both of the classes before teaching speaking. Then, the researcher gave the question that was in the instrument to the students. Next, the researcher collected the students scores and then analsed the scores.

2.2.4.2. Treatment

a. Experimental class

In this class using the show and tell technique, the procedure was as below :

1). Grouping students

a) Grouping students

The teacher divided the students into several groups that consisted of the number of students in the class. Then, the students were asked to sit on the circle based on their respective group.

b) Generiting the ideas

The teacher explained that the purpose of brainstorming was to generate lost of ideas. The students were asked to listen it.

c) Take turns

The teacher informed the students that they would take turns to appear and announce the deadline and the students carried out the instructions from the teacher.

d) Activity

The teacher asked one students to begin the activity by stating a new idea. The activity continues, moving from member to member in sequence, until all students have participated.

b. Control class

in this class, the researcher used a conventional technique based on the sylabus program in the teaching and learning process.

2.2.4.3. post-test experimental and control class

After teaching , the researcher gave an oral test both of the classes. The test should be similar. The researcher did the following instruction :

1. Asked the students if they were ready for the test.

2. the test was an oral test that the researcher prepared before.

3. scoring the students test. The formula was the same within the pre-test about the speaking aspect test.

2.2.4. Technique of the Data Analysis

Analysis of the data was a process to analyze and to interpret the data to get the result of the research to analyze the data. This research, the data took the test to compare the difference of the mean score between the control class and the experiment class. Related to Sugiyono, if the research was compare between two groups in the hypothesis is tested by using t-test (Sugiyono, 2015).

This research used the t-test to analyze the data in this research. To find whether the significant effect of students speaking Performance by using Round robin technique, feedback used the test as suggested by Gay as formula below:

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{ss_1 + ss_2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}\right)}}$$

Note:

t: The score of t-calculated (obtained)

$\bar{X}1$: Mean score of the post-test of the experimental class

$\bar{X_2}$: Mean score of the pre-test of the experimental class

$SS1$: Sums of squares of the post-test of the experimental class

$SS2$: Sums of squares of the pre-test of the experimental class

$n1$: Number of experiment class on post-test

$n2$: Number of experiment class on pre-test

The post-test score experimental class analyzed whether there was a significant effect or not of the students speaking comprehension by using cooperative script technique feedback and students who did not give the feedback by comparing the mean score before and after the treatment of the class.

To the hypothesis, to include the significant difference between the mean of the score for two classes compared between t obtained to the value of t obtained indicate a significant difference, this research would consult the t-test result into t-table by cooperative script technique feedback would use the test which was suggested by Gay as formula below:

$t-_{test} \geq t-_{tab}$, it means H_a is accepted and H_0 is rejected.

$t-_{test} \leq t_{tab}$, it means H_a is rejected and H_0 is accepted

1. Finding and Discussion

In this chapter, the researchers described the description of the data, analysis of the data, and testing of the hypothesis.

3.1. Description of the Data

The data of this research was taken from MTs. Muhammadiyah Pulau punjung. It was taken from students' scores of pre-test and post-test from both of the classes: experimental and control classes. Related to Anderson, there were five standardization of measurement in the speaking test: fluency, pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, and comprehension. The result of the students' pre-test and post-test in the experimental and control classes could be seen by the table below.

3.1.1. Pre Test Scorer

a. Pre-test score of the experimental class

Table 3. Pre-test score of the experimental class

No	Nama	Score
1	AR	40
2	ARG	40
3	ARS	40
4	DM	40
5	DH	40
6	DI	55
7	FA	40
8	FB	45
9	FR	45
10	H	50
11	HS	50
12	KY	55
13	LMR	50
14	MFM	55
15	NJ	45
16	RA	35
17	RRP	50
18	RMP	55
19	RA	35
20	SA	40
21	SM	50
22	YW	55
23	F	55
Total		1.065
n		23
Mean		46

From the table above, the highest score of experimental class in the pre-test was 55, while the lowest score was 35. Score distribution had mean 46. The pre-test that had been collected related to the students Performance in speaking. The data shown that the lowest score of pre-test that was gained by the experimental class was 35, the higher score was 55,variant was 48, satndard deviation was 6,95 an the mean score was 46.

b. Pre-test of control class

the last result of the controll class shown by the table bellow :

Table 4. Pre-test score of the control class:

No	Nama	Score
1	AAA	35
2	AA	40
3	AS	50
4	DFP	45
5	DS	40
6	DN	35
7	DA	35
8	F	40
9	FES	45
10	IF	55
11	LA	50
12	LG	50
13	MKI	40
14	NAN	45
15	NEP	35
16	NFA	35

17	RA	40
18	RMP	50
19	R	55
20	SIA	40
21	SLD	35
22	VV	40
23	H	45
		920
Total n Mean		23
		43

From the table above, the highest score of control class in the pre-test was 55 and the lowest score was 35 score distrubution has mean 43, variant was 41, standard deviation was 6,55. The result of pre-test experimental and control class also could be shown as the table below

Table 5. The test result in pre-test ofexperimental and control class

Statistic	Experimental class	Control class
N	23	23
Mean score	46	43
Standard deviation	6,95	6,55
Minimum	40	35
Maximum	55	35

The data presented above showed that there are 46 students who re involved in the pre-test : 23 students in the pre-test : 23 students in experimental class and 23 students in control class. The mean score of the experimental class was 46 and the controll class was 43. The standar deviation of the experimental class was 6,95 and the control class and the control class was 48 and the control class was 41. It means that the variant of the experimental class was higher than control class.

c. Data from the post-test of experimental class and control class

Post-test was a process of measure students speaking Performance after students were given the treatment to see result. Posttest was given for both experimental class and control class in the last meeting.

3.1.2. Post-Test

a. Post-test score of the experimental class

Table 6. The Post-test score of the experimental class

No	Nama	Score
1	AR	79
2	ARG	75
3	ARS	60
4	DM	67
5	DH	75
6	DI	79
7	FA	88
8	FB	75
9	FR	79
10	H	88
11	HS	92
12	KY	75
13	LMR	80
14	MFM	70
15	NJ	75

No	Nama	Score
16	RA	88
17	RRP	80
18	RMP	67
19	RA	75
20	SA	92
21	SM	88
22	YW	75
23	F	75
Total		1.797
n		23
Mean		78

From the table above, the highest score of the experimental class in the post-test was 92, while the lowes score was 55. Score distribution had mean 78, variant was 68 and standard deviation was 8,24.

b. Post-test of control class

Table 7. Post-test score of the control class

No	Nama	Score
1	AAA	50
2	AA	40
3	AS	50
4	DFP	60
5	DS	70
6	DN	65
7	DA	75
8	F	55
9	FES	60
10	IF	55
11	LA	45
12	LG	70
13	MKI	75
14	NAN	70
15	NEP	65
16	NFA	65
17	RA	65
18	RMP	60
19	R	70
20	SIA	75
21	SLD	80
22	VV	75
23	H	80
Total		1.410
n		23
Mean		61

From the table above, higher score of control class in the pre-test was 88, while the lowest was 40. From the data, it was found that the mean value was 61 variant was 127,23 and standard deviation was 11, 28

The result of pre-test experimental and the control class could be shown as the table:

Table 8. The result in post-test of experimental and control class

Statistic	Experimental class	Control class
N	23	23
Mean score	78	61
Standard deviation	8,24	11,28
Minimum	60	45
Maximum	92	88

After doing the pre-test and post test, the researcher compared both of the result of the pre-test and post-test from the experimental class and control class. The comparison test result of pre-test and post-test from the experimental class and control class showed in the following table :

Table 9. The comparison of pre-test and post-tes of the experimental and the control class

The result The class	Pre-test	Post-tes
experimental class	X= 46 S= 6,95 S2= 48	X= 78 S=8,24 S2=68
control class	X= 43 S=6,55 S2=41	X=61 S=11,28 S2= 122,23

Based on the table above, the pre-test result of experimental class was higher than control class result. It means that the treatment that have been used by the researcher to improve the students speaking Performance can applied by the students , so that the post-test result of of the student can incrase than post-test. The increasing can we analyzed from the mean score in pre-test result. The increasing can we analyzed from the mean score in pre-test of experimental class was 48 lower than post-test was 78.

The comparison the post-test of the experimental class and control class allowed that control class the result was lower than control class was lower than experimental class. The mean score of the post-test result of control class was lower than experimental class post-test result,61 was lower than 78. It means that the students who treated by using Round Robin technique was better than students who use conventional technique.

3.1.3. Analysis of the data

The researcher did normality and homogenity test of the result of pre-test and post-test the experimental class and control classes. To analyze the data, the researcher used the liliforss test to find out whether the data was distributed normally or not and used ftest to obtain whether the data of of two class where homogeny or not.

3.2. Discussion

This research was about the effect Round Robin Technique toward students speaking Performance in MTs. Muhammadiyah Pulau Punjung. This section discussed the researcher finding based on related study. This research was done by giving the speaking test to the student in experimental class and control class. The function of the speaking test was to see the students fluency and accuracy in speaking English well, the grammar, vocabulary, and comprehension interpersonal dialogue. According to Kagan, Round Robin Techique can improve the students speaking performance because principles of cooperative learningapplied well in the classroom (Syafridin, 2013). In order to expressed their own ideas, feelings based on the topic selected. In this research, the researcher choosed interpersonal dialogue related to the invitation material, in using the round robin

technique there were several steps taken by the teacher. The first, teacher divided the students into several groups. The second, teacher took notes or recorded things that students thought were important. The third, the students began to learn. The fourth, teacher showed one group to come forward and finally the students go to another group to perform next until all groups can appear in front of the class that was the steps to using the round robin technique. In this research, the researcher had seen the effect of using Round Robin Technique in improving speaking Performance.

Based on the researcher finding above, the result hypothesis from this research could answer the formulation of the problems as stated in chapter one where the researchfinds that all the alternative hypothesis (Ha) was accepted. The result of the research related to the first hypothesis assertss that there was a significant effect of using Round Robin Technique toward students speaking Performance. According susmiarti, Round Robin Technique as there many generated ides that students can gather from and it helps students to explore new concept (Sripradith & Raweewat, 2019). Considering the development of teaching speaking technique, Round Robin technique has been one of considered technique to be implmented in any level of education. According Barkley, Round Robin technique was a technique supporting students to elaborate, explain, evaluate, the question with a word, phrase, or a short answer (Sahardin et al., 2019). It means that Round Robin technique give freedom to students to speaking.

The second hypothes was Round Robin Technique , to know whether the technique was effective to improve students Performance. Teaching students by using Round Robin Technique helped to do their work information, a higher thingking skill. The Round Robin technique was selected because it was belived to be able to simulate to be more involved in the speaking activities and facilitate the students to comprehand the passeges. Round Robin Technique teams to achieve the knowldge needed for future work.

Last, the third hypothesis asserted the students speaking Performance by using Round Robin Technique was better than students using conventional technique. However, storch stated that the study which described how well Round Robin Technique. From the explanation above , it could be concluded that Round Robin Technique can improve students speaking Performance.other than that, Round Robin Technique could also be used an effective technique to help teacher in teaching.

2. Conclusion

Based on the finding and discuss above, th researcher concluded that by using Round Robin technique in speaking perfomance. Firstly, there was a significant effect of using Round Robin Technique toward students speaking Performance. It could be seen in previous chapter related to the result of statistical analysis by using Round Robin technique in this research.

Secondly, there was a significant difference betweeen using Round Robin Technique toward students speaking Performance. It could be seen from the result of statistical analysis by using independent sample test where tobtained (19,10) was higher than table with level significant 0,05. It means that the null hypothesis (ha) was accepted.

Lastly, students speaking Performance in speaking by using Round Robin Technique was better than using conventional technique. It could be seen from the result of statistical analysis by using experimental class where tobtained was higher than table with the level significant 0,05. It means that the null hypothesis(ha) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis (ha) was accepted.

References

Arikunto, S. (1997). *Dasar-Dasar Evaluasi Pendididkan*. Bumi Aksara.

Elizabeth F. Barkley, Cross, K. P., & Major, C. H. (2005). *Collaborative Learning Techniques*. Jossey-Bass.

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2012). *Competencies for Analysis and Applications*. Pearson: Educational

Research.

Gay, Lorraine R. (2012). *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Applications*. Pearson Education.

Lestari, A. D., Pratiwi, R., & Nastion, S. J. (2022). Strategi Pembelajaran Contextual Teaching Learning pada Sejarah Kebudayaan Islam. *Journal of Educational Management and Strategy (JEMAST)*, *1*(1), 34–39.

Margono. (2007). *Metodologi Penelitian Pendidikan*. PT Rineka Cipta.

Sahardin, R., Heriansyah, H., & Authari, M. D. (2019). The use of Round Robin technique to improve students' speaking skill. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *6*(2), 343–352. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v6i2.14787

Sripradith, & Raweewat. (2019). An Investigation of The Round Robin Brainstorming in Improving English Speaking Ability Among Nakhonphanom University Second Year Students in Thailand. *Journal of Education and Learning*, *8*(4), 153–160.

Sugiyono. (2015). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.

Syafridin. (2013). Improving Grade X Students Speaking Achievement under Round Robin Technique. *International Journal Education*, *1*(1).