

## IMPROVING ELEVENTH GRADERS' SPEAKING ACHIEVEMENT THROUGH THE GOGOMO STRATEGY

Asmiranda, Heru Setiawan

Tridinanti University

Asmiranda9925@gmail.com, herusetiawan@univ-tridinanti.ac.id

**ABSTRACT:** GOGOMO is a collaborative approach that enables students to engage and practice speaking with each other. This approach allows students to express their thoughts. This research sought to: (1) determine if there was a notable enhancement in the speaking skills of the eleventh-grade students at SMA Negeri 10 Palembang through the GOGOMO strategy, and (2) assess if there was a significant disparity in speaking skills between the eleventh-grade students at SMA Negeri 10 Palembang who learned with the GOGOMO strategy and those who did not. This research employed a quasi-experimental design involving 70 students, who were chosen through purposive sampling. The data were gathered through a speaking assessment. To confirm the hypotheses, the collected data were examined with the Paired Sample T-Test and Independent Sample T-Test. The findings showed that the GOGOMO strategy significantly enhanced the speaking proficiency of eleventh-grade students at SMA Negeri 10 Palembang. Moreover, a notable difference existed in the speaking achievements of the eleventh-grade students at SMA Negeri 10 Palembang between those instructed with the GOGOMO strategy and those who received no such instruction. The experimental group surpassed the control group in terms of speaking performance. The GOGOMO strategy may have created an environment for students to engage with their peers and enhance their speaking skills. When used for a speaking class, GOGOMO needs to be modified or supplemented, even though it might work well for some activities. Alternative approaches that improve engagement while preserving comprehension accuracy should be investigated in future studies.

**Keywords:** *speaking achievement, GOGOMO strategy, cooperative learning*

---

## MENINGKATKAN PRESTASI BERBICARA SISWA KELAS SEBELAS MELALUI STRATEGI GOGOMO

**ABSTRAK:** Pembelajaran *Speaking* harus menawarkan lingkungan belajar yang mendukung bagi siswa melalui pembentukan praktik yang relevan. Sebuah strategi melibatkan penerapan pendekatan Give One Get One Move On (GOGOMO). GOGOMO adalah pendekatan kolaboratif yang memungkinkan siswa untuk terlibat dan berlatih berbicara satu sama lain. Pendekatan ini memungkinkan siswa untuk mengekspresikan pikiran mereka. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk: (1) menentukan apakah ada peningkatan yang nyata dalam keterampilan berbicara siswa kelas sebelas di SMA Negeri 10 Palembang melalui strategi GOGOMO, dan (2) menilai apakah ada perbedaan yang signifikan dalam keterampilan berbicara antara siswa kelas sebelas di SMA Negeri 10 Palembang yang belajar dengan strategi GOGOMO dan mereka yang tidak. Penelitian ini menggunakan desain kuasi-eksperimental yang melibatkan 70 siswa, yang dipilih melalui purposive sampling. Data dikumpulkan melalui penilaian berbicara. Untuk mengkonfirmasi hipotesis, data yang dikumpulkan diperiksa dengan Paired Sample T-Test dan Independent Sample T-

Test. Temuan penelitian menunjukkan bahwa strategi GOGOMO secara signifikan meningkatkan kemampuan berbicara siswa kelas sebelas di SMA Negeri 10 Palembang. Selain itu, terdapat perbedaan yang mencolok dalam prestasi berbicara siswa kelas sebelas di SMA Negeri 10 Palembang antara mereka yang diajar dengan strategi GOGOMO dan mereka yang tidak menerima pengajaran tersebut. Kelompok eksperimen mengungguli kelompok kontrol dalam hal kinerja berbicara. Strategi GOGOMO mungkin telah menciptakan lingkungan bagi siswa untuk berinteraksi dengan teman sebayanya dan meningkatkan keterampilan berbicara mereka. Bila digunakan untuk kelas berbicara, GOGOMO mungkin perlu dimodifikasi atau dilengkapi, meskipun mungkin berfungsi dengan baik untuk beberapa aktivitas. Pendekatan alternatif yang meningkatkan keterlibatan sambil mempertahankan akurasi pemahaman harus diselidiki dalam penelitian mendatang

**Kata Kunci:** *pembelajaran speaking, strategi GOGOMO, pembelajaran kooperatif*

---

---

## INTRODUCTION

English is regarded as a worldwide language because it is utilized between countries. The expansion of English as the main language for global communication has clearly persisted for numerous decades (Graddol, 2006). Individuals utilize it to connect and engage with others globally, making it difficult to overlook its role as a global language. English is broadly applied in numerous areas of our lives, including computer programming, aviation, business, education, politics, and more. At present, Indonesia is implementing Curriculum 2013. According to the 2013 curriculum, the aim of teaching English at the Senior High School level in Indonesia is to enhance students' abilities in communicative competence for interpersonal, transactional, and functional uses in both oral and written forms (Kemendikbud, 2014).

To attain communication proficiency, learners must excel in four areas: speaking, listening, writing, and reading. Speaking is one of the four essential skills that students should acquire effectively. Speaking English is a vital ability for the 21st century (Scott, 2015). Talking is essential, as it is the most utilized ability when individuals want to express thoughts and exchange information. The speaking ability is the most essential skill for all students aiming to learn English to advance their careers, boost business, increase self-assurance, deliver public speeches, engage in interviews, take part in debates and group discussions, and present information. (McLaren, Madrid, & Bueno, 2006). Effective communication aids the younger generation in building improved careers in the future. The younger generation needs to be aware that it is a global issue, yet they still face challenges in mastering spoken English. The primary issues faced by learner-speakers stem from two elements: knowledge and skills (Thornburry, 2008, p. 39). Because English is a foreign language in Indonesia, students still face numerous challenges in learning it.

Although students acquire English since they are in Junior High School, students still have problems in producing spoken English. According to Panggabean (2015), students lacked opportunities to practice English in their daily conversation since it was not the official language in Indonesia. It is in line with Junita et al. (2024) who found that most of the students lack confidence, motivation, and vocabulary; they also speak poorly and are too nervous to speak English in front of their peers; the teacher uses repetitive teaching methods; and there are few opportunities for the students to practice speaking the language. Due to this circumstance, the students are less engaged in speaking classes. Moreover, other factors make speaking difficult for foreign learners. Spoken English has some features that make the oral production process difficult. They cover clustering, redundancy, reduced forms, performance variable, colloquial language, rate of delivery, stress, rhythm, intonation of English, and interaction (Brown, 2007, p. 270).

Additionally, the students remain uncertain about how to engage in conversation, express statements, and share opinions in English both inside and outside the classroom. Speaking practice is limited to in-class activities, which demotivates and inactively engages pupils. Additionally, students find speaking assignments boring due to their low and inadequate speaking abilities (Wati & Sari, 2023). According to the writer's observations during their teaching at SMA Negeri 10 Palembang and discussions with the English teacher, the reasons for the students' low speaking skills included: (1) the 3 students lacked confidence when speaking English in front of their classmates. They were scared of making errors while speaking English, (2) the students had insufficient vocabulary resources, and (3) the students had few chances to enhance

their speaking skills. Consequently, educators employed the conventional approach to instruct the learners in the classroom. This situation resulted in students being disengaged and finding it difficult to learn English.

Furthermore, it confirmed that students did not get a supportive learning atmosphere in practicing their oral language production. Therefore, to overcome those problems, teachers have to use effective teaching strategy to teach students' speaking skill and make them more interested in learning English. The teachers should select an effective strategy that help the students to build learning atmosphere to practice their speaking. Selecting and implementing effective teaching techniques is essential to fostering a supportive learning environment where students can practice speaking English in authentic contexts (Jumeidi & Dianti, 2024). One of the strategies that can be used for teaching speaking is Give One Get One Move On (GOGOMO) strategy. GOGOMO strategy is one of the discussion session strategy that make students actively and intentionally get and give the information from each other (UDL Strategy Index, 2021).

Meanwhile, Guillaume (2007, p. 176) mentions that the GOGOMO strategy encourages learners to circulate the room, exchanging ideas on specific topics and gathering them from their classmates. The GOGOMO approach is the strategy that fosters collaborative learning. The main benefits of the GOGOMO strategy are to encourage students and facilitate their interaction with peers (Amalia, 2017). Furthermore, as stated by Chersia, W. (2015), GOGOMO offers students a session for peer sharing. Similarly, the GOGOMO approach assists learners in quickly locating information, collaborating with classmates, and engaging their existing knowledge. The instructor can direct the students to circulate in the classroom, locate a partner, and exchange one of their thoughts. This framework offers students the chance to hear different viewpoints. Certain researchers have demonstrated that utilizing Give One Get One Move On (GOGOMO) can enhance specific skills in English learning among students.

The initial research was carried out by Fardan in 2016 utilizing the Give One Get One Move On (GOGOMO) Strategy to enhance students' skills. This study aimed to determine if the GOGOMO strategy could enhance students' speaking skills. The findings of this research indicated that the speaking skills of the students enhanced considerably. Employing the GOGOMO strategy enabled the students to enhance their skills in effectively speaking English. Additionally, Amalia (2017) examined the impact of implementing the Give One-Get One Strategy on the reading comprehension of students in the first semester of the Eighth Grade at SMP Negeri 20 Bandar Lampung during the Academic Year 2016/2017. The findings of this research indicated that there was a notable impact on the students' reading comprehension. Considering the detailed explanation provided, the author aimed to carry out a study titled "Improving Eleventh Graders' Speaking Achievement Through the GOGOMO Strategy."

## METHODOLOGY

### 1. Research Method and Design

In this research, the researchers employed a quantitative approach and utilized a quasi-experimental design. Next, they administered the pre-test, provided the treatment, and conducted the post-test. Creswell (2012, p. 309), a quasi-experimental design includes experimental and control groups with both pretest and post-test, but subjects

are not randomly assigned. In a quasi-experimental design, the researchers provided varying treatments to both the experimental and control groups, subsequently evaluating the students' speaking skill achievement through pre-tests and post-tests. The pretest was conducted before the treatment implementation, and the post-test was conducted after the treatment was completed. The design is depicted in Figure 1 below.

|                     |                      |          |                      |
|---------------------|----------------------|----------|----------------------|
| <b>Experimental</b> | <b>O<sub>1</sub></b> | <b>X</b> | <b>O<sub>2</sub></b> |
| <b>Control</b>      | <b>O<sub>3</sub></b> |          | <b>O<sub>4</sub></b> |

Figure 1. Types of Non-Equivalent Group Design

## 2. Techniques in Collecting the Data

### 2.1 Test

The oral test (speaking test) was administered to collect data on students' speaking skills. Uno and Koni (2013) state that a test is a set of tasks that must be done to measure the level of understanding and ability to cover of material. The test was administered twice for both groups, pretest and posttest. A pre-test was given before the treatment, and a post-test was given after the treatment. During the test, the teacher recorded the students while they were performing the dialogue within 5 minutes about giving and asking opinions based on the issue chosen. The student's speaking performance was scored or rated by using an analytical speaking rubric adopted from Brown (2004). The raters were the English Lecturer of Tridinanti University Palembang and the English Teacher of SMA Negeri 10 Palembang. The rubric is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Speaking Scoring Rubric

| Aspect  | Student's Action  | Categories | Score |
|---------|---|------------|-------|
| Grammar | Grammar errors are frequent, but a speaker can be understood by a native speaker used to dealing with foreigners attempting to speak their language.  | Very Poor  | 1     |
|         | Can usually handle elementary constructions quite accurately, but does not have thorough or confident control of the grammar.   | Poor       | 2     |
|         | Control of grammar is good. Able to speak the language with sufficient structural competence to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, and professional topic. | Average    | 3     |
|         | Able to use the language accurately on all levels normally pertinent to professional needs. Grammar errors are quite rare.  | Good       | 4     |
|         | Equivalent to that of an educated native speaker.   | Very Good  | 5     |
|         | Speaking vocabulary is inadequate to express anything but the most elementary needs.  | Very Poor  | 1     |
|         | Has a speaking vocabulary sufficient to express himself simply with some circumlocutions.   | Poor       | 2     |
|         | Able to speak the language with sufficient vocabulary to participate effectively in most formal   |            |       |

|               |   |           |   |
|---------------|---|-----------|---|
|               | and informal conversations on practical, social, and professional topics.   | Average   | 3 |
| Vocabulary    | Understand and participate in any conversation within the range of his experience with a high degree of precision in vocabulary.  | Good      | 4 |
|               | Speech on all levels is fully accepted by educated native speakers in all its features, including breadth of vocabulary and idioms, colloquialisms, and pertinent cultural references.          | Very Good | 5 |
| Comprehension | Within the scope of his very limited language experience, can understand simple question and statements if delivered with slowed speech, repetition or paraphrase.                              | Very Poor | 1 |
|               | Can get the gist of most conversation of non-technical subjects.  | Poor      | 2 |
|               | Comprehension is quite complete at a normal rate of speech.   | Average   | 3 |
|               | Can understand any conversation within the range of his experience.   | Good      | 4 |
|               | Equivalent to that of an educated native speaker.   | Very Good | 5 |
| Fluency       | No specific fluency description. Refer to other four language areas for implied level of fluency.   | Very Poor | 1 |
|               | Can handle with confident but not with facility most social situation, including introductions and casual conversation about current events, as well as work, and autobiographical information. | Poor      | 2 |
|               | Can discuss particular interest of competence with reasonable ease.   | Average   | 3 |
|               | Rarely has to grope for words.  |           |   |
|               | Able to use to language fluently on all levels normally pertinent to professional needs. Can participate in any conversation within the range of this experience with a high degree of fluency. | Good      | 4 |
| Pronunciation | Has complete fluency in the language such as that his speech is fully accepted by educated native speaker.  | Very Good | 5 |
|               | Errors in pronunciation are frequent but can be understood by a native speaker used to dealing with foreigners attempting to speak his language.  | Very Poor | 1 |
|               | Accent is intelligible though often quite faulty.   | Poor      | 2 |
|               | Errors never interfere with understanding, and rarely the native speaker. Accent may obviously foreign.   | Average   | 3 |
|               | Errors in pronunciation are quite rare.   | Good      | 4 |
|               | Equivalent to and fully accepted by educated native speakers.   | Very Good | 5 |

## 2. Techniques of Analyzing the Data

The acquired data was first analyzed descriptively to identify the statistical descriptive data related to the students' speaking assessments. Subsequently, the author conducted inferential analyses to confirm the hypotheses. To begin the inferential analyses, the author first examined the data for normality and homogeneity. If the data exhibits normal distribution and homogeneity, the author would proceed with the analysis using the Paired-sample t-test and the Independent-sample t-test. A normality test was conducted to assess whether the students' speaking skill data were normally distributed. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was utilized for assessing normality. A Kolmogorov-Smirnov probability coefficient of  $\geq 0.05$  indicates that the data follows a normal distribution.

Homogeneity was utilized to assess whether the data were uniform or not. The researchers applied Levene's test to assess the homogeneity of the data. McCormick and Jesus (2015, p. 242) indicate that homogeneity is used to assess whether the variation between the two groups is alike or distinct. The homogeneity test determines whether samples are drawn from significantly related populations. The data can be classified as homogenous when the coefficient of Levene's test (F-test) exceeds 0.05.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### 1. The Result of the Pre-Test and the Post-Test

According to the pre-test outcomes of the experimental group, the top score was 60, the bottom score was 44, and the average score was 52.78 with a standard deviation of 4.065. In the results of the post-test for the experimental group, the highest score recorded was 98, the lowest was 72, and the average score was 80.44 with a standard deviation of 5.261. In the control group pre-test, the top score was 56, the lowest was 46, and the average score was 50.82 with a standard deviation of 3.119. Finally, in the control group's post-test, the highest score recorded was 68, the lowest was 60, and the average score was 64.82 with a standard deviation of 2.263. Table 2 displays the summary of the pre-test and post-test results for the experimental group and control group comprising 39 students.

*Table 2. Descriptive Analysis for Experimental Group and Control Group*

|              |           | Minimum | Maximum | Mean  | Std.<br>Deviation | N  |
|--------------|-----------|---------|---------|-------|-------------------|----|
| Experimental | Pre- Test | 44      | 60      | 52.78 | 4.065             | 36 |
|              | Post Test | 72      | 98      | 80.44 | 5.261             |    |
| Control      | Pre- Test | 46      | 56      | 50.82 | 3.119             | 34 |
|              | Post Test | 60      | 68      | 64.82 | 2.263             |    |

### 2. Frequency Analysis

According to the frequency analysis results of the experimental group pre-test, 27 students (69.4%) were assessed at a low level, while 9 students (30.6%) were at an adequate level. Subsequently, according to the post-test findings, 32 students (86.1%) were at a good level, while 4 students (13.9%) achieved a very good level. Table 3 shows the summary of the speaking achievement of the students in the experimental group.

Table 3. The Score Distribution for Experimental Group

| Score  | Category  | Pre-Test  |            | Post-Test |            |
|--------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|
|        |           | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| 86-100 | Very Good | -         | -          | 4         | 13.9%      |
| 71-85  | Good      | -         | -          | 32        | 86.1%      |
| 56-70  | Enough    | 9         | 30.6%      | -         | -          |
| 41-55  | Low       | 27        | 69.4%      | -         | -          |
| 0-40   | Failed    | -         | -          | -         | -          |
| Total  |           | 36        | 100%       | 36        | 100%       |

Meanwhile, the level of students' speaking achievement for the control group before the treatment phase was as follows: 32 students (94.4%) were categorized as low, and 2 students (5.6%) were categorized as enough. After that, in the post-test results, it was found that 34 students (100%) were at enough level. The summary of the students' speaking achievement for the control group is presented in Table 4.

Table 4. The Score Distribution for the Control Group

| Score  | Category  | Pre-Test  |            | Post-Test |            |
|--------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|
|        |           | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| 86-100 | Very Good | -         | -          | -         | -          |
| 71-85  | Good      | -         | -          | -         | -          |
| 56-70  | Enough    | 2         | 5.6%       | 34        | 100%       |
| 41-55  | Low       | 32        | 94.4%      | -         | -          |
| 0-40   | Failed    | -         | -          | -         | -          |
| Total  |           | 34        | 100%       | 34        | 100%       |

### 3. Paired Sample T-Test

The paired sample t-test aimed to assess the mean scores of the sample groups prior to and following the treatment. The researchers applied a paired sample t-test to determine if there was a noteworthy enhancement in the experimental and control groups. According to the outcome of the paired sample t-test, the t-obtained value was 74.882, which exceeded the t-table value of 2.032. Subsequently, the significance value (sig.2-tailed) was 0.00, which was less than the alpha value (0.05). This indicated a notable enhancement in students' speaking abilities after they received instruction through the Give One Get One Move On (GOGOMO) strategy.

Table 5 Paired Sample T-Test

| Group        |                        | Mean Difference | t-obtained | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|--------------|------------------------|-----------------|------------|----|-----------------|
| Experimental | Pre-test and Post-test | 27.667          | 74.882     | 35 | 0.000           |

### 4. Independent Sample T-Test



The outcome of the independent sample t-test indicated that the t-obtained value was 15.968, which exceeded the t-table value of 1.995. Subsequently, the significance coefficient was (0.000) and it was less than the alpha value (0.05). It suggested that the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) was dismissed and the alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) was approved. It suggested that there was a notable difference in achievement between the students who were instructed using the Give One Get One Move On (GOGOMO) strategy and those who were not. The outcome of the independent sample t-test can be found in Table 6 below.

Table 6. The Independent Sample T-Test

| Groups   | F      | Sig. | t-obtained | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|--|--------|------|------------|----|-----------------|
| Post-test (experimental group and control group) | 12.568 | 0.54 | 15.968     | 68 | 0.000           |

## DISCUSSION

From the findings of the study, several interpretations could be made. Initially, the students' speaking skills were enhanced following instruction through the Give One Get One Move On (GOGOMO) strategy. A notable contrast existed in their speaking performance, particularly in expressing and soliciting opinions before and after they underwent treatment with GOGOMO. Prior to the treatment phase, the students' speaking performance in expressing and receiving opinions was deemed low. The students were uncertain about how to communicate, they struggled to articulate their thoughts, and they felt anxious about making mistakes. Following the treatment, their ability to speak when asking for and giving opinions was predominantly deemed good. It could be due to the GOGOMO strategy enabling students to engage actively in the classroom. The students moved around the classroom to locate their partners and exchanged their thoughts. This situation allowed the students to engage with their classmates and enhance their verbal skills.

This aligns with Ahmad (2021), who stated that every social interaction offers students a fresh chance to practice language. Furthermore, Burns and Siegel (2018) noted that effective speakers need to handle interactions with their conversational partners, such as knowing when to switch speaking turns, how to elaborate on earlier statements, and how to request clarification. Speaking involves the active use of language, emphasizing interaction, communication, and mutual understanding. Speaking proficiency may enhance when students consistently engage in direct conversation practice (Zhang, L., & Head, K. 2023). The implementation of the GOGOMO strategy offered students an opportunity to enhance their speaking skill through additional practice. Fardan (2016) and Amalia (2017), who examined the use of the GOGOMO strategy, also discovered that this approach was effective in enhancing students' speaking and reading abilities. Secondly, it was also revealed that there was a significant difference between experimental and control group dealing with their speaking achievement after the treatment phase.

The students of experimental group were categorized as good and very good level in their speaking skill. Meanwhile, the students of control group were classified as enough level in their speaking skill. GOGOMO strategy was more effective to help students in speaking than direct instruction since it supported the students of experimental group with an effective learning condition by practicing their verbal communication directly. Effective learning environment in classroom enhance students' progress (Good & Brophy, 2018). Also, Berk (2005) added that effective teacher can create environment of cooperative learning where students interdependent on each other for learning. Teacher's creative learning can stimulate problem-solving, develop critical thinking and increase confidence levels. Therefore, students in experimental group performed better than control group.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the findings and interpretation of this study, there were two points that could be concluded. First, it was significant using Give One Get One Move On (GOGOMO) strategy to improve students' speaking skill in asking and giving opinion of the eleventh grade students of SMA Negeri 10 Palembang. It could be seen from the students' speaking progress after the post-test was given. Second, there was a significant difference between students who were taught by using Give One Get One Move On (GOGOMO) strategy and students who were not. Experimental group performed better than control group. GOGOMO can be one of specific speaking strategies for asking and giving opinion.

## REFERENCE

- Ahmad, I. (2021). *How can I improve my students speaking skills?* Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/post/How-can-I-improve-my-students-speaking-skills>
- Amalia, R. (2017). *The influence of using give one-get one strategy towards students' reading comprehension at the first semester of the eight grades of SMP Negeri 20 Bandar Lampung in the academic year 2016/2017*. Lampung: University of Raden Intan Lampung.
- Berk, A. R. (2005). Survey of 12 strategies of measure teaching effectiveness. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 17(1), 1-18.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principle of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Burns, A., & Siegel, J. (2018). *Teaching speaking: A holistic approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- Chersia, W. (2015). the Effect of "GOGO" Strategy and Motivation on Students' Reading Comprehension of Narrative Text At Grade X of Sman 7 Padang 2014/2015 Academic Year. *Journal English Language Teaching*, 1(1), 1-8.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). USA: Pearson Education, inc.
- Fardan. (2016). *Improving the speaking ability of the tenth year students of MA Muhammadiyah Punnia Pinrang through give one, get one, move on (GOGOMO) strategy*. Pinrang: Muhammadiyah Parepare University.
- Good, T. L., & Brophy, J. E. (2018). *Looking in classroom* (11th ed.). New York, NY: Longman.
- Graddol, D. (2006). *English next*. London: British Council.

- Guillaume, A. (2007). *50 Strategies for active teaching: Engaging K-12 learners in the classroom*. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Jumeidi, A., & Dianti, R. (2024). Leveraging Vlog to enhance secondary school students' speaking performance. *Didascein: Journal of English Education*, 5(1), 62–69. <https://doi.org/10.52333/djoe.v5i1.698>.
- Junita, R., Dianti, R., & Ria, N. (2024). Promoting Four Corners strategy to improve secondary school students' speaking skills. *Didascein: Journal of English Education*, 5(2), 121–133. <https://doi.org/10.52333/djoe.v5i2.835>.
- Kemendikbud. (2014). *Kurikulum 2013*. Jakarta: Kementrian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- McCormick, K., & Jesus, S. (2015). *SPSS statistics for dummies*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- McLaren, N., Madrid, D., & Bueno, A. (2006). *TEFL in secondary education*. Granada: Editorial Universidad de Granada.
- Panggabean, H. (2015). Problematic approach to English learning and teaching: A case in Indonesia. *Canadian Center of Science and Education*, 8(3), 35- 36.
- Scott, C. L. (2015). *The future of learning 2: What kind of learning for the 21<sup>st</sup>-century?* Paris: Education Research and Foresight.
- Thornbury, S. (2008). *How to teach speaking*. England: Pearson Education Limited.
- UDL Strategy Index. (2021). *Give one get one move on strategy*. Retrieved from <https://goalbookapp.com/toolkit/v/strategy/give-one-get-one>
- Uno, H., & Koni, S. (2013). *Assessment pembelajaran*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Wati, S., & Sari, F. (2023). Increasing students' speaking skill through Fishbowl. *Didascein: Journal of English Education*, 4(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.52333/djoe.v4i1.61>.
- Zhang, L., & Head, K. (2023). Classroom role-play strategies for enhancing language fluency. *Language Pedagogy Journal*, 35(2), 210-230.