Round Robin as an Interactive Technique to Teach Speaking
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Abstract

English is a language that is loved by everyone because of its role as the language that unifies the nation. Most people in the world speak English. No wonder if everyone is competing to be able to master this language in order to communicate and absorb information from outsiders. But in fact, English is still a scourge for most students in Indonesia. Moreover, there are four English skills that the students must master, namely, reading, writing, listening and speaking. Speaking is a productive skill. For some of English learners, speaking is the main point in learning English, but on the other hand, speaking is also a very difficult skill to master. Therefore, it requires various kinds of learning methods and techniques that can improve students' speaking skills. This study aims to see the effect of the round robin technique on students' speaking skills. This technique has many positive impacts on learning speaking in the classroom. This technique also makes students more interactive and raises the confidence of students to dare to speak English in their daily lives. This research is a quantitative study conducted at STKIP PGRI Bandar Lampung. There are two classes which are used as research subjects, namely the control class and the experimental class. The experimental class received treatments from the round robin technique, while the control class used the direct method.
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INTRODUCTION

Do not need to be discussed lengthy that English has become a necessity in the millennial era like today, including in the world of education. That is because English is an international language. Most of the important information and academic learning resources around the world are in English.

In learning English, we will not be separated from the skill *speaking*. For some people, maybe, think that speaking is the second most boring English lesson after grammar. However, there
are also those who think speaking is the most important skill in learning language in general, especially English.

Difficulty speaking in English is a problem for many people who want to master English. Most students in Indonesia have studied English since they were in elementary school, but they are still confused about speaking English. Even though it has been studying for years, there are still difficulties and it is still a scourge for students.

Although the students can write and read English texts, and the English test results show good grades, but when communicating in English many students become confused and do not know what to answer. Of course this makes English learners stressed. This is because for speaking we must be able to use it directly and automatically, for example, if someone asks, you must answer immediately. There is no time to think. This is very different from reading and writing which still has time to think first, look for the meaning of words or sentences, studying the word structure, grammar and etc.

In fact, there are many benefits that we can feel if we are able to speak English, among are:

1. Increase Self Confidence; Speaking English in front of many people, will make the learners more confident in carrying out an activity and also face various problems, not only at the local level, but also at the international level. The learners will be confident to do anything even though other people think it is impossible to do, because the confidence in you has increased rapidly.

2. Trusted to Represent an Event; Good at English speaking, it is definitely sought after by those closest to you. For example, during college there is a student exchange activity or at work that requires you to become an office representative because you are good at English speaking, where you can express your opinion and explain it in front of many people.

Being able to communicate in English also opens up wide opportunities for work and business, we cannot deny that English is people's language. There are so many transactions on the world market that use English as a tool for supporting devices. This is because English is a language communication tool that can unite differences and equalize perceptions. Economic agreements with foreign parties are also made in English.

Then, English is a personal branding for the learner. Mastering and being able to communicate verbally in English is a plus for someone. Grauberg (1997: 201) describes that, “For many pupils the prime goal of learning a foreign language is to be able to speak it. Teaching should therefore help them to achieve that goal to the best of their ability”.

In order to increase the students’ speaking skill, what must be changed is the method learning, so far the learner uses the eyes more to learn writing and reading. It must be changed by listening more. Students must be familiar and constantly trained to have the courage to communicate in English. Therefore, in learning English, a learning technique is needed that can encourage students to be more active in communicating using English. This is supported by the opinion of Bahrani (2012: 25), "A common argument among language teachers who are dealing with conversation courses is that
the students do not talk at all. One way to tackle this problem is to find the root of the problem and start from there. If the problem is cultural, that is in your culture it is unusual for students to talk out loud in class, or if students feel really shy about talking in front of other students then one way to go about breaking this cultural barrier is to create and establish your own classroom culture where speaking out loud in English is the norm."

Collaborative learning techniques can build an effective learning atmosphere not only in small classes, but also in large classes. Collaborative Learning is learning that focuses on student to student so that it can lead to positive attitudes that exist within the learner. Collaborative learning allows students to study, solve the problem and find the solution together. According to Pluta (2013: 9) who defines “collaborative learning as any learning activity that includes the coordinated engagement of two or more learners for the purpose of completing tasks (eg, solving cases) that leads to desired learning outcomes (eg, developing deep. Content knowledge). "It means that, if executed properly, collaborative learning can provide many benefits, for example students are able to exchange information, complement each other, and take advantage of each other in terms of skills and learning.

For speaking activity in a large class, collaborative learning is one of the method that can be adapted. One of the technique from collaborative learning is round robin technique. Based on Barkley (2005: 153), “round robin is a technique where students generate ideas and speak sequentially from one student to the next.” This means that students provide feedback and ensure that all students participate. The researchers believe that collaborative learning through the round robin technique can be a solution for learners who have difficulty. Especially for students at STKIP PGRI Bandar Lampung, Indonesia. This is the reason why researchers want to take up this topic.

In this study, the researchers wants to explore the questions:
1. Is there any significant difference in students’ speaking skill at second semester between using round robin technique and without round robin technique?
2. Is round robin technique more effective than conventional technique for teaching speaking in a large class?

The aims of this research are:
1. To find out a significant difference in students’ speaking skill between using round robin technique and without round robin technique.
2. To find out the effectiveness of using round robin technique towards student’ speaking skill.

METHOD

In this research, the researchers intended to find out the effectiveness of using Round Robin Technique in teaching speaking skill. Speaking itself is an activity which can be defined as for expressing opinions, to express what we want to say. According to Gorini (2007:244), “Writing and speaking are fundamental to the learning process”. This indicates that if the learner is able to master these two skills then it can be a significant contribution to the quality of education. Gorini (2007)
point out that “Speaking, however, may appear to be more difficult to teach than writing. Students may not have had much experience speaking and some may be shy or nervous.” The researchers realized that speaking is not an easy thing for most Indonesian students to master, considering that English is also not the first language in Indonesia. Therefore, it is very necessary for educators or teachers to continue to develop techniques or methods that are easy to apply, interesting, and can improve the learner's speaking ability. One technique that can lure learners to want to communicate in English is the round robin technique.

Barkley in Sripradith (2019:153) defined the key terms of round robin:

1. Involves the generation and development of ideas in a group brainstorming session.
2. University students—they are students who have enrolled in either a college or a university. The term also refers to people who have gained admission in colleges or universities (Demirci, 2015).
3. English speaking ability is the creation of communication that contains meaning that is chosen and interprets language (Krogstad et al., 2015). They must have knowledge of the sound systems of the language and random symbols with meaning that has been agreed upon.

According to Kagan (2007), Round Robin is defined as a method in which ideas are generated and developed in brainstorming sessions. This means that Round Robin is characterized as a technique in which thoughts are created and created in meetings to generate new ideas. In addition, Asari (2017) stated that, “Round Robin can improve students’ holistic ability, including students’ presentation skill”.

The procedure of teaching speaking through round robin based on Barkley (2005:163):

1. Ask students to make groups consists of six people
2. Explain that the purpose of the brainstorming is to generate ideas. Group members will get a turn one by one to respond to questions. To avoid interruptions, they should refrain from directly evaluating or questioning or discussing the ideas
3. Tell students whether they will have one turn at a time according to one turn or how many times, announce the time limit.
4. Ask one of the students in the group to start the activity by stating an idea. The next student went on to come up with a new idea.
5. The activity continues until all students participate.

This research is based on the quantitative method, especially categorized as a quasi experimental study. Based on Maciejewski (2018), “A quasi-experiment is a prospective or retrospective study in which patients or clusters of patients self-select into (or their providers select on their behalf) one of several different treatment groups for the purpose of comparing the real-world effectiveness and safety of those non-randomized treatments.”

Creswell (2008: 100) points out that quantitative is based on measurable data gathered from a wide range of sources, often followed by objective analysis. A general description includes facts, figures and scientific observation that can be statistically analyzed. The purpose is to identify a theory
and the variables, placing these variables in order from independent to dependent, mentioning the strategy of inquiry and specifying the participant and research site for the research.

In the simplest sort of experiment, two contrasting methods are compared and an attempt is made to control for all other variables – such as student ability level, age, grade level, time, materials, and teacher characteristics – that might affect the outcome under investigation.

Dornyei (2007: 116) points out that a typical experimental design would be an intervention study which contains at least two groups; the ‘treatment’ or ‘experimental group’, which receives the treatment or which is exposed to some special conditions, and the ‘control group’, whose role is to provide a baseline for comparison. This research used non-equivalent control group design where it will take two classes, the first class was the experimental group and the second class was control group. There are two main variables of this research they are independent and dependent variable. Dependent variable is the variable which is observed and measured to determine the effect of the independent variable. Independent variable is the variable which is selected, manipulated, and measured by the research.

The population on this research was the elementary teacher education students at the second grade of STKIP PGRI Bandar Lampung in the academic year of 2020/2021. There are 74 students from 4 classes. However, the researcher chose two classes for experimental and control class. Each of class consist of 20 and 17 students.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The comparison of the descriptive analysis of pre-test and post-test of both experimental and control group can be seen at table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>62.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>8.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>51.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Difference</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table 1, it is found that there is difference of mean improvement between experimental group and control group. The mean of experimental group increases 14.4 point, while the mean of control group increase only 8.47 point. The difference also found in standard deviation between experimental group and control group where the standard deviation of experimental group decreases 1.26 point, while the standard deviation of control group increases -0.789 point. There is also difference of minimum score improvement between both group, the minimum score of experimental group increases 14 point, while the minimum score of control group increases only 7
point. There is no different improvement of maximum score. The maximum score of experimental group increases 16 points and in control group increases 4 points.

Then, based on the mean difference, it can be concluded that the students of experimental group has better improvement than the students of control group because the mean difference of experimental group (14.4) is higher than the mean difference of control group (8.47). Thus, based on the descriptive analysis, there is significant difference between experimental and control group.

**Inferential Analysis**

Inferential analysis is directed to find that there is significant difference between experimental and control group. The inferential analysis includes normality test, homogeneity test, and hypothesis testing.

**Normality Testing**

Normality test is conducted to make sure that the test in normal distribution or not. The method of normality test used in this research is Kolmogorov Smirnov method that is analyzed using SPSS 22. The data can be decided normally distributed if the probability (sig) is higher than significance level (α). The significance level used in this research is 0.05, thus, the test were normally distributed if sig > 0.05. The result of normality test is shown on table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tests of Normality</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnovα Statistic</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-test of Experiment</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Test of Control</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Test of Experiment</td>
<td>0.784</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Test of Control</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.554</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, it is found that the probability (sig.) of data of pre-test of experimental group (0.851) > 0.05, so it is normally distributed. It is also found that the probability (sig.) of post-test of experimental group (0.571) > 0.05, so it is normally distributed too. The data of pre-test of control group is also distributed normally because the probability (sig.) is higher than α (0.528 > 0.05). The probability (sig.) of post-test of control group is 0.554 which is higher than α (0.554 > 0.05), so it can also be decided normally distributed.

**Homogeneity Testing**

Homogeneity test is used to find out whether or not the scores of one group have homogeneous variance with the other group’s score. In this research, levene statistic is used to find the homogeneity and the data is analyzed using SPSS 22.
Data were homogenous if the probability (sig.) is higher than probability obtained (0.05), in the other hand, if the probability (sig.) is lower than probability obtained (0.05), data were not homogenous. The result of homogeneity test of this research is shown on table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Levene Statistic</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>1.860</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>Homogenous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td>1.550</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>Homogenous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table 3, it is found that the probability (sig.) of pre-test (0.181) > 0.05, so the data variance of pre-test is homogenous, and the probability (sig.) of post-test (0.221) > 0.05, so the data variance of post-test is also homogenous.

**Hypothesis Testing**

Hypothesis testing is held to identify whether or not there is significant difference between the experimental group and control group after treatment so the research hypothesis will be answered. In this research, hypothesis testing is held using ANCOVA (Analysis of Covariate) test. If probability (sig.) is lower than 0.05, there is significance difference between the experimental group and control group after treatment based on the pre-test of the covariate, so $H_1$ is accepted $H_0$ is rejected. If the probability (sig.) is higher than 0.05, there is no significance difference between experimental group and control group after treatment, so $H_0$ is accepted and $H_1$ is rejected. The result of ANCOVA test is shown on table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>1737.906*</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>96.550</td>
<td>2.030</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>11035.116</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11035.116</td>
<td>232.051</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>104.348</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>104.348</td>
<td>2.194</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>1007.623</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>59.272</td>
<td>1.246</td>
<td>.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>855.986</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47.555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200059.000</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>2593.892</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, it is found that probability (sig.) 0.000 which is lower than 0.05 (0.000 < 0.05), so there is significant difference between the experimental group and control group after treatment based on the pre-test as the covariate. Thus, $H_1$ is accepted and $H_0$ is rejected.

After conducting this research, it was found that Round robin technique was appropriate as a good technique to be employed in teaching speaking for the university level, because round robin technique could be help the student to be work in groups, help students to generate ideas in speaking, and to motivate students in speaking. Round robin can encourage the students to be more fluent in speaking, because the students are demanded to be able to communicate well orally. So, the students
realize that there is interlocutor or listener for their speech. Round robin technique builds confidence and give more positive about their speaking, their teacher, their friends and their English. It was given good affect to the students’ scores, it can be seen the students’ scores before giving round robin technique and after administrating it.

It was proven from the result of the ANCOVA test, it was found that the researchers infer that F ratio was significant at both levels which means the difference in group means was significant. It was found that the significant of value was \(0.000 < 0.05\), then the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected. So, there is a significant difference between teaching English using round robin technique on speaking skill of students and those were without taught by using round robin technique. It means that alternative hypothesis (H1) was accepted.

**CONCLUSION**

Round robin technique is one of the recommended technique which can be applied to teach English, especially in speaking skill. It can courage the students to speak and it can minimize the students’ self-doubt. There is effectiveness of Round robin technique towards the students’ speaking skill at the second semester of the elementary teacher education at STKIP PGRI Bandar Lampung 2020/2021. It can be seen from probability (sig.) \(0.000\) which is lower than \(0.05\) \((0.000 < 0.05)\), so there is significant difference between the experimental group and control group after treatment based on the pre-test as the covariate. Thus, \(H_1\) is accepted and \(H_0\) is rejected.

There is effectiveness of using round robin technique to teach the students’ speaking skill. The data show that the average score of pre-test in experimental class is 62.75. Then, after some treatments by using round robin technique the average score of post-test in experimental class increased become 77.15 It means that Round robin technique is effective to teach speaking skill.
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