JOURNAL OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE PEDAGOGY
Vol. 4, No. 2, July 2019, pp. 54-65

USING ROTATING TRIO EXCHANGE (RTE) METHOD IN TEACHING SPEAKING ON ANALYTICAL EXPOSITION TEXT

Mike Amelia
Universitas Bina Sarana Informatika
ameliamike@yahoo.co.id

ABSTRACT

This research purposed is to find out the effect of using Rotating Trio Exchange (RTE) Method in teaching Speaking on Analytical Exposition Text at Universitas Singaperbangsa Karawang (UNSIKA). This research used experimental class. The sample of this research was 30 students (1A) at experimental class and 30 students in control class(1B). The instrument of this reasearch was speaking test. The research finding of this research indicated that the Rotating Trio Exchange method gave positive effect on students' speaking ability from pre-test to post-test. Students' ability in speaking analytical exposition text analyzed by using t-test statistical which $t_{calculated} = 5,74$ *and* t_{table} *(0,95:69) = 1,67. It could be concluded that* $t_{calculated} > t_{table}$*. So, the null hypothesis (*H_0*) was rejected while alternative hypothesis (*H_1*) was accepted.*

Keywords: *Rotating Trio Exchange (RTE),speaking, Analytical Exposition Text*

INTRODUCTION

Speaking refers to the gap between linguistic expertise and teaching methodology. Linguistic expertise concerns with language structure and language content. Teaching speaking is not like listening, reading, and writing. It needs habit formation because it is a real communication. The speaking needs to be practiced as often as possible. It is not like writing and reading but speaking must be practiced directly in full expression.

However, teaching speaking is not an easy task. The problem is faced by the first grade students of UNSIKA, when the lecturer give an oral test, many students achieve low scores. Students have low motivation in speaking. Most of them were passive in speaking English, they just talked about other things that were not related with their lesson. So they waited everything from the lecturer and they just sit and heard lecturer's explanation. Another problem was students had lack of vocabulary to express their ideas. It made them shy to speak. As a result, they got difficulties when they wanted to express and develop their idea. Even though they had plan or ideas that they wanted to tell, it made them have to find the

meaning of the sentence in the dictionary. Finally, they were lazy to speak. The last problem was students were difficult to express, explain and elaborate their ideas in analytical exposition text. It due to the topic on analytical exposition text that given by the lecturer was not familiar for the students and the text was new for them. The text given by the teacher was not appropriate with the students' background knowledge and their critical thinking was still low. They did not have prior knowledge about the topic that given. In addition, they could not arrange and elaborate their ideas in speaking activity of analytical exposition text. This situation made the students confuse and spent much time to think of what they should speak. The other problems were some of students did not understand how to determine the part of generic structure of analytical exposition text and they were difficult to determine the language feature of the text. The generic structures of this text are thesis, argument and reiteration. The language features of analytical exposition text are simple present tense, the use of passive voice and the use connective words.

This situation leads the researcher to investigate what actually the students experience while learning speaking English. From the problems above the researcher applied one of teaching strategy. That was an interesting strategy and it assumed could be effective ways in teaching speaking namely Rotating Trio Exchange (RTE) Method . The strategy was designed to create the students' interest to learn with pleasant method. The core of rotating trio exchange was corporation between groups and shared.

According to Silberman (2006: 103), rotating trio exchange is a detailed way for students to discuss the problem with all of their classmates. The exchanges can make students easily encourage their speaking ability in the classroom. Isjoni (2009: 59) states that The model consists of 3 people in a group, numbered 0,1 and 2. The number 1 moves clockwise and the number 2 instead counter-clockwise while the number 0 remain in place. Each group is given a question to be discussed after the group rotated back and going on a new trio and each is given a new trio of new question to be discussed, by added question level difficulty.

Metini in Ningsih (2009: 3) states rotating trio exchange have many advantages. This model can involve students actively in learning whether mental, physical , and social . Mentally students appreciate other people's opinions when performing trio. Physically student movements, move from one group to another group. Socially, students can interact with all of classmates, but it can bring students towards answering questions and maintains during the discussion.

a. The Procedure of Rotating Trio Exchange.

1. Compose a variety of questions that help participants begin discussion of the course content.
2. Divide participants into trios. Position the trios in the room so that each trio can clearly see other trios to its right and to its left. (The best configuration of trios is a circle or square.)
3. Give each trio an opening question (the same question for each trio) to discuss. Select the least threatening question you have devised to begin the trio exchange. Suggest that each person in the trio take a turn answering the question.
4. After a suitable period of discussion, ask the trios to assign a 0, 1, or 2 to each of their members. Direct the participants with the number 1 to rotate one trio clockwise and the participants with the number 2 to rotate two trios clockwise. Ask the participants with the number 0 to remain seated. They will be permanent members of a trio site. Have them raise their hands high so that rotating participants can find them. The result of each rotation will be entirely new trios.
5. Start each new exchange with a new question. Increase the difficulty or sensitivity of the questions as you proceed.
6. You can rotate trios as many times as you have questions to pose and the discussion time to allot. Use the same rotation procedure each time. For example, in a trio exchange of three rotations, each participant will get to meet six other participants in depth.

b. The Advantages of Rotating Trio Exchange .

1. Discussion of controversial topics promotes more sophisticated thinking
2. Learn Faster; Working together, students in study groups can generally learn faster than students working alone. In addition, the students can help your fellow students also when they have difficulties in understanding something that the other students do understand.
3. Get new perspectives; If the students study by yourself, they will always see your material from the same perspective. While this may not be a problem, getting fresh perspectives on a topic can help you learn it more thoroughly. Study groups are the perfect places to find these new perspectives. As the students listen and ask questions, they will soon start noticing a wide variety of different viewpoint on the same idea. This will force them to think more about their position and will, therefore, develop their critical thinking skills while helping they study.
4. Learn new study skills

5. Breaks the monotony; studying by yourself, especially for long periods of time, can become a monotonous activity. However, by joining a study group, the students can break this monotony and learn faster.

   In addition, the auditory factor of study groups can help auditory students who dislike the silence of studying alone.

6. Fill in learning gaps; Study groups provide an excellent opportunity to fill in gaps in the notes. By comparing notes with other students, the students can evaluate the accuracy, fix any errors, and get ideas for better note taking. If the students are a great note taker, the students can help other students who had note taking problems fix their mistakes and learn better techniques.

METHOD

The design of this research was quasi-experimental research. According to Gay (2000: 394), quasi experimental design is the design that cannot all sources from internal and external validity. This research used experimental and need two classes for the research. They were experimental class and control class. Both of these classes were treated by different treatment. Experimental class treatment was done by using rotating trio exchange and control class by using group discussion method. Finally, both of two classes were given the post test to find out whether there was positive effect in experimental class after given treatment or not. The design of this research was shown in table as follows:

Table 1: Pre-test – post-test Non equvalent Group Design

Samples	**Pre-test**	**Treatment**	**Post-test**
Experimental class	Se_1	X	Se_2
Control class	Sc_1	O	Sc_2

Se_1 = Students' speaking ability of experimental class in pre-test

Sc_1 = Students' speaking ability of control class in pre-test

Se_2 = Students' speaking ability of experimental class in post-test

Sc_2 = Students' speaking ability of control class in post-test

X = Treatment by using Rotating Trio Exchange (RTE) Method

O = Treatment by using Group Discussion Method

The population of this research was first grade students of UNSIKA at 2017/2018 academic year. The total of population was 235 students. They were divided into 7 classes.

1A, 1B, 1C, 1D, 1 E, 1 F, 1G. There were two classes as the samples. They were experimental and control classes. Both of these classes should be homogeneous. To determine both of two classes, purposive sampling technique used by the researcher. Purposive sampling technique was chosen by considering some criteria. The criteria were the ability of the student almost the same, and they were taught by the same lecturer in process of teaching speaking. To determine sample, the previous speaking test was used by researcher as preliminary test to know the mean score and standard deviation of the population. It used as a criterion to determine the capabilities of the sample class. Finally, the two classes have the same or nearly same standard deviation selected 1A as experimental class and 1B as control class. In this research, researcher used speaking test as the instrument of the research. At the end of the experiment, the researcher checked their ability, especially in speaking skill. To determine their speaking ability, researcher instructed the every group to present their analytical exposition text in front of the classroom orally, and then the other groups gave their opinion about the topic presented. The purpose was to know whether the treatment was success or not. The instrument of this research based on indicator follows:

Table 2: Instrument of the Research

No.	Topic
1.	Things that students should bring to school
2.	Duration time at school
3.	Students' task
4.	Electronic media.
5.	Public figure

The test checked and scored by speaking lecturer of UNSIKA to get validity and reliability of the data. The criteria of the test as instrument the research are valid and reliable.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

Before the treatment was done, researcher did pre-test first for both of two classes to know the basic knowledge of students' speaking skill and to determine of the sample have same ability in speaking and homogenous. The data of pretest could be seen on table as follow:

Table 3. The Data of Students Pre-Test Score

Class	N	$\overline{X}$	Xmax	Xmin
Experiment	30	12,9	14,5	11,5

Control	30	12,41	12,5	10

The data of students post-test can be seen on table as follows:

Table 4. The Data of Students' Post-Test Score

Class	**N**	$\bar{X}$	**Xmax**	**Xmin**
Experiment	30	15,5	17	14
Control	30	13,9	16	13

The mean score of experimental class that was taught by using rotating trio exchange method was higher than the means score of the control class that was not taught by using group discussion.

Normality Testing

In analyzing the normality of the data on students' speaking ability on analytical exposition text on experimental class and control class, the researcher got the data from both of the classes. The normality of students' speaking ability pre-test and post-test score at experimental class and control class could be seen on table as follow:

Table 5. The Normality of Students' Speaking Ability on Analytical Exposition Text Pre-Test Score

Class	**Number of Students (N)**	**(α)**	**Critical Value of Accounting (L_o)**	**Critical Value of Accounting (L_t)**	**Distribution**
Experiment	30	0,05	0,01570	0,161	Normal
Control	30	0,05	0,00457	0,161	Normal

From the experimental class, it was gotten that calculated normally coefficient Lo= 0,01570 at the significances level 95% and the table normality coefficient Lt= 0,16100. It means that Lo ≤ Lt. The data from control class were Lo= 0,00457 and Lt= 0,16100. It means that Lo ≤ Lt. According to the data analysis above, it could be concluded that the data from both experimental class and control class were distributed normally.

Table 6. The Normality of Students' Speaking ability on Analytical Exposition Text Post-Test Score

Class	**Number of Students (N)**	**(α)**	**Critical Value of Accounting (L_o)**	**Critical Value of Accounting (L_t)**	**Distribution**
Experiment	30	0,05	0,0664	0,161	Normal
Control	30	0,05	0,0007	0,161	Normal

From the experimental class, it was gotten that calculated normally coefficient Lo= 0,0664 at the significances level 95% and the table normality coefficient Lt= 0,16100. It means that Lo ≤ Lt. The data from control class were Lo= 0,0007 and Lt= 0,16100. It means that Lo ≤ Lt. According to the data analysis above, it could be concluded that the data from both experimental class and control class were distributed normally.

Homogeneity Testing

Table 7. The Result of Homogeneity Testing of Pre-Test

Class	**(n)**	**(α)**	**S**	**S^2**	**F_c**	**F_t**	**Variances**
Experiment	30	0,05	0,82	0,67	1,24	1,84	Homogeneous
Control	30		0,91	0,82	1.24	1,84	

Based on the table above it was gotten the pre-test data $F_{calculated}$ = 1,24 at the significances level α= 0,05. F_{table} = 1,84. It can be concluded that $F_{calculated} \leq F_{table.}$ So, both experimental and control class had the same variance

Table 8. The Result of Homogeneity Testing of Experimental Class

Class	**Stage**	**(n)**	**(α)**	**S**	**S^2**	**F_c**	**F_t**	**Variances**
Experiment	Pre-test	30	0,05	0,82	0,67	1,00	1,84	Homogeneous
	Post-test	30		0,82	1,16			

Based on the table above, it was gotten the pre-test data $F_{calculated}$ = 1,00 at the significances level α= 0,05. F_{table} = 1,84. It can be concluded that $F_{calculated} \leq F_{table.}$ So, both experimental and control class had the same variance.

Table 9. The Result of Homogeneity Testing of Control Class

Class	Stage	(n)	(α)	S	S^2	F_c	F_t	Variances
Control	Pre-test	30	0,05	0,91	0,82	0,56	1,84	Homogeneous
	Post-test	30		0,98	0,96			

Based on the table above, it was gotten the pre-test data $F_{calculated}$ = 0,56 at the significances level α= 0,05. F_{table} = 1,84. It can be concluded that $F_{calculated} \leq F_{table.}$ So, both experimental and control class had the same variance. Based on the table above, the researcher got the pre- test, post- test, and pre-test post-test data $F_{calculated} \leq F_{table}$ at the significances level α= 0,05.

Table 10. The Result of Homogeneity Testing of Post-Test

Class	(n)	(α)	S	S^2	F_c	F_t	Variances
Experiment	30	0,05	0,82	1,16	1,01	1,84	Homogeneous
Control	30		0,98	1,06			

Based on the table above, it was gotten the pre-test data $F_{calculated}$=1,01 at the significances level α= 0,05. F_{table} = 1,84. It can be concluded that $F_{calculated} \leq F_{table.}$ So, both experimental and control class had the same variance.

Hypothesis Testing

In order to know there was any differentiation of students speaking ability in both experimental and control class, the researcher did T-test statistical analysis. It can be seen in the following table

Table 11. Result of t-test on Pre-Test

Class	N	S^2	S	(α)	$\bar{X}$	T_c	T_t	Reference
Experiment	30	0,67	0,82	0,05	12,96	0,34	1,67	Ho was received and Ha was rejected
Control	30	0,54	0,74	0,05	12,41	0,34	1,67	

Based on the table above, it was gotten the data from pre-test score at experimental class and control class at significance level α= 0,05. $T_{calculated}$ = 0,16 and T_{table} = 1,67, H_0 was received and H_a was rejected.

Table 12 . Result of t-test of Experimental Class

Class	Stage	N	S^2	S	(α)	$\bar{X}$	T_c	T_t	Reference
Experiment	Pre-test	30	0,67	0,82	0,05	12,96	10,62	1,67	Ho was rejected and Ha was received
	Post-test	30	0,67	0,82	0,05	15,51	10,62	1,67	

Based on the table above, it was gotten the data from pre-test and post-test score at experimental class at significance level α= 0,05 $T_{calculated}$= 10,62 and T_{table} = 1.67. In conclusion, H_0 was rejected and H_1 was received.

Table 13. Result of t-test of Control Class

Class	stage	N	S^2	S	(α)	$\bar{X}$	T_c	T_t	Reference
Control	Pre-test	30	0,82	0,91	0,05	12,41	7,41	1,67	Ho was rejected and Ha was received
	Post-test		0,96	0,98		13,96			

Based on the table above, it was gotten the data from pre-test and post-test score at control class at significance level α= 0,05 $T_{calculated}$ = - 7,41 and T_{table} = 1,67. in conclusion, H_0 was rejected and Ha was received.

Table 14. Result of t-test on Post-Test

Class	N	S^2	S	(α)	$\bar{X}$	T_c	T_t	Reference
Experiment	30	0,67	0,82	0,05	15,51	5,74	1,67	Ho was rejected and Ha was received
Control	30	0,96	0,98		13,96			

Based on the table above, it was gotten the data from post-test score at experimental class and control class at significance level α= 0,05, $T_{calculated}$ = 5,74 and T_{table} = 1,67. In conclusion, H_0 was rejected and H_a was received. From the table above, the researcher got the data from pre-test and post-test in experimental and control class $T_{calculated} \geq T_{table}$. In conclusion, H_0 was rejected and H_1 was received. It means the students' speaking ability that taught by using rotating trio exchange method was better than students' speaking ability that taught by using group discussion method. In the other words, there was a positive effect on students' speaking ability by using rotating trio exchange method.

Discussion

Rotating trio exchange method is one of the method make the students responding orally through taking turn together. Implementing of rotating trio exchange method in teaching speaking on analytical exposition text made the students more active to share their idea. It is supported by Inombi (2014: 10) rotating trio exchange method can improve students' ability, such as their critical thinking and students can share idea with friends in the group and also by using this method the students felt enjoy in the class, the students enthusiastic and every students was active because every students have responsibility. Then, according to Ningsih (2009: 7) by using rotating trio exchange method all students had to be active and motivated in learning because students gave question to the other groups, students received or answer the question. Student interacted each other to compare their question and corrected many things that less certain and discussed the lesson. If students participated actively in learning so student would have knowledge or good comprehend.

On the other hand, Implementing of group discussion method in teaching speaking on analytical exposition text made the students shared and discusses the idea together. According to Sabri (2007: 54), group discussion is an group activity to solve a problem to get together understanding.. In addition, Addition by Gibson (2010: 4) states that students in a group discussion will looking for new information about the content of the module (from you, from their peers and from materials distributed in class); they will explore and develop their own ideas about the material in discussion; and in doing so, they will respond to 'feedback' (responses to their ideas) from their classmates and from their teacher. It was proved by the researcher when she implemented the method at first grade students of UNSIKA, where the researcher found that the students' main score control class in the post-test reached 13,96. It was higher than the pre-test mean score that only 12,41 point. It just was increased 1,55 point.

By implementing group discussion method, students had less interaction with their classmate. It could be solved by using rotating trio exchange method that could increase students' interaction in the class room. So, rotating trio exchange method gave the better effect than group discussion method. Which was by using group discussion method just increased 1,55 point, but by using rotating trio exchange method increased 2,55 point. Based on the finding above, the researcher assumed that applying rotating trio exchange method in teaching speaking gave better effect than group discussion method in teaching speaking especially on analytical exposition text.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

There was highly improvement on students' speaking ability on analytical exposition text after taught by using rotating trio exchange (RTE) method at first grade students of UNSIKA. There was improvement but not really high on students' speaking ability on analytical exposition text after taught by using group discussion method, however Rotating Trio Exchange Method gave a better effect toward students' speaking ability because it made the students actively interact with their whole class mate and each student was certainly given specific responsibility to speak. This method also made the students to actively asking and answering question. It is suggested to English teacher and lecturer to use Rotating Trio Exchange as a new method in learning process in teaching speaking. So that, the students will be provided with an enjoyable teaching and learning process and It is suggested to other researchers who are interested to carry out a research by using Rotating Trio exchange in the other skill.

REFERENCES

Arikunto, suharsimi. 2010. *Prosedur Penelitian.* Jakarta : PT Rineka Cipta

Brown, H. Doughlas. 2004. *Language assessment principle and classroom practice.* San Fransisco: Longman Publishing

Damayanti and friends. 2015. *Strategi Khusus Menghadapi Ujian Nasional SMA/MA Bahasa Inggris.* Klaten Viva : Pakarindo.

Djuharie, Setiawan. 2007. *Genre.* Bandung : Yrama Widia

Fauzan, Ahmad. 2007. *Practical English for Practising Lawyers.* Bandung: Yrama Widya.

Fleta, Teresa. 2006. 'Stepping Stones for Teaching English L2 in the Early Years', in *Teachers and Young Learners Reseach in Our Classrooms*. IATEFL. Canterbury : Mitchell-Shuitevoerder and S. Mourao.

Gibson, Jonathan. 2010. *Small Group Teaching in English Literature: A Good Practice Guide.* London: English Subject Center.

Harmer, Jeremy. 2001. *The Practice of English Language Teaching.* New York: Pearson Educated Limited.

Hui, Li. 2011. *Improving Students' Speaking Skill Through Content-Based Instruction.* Surakarta: Sebelas Maret University.

Gay and Alrasia. 2000, *Educational Research*, Ohio: Merrill

Inombi, Rifka. 2014. *'Improving Students' Reading Ability in Narrative Text by Using Rotating Trio Exchange Method'.* Gorontalo: Universsity of Gorontalo.

Isjoni. 2009. *Cooperative Learning* Bandung.*:* Alfabeta.

Lou, Robby. 2008. *The Handbook of Basic Speaking Skill.* Jakarta : V-print.

Luoma, Sari. 2004. *Assessing Speaking.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Melvin L. 2006. *Active Learning.* Bandung : Nusamedia

Naga, Meristy Tia. 2013. '*Penerapan model cooperative learning tipe Rotating Trio Exchange untuk meningkatkan aktivitas dan hasil belajar siswa pada mata pelajaran IPS Kelas VA SD Negeri 1 Palapa Bandar Lampung Tahun Pelajaran 2012/ 2013'.* Lampung : Universitas Bandar Lampung.

Ningsih, Eplia Maya and friends. 2009. '*Penerapan model pembelajaran kooperatif tipe arotating atrio aexchange (RTE) untuk meningkatkan prestasi belajar siswa pada pokok bahasan tatanama senyawa dan persamaan reaksi dikelas X IPA SMA Negeri 1 Seberida Kabupaten Indragiri Hulu.* Riau : Universitas Riau

Nunan, Dafid. 2003. *Practical English Language Teaching.* United State of America: Monterey Institute of International Studies.

Palmer, Erik. 2014. *Teaching Core Skill of Listening and Speaking.* New York: ACSD

Pawlak, Miroslaw. 2015. *Issues in Teaching, Learning and Testing Speaker in a Second Language*. New York: Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.

Sabri, Ahmad. 2007. *Strategi Belajar Mengajar MicroTeaching.* Ciputat : Quantum Teaching.

Sanjaja and Heriyanto. 2006. *Panduan Penelitian.* Jakarta : Prestasi Pustaka. Silberman.

Sudarwarti and Eudia Grace. 2007. *Look Ahead: An English Course for Senior High School Students Year XI, Science and Social Study Program.* Jakarta: Erlangga

Sudjana. 2005. *Metode Statiska.* Bandung

Sugiyono. 2012. *Statistika untuk Penelitian.* Bandung : Alfabeta.

.
.