Abstract
This research is a classroom action research. It is aimed to find out how well Round Robin Technique in improving students’ speaking learning process method to solve the problems faced by the students. This research conducted at the Tenth Grade Students of SMAIT Al Fityan. Through observation checklist and field note, the students’ action was observed and reflected in each cycle. From the process of this study, the finding shows that there were good impacts toward students’ speaking. Most of students were interested and enthusiastic in the teaching and learning process. Based on the observation in the implementation of Round Robin technique, it showed that encouraging students to be active in sharing their ideas through Round Robin technique was able to improve students’ ability in speaking. In addition, this technique also helped the students to enlarge their vocabulary by opening dictionary, discussing together with group or asking to the teacher. The result of this research showed that the students’ activeness in participation of each cycle has improved during their discussion and performance of speaking learning process. Therefore, Round Robin Technique could help the teacher in teaching and learning process because this method encouraged students to learn actively.

Keywords: Speaking, Round Robin Technique, Classroom Action Research

INTRODUCTION
Based on the writer’s experience in teaching English in senior high school level and his preliminary observations to the students, the writer noticed that there were two main problems that the students faced in learning speaking. The first was lack of vocabulary. After having little interview with all of students, approximately 20 from 24 students admitted that they knew limited vocabulary. This problem caused the students faced difficulty in stating their ideas. Secondly, most of the students were passive in the class. Therefore, the speaking activity always dominated by the active students in the classroom, then the other students did not have similar opportunity to speak. In my previous monitoring, only 7 students were active in the class. Those two problems interrelated each other. Therefore, they affect to the process of speaking activity.

In response to the mentioned problems, it is necessary for teachers to choose appropriate teaching technique that can address all the problems. In this case Round Robin technique can be seen as feasible alternative. Round Robin technique was suggested by Kagan & Kagan
(2009) that Round Robin technique is technique that will engage all the students to speak in a group in turn. All the students have similar opportunity to express their ideas and speak English freely with their group without feeling ashamed with all their classmates. Simply, with Round Robin technique teacher poses a problem to which there are multiple possible responses or solution, and provide think time and students take turns stating responses or solutions. It is believed that learning English speaking by using Round Robin technique could improve their vocabulary mastery and their activeness.

METHOD

In this study, the writer used classroom action research (CAR) as a research design in order to answer the research problems. According to Creswell (2012, p. 577) the purpose of action research is to improve the practice of education, with researchers studying their own problems or issues in a school or educational setting. In addition, Richards & Farrell (2005) stated that action research takes place in the teacher’s own classroom and involves a cycle of activities centering on identifying a problem or issue, collecting information about the issue, devising a strategy to address the issue, trying out the strategy, and observing its effects. Thus, action research design can be applied to improve the process of teaching and learning speaking skill to the tenth year students of SMAIT Al Fityan School Kubu Raya in Academic Year 2019/2020 by using Round Robin technique. In addition, this study tried to describe the implementation of Round Robin technique in improving the process of teaching and learning speaking skill.

The subject of this study was Year 10A students of SMAIT Al Fityan School Kubu Raya in Academic Year 2019/2020. They consist of 24 students and all of them are males. The writer selects this class because based on the preliminary observation during teaching this class, the students of this class face some difficulties in learning English, especially in speaking skill.

In order to collect the data for the study and find out to what extend Round Robin technique improve the process of teaching and learning of speaking skill of the tenth year students of SMAIT Al Fityan School Kubu Raya in Academic Year 2019/2020, the writer used some research instruments, those are observation checklist, field notes sheet, the
students’ speaking scores. Learning English speaking by using Round Robin technique could improve their vocabulary mastery and their activeness.

The method for collecting action research data are generally qualitative in nature, but this does not mean that quantitative methods are irrelevant to action research; there may well be cases where quantitative methods was used to complement or extend the findings of collaborative or individual action research project (Burns, 1999). Therefore, the qualitative data was collected from the observation and field notes while the quantitative data was collected from the pre-test and post-test score. The data was analyzed after all of the data from the observation checklist, field notes, speaking test score and video or audio recording collected. The qualitative data was analyzed using the process of analysis proposed by Burns (1999).

RESEARCH FINDING

This study was conducted to get information about problems really existed during speaking teaching and learning process before the writer began the classroom action research. The writer noticed that there were two main problems that the students faced in learning speaking. The first was lack of vocabulary. After having little interview with all of students, approximately 20 from 24 students admitted that they knew limited vocabulary.

Secondly, most of the students were passive in the class. Therefore, the speaking activity always dominated by the active students in the classroom, then the other students did not have similar opportunity to speak. In previous monitoring, only 7 students were active in the class. Besides the monitoring, the writer conducted pre-test to measure students’ competence in speaking.

The test in the form of describing the pet orally. By giving test, the writer found that the students’ competence in speaking was still low. From the result of the test, the writer found that among 24 students who joined the test, only 6 students could get score 75 or more. And the others got score less than 65. The percentage of success is 25 %.

Findings of Cycle 1

The teacher and the collaborator observed the first cycle by using observation checklist
and a field note. It was aimed to make the collaborator easier to see the improvement of the teaching and learning process. Based on the observation, the overall activity of teacher ran not bad although there were some disturbances and some unexpected thing happened in the class. Based on the observation checklist in two meeting, the teacher did activities based on the planning of the lesson plan. The teacher gave instruction clearly explained the descriptive text in detail and motivated the students to study English harder. Although the teacher did some activities well, but in the first meeting he forgot to inform learning objective clearly and teacher did not supervise the students strictly. As a result, the students did not know what will they improve on the day and some of them still confused how to get the ideas. Therefore, the teacher performance was only categorized as good.

To see the improvements of students’ activeness in teaching learning process using Round Robin technique, the observer used observation checklist. The data gathered are divided into two categories: discussion stage and performance stage. In this first cycle, most of students were still passive on the discussion stage. On the other hand, on the performance stage, most students participated actively. Although some of them did not contribute in offering ideas, they agreed with their friends’ opinions and also paid attention. The percentage of students’ activeness in participation of learning process on the first cycle based on the observation checklist is as follows:

### First meeting percentage (cycle 1)

| Objectives                                         | Discussion | Performance |
|----------------------------------------------------|------------|-------------|
| Initiated interaction whenever appropriate         | 29 %       | 100 %       |
| Spontaneity                                        | 50 %       | 79 %        |
| Not afraid to challenge others’ ideas              | 25 %       |             |
| Able to defend own ideas                           | 17 %       |             |
| Elaborate answers                                  | 29 %       |             |
| Show confidence                                    | 42 %       | 46 %        |
| High interaction with classmates                   | 46 %       | 71 %        |
| Tend to participate to help classmates out         | 25 %       |             |
| Interact with teacher or peers when they need help | 21 %       |             |
| Pay attention                                      | 92 %       | 96 %        |
Second meeting percentage (cycle 1)

| Objectives                                      | Discussion | performance |
|------------------------------------------------|------------|-------------|
| Initiated interaction whenever appropriate     | 45 %       | 100 %       |
| Spontaneity                                     | 67 %       | 75 %        |
| Not afraid to challenge others’ ideas           | 46 %       |             |
| Able to defend own ideas                        | 17 %       |             |
| Elaborate answers                               | 29 %       |             |
| Show confidence                                 | 42 %       | 50 %        |
| High interaction with classmates                | 92 %       | 75 %        |
| Tend to participate to help classmates out      | 25 %       |             |
| Interact with teacher or peers when they need help | 21 %   |             |
| Pay attention                                   | 100 %      | 96 %        |

Overall, the students’ activeness in discussion stage of first cycle was 43%, which is categorized as poor. By contrast, the students’ activeness in performance stage of first cycle was 79%, which is categorized as good.

Findings of Cycle 2

As in the first cycle, the writer used observation checklist and field notes. The form of the observation checklists and the field notes were almost the same with the first cycle. However, in the observation checklists of this cycle, there was an addition for the activities to be observed. Based on the observation checklist for teacher, almost all activities got the higher point; meaning the teacher had done each activity was better than previous cycle. He did not forget to explain the learning objective. He became an instructor, motivator, and guider of the technique successfully, although it was not maximal, but it was better than previous performance. Therefore, performance of teacher in the second cycle was categorized as good.

Based on the evaluation of the second cycle, the students’ activeness was improved on discussion stage. The percentage of students’ activeness in participation of learning process on the second cycle based on the observation checklist is as follows:
First meeting percentage (cycle 2)

| Objectives                                      | Discussion | Performance |
|------------------------------------------------|------------|-------------|
| Initiated interaction whenever appropriate     | 42 %       | 100 %       |
| Spontaneity                                     | 100 %      | 100 %       |
| Not afraid to challenge others’ ideas           | 42 %       |             |
| Able to defend own ideas                        | 42 %       |             |
| Elaborate answers                               | 25 %       |             |
| Show confidence                                 | 63 %       | 71 %        |
| High interaction with classmates                | 79 %       | 79 %        |
| Tend to participate to help classmates out      | 46 %       |             |
| Interact with teacher or peers when they need help | 54 %       |             |
| Pay attention                                   | 100 %      | 100 %       |

Second meeting percentage (cycle 2)

| Objectives                                      | Discussion | Performance |
|------------------------------------------------|------------|-------------|
| Initiated interaction whenever appropriate     | 63 %       | 100 %       |
| Spontaneity                                     | 100 %      | 100 %       |
| Not afraid to challenge others’ ideas           | 54 %       |             |
| Able to defend own ideas                        | 42 %       |             |
| Elaborate answers                               | 29 %       |             |
| Show confidence                                 | 75 %       | 79 %        |
| High interaction with classmates                | 100 %      | 100 %       |
| Tend to participate to help classmates out      | 54 %       |             |
| Interact with teacher or peers when they need help | 63 %       |             |
| Pay attention                                   | 100 %      | 100 %       |

Overall, the students’ activeness in discussion stage of second cycle was 65%, which is categorized as good. By contrast, the students’ activeness in performance stage of second cycle was 93%, which is categorized as excellent.
Findings of Cycle 3

As same as two previous cycles, in this cycle, the teacher also helped the writer to be observer. The form of the observation checklists and the field notes were almost the same as in the first and second cycle. While doing observation. The writer found some finding that the third cycle was better than previous cycles. Based on observation checklist, writer performance on pre-activity was good. She had been a good motivator because she raised the students’ motivation to study harder and successfully brainstorming the students before they began to build the ideas and share it to the group.

The writer not only did best on pre-activity but also in whilst activity. He successfully became a good guide, facilitator and supervisor for the students. He did the activities systematically based on the planning. It was almost perfect. In post-activity, he forced the students to speak English more and asked the students to share their problems while the teaching learning process was taking place. As a result, the performance of teacher in the cycle three was categorized very good.

Based on the field note, there were no unexpected bad things happened in the class. All things happened successfully based on the expectation from both teacher and the writer. Besides, Round Robin technique, especially successfully helped the students to be active in speaking learning process. Based on the evaluation of the second cycle, the students’ activeness was improved on discussion stage. The percentage of students’ activeness in participation of learning process on the third cycle based on the observation checklist is as follows:

**First meeting percentage (cycle 3)**

| Objectives                                      | Discussion | performance |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------|-------------|
| Initiated interaction whenever appropriate      | 63 %       | 100 %       |
| Spontaneity                                     | 92 %       | 92 %        |
| Not afraid to challenge others’ ideas           | 54 %       |             |
| Able to defend own ideas                        | 46 %       |             |
| Elaborate answers                               | 25 %       |             |
| Show confidence                                 | 79 %       | 79 %        |
| High interaction with classmates                | 100 %      | 92 %        |
| Tend to participate to help classmates out      | 58 %       |             |
**Second meeting percentage (cycle 3)**

| Objectives                                      | Discussion | performance |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------|-------------|
| Initiated interaction whenever appropriate      | 71 %       | 100 %       |
| Spontaneity                                     | 100 %      | 100 %       |
| Not afraid to challenge others’ ideas           | 67 %       |              |
| Able to defend own ideas                        | 67 %       |              |
| Elaborate answers                               | 54 %       |              |
| Show confidence                                 | 88 %       | 83 %        |
| High interaction with classmates                | 100 %      | 96 %        |
| Tend to participate to help classmates out      | 54 %       |              |
| Interact with teacher or peers when they need help | 63 %      |              |
| Pay attention                                   | 100 %      | 100 %       |

Overall, the students’ activeness in discussion stage of third cycle was 73%, which is categorized as good. By contrast, the students’ activeness in performance stage of third cycle was 95%, which is categorized as excellent.

**The result of post test**

The aim of giving a post test is to compare its result with the pre – test’s result and see the improvement of the student’s speaking skill, it was 79%. There were five students that unsuccessful in this test. By observing the students’ vocabulary mastery from preliminary study and post test, there was a significance development in their achievement. In this study, improving student’s vocabulary mastery runs successfully. Through this technique, the students can enlarge their vocabulary treasury. They get new experience in teaching and learning process. The result of the students’ achievement can be used as the detail of success. From the result of the test, the writer found that among 24 students who joined the test, 19 students could get score 75 or more. And only 5 students got score less than 75. The
DISCUSSION

Round Robin Technique was considered successful in this research. It was shown by the improvement of the students’ activeness from the first cycle to the third cycle, as well as their score in the post test. As mentioned in the previous part of this chapter, the writer has done three cycles. The mean score of students’ activeness on detail information of first to last cycle was gradually improved. It can be concluded that teaching speaking by using Round Robin technique successfully helped the Tenth-grade students of SMAIT Al Fityan. From the description above, it showed that encouraging students to be active in sharing their ideas through Round Robin technique was able to improve students’ ability in speaking. In addition, this technique also helped the students to enlarge their vocabulary by opening dictionary or asking to the teacher.

The improvement students’ activeness in each cycle can be seen as follow: On the first cycle, 43% of the students participate actively in the discussion stage and 79% of the students participate actively in the performance stage. In which, this result shows that only some students who participate actively. However, in the second cycle, the result shows students’ participation has improved again. It is shown that 65% of the students participate actively in the discussion stage and 93% of the students participate actively in the performance stage. And in the last cycle, the students’ participation has improved again. It is shown that 73% of the students participate actively in the discussion stage and 95% of the students participate actively in the performance stage. And based on the observation checklist of students’ performances and also the field note, there were some important improvement of students.

1. Based on the observation in cycle 1 to cycle 3, it was found that there was improvement in students’ vocabulary. Students learned many useful and practical vocabularies related to each topic in the class; most of students could apply the words correctly to express their ideas in describing some pictures. Moreover, vocabulary is the most important component in speaking skill. By mastering enough vocabularies, students can express their idea clearly. As stated by Jolliffe (2007:6) the rich of vocabulary student’s grab, the more easily for students explore new ideas.

2. It was found that the students’ learning motivation was increased and the whole classroom situation was changed after the implementation of Round Robin technique; the speaking class was not silent.
anymore. The class was full of activities and the students enjoyed to work in group very much. As stated by Jolliffe (2007:36) providing cooperative learning opportunities for pupils in pairs and small groups can ensure that pupils talk meaningfully and in relation to the task.

CONCLUSION

Based on the research finding of this research, the writer concludes that teaching speaking to tenth grade students of SMAIT Al Fityan by using Round Robin technique improves the students’ speaking teaching and learning process. In turns, it improves the students’ activeness in speaking teaching and learning process they had from cycle to cycle. After using and applying the Round Robin technique on the students, it could be seen that their activeness was improved from cycle to cycle. The improvement was happening gradually and significantly. It would be proven by the students’ participation from cycle to cycle.

Teaching speaking by using Round Robin technique absolutely asked the active involvement of the students. The students had to work together to think to find out the ideas related to the pictures/questions the writer given. The students had to think both individually and cooperatively. The characteristics and the strengths of Round Robin technique made the students were able to work in group to create cooperative learning among the learners.

SUGGESTION

The suggestions below are based on the research and analysis on how the research ran and the contribution of the technique of the Round Robin technique to the students’ achievement. The suggestions are:

For Students

1) The Round Robin technique is appropriate technique to be applied for the students who have difficulty in stating the ideas and who were passive in teaching and learning process.

2) The students are expected to build their vocabulary treasury in learning English since vocabulary is one of the main fundamentals in learning foreign language.

3) The Round Robin technique is able to encourage the students to work together to respond to the problem, since the technique empowers the cooperative learning through the discussion in group.

For Teachers
1) Before the use of the Round Robin technique, the teacher is suggested to prepare lesson plan well to make the teaching run well.

2) The Round Robin technique is recommended for English teacher as alternative teaching technique in improving the students’ activeness in teaching and learning process.

3) In the Round Robin technique, the teacher is suggested to prepare media to make the teaching and learning process easier.

4) The Round Robin technique is the technique needed by the teacher to be good facilitator and instructor. The teacher’s role as facilitator is to facilitate the students in learning and guide the students to respond to the problems. As the instructor, the teacher can give instructions to the students systematically to the students to work together in the group.

5) Suggestion to the teacher to use the technique in teaching the other skills.

For other researchers

1) It is suggested to the other researchers to conduct another research regarding to the use of Round Robin technique.

2) It is suggested to the other researchers to do a research on the use of Round Robin technique in teaching the other skills.

3) The other researchers are suggested to read this research to see the gap with research opportunity in future.
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