

## THE IMPACT OF ORAL PRESENTATION IN IMPROVING STUDENTS' SPEAKING ABILITY IN PUBLIC JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Abd. Syakur, Agung Budisetyawan, Lailatul Musyarofah, Yulianto Sabat

STKIP PGRI Sidoarjo, Indonesia

*syakurabdmpd@gmail.com*  
*Agungbudisetyawan442@gmail.com*  
*ibulaila7810@gmail.com*  
*sabatkeren@gmail.com*

### ABSTRACT

To sustain its future competitive employment both at national and international level, Indonesia Government needs to invest more in its human resources. Therefore, education is the critical aspect to prepare highly educated and well-trained human resources for an innovation driven global competitiveness where ideas are needed to be spoken and trained from earlier age. This study aims to analyse the impact of oral presentation in improving students' speaking ability in a suburb area in Indonesia. The researcher analyzed how controlled speaking task is able to improve students' speaking ability in English. The data were collected from SMP Al-Islam Krian Sidoarjo since the school mainly represents the condition of the majority junior high school students in the suburb area in term of teaching and learning situation whom mostly shy and reluctant to show their idea off. While this speaking skill is urgently needed. This study shows that the oral presentation technique is able and effective to help English teachers to solve problems of shy and reluctant students find a way to express their idea spoken.

**Keywords:** Oral Presentation, Speaking Ability, English Language Teaching, Junior High School Students

## A. INTRODUCTION

English is very important for everyone who wants to gain access to the global communication. In the era of international cooperation, people need both spoken and written English language for communication.

The status of English is the first foreign language/second language can be taught in schools in Indonesia beginning from the kindergarten school to advance education. The teaching and learning English covers to the four language skills i.e. listening, speaking, reading, writing, and the language components, i.e structure, vocabulary, and pronunciation. At the high school, listening, speaking, reading, and writing are taught to work in balance.

SMP Al-Islam Krian gives a great attention to English lesson. Beside the regular lesson, it has English Rhetoric, Mathematic, and Science, Bilingual lesson, English program from Non Academic Competence one of fifteen extracurricular program, Intensive English Conversation (IEC) and road TOEFL, TOEIC, IELTS, and English for Professional Teacher Training. Those lessons support the Basic Strategic Planning of SMP Al-Islam Krian as it has planned.

The obsession and the vision of the school, we can understand that English plays an important role in the increasing of schools quality. Moreover, since the school is promoted to be pioneering Private Bilingual School, National Standard School, and International Standard School in West Sidoarjo, English becomes more important than before. Because of those reasons, the researcher need to increase/improve the students' English competence, especially in speaking.

The English teachers' obsession, the students' willingness, the principal support and the provided facilities for teaching and learning process lead SMP Al-Islam Krian to gain better and better, even it is considered as a suburb area school.

Those above statements motivate and support the researcher as the English teacher of SMP Al-Islam Krian to find an alternative strategy to increase/improve the students' interest to learn English, especially speaking skill.

The researcher focuses on speaking skills because he wants her students can communicate in English orally and actively. The spoken language communication will indicate the speaking ability (see Anum & Apriyanto, 2019; Apriyanto, 2019a, 2019b; Apriyanto & Anum, 2018; Hidayat & Apriyanto, 2019; Kusuma & Apriyanto, 2018). The position of SMP Al-Islam Krian which is rocketing locally, regionally, and nationally should be balanced by the increasing of speaking ability. Besides the willingness of all the communities around of Krian Sidoarjo, especially the communities nearest and closed to SMP Al-Islam Krian want it better.

In the K13 curriculum, there are four standard skills that need to be mastered by the students, those are SKL for listening, speaking, reading, and writing. In fact, in the teaching and learning process, listening is commonly combined with speaking, while reading is combined with writing. Therefore, in this research, the researcher also combines listening and

speaking skills through oral presentation. The reason is the students give a good attention and response in both listening and speaking skills through the oral presentation. The researcher used this atmosphere to interact, to digest, to gain the students' attention in speaking lesson by using the oral presentation strategy.

The researcher has tried some techniques or method in teaching and learning speaking, such as audiolingual method, natural approach, total physical response to teaching and learning process. In this process and activities, the students can do to practice their English, but for the result, it was not so good and the students did the activities reluctantly. Thus, the researcher tried new method for the students, teachers, and school.

## **B. METHODOLOGY**

The design of this research/study was a Classroom Action Research (CAR) (see Herlisya & Wiratno, 2022; Nissa et al., 2021; Nurchurifiani et al., 2021; Sagita, 2021). It was applied to develop a new model of oral presentation in assessing the students' speaking skill/ability. Considering the aim of the Classroom Action Research, that is, improving teaching – learning quality, the researcher wants to apply this design to improve the speaking ability of the seventh grade students at SMP Al-Islam Krian Sidoarjo through Oral presentation.

As classroom action research, this study followed the design of Kemmis and McTaggart (in Kasbollah and Sukaryana, 2001) in which each cycle consists of four steps: planning of action, implementing of action, observing and evaluation and analysis and reflection. The four main steps were preceded by reconnaissance (preliminary study) and analysis and identification of problem.

## **C. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

In this chapter the researcher presented and deals with the presentation of data and findings as the result of Oral Presentation implementation to improve the students' speaking ability. This chapter covers preliminary study, classroom action research with its phases: planning, implementation, observation, and reflection for cycle 1 and cycle 2.

Before the classroom action research began, the researcher had conducted preliminary study with was done on July 24th, 2019. During the preliminary study, the researcher and the collaborator observed the students' speaking ability through Oral Presentation. The researcher and the collaborator found some problems faced by the students dealing with speaking ability. The problems ranged from all aspects of speaking skill namely pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehensibility. In their observation, the researcher and the collaborator focused on the ability of the seventh students at SMP Al-Islam Krian Sidoarjo in their oral production using the target language.

According to the result of the preliminary study observation, see on table 1, the researcher found that the average speaking ability of the students was very low. The average score of the students' speaking ability after was combined with both the researcher score and

the collaborator score:  $(6.19 + 5.76) : 2 = 5.975$ . Only 4 students (about 15% to 17%) who could fulfill the criteria of success, that is 7.0 - 7.5.

**Table 1. Score of Students' Speaking Ability from Researcher and Collaborator in Preliminary Study**

Name	Researcher					Total	Avg	Collaborator					Total	Avg
	Pro.	Gra.	Voc.	Flue.	Com			Pro	Gra	Voc	Flue.	Com		
AVS	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.3	22.1	4.40	5.5	5.8	7.0	5.2	6.0	29.5	5.90
AEP	7.2	7.4	7.0	7.2	7.0	35.2	7.20	7.1	7.2	6.0	7.1	7.0	34.4	6.88
BSH	7.1	7.3	7.2	7.1	7.2	35.9	7.80	7.0	7.2	7.1	7.1	7.1	35.5	7.10
DAA	8.0	8.5	8.6	8.8	8.7	42.6	8.50	7.9	8.4	8.5	8.8	8.7	42.3	8.40
DQA	6.2	6.3	6.3	6.4	6.6	31.8	6.36	6.1	6.2	6.2	6.2	6.5	31.3	6.20
EJC	4.5	4.3	4.6	4.3	4.3	22.0	5.60	4.4	4.2	4.5	4.2	4.2	21.5	4.30
E	4.2	4.1	4.3	4.4	4.5	21.5	4.30	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.4	21.2	4.20
FOPR	5.6	7.6	7.4	7.6	7.8	36.0	7.20	5.5	7.5	7.3	7.5	7.7	35.5	7.10
HR	8.0	8.0	8.0	7.5	6.5	38.0	7.60	7.8	7.8	7.7	6.4	7.4	37.1	7.42
IRA	4.3	4.2	4.4	5.0	6.0	17.9	3.58	4.2	4.2	4.4	5.0	6.0	23.9	4.78
KW	5.0	6.0	6.5	5.3	5.8	28.6	5.70	5.1	6.0	6.4	5.4	5.7	28.6	5.72
MFAA	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.3	22.1	4.40	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.6	4.2	22.0	4.40
MAA	5.0	6.0	6.5	5.3	5.8	28.6	5.70	5.0	6.1	6.4	5.3	5.8	28.6	5.72
MHHS	5.0	8.0	8.0	7.5	6.5	38.0	7.60	7.9	7.9	7.9	7.4	6.6	37.7	7.54
MYA	6.0	6.5	7.0	5.5	6.3	31.3	6.26	5.0	6.4	6.0	5.4	6.3	29.1	5.80
MZPP	4.5	4.3	4.6	4.3	4.3	22.0	5.50	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.3	21.8	4.30
ND	5.6	7.6	7.4	7.6	7.8	36.0	7.20	5.7	7.6	5.4	7.6	7.8	34.1	6.82
NMN	6.2	6.3	6.3	6.4	6.6	31.8	6.36	6.2	6.3	6.3	6.4	6.6	31.8	6.30
NRA	5.6	7.6	7.4	7.6	7.8	36.0	7.20	5.7	7.7	7.5	7.7	7.8	36.4	7.21
ODR	4.5	4.3	4.6	4.3	4.3	22.0	5.50	4.6	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.3	22.0	4.45
	114.5	122.9	125.9	121.1	122.4	599.4	123.86	113.6	123.6	122.3	120.1	124.4	604.3	115.6
	5.72	6.14	6.25	6.05	6.12	30.28	6.19	5.68	6.18	6.11	6.01	6.22	30.215	5.7

$X_1$  = researcher's scoring

$X_2$  = collaborator's scoring

Thus,  $X_1 = 1233.86 : 20 = 6.19$

$X_2 = 115.1 : 20 = 5.76$

$X = (6.19 + 5.76) : 2 = 11.9 : 2 = 5.978 = 5.98$ .

Result from Cycle 1 can be seen from table 2 below.

**Table 2. The Score of the students' speaking ability from the researcher and the collaborator in cycle 1**

Name	Researcher					Total	Avg	Collaborator					Total	Avg
	Pro.	Gra.	Voc.	Flue.	Com			Pro	Gra	Voc	Flue.	Com		
AVS	5.0	5.0	6.0	6.0	7.0	29.1	5.80	5.5	5.4	6.2	6.3	6.2	29.7	5.94
AEP	6.5	6.6	6.4	6.7	6.8	33.0	6.60	6.6	6.7	6.5	6.8	6.9	33.5	6.70
BSH	7.4	7.6	7.8	7.5	7.8	38.1	7.62	7.5	7.6	7.8	7.6	7.8	38.3	7.66

DAA	8.0	8.5	8.0	7.5	7.8	39.8	7.96	8.2	8.6	8.2	7.8	7.9	40.7	8.14
DQA	6.8	8.0	8.0	7.4	7.8	38.0	7.60	6.9	8.2	8.2	7.4	7.6	38.3	7.66
EJC	5.0	5.0	6.0	6.0	7.0	29.0	5.80	5.0	5.0	6.0	6.0	7.0	29.0	5.80
E	5.0	5.0	6.0	6.0	7.0	29.0	5.80	5.0	5.0	6.0	6.0	7.0	29.0	5.80
FOPR	6.4	6.5	6.6	6.8	7.0	33.3	6.66	6.4	6.5	6.6	6.8	7.0	33.3	6.66
HR	6.8	8.0	8.0	7.4	7.8	38.0	7.60	6.8	8.0	8.0	7.4	7.8	38.0	7.60
IRA	5.8	5.9	6.0	6.5	6.6	30.8	6.16	5.8	5.8	7.0	6.4	6.5	31.5	6.30
KW	6.8	8.0	8.0	7.4	7.8	38.0	7.60	6.9	8.0	8.0	7.5	6.7	37.1	7.42
MFA A	6.4	6.5	6.6	6.8	7.0	33.3	6.66	6.5	6.5	6.5	6.7	7.1	33.3	6.66
MAA	6.5	6.6	6.4	6.7	6.8	33.0	6.60	6.6	6.6	6.4	6.7	6.8	33.1	6.62
MHH S	8.0	8.5	8.0	7.5	7.8	39.8	7.96	8.4	8.5	8.2	8.5	8.0	41.6	8.32
MYA	6.8	8.0	8.0	7.4	7.8	38.0	7.60	6.7	8.0	8.0	7.4	7.7	37.8	7.56
MZPP	5.0	5.0	6.0	6.0	7.0	29.0	5.80	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	7.0	31.0	6.20
ND	6.4	6.5	6.6	6.8	7.0	33.3	6.66	6.5	6.5	6.5	6.7	7.2	33.4	6.68
NMN	7.4	7.6	7.8	7.5	7.8	38.1	7.62	7.5	7.5	7.6	7.4	7.7	37.7	7.54
NRA	6.8	8.0	8.0	7.4	7.8	38.0	7.60	6.7	8.2	8.0	7.3	7.6	37.8	7.56
ODR	6.4	6.5	6.6	6.8	7.0	33.3	6.66	6.4	6.4	6.5	6.6	7.0	32.9	6.58
	120.2	137.3	140.8	138.1	146.4	691.9	138.36	131.9	139.0	142.2	134.3	144.5	697.0	139.37
	6.46	6.86	7.04	6.09	7.32	34.595	6.92	6.59	6.95	7.11	6.96	7.22	34.85	6.97

X1 = Researcher's scoring

X2 = Collaborator's scoring

Thus,  $X1 = 138.36 : 20 = 6.918$

$= 6.92$

$X2 = 139.37 : 20 = 6.968$

$= 6.97$

$X = (6.92 + 6.97) : 2 = 6.945 = 6.95$

While the result from cycle 2 can be seen from table 3 below

**Table 3. The Score of the students' speaking ability from the researcher and the collaborator in cycle 2**

Name	Researcher					Total	Avg	Collaborator					Total	Avg
	Pro.	Gra.	Voc.	Flue.	Com			Pro	Gra	Voc	Flue.	Com		
AVS	6.4	7.4	7.5	7.6	7.8	36.7	7.34	6.3	7.3	7.4	7.4	7.6	36.0	7.20
AEP	6.7	6.8	7.2	7.2	7.1	35.0	7.00	6.8	6.7	7.1	7.1	7.2	35.0	7.00
BSH	7.6	7.7	7.8	7.8	7.8	38.7	7.74	7.6	7.6	7.7	7.7	7.6	38.2	7.64
DAA	8.3	8.7	8.3	8.5	8.3	42.1	8.42	8.2	8.6	8.4	8.4	8.2	41.8	8.36
DQA	7.1	8.3	8.4	7.6	7.7	39.1	7.82	7.1	8.2	8.3	7.6	7.6	38.8	7.76
EJC	6.2	6.4	6.5	6.4	7.2	32.7	6.54	6.3	6.4	6.4	6.6	7.2	32.9	6.62
E	6.1	6.2	6.4	6.4	7.1	32.2	6.44	6.1	6.3	6.3	6.4	7.1	32.2	6.44
FOPR	6.5	6.6	6.8	7.0	7.2	34.1	6.82	6.5	6.6	6.8	7.1	7.2	34.2	6.84
HR	6.9	8.2	8.4	7.8	7.9	39.2	7.84	6.9	8.2	8.3	7.8	7.9	39.1	7.82

IRA	7.1	6.4	7.4	7.4	7.6	35.9	7.18	7.1	6.5	7.3	7.3	7.4	35.6	7.12
KW	7.2	8.0	8.0	7.5	6.8	37.5	7.50	7.2	8.0	8.1	7.6	6.9	38.2	7.64
MFA A	7.2	7.1	7.4	7.6	7.8	37.1	7.42	7.3	7.2	7.3	7.5	7.7	37.0	7.40
MAA	6.8	6.8	6.6	6.8	6.9	33.9	6.78	6.9	6.8	6.7	6.9	7.1	34.4	6.88
MHH S	8.5	8.5	8.2	8.5	8.2	41.9	8.38	8.4	8.4	8.2	7.4	7.7	42.1	8.42
MYA	6.7	8.0	8.0	7.4	7.7	37.8	7.56	6.8	8.0	8.0	7.4	7.7	37.9	7.58
MZPP	6.4	7.8	7.8	6.8	7.2	36.6	7.32	6.4	7.8	7.8	6.8	7.8	36.6	7.32
ND	6.6	7.9	7.9	7.4	7.5	37.3	7.46	6.6	7.7	7.9	7.5	7.5	37.3	7.46
NMN	7.6	7.6	7.6	7.5	7.8	38.1	7.62	7.7	7.6	7.6	7.5	7.8	38.2	7.64
NRA	6.7	8.2	8.0	7.3	7.6	37.8	7.56	6.7	8.1	8.0	7.2	7.5	37.5	7.50
ODR	6.8	6.9	6.8	7.5	7.2	35.2	7.04	6.8	6.9	6.8	7.4	7.3	35.2	7.04
	139. 4	149. 5	151. 0	148. 0	150. 4	738. 9	147.7 1	139. 4	139. 7	148. 9	150. 4	146. 6	738. 2	140. 6
	6.97	7.47	7.55	7.04	7.52	36.9 4	7.385	69.7	6.98 5	7.44	7.52	7.33	36.9 1	7.03

X1 = Researcher's scoring

X2 = Collaborator's scoring

Thus,  $X1 = 147.71:20 = 7.39$

$X2 = 140.6: 20 = 7.03$

$X = (7.39 + 7.03): 2 = 7.21$

From the data, it can be seen that there was a great improvement on the students' speaking ability in general compared to the previous data that were from the preliminary study and data from cycle 1. The significant improvement was on the average score on grammar, vocabulary, comprehensibility, and fluency. While in pronunciation, even it showed an improvement, it was not so significant.

Both the researcher and the collaborator did the instruments used to collect the data observation. Field note was also used to complete the data. While the techniques used to collect the data were by observing the students' oral presentation and noted it by using a field note.

Based on the data obtained, the researcher got some results dealing with the implementation of Oral Presentation or Oral Report Work activities applied in cycle 2.

Firstly, the researcher found that the students seemed more confident and enthusiasm to express their opinions or ideas through oral presentation or oral report orally. The students

felt more enjoyable when they were working in presenting or in giving report and it was very helpful for the shy students.

Secondly, being in presenting or reporting, the students felt less anxious to make mistakes they made would be helpful corrected by the other students. So, such condition was able to create a stress-free atmosphere within the students and a natural situation in which the students felt safer to use their English. This situation is very beneficial to improve their grammar, vocabulary, comprehensibility, and fluency.

However, the researcher found that mispronunciation still frequently happened. Based on the researcher observation, it might be caused by some factors. First, words being used were unpredictable, it means when the students were expressing their opinions or ideas in having oral presentation they might use certain words that they never predicted before; they might know the spelling of the words but do not know how to pronounce them. Another factor was that because the students had less practice in using spoken language and writing activities than in speaking.

Finally, the researcher concluded that the implementation of oral presentation activities in Cycle 2 brought a success. Two indicators of success criteria were fulfilled: there was an increase in the number of students who were actively involved in speaking ability. The number of the active students exceed to the passing grade or target grade, from 50% in cycle 1 to 70%-75% in cycle 2 or there were 16-18 out of 20 students who actively participated in the speaking activity. Thus, the action could be stopped.

#### **D. CONCLUSION**

By knowing the facts that the speaking ability of the seventh grade students at SMP Al-Islam Krian Sidoarjo was very low, which was proved by the preliminary study done or conducted on July 24th, 2019, the researcher was highly motivated to held or conduct a research to improve their speaking ability through Oral Presentation or Oral Reports Work technique or strategy in teaching speaking.

As it was presented in the previous chapter, this research was carried out in two cycles with two meetings for each cycle. The first cycle was conducted on July 31st, 2019 and on August 7th, 2019. While the second cycle was conducted on August 14th, 2019 and on August 21st, 2019, as the revision of the action in former or first cycle.

The result of the action in the first cycle was not satisfactory yet. The mean score of the students' speaking ability only reached 6.94. This mean score was obtained from combining the researcher's score and the collaborator's score. From this fact, it means that the score could not fulfill the passing grade or the stated score of criteria of success: 7.0. (See table 2)

Based on the data obtained and the reflection during the action in cycle 1, the researcher concluded that although the result showed there was an improvement in the students' speaking ability, the action in cycle 1 had some weaknesses so that it had to be revised and continued to the next cycle, that was cycle 2.

Based on the obtained, the result of the action in cycle 2 showed a satisfying result. It is when the mean score of the students' speaking ability could reach 7.21. It means that the score could fulfill the passing score or stated criteria of success that is 7.0. Where there were 16 students out of 20 students who actively participated in the speaking activity that is in presenting or reporting their topics assignments given by their teacher or chosen by themselves and for completing information (see Table 3). Considering the result, the researcher decided to end or to stop the action up to the second cycle. Hence, this is in line with Based on the oral presentation contents and the students' performance that the students have done, the researcher found that the students have more creative to prepare and to produce their preparation. They were not afraid to make mistakes because they have opportunity to revise their work or assignment. The researcher also found that the students could evaluate their oral presentation fairly, they have to justify their grade with reference to the goal. Research students conference is the most important means of supporting students self improvement. Unlike more self evaluation procedure, conferences can follow the lead of the student after the support of feedback necessary to prompt as well as guide reflection (Tierney, 1991).

## REFERENCES

- Allen, D.E, and Valette, M.R. (1997). *Classroom Techniques Foreign Language and English as a Second Language*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
- Allen, P, and Amato, R. (2003). *Making it Happens; From Interractive to Participaty Language Teaching – Theory and Practice*. New York: Peasion Education, Inc.
- Anum, A., & Apriyanto, S. (2019). Detecting Gender'S Strategies in Learning Speaking. *Premise: Journal of English Education*, 8(1), 57. <https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v8i1.1932>
- Apriyanto, S. (2019a). *Gender Strategies in Learning English* (Junaidi (ed.); 1st ed., Vol. 73). Sulur Pustaka. [www.sulur.co.id](http://www.sulur.co.id)
- Apriyanto, S. (2019b). *Gender Strategies in Learning English* (Vol. 73, Issue July). [www.sulur.co.id](http://www.sulur.co.id)
- Apriyanto, S., & Anum, A. (2018). Gender Dynamics on Speaking Interaction in the College Classroom. *Jurnal Smart*, 4(2), 73. <https://doi.org/10.26638/js.692.203x>
- Azwar, S. (2000). *Tes Prestasi, Fungsi dan Pengembangan Pengukuran Prestasi Belajar; edisi II*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Belajar.
- Baker, J. and Westrup, H. (2000). *The English Language Teacher's Handbook; How to Teach Large Classes with Few Resources*. New York: VSO
- Brown, D. H. (2004). *Language Assessment; Principles and Classroom Practices*. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Brown, D.H. (1994). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York: Prentice Hall Regents
- Bygate, M. (1987). *Speaking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Depdiknas. (2013). *Kurikulum 2013, Standar Kompetensi. Mata Pelajaran BAHASA INGGRIS*. Jakarta: Depdiknas.
- Depdiknas. (2013). *Pedoman Khusus Pengembangan Sistem Penilaian Berbasis Kompetensi SMP, Mata Pelajaran Bahasa Inggris*. Jakarta: Depdiknas
- Echols, M. John.; Shadily, H. (1987). *Kamus Inggris Indonesia*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Harmer, J. (1996). *The Practice of English Language Teaching; New Edition*. London: Longman Group Limited.



- Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. England: Pearson Education Limited
- Herlisya, D., & Wiratno, P. (2022). Having Good Speaking English through Tik Tok Application. *Journal Corner of Education, Linguistics, and Literature*, 1(3), 191–198. <https://doi.org/10.54012/jcell.v1i3.35>
- Hidayat, O., & Apriyanto, S. (2019). Drama Excerpt : Tool in Enhancing Speaking Ability for Junior High School. *IJECA (International Journal of Education and Curriculum Application)*, 2(3), 1–9.
- Hornby, S. A. (1974). *Oxford Advance Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kusuma, H. A., & Apriyanto, S. (2018). Strategy on Developing English Learning Material for Specific Purposes. *IJECA (International Journal of Education and Curriculum Application)*, 1(3), 39. <https://doi.org/10.31764/ijeca.v1i3.2144>
- Latief, A. M. (2004). *Pembelajaran, Penilaian dan Penelitian Bahasa Inggris*. Malang: Universitas Negeri Malang.
- Nissa, R. N., Nurchurifiani, E., & Febriyanti. (2021). Improving S tudents ' Vocabulary Mastery Through the Keyword Technique At The Tenth Grade of SMAN 2 Tulang Bawang Tengah. *Journal Corner of Education, Linguistics, and Literature (JCELL)*, 1(2), 139–147. <https://doi.org/10.54012/jcell.v1i2.28>
- Nunan, D. (1991). *Language Teaching Methodology: A Textbook for Teachers*. UK: Prenties Hall.
- Nurchurifiani, E., Nissa, R. N., & Febriyanti, F. (2021). Improving Students' Vocabulary Mastery Through the Keyword Technique At The Tenth Grade of SMAN 2 Tulang Bawang Tengah. *Journal Corner of Education, Linguistics, and Literature*, 1(2), 139–147. <https://doi.org/10.54012/jcell.v1i2.28>
- O' Malley, J. M, and Pierce, V. L. (1996). *Authentic Assessment For English Language Learners; Practical Approaches for Teacher*. New York: AbdisomWesley Publishing Company, Inc.
- Oshima, A, and Hague, A. (1999). *Writing Academic English; Third Edition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Pardiyono. (2006). *12 Writing Clues for Better Writing Competence*. Yogyakarta: CV. Andi Offset.
- Ricards, J. C., and Renandya, A. W. (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching; AN Anthology of Current Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J., and Heidiweber, E.J. (1986). *Longman Dictionary Applied Linguistics*. U.S.A. Cambridge University Press.
- Sagita, I. K. (2021). Applying Conversation Method and Self-Confidence and Its Effect to Learning Achievement. *Journal Corner of Education, Linguistics, and Literature*, 1(2), 122–131. <https://doi.org/10.54012/jcell.v1i2.11>
- Tompkins, E.G, and Hoskisson, K. (1991). *Language Arts; Content and Teaching Strategies*. New York: Macmi Publishing Company.

