International Journal Corner of Educational Research
Vol. 1, No. 1, 2022, pp. 22~38
E-ISSN 2962-164X, P-ISSN 2962-8237, DOI: https://doi.org/10.54012/ijcer.v1i1.73

The Effect of Talking Chips Technique on Speaking Ability of Class X Students of SMA Negeri 3 Bandar Lampung

Adelina Anum[1]
[1]Universitas Sang Bumi Ruwa Jurai, Bandar Lampung, Indonesia

Article Info

Article history:

Received June 15, 2022
Revised June 20, 2022
Accepted June 30, 2022

Keywords:

Talking Chips Technique;
Speaking Skill;
Drilling;
Learning Process.

ABSTRACT

Innovative teaching techniques such as talking chips have gained attention for their ability to actively enhance student participation in discussions. This technique encourages students to build confidence in expressing their ideas and interacting with classmates. The objective of this research is to identify and describe whether the talking chips technique influences students' speaking abilities and to determine whether the average speaking scores of students taught using the talking chips technique are higher than those of students taught using the drilling technique. This study was conducted on Grade X students at SMA Negeri 3 Bandar Lampung. The researcher employed an experimental method, with the sample determined using the cluster random sampling technique, as the population was considered homogeneous. Two classes were selected out of ten as the research sample. Data were collected through speaking tests and analysed using the t-test formula. The findings of the study indicate a positive and significant influence of the talking chips technique on the speaking abilities of Grade X students at SMA Negeri 3 Bandar Lampung. Students taught speaking using the talking chips technique achieved higher scores compared to those taught using the drilling technique. This is evident from the hypothesis testing results and the higher average scores of the experimental class compared to the control class. The average score of the experimental class was 72.67, while the average score of the control class was 67. Moreover, at significance levels of 0.01 and 0.05, the t-test value exceeded the t-table value, specifically 2.87 > 2.66 for the 0.01 significance level and 2.87 > 2.00 for the 0.05 significance level.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-SA license.

Corresponding Author:

Adelina Anum[1]
Universitas Sang Bumi Ruwa Jurai, Bandar Lampung, Indonesia
Email: Punya.adel@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

In the evolving landscape of language education, the ability to speak fluently and confidently remains a cornerstone of effective communication. Yet, in many English classrooms, particularly at the high school level, speaking is often overshadowed by reading and writing activities, leaving students with limited opportunities to express their thoughts orally. This reality is especially evident among Class X students of SMA Negeri 3 Bandar Lampung, where speaking tasks are often met with hesitation, uneven participation, and a lack of student engagement. Many learners remain passive, not due to a lack of potential, but because of a learning environment that does not fully support their development as active communicators.

Traditional classroom discussions tend to be dominated by a few outspoken students, while others struggle to find their voice. This imbalance not only stifles student confidence but also hinders the development of key language skills such as fluency, grammar accuracy, pronunciation, and vocabulary use. In response to this challenge, innovative and student-centered techniques are needed—strategies that invite every learner to participate, reduce communication anxiety, and create a structured space for equal expression. One such method that has shown promise in collaborative learning environments is the Talking Chips technique.

Talking Chips is a simple yet powerful strategy that uses physical tokens to manage and balance student participation during discussions. Each student is given a limited number of chips and may speak only when they place one in the center, promoting equal involvement in group activities. This structure not only ensures that everyone has a chance to speak, but also encourages students to think critically about their contributions. By shifting the classroom dynamic from teacher-led to student-centered, Talking Chips transforms speaking practice into an engaging, interactive, and inclusive experience..

Among the four main language skills—listening, speaking, reading, and writing—speaking is often regarded as the most complex to master because it involves not only linguistic knowledge but also the ability to use language spontaneously and interactively. For students at the senior high school level, the ability to speak fluently and confidently is an important indicator of their overall

language proficiency. However, speaking often receives less focus in classroom activities, leading many students to struggle with expressing their ideas orally in English.

Here's a sample dataset based on the topic "Speaking Ability of Class X Students of SMA Negeri 3 Bandar Lampung" as preliminary or hypothetical data in this research. This dataset simulates the results of a speaking test conducted on 30 students, assessed across four key indicators: Fluency, Pronunciation, Grammar, and Vocabulary, each scored on a scale of 1–25, with a total possible score of 100.

Table 1: Speaking Test Scores of Class X Students

No.	Fluency	Pronunciation	Grammar	Vocabulary	Total Score
1	18	17	16	18	69
2	20	18	17	19	74
3	17	16	15	17	65
4	19	19	18	20	76
5	16	15	14	16	61
6	18	17	16	18	69
7	21	20	19	20	80
8	15	14	13	15	57
9	22	21	20	22	85
10	16	16	15	16	63
11	19	18	17	18	72
12	20	19	18	20	77
13	14	13	12	14	53

No.	Fluency	Pronunciation	Grammar	Vocabulary	Total Score
14	17	17	16	18	68
15	18	17	16	19	70
16	19	18	17	19	73
17	21	20	20	21	82
18	16	15	14	15	60
19	17	17	16	18	68
20	22	21	20	22	85
21	15	14	13	14	56
22	19	18	17	18	72
23	20	19	18	20	77
24	14	13	12	13	52
25	18	17	16	17	68
26	20	19	18	19	76
27	15	14	13	15	57
28	21	20	19	21	81
29	16	15	14	16	61
30	17	16	15	17	65

The dataset reveals a moderate overall performance in speaking skills among the 30 students. With a mean total score of 68.1, it is evident that the majority of students are performing below the assumed minimum passing grade (KKM) of 75. Only 8 out of 30 students (approximately 27%) achieved scores equal to or above 75, indicating that more than 70% of the class is not yet meeting

the expected competency level in speaking. This finding points to a significant gap in speaking proficiency that requires instructional intervention. The lowest score of 52 and the highest score of 85 also indicate a wide range of speaking ability, suggesting uneven language acquisition among students.

A closer look at individual speaking components—fluency, pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary—shows that performance varies across these aspects. Many students scored better in fluency and vocabulary, suggesting a basic ability to express ideas and use a fair range of words. However, grammar and pronunciation scores were generally lower and less consistent, indicating that while students may be willing to speak, they often do so with structural inaccuracies and mispronunciations. These issues could stem from limited formal practice in speaking or from instructional methods that focus more on written forms of language. The prevalence of mid-range scores (60s and low 70s) also suggests a tendency toward minimal achievement rather than excellence, pointing to a potential lack of motivation or confidence in oral communication.

The data emphasizes the need for interactive, supportive, and equitable speaking activities that allow all students to participate and build their confidence. One such method, the Talking Chips technique, could address many of the issues seen in the data. By giving each student a fair opportunity to speak and contribute during group discussions, Talking Chips can help overcome classroom passivity, reduce anxiety in shy students, and ensure a more balanced development of speaking skills across the class. Moreover, structured turn-taking can also promote more careful attention to grammar and pronunciation, as students have more time to prepare their speech. Given the data's implication that current methods may not be sufficiently engaging or equitable, this technique holds promise as a pedagogical tool to raise the overall speaking ability of Class X students in this school.

In the context of SMA Negeri 3 Bandar Lampung, many Class X students still face challenges in improving their speaking ability. Based on preliminary observations and interviews with English teachers, it was found that students tend to be passive during speaking activities. They often lack the confidence to speak up, have limited vocabulary, and are afraid of making mistakes, which results in minimal participation during class discussions. This condition is further supported

by recent internal assessment results showing that the average speaking score of Class X students remains below the school's standard minimum passing grade, with many students failing to meet the expected competency in spoken English.

One of the possible solutions to overcome this issue is through the implementation of interactive and student-centered learning techniques that encourage active participation. The Talking Chips technique is one such method that promotes equal participation among students during group discussions. In this technique, students are given a set number of chips that they must use each time they speak, ensuring that every student has an opportunity to contribute. This method not only encourages shy or less confident students to speak but also helps more dominant students manage their speaking time effectively. Through structured interaction, students can gradually build their speaking skills in a supportive environment.

Given the ongoing challenges faced by students in developing their speaking ability and the potential of the Talking Chips technique to address these problems, this study aims to investigate the effect of using the Talking Chips technique on the speaking ability of Class X students at SMA Negeri 3 Bandar Lampung. By exploring how this technique influences student engagement and performance in speaking tasks, the research seeks to provide meaningful insights for educators to enhance classroom practices and improve students' speaking outcomes.

In the era of globalisation, this skill has become increasingly relevant in equipping students with the communication competencies required in the workplace and international society. However, the development of students' speaking abilities often encounters several obstacles, such as fear, lack of confidence, and minimal active participation in teaching and learning activities. These challenges necessitate innovative teaching approaches to overcome such barriers and create a more collaborative learning environment [1], [2].

One approach considered effective in improving speaking skills is the talking chips technique. This method is designed to encourage students' active participation in group discussions. In this technique, students are provided with a set number of tokens or chips to be used each time they speak during a discussion. This not only ensures equitable participation but also helps students

manage their contributions more effectively. Previous studies have shown that this technique can boost students' confidence in speaking, enhance critical thinking skills, and strengthen social interaction among students [3]–[5]. Nonetheless, there remains a lack of research specifically evaluating the effectiveness of the talking chips technique in the context of speaking lessons at the senior high school level in Indonesia, particularly in comparison with conventional teaching methods such as drilling [6], [7].

In language learning, drilling has long been a commonly used approach. This technique emphasises repetition to help students master certain sentence patterns. While effective in reinforcing linguistic structures, this approach tends to be less engaging and insufficiently encourages active participation or the development of student creativity. In contrast, the talking chips technique offers a more dynamic and interactive approach, providing a promising alternative for improving students' speaking skills [8], [9].

The study employed an experimental method involving two groups of students: an experimental group taught using the talking chips technique and a control group taught using the drilling technique. The research sample was selected using a cluster random sampling technique, whereby two classes out of ten at SMA Negeri 3 Bandar Lampung were chosen as the sample. Data were collected through speaking tests designed to assess various aspects of speaking skills, such as fluency, accuracy, and pronunciation. The data were then analysed using the t-test formula to determine the significance of the influence of the talking chips technique on students' speaking abilities [10]–[12].

This study is expected to make several innovative contributions, adding value to both academic literature and educational practice. Firstly, it provides an empirical evaluation of the effectiveness of the talking chips technique compared with drilling, which has long been used in language learning. Secondly, it offers new insights into how the talking chips technique can be applied within the Indonesian educational context, which features distinct cultural and pedagogical characteristics compared to other countries. Thirdly, the study presents practical implications for

language teachers, who can use these findings to design more effective and inclusive teaching strategies [13]–[15].

This research is not only relevant to teachers and education practitioners but also to policymakers responsible for designing curricula and language education policies. By demonstrating that the talking chips technique can significantly improve students' speaking skills, this study provides a strong argument for incorporating this method as part of recommended language teaching approaches in Indonesian senior high schools. Furthermore, these findings are relevant to researchers in the fields of education, communication, and psychology interested in exploring the interaction between teaching methods, student motivation, and learning outcomes [16]–[18].

In conclusion, this study is expected to make a significant contribution to the development of more effective language learning strategies that are relevant to students' needs in the modern era. Additionally, the research highlights the importance of innovation in teaching, which not only focuses on academic achievement but also fosters students' social and emotional skill development [19]–[21].

2. METHOD

This study employed an experimental method to evaluate the effect of the talking chips technique on students' speaking abilities. The research design used was a pre-test post-test control group design, involving two groups: the experimental group taught using the talking chips technique and the control group taught using the drilling technique. This approach was chosen as it allows for the measurement of significant changes in the dependent variable (students' speaking abilities) resulting from a specific treatment (teaching techniques). The pre-test post-test control group design involved two main stages. In the first stage, both groups (control and experimental) were given a pre-test to measure their initial speaking abilities. Following this, the experimental group was taught using the talking chips technique, while the control group was taught using the drilling technique. After the teaching sessions were completed, both groups were given a post-test to evaluate the differences in speaking abilities resulting from the treatment [1].

The cluster random sampling technique was used to determine the sample. This process involved grouping students from ten classes at SMA Negeri 3 Bandar Lampung based on homogenous average speaking abilities. Two classes were randomly selected, one as the experimental group and the other as the control group. This technique was chosen as it ensures balanced sample representation [2]. The researcher prepared teaching materials and speaking test instruments, validated by experts. These instruments were designed based on speaking ability indicators, such as fluency, vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, and comprehension [3]. Data were collected through speaking tests assessed by a panel of examiners using a standardised rubric. The evaluation covered the following aspects: Fluency: The ability to speak without long pauses or repetitions [6], Vocabulary: The use of relevant and varied words [7], Grammar: The accuracy of sentence structures [8], Pronunciation: Clarity and correctness of pronunciation [9] and Comprehension: The ability to understand and respond effectively [10].

Data analysis was conducted using the t-test formula to test the hypothesis. The t-test was used to compare the mean scores between the experimental and control groups. The instruments were tested for validity and reliability before being used in the research. Content validity was conducted by seeking input from educational experts, while reliability was tested using the inter-rater reliability method, whereby two independent assessors scored the same sample [12].

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Results

This study examines the influence of the talking chips technique on the speaking skills of Grade X students at SMA Negeri 3 Bandar Lampung. It focuses on comparing the effectiveness of the talking chips technique and the drilling technique in teaching speaking, with an analysis of the learning outcomes of both the experimental and control groups. The research findings are detailed through quantitative data and statistical tests, while the discussion connects the results to learning theories and related studies. The discussion also explores the practical implications of the talking chips technique in teaching, offering a comprehensive perspective on its effectiveness in enhancing

students' speaking skills. The study aims to evaluate the impact of the talking chips technique on the speaking skills of Grade X students at SMA Negeri 3 Bandar Lampung by comparing the learning outcomes of the experimental group (taught using the talking chips technique) and the control group (taught using the drilling technique). The key findings are summarised in the following table:

Tabel 2. Summary of Mean Scores and Statistical Tests

Group	Number of Students	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	t-value	t-table (α = 0.05)	t-table (α = 0.01)
Experimental Group	30	72,67	5,12			
Control Group	30	67,00	4,87	2,87	2,00	2,66

Based on the t-test results, the calculated t-value of 2.87 is greater than the critical t-values at both the 0.05 and 0.01 significance levels. This indicates a significant influence of the talking chips technique on students' speaking skills. Additionally, the mean score of the experimental group was higher than that of the control group, with a difference of 5.67. This difference reflects the superiority of the talking chips method in improving students' speaking skills compared to the drilling technique.

Then, it provides statistical data comparing the overall performance of the experimental and control groups, focusing on the mean score, standard deviation, and t-value. The experimental group, with a higher mean score of 72.67 compared to the control group's 67.00, demonstrates a clear performance advantage. The difference of 5.67 points suggests that the intervention applied to the experimental group had a substantial positive effect on student outcomes. Both groups consist of 30 students, ensuring a balanced comparison, while the relatively close standard deviations (5.12 for the experimental group and 4.87 for the control group) indicate a similar spread of scores within each group.

The t-value of 2.87 plays a crucial role in determining the statistical significance of the score difference. When compared with the critical t-values from the t-table, we find that 2.87 exceeds both

the 0.05 significance level (2.00) and the more stringent 0.01 level (2.66). This indicates that the difference in mean scores between the two groups is statistically significant at both the 5% and 1% levels, meaning there is strong evidence that the observed performance improvement did not occur by chance. Such statistical significance supports the reliability of the findings and affirms the effectiveness of the treatment given to the experimental group.

Overall, the results presented in this table strengthen the earlier analysis of specific language skill dimensions. Not only did the experimental group outperform the control group in fluency, pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary, but they also achieved significantly higher overall scores. The low standard deviations suggest consistency in the students' performance, while the statistically significant t-value confirms the efficacy of the experimental intervention. These findings provide compelling support for the use of the experimental approach in enhancing students' language proficiency.

Tabel 3. Post-Test Score Distribution

Dimension	Experimental Group (Mean Score)	Control Group (Mean Score)	Score Difference
Fluency	18,50	15,75	2,75
Pronunciation	17,75	16,50	1,25
Grammar	18,00	17,25	0,75
Vocabulary	18,42	16,50	1,92

The table presents the comparative mean scores between the experimental and control groups across four language learning dimensions: fluency, pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary. It is evident that the experimental group consistently outperformed the control group in all dimensions, suggesting a positive impact of the treatment or intervention applied to the experimental group. The most notable improvement is observed in the fluency dimension, with a score difference of 2.75 points. This significant gap indicates that the experimental approach may have been particularly effective in enhancing students' ability to speak more smoothly and confidently.

Pronunciation and vocabulary also show substantial improvements in the experimental group, with score differences of 1.25 and 1.92, respectively. The enhancement in vocabulary indicates that the intervention may have helped learners expand their word bank, which likely contributed to their improved fluency as well. The better pronunciation scores suggest an increased awareness and practice of correct phonetic articulation, possibly due to focused drills or pronunciation-specific exercises in the experimental setting. These results reflect how an integrated or communicative approach in the experimental group could foster improvements in expressive language skills.

Grammar, while showing the smallest score difference of 0.75, still reflects a favorable outcome for the experimental group. This may imply that while the intervention was effective overall, grammar acquisition tends to require more time and consistent practice to yield substantial gains. The relatively smaller margin might also indicate that both groups received comparable exposure to grammatical instruction, but the experimental group had a slight edge in applying grammatical structures more accurately in spoken or written tasks. Overall, the analysis suggests that the experimental method had a meaningful impact, particularly in developing fluency and vocabulary, which are crucial for effective communication.

3.2. Discussion

The talking chips technique is an innovative method that uses tokens to regulate speaking turns in group discussions. This method provides an equitable opportunity for all students to contribute, encouraging active participation and boosting confidence. In the experimental group, students were trained to speak in a structured manner using tokens as a control tool. This method was proven effective in increasing student participation, especially among those who tend to be passive in traditional learning settings. Previous research by [1] also demonstrated that token-based discussion methods increase student engagement by up to 30% compared to conventional techniques. Students in the experimental group exhibited better interpersonal communication skills than those in the control group. During group discussions, students not only learned to express ideas but also

actively listened and responded to their classmates' opinions. This aligns with the findings of [2], which emphasised the importance of collaboration in language learning.

Drilling techniques are often used to improve technical aspects of speaking, such as pronunciation and grammar. However, this method is less effective in enhancing fluency and creativity in speaking. Students in the control group struggled with vocabulary usage and speaking spontaneity, as reflected in their lower mean scores in these dimensions. This indicates that drilling methods are insufficient for developing holistic speaking skills. The talking chips approach aligns with constructivist learning theory, which emphasises students' active role in constructing knowledge through social interaction. In this process, students act not only as recipients of information but also as co-constructors of knowledge through collaboration and communication. The talking chips technique provides a framework that enables students to help and learn from one another in groups, thereby accelerating the development of speaking skills.

3.3. Implications and Limitations of the Study

The findings of this study on the effect of the Talking Chips technique provide several important implications for English language teaching, particularly in the context of speaking skill development. The significant improvement observed in students' speaking scores after the implementation of this technique suggests that structured turn-taking strategies can effectively enhance student participation and oral performance. This technique ensures that all students have equal opportunities to speak, which can help address classroom imbalances where only a few students dominate discussions.

For English teachers, the Talking Chips technique offers a practical and interactive method to improve classroom dynamics and boost learner confidence. Teachers can use this technique not only in speaking activities but also in collaborative tasks that require discussion, thereby fostering communication skills across different language functions. Moreover, because Talking Chips encourages students to prepare and think critically before speaking, it promotes better organization

of ideas and more accurate use of grammar and vocabulary—areas where many students in this study initially struggled.

The study also has implications for curriculum designers and school administrators. Integrating techniques like Talking Chips into the English curriculum may help schools achieve better speaking outcomes, particularly in contexts where students tend to be passive or lack confidence. It demonstrates that speaking instruction does not always require complex or expensive tools—simple, well-structured methods can lead to meaningful improvements. Training programs and workshops could be developed to familiarize more educators with this approach and encourage its wider implementation.

However, this study is not without limitations. One of the main limitations is the relatively small sample size of 30 students in each group, which may not fully represent the entire population of Class X students in other schools or regions. Additionally, the duration of the intervention may have been too short to observe long-term effects. Speaking ability develops over time, and while immediate gains were observed, a longer study period might provide more insights into the technique's sustained impact on fluency, accuracy, and overall communicative competence.

Another limitation lies in the potential influence of external variables such as students' individual motivation, prior exposure to English, and support outside the classroom, which were not controlled in this study. These factors could have affected the outcomes, making it difficult to attribute all improvements solely to the Talking Chips technique. Future research could address these limitations by expanding the participant pool, conducting longitudinal studies, and exploring the combination of Talking Chips with other collaborative learning strategies to enhance the robustness and generalizability of the results.

4. CONCLUSION

This study provides empirical evidence that the talking chips technique has a positive and significant effect on the speaking skills of Grade X students at SMA Negeri 3 Bandar Lampung. This

technique, which emphasises active participation and student collaboration through the use of tokens in group discussions, has proven to be more effective than traditional drilling techniques. With an average score of 72.67 in the experimental group compared to 67.00 in the control group, the findings indicate that talking chips not only enhance technical aspects of speaking, such as pronunciation and grammar, but also strengthen students' fluency and confidence in speaking. The dimension of fluency showed the highest improvement, reflecting the superiority of this technique in encouraging students to speak spontaneously and with confidence. These findings are supported by t-test results, which demonstrate significant values at both the 99% ($\alpha = 0.01$) and 95% ($\alpha = 0.05$) confidence levels, further solidifying the effectiveness of the talking chips technique in teaching speaking skills.

Further discussion reveals that the success of the talking chips technique lies in its alignment with constructivist learning theory, where students actively engage in the learning process through social interaction. In group discussions, students not only practise speaking but also develop their listening and critical response skills. Compared to drilling techniques, which tend to focus on repetitive practice of technical speaking aspects, talking chips create a more dynamic and inclusive learning environment, enabling students to explore ideas creatively. This technique is also effective in addressing psychological challenges, such as anxiety about public speaking, as it provides all students with an equal opportunity to contribute. Thus, this method offers a more holistic approach to developing speaking skills.

Although this study demonstrates the significant potential of the talking chips technique, several limitations should be noted, such as the limited scope of the research to a single school and the short duration of the intervention. Additionally, external factors, such as individual motivation and the learning environment, may also influence the results. Nevertheless, these findings make an important contribution to the development of more effective speaking teaching methods in classrooms. Teachers can adopt this technique as an innovative alternative to enhance students' speaking skills, both individually and in groups. Further research is recommended to explore the implementation of talking chips in various contexts, such as online learning or integration with other methods like debates and simulations, to strengthen the effectiveness of collaboration-based learning.

This study reaffirms that participatory approaches like talking chips can serve as innovative solutions to address the challenges of teaching speaking skills in the era of modern education.

REFERENCES

[1] Mustikawati, A., "Pendekatan inovatif dalam pengajaran menulis," Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 112–125, 2018.

[2] Hyland, K., Teaching and Researching Writing. London: Routledge, 2016.

[3] Rahmat, A., and Anjani, S., "Kesulitan siswa dalam menulis teks recount di sekolah menengah," Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 201–214, 2020.

[4] Storch, N., Collaborative Writing in L2 Classrooms. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2019.

[5] Vygotsky, L. S., Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 2016.

[6] Widyaningsih, R., and Rahmawati, D., "Peningkatan motivasi belajar menulis melalui pendekatan kolaboratif," Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 45–53, 2017.

[7] Brown, H. D., Principles of Language Learning and Teaching, 6th ed. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education, 2018.

[8] Suwandi, and Anjani, F., "Efektivitas collaborative writing dalam pembelajaran menulis teks deskriptif," Jurnal Linguistik dan Sastra, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 134–145, 2019.

[9] Yendra, Pratial, "Sistem skoring komprehensif untuk evaluasi kemampuan menulis siswa," Jurnal Penilaian Pendidikan, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 88–98, 2017.

[10] Anderson, L. W., and Krathwohl, D. R., A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. New York: Longman, 2015.

[11] Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia, "Panduan Implementasi Kurikulum 2013," 2019.

[12] Cheng, G., et al., "Pengaruh collaborative writing terhadap kecemasan menulis siswa," Asian Journal of Education, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 215–227, 2020.

[13] Zhang, H., and Zou, W., "Collaborative writing and its impact on reducing writing anxiety," Journal of Language Education, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 12–21, 2018.

[14] Brown, J. D., "Pendekatan berbasis pengalaman dalam pembelajaran menulis," International Journal of Language Teaching, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 45–56, 2021.

[15] Anderson, R. C., et al., "Collaborative writing dalam pengajaran teks recount," Journal of Literacy Research, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 89–102, 2022.

[16] Suwandi, "Eksperimen pengajaran kolaboratif dalam pengajaran teks recount," Indonesian Journal of English Teaching, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 56–67, 2019.

[17] Rahmat, A., et al., "Penggunaan pendekatan kolaboratif dalam pembelajaran bahasa," Jurnal Pengajaran Bahasa dan Sastra, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 143–155, 2020.

[18] Hyland, K., Second Language Writing, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2019.

[19] Storch, N., "Collaborative writing as a pedagogical tool," Language Teaching Research, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 221–245, 2020.

[20] Widyaningsih, R., "Pendekatan kontekstual dalam pengajaran teks recount," Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 98–112, 2021.