A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF DIFFERENT TEACHING STRATEGIES BASED ON TEXT TYPES ON STUDENTS' SPEAKING COMPETENCY

Tari, Nirmala[1], Padmadewi Ni Nyoman[2], Artini, Luh Putu[3]

Language Education Study Program, Postgraduate Program
Ganesha University of Education
Singaraja, Indonesia

e-mail : (tari, padmadewi, artini)@pasca.undiksha.ac.id

Abstract

This study aimed at comparing the effect of different teaching strategies based on text types on students' speaking competency. Post-test Only Comparison Group Design was applied as the research design. After the treatment sessions, post-test was administered to discover the impact of the treatments. The data obtained from the post-test were analyzed by using descriptive and inferential statistical analyses. Through descriptive analysis, it was found that the mean scores of the two samples for descriptive text were 71.63 and 73.96 and for procedure text were 74.93 and 76.80. The difference between students' speaking competency who were taught using different teaching strategies was analyzed through two-way Anova. Based on the result of the hypothesis testing, it was found that; there was a significant difference between two teaching strategies on students' speaking competency and there was no interactional effect between two teaching strategies and the text types on students' speaking competency. These findings provide empirical evidence of the importance to determine teaching strategies that suit the text types taught in speaking class.

Key terms : speaking competency, speaking random club, panauricon and text types

INTRODUCTION

English is an International language that is spoken by most people in the world. Nowadays, each aspect of education and non education uses and needs English. People will have an additional skill that can be used to compete in the globalization era if they are able to acquire English as a means of communication. It is supported by Tanveer (2007) who states that the use of modern language teaching approaches in the language classrooms and the wide-spread use of English language have increased the demand to learn good communication skills.

The importance of English cannot be denied and ignored. English has been playing a major role in many sectors. There are some reasons behind the importance of learning English. The first, students will be able to find a high-quality job. In business life, the most important common language is obviously English. The second, learners will be able to communicate with the international world. The last is, learners will have a great ability to access information all over the world.

Since 2006, Indonesia has implemented school-based curriculum which accommodates the actual needs and condition of the school. This curriculum provides spaces to include the local need as well as the national standard as developed by the department of national education. Among a list of subjects English is considered as one of the most important subjects.

English has been labeled as an important subject to learn because the language is a pathway to achieve era globalization's requirements to be competent and skillful. According to Mardapi as cited by Dewi (2006:1), the learners can be said competent and skillful if they have good competency which covered knowledge, skill and attitude. Mardapi as cited by Dewi (2006:1) states that competency that should be possessed by the students in learning English is stated in standard competency. Speaking competency is one of those skills used by students in every class and will be continued throughout their life. The speaking competency is developed by giving opportunities to the students to participate and practice their ability in speaking class.

Realizing the importance of speaking, this study then concerns on speaking skill. The researcher chose speaking to be the focus of the research that needs urgent attention and worth to be examined because nowadays, along with the strengthening position of English as a language for international communication, teaching speaking skill has become increasingly important. The teaching of speaking skill is also important due to the large number of students who want to study English in order to be able to use English for communicative purposes. Speaking is the most important aspect of language teaching that should be mastered by the students. This reason is stated by considering the main function of language that is for doing communication. It is also supported by Richard and Renandyas (2002) in their public speaking which state that a large percentage of the worlds language learners study English in order to develop proficiency in speaking. Richard and Renandyas (2002) consider speaking ability as the measurement of knowing students' fluency. They define fluency as the ability to converse with others much more than the ability to read, write or comprehend oral language. Moreover, according to Richard and Renandyas (2002) speaking is one of the most important skills that should be mastered by the students because by mastering this skill the students can communicate to the world. Cutting (2000) states that speaking can also be used as a means of revealing speakers' personality, attitude, nationality and religion.

Generally, teachers taught speaking by having students repeated sentences and recited to memorized textbook dialogues. The students supposedly learned to speak by practicing grammatical structures and then later using them in conversation. The teacher usually uses audio-lingual repetition drills in speaking class (Bailey in Nunan, 2003: 49). According to Bailey in Nunan (2003: 54), teaching speaking should be done communicatively. The teacher has to maintain interactions with the students as well as the interaction between each student in the classroom. According to Bailey in Nunan (2003:54), there are several principles for teaching speaking. The principles that must be applied are: the first, being aware of the differences between second language and foreign language learning contexts. The second, giving students practice both fluency and accuracy. The third, providing opportunities for students to talk by using group work or pair work, and limiting teacher talk. The fourth principle is the teacher plans speaking tasks that involves negotiation for meaning. The last principle is the teacher designs classroom activities that involve guidance and practice in both transactional and interactional speaking.

Based on the observation which was started on Wednesday, 2nd January 2013 to Tuesday 8th January 2013 in SMP N 3 Singaraja especially in grade VII, the researcher found that the principles of teaching speaking did not well developed. It made students had difficulties and problems in speaking class. There were several examples of speaking problems which were encountered by the students. Mispronunciation, lack of vocabulary, inappropriate used stress and intonation, and lack ability of expressing the content of text are examples of students' problems in speaking. Chintya (2011) in her research found that students of junior high school had a great number of errors when speaking. The errors included pronunciation, grammatical accuracy, tenses, vocabulary, fluency and interactive

communication. Similarly, Setiawati (2009) in her study reported that students had difficulties in using grammar and in applying new vocabulary items in speaking class. The previous problems occurred because of different learners' cognitive ability, the background knowledge and speaking strategies. While Beebe and Beebe (2003:104) state that students need cognitive ability, good background of knowledge and appropriate speaking strategies in order to be capable in understanding the content of speaking, then performing it fluently and accurately.

On the first meeting after observation session, the researcher interviewed about thirty students informally about their teacher's strategy in teaching speaking. Previously, the teacher used material in the students' worksheet only in teaching students in speaking class. The teacher only focused on the book and discussed the material in the book. After that, the teacher asked students to answer the questions in the text book orally. Generally, this strategy is commonly used to teach reading but when the researcher asked for the teacher's clarification, the teacher explained that she used that way to teach speaking also. She emphasized on the session of question and answer. Beside that, the teacher asked students to write their idea and memorize it then perform it in front of the class orally. This strategy made students bored and did not have adequate opportunity to speak well. This conventional strategy was less effective and efficient which then made students had lack of chances to practice their speaking in the classroom.

Another problem that caused the students bored in learning English was the way how the teacher teaches and explains the topic and learning material. The teacher should choose and develop learning material selectively based on students' need.   English teachers said that the students would be active in the classroom if the topic of the learning material was interesting for them. This fact makes the teacher needs to use certain innovative strategy to teach learning material as interesting as possible.

Based on the result of the observation that was done on Wednesday 2nd to Tuesday 8th January 2013, the researcher thought that different teaching strategies in teaching speaking based on text types were suitable to be introduced to the teacher in order to give variation in the teaching and learning process.

Text type is one of important aspects which contributes to learning outcomes. It is in fact as important as teaching learning to support students' comprehension. Sutarsa (2011) found that the students seemed to be more enthusiastic and interested in the learning process when they were taught with comprehensible text. Cooper (2000) states that text refers to stories, information texts, magazines, newspaper, brochures, maps, stories and any other materials which are able to be read. Based on the form, texts are divided into description, exposition, argumentation, and narration. Meanwhile, the text styles maybe specified in terms of formality and the purpose of the texts. Based on the generic structures and language feature dominantly used, texts are divided into several types. They are narrative, recount, descriptive, report, analytical exposition, hortatory exposition, procedure, explanation, discussion, news item, spoof and anecdote. Based on the curriculum in the junior high school especially for the seventh grade students, there are two main texts that should be learned by the students. The texts which were used in this grade were descriptive and procedure.

Descriptive and procedure text have similar characteristics. These genres are similar in the case of length, language features, and both of them are taught through grouping. Descriptive text is a verbal picture of person, place or object Wilhelm (2012:8). Descriptive text has a social function to describe someone, something or places as clear as possible. Descriptive is not only describing person, but also describing place, animal, thing and any subject that can be described. According to Wilhelm (2012), there are several considerations that should be paid attention in describing place, person or things. In describing place or thing, the learners should consider the location of the

objects in the room which should be clear and the details should be arranged logically and systematically so that the readers would be easier to visualize it in his or her mind. While, in describing person, the learners should consider a person's appearance, clothes, manner of speaking, color and style, facial appearance, body shape and expression. The most logical way to organize descriptive detailed is in spatial order that was arranged in space from top bottom or left to the right. Even a description that involved people or animals establish the setting of full scene and which is presented in spatial order.

Gatzke (2003) states that procedure is a text that shown a process which has a social function to describe how something is completely done through a sequence of series. He also states that procedure text has three major generic structures namely; goal, material and steps. Goal means the aim of the activity; materials or the ingredients is tool or equipments that can be used in the activity and the steps are the process of the activity. Procedure text has similar language features with descriptive text. The language features of procedure are temporal conjunction, using action verb, imperative sentence and simple present tense. Generally, the examples of procedure text are related to the recipes, rules for games, science experiments, road safety rules and how to do it manualy.

By considering the problems that were mentioned previously, the researcher thought that it is very important to conduct an experimental research that investigates the effect of two new strategies in EFL (English as a Foreign Language) teaching. Then they were compared and discussed in conjunction with the text types and students' speaking competency. The strategies would be used in teaching both of descriptive and procedure texts. The strategies were "Speaking Random Club" and "Panauricon". These teaching strategies needed to be experimented because they had important roles in speaking competency. These strategies had the same characteristics in its implementation. These strategies were types of cooperative learning. Beside that, these strategies were not implemented yet in this school before, so this phenomenon made the researcher eager to conduct the research by using these strategies and compared them.

"Speaking Random Club" was used for descriptive and procedure texts and "Panauricon" was also used for teaching both text types. These techniques have their own strengths. Speaking Random Club was similar with group work. The difference of this technique and group work was in the form of the grouping management. The students were divided by the teacher into several clubs. The members of each club were decided by the teacher. It was fair because the teacher divided the students by considering students' ability in speaking. So, there were students who had more capability in speaking and those who had less capability in speaking in each group. Through this strategy, the students who were passive would be helped by their members. The activity of learning was monitored by the teacher, so all the members had a chance to participate in the classroom activity. This technique also did not spend much time, so it would be more effective. Speaking Random Club technique was first used by Flynn in 2007. He stated that this technique improved his students' ability in debating class. Then, Douglas in 2007 also conducted this research in his study. Douglas in 2007 stated that this technique is an effective strategy that can be used in speaking. Based on their research findings, it can be explicitly found that the Speaking Random Club has several advantages. The first advantage is the students work with different people in their group; it makes the students get different knowledge and experiences in their discussion. The second benefit of this technique is the students do not spend much time to select their friends, because the members of each group are already selected by the teacher randomly.

Panauricon was a group work, but it was different from another group work. Panauricon is a technique that is implemented through dividing a class into two circles. There were an outside circle and an inside circle. Each student who stood up in the outside circle had a partner in the inside circle. They faced each other

and had more chance to speak with different partner, because they moved to the next partner until all the students spoke to all the members in the both circles. This technique helped the students to communicate each other and learned from their partners. They had chances to speak as much as possible but still related to the topic. This technique was effective being used in this research.

There were some researchers who conducted their study by using Panauricon technique. This technique was first used by Kelen in 2006. Kelen found that panauricon was effective to be applied in school whose students had diverse cultural background. Second, Mila (2008) conducted a classroom action based research using Panauricon technique toward second grade students in SMPN 1 Gerokgak in the academic year 2007/2008. The result showed that the implementation of Panauricon technique was effective to improve the students' speaking ability in five aspects; pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension. Third, a comparative study between the implementation of Panauricon technique and storytelling technique assisted with series of picture (STSP) toward the development of students pragmatic competency was also conducted by Adnyani (2009). The result of the study showed that there was a significant difference of students' pragmatic competency between those who were taught through Panauricon technique and those who were taught through STSP. Those different strategies had different strength and were able to help students in speaking ability. So, the researcher wanted to investigate their effectiveness based on text types. The researcher expected by comparing these different teaching strategies, the effective and appropriate strategy could be found that could be used to teach descriptive and procedure texts.

Considering the explanation previously, the researcher believed that these techniques which were combined with text types need to be introduced on students' speaking competency. So, this research was done as a comparative study which had a title "A Comparative Study of Different Teaching Strategies (Speaking Random Club and Panauricon) based on Text Types on Students' Speaking Competency in SMP N 3 Singaraja which covered four research objectives namely; discovering whether there is a significant difference in speaking ability between those students who are taught by using Speaking Random Club and those who are taught by using Panauricon technique, discovering whether there is an interactional effect between teaching strategies and text types upon students' speaking competency, discovering whether there is a significant difference in speaking competency about descriptive text between students who are taught using Speaking Random Club and those who are taught by using Panauricon and discovering whether there is a significant difference in speaking competency about procedure text between students who are taught by using Speaking Random Club and those who are taught by using Panauricon.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

According to Levine *et al.* (1999:166) population is the totality of the item or things under consideration. In addition, Wiersma (1986:177) defines population as the totality of all elements, subjects, or members that possess a specified set of one or more characteristics. Based on those definitions, the population upon this study structured the students who were in the seventh grade of SMP N 3 Singaraja.

Fraenkel and Wallen (1993:79) also state that a sample is a group in a research study on which information is obtained. Levine *et al.* (1999:168) also state that a sample is the portion of the population that is selected for analysis. It is in line with Wiersma's idea of sample (1986:177) that is defined as a subset of the population under study. According to Fraenkel and Wallen (1993) sampling referred to the process of selecting a sample. Based on the definition above, the samples of this research were the seventh grade student of class VII D and VII I. The total number of students who were treated as sample was sixty pupils.

During sample selection, this study used multistage random sampling

technique which covered four steps. The first step is selecting one school as a place of conducting the research. The second step is selecting certain grade as a population. After that, selecting randomly two classes to get two groups as the samples of study and administering homogeneity and normality test to both classes (if the two groups are normal and homogeneous, these groups can be treated as samples of study).

Fraenkel and Wallen (1993:44) state that a variable is one of the most important concepts in research. They define a variable as a concept - a noun that stands for variation within a class of objects, such as chair, gender, eye color, achievement, motivation, or running speed. Besides, Wiersma (1986:23) also states that a variable is a characteristic that takes on different values or condition for different individuals.

There were three kinds of variable in this study. They were independent, dependent and moderator variable respectively. Fraenkel and Wallen (1993: 49) say that an independent variable is the treatment or manipulated variable referred to previously, whilst a dependent variable is the variable that is presumed to affect. So, the independent variables in this study were Speaking Random Club and Panauricon technique, whilst dependent variable in this research was students' speaking competency and moderator variable in this research was text types.

The design of this study was a quasi experimental design. This study used post test only comparison group. The result of data in this research was analyzed by using Anova. There were several procedures which should be done in doing this research. The researcher did the following steps; deciding the population and the samples, designing and trying out the instrument, collecting the data, processing the obtained data and drawing conclusion from the analyzed data.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

It has been stated previously that this study intended to discover whether or not there was significant difference in speaking competency between those students taught by using Speaking Random Club and those students taught by using Panauricon technique. This study also intended to discover whether or not there was interactional effect between teaching strategies and text types upon students' speaking competency, this study also intended to investigate whether or not there was significant difference in speaking competency about description between students who were taught using Speaking Random Club and Panauricon, there was significant difference in speaking competency about procedure between students who were taught using Speaking Random Club and Panauricon. The data collection was conducted in SMP N 3 Singaraja, in two classes of grade seven. The classes were chosen as the samples of this study through multi stage random sampling.

The result of the test for homogeneity of variance shows that probability value based on the mean is 0.076, whilst the probability value based on the median is 0.075. The data also shows that the probability value based on the median and with adjusted df is 0.76 and probability value based on the trimmed mean is 0.077. Considering the results of Levene's statistics, it is seen that all probability values are >0.05. So, the researcher concludes that the samples of the data had homogenous variance. The scores of the statistical value of Kolmogorov-Smirnov on homogeneity test is 0.154 for group A (class D) with a probability (sig) of 0.192; and 0.147 for group B (class I) with probability (sig) of 0.477. The data can be said normal if the value of probability (sig) > 0.05 (more than 0.05). Because the values of both two classes were > 0.05; the data based on Kolmogorov-Smirnov were normally distributed.

To prove whether there was significant difference between two teaching strategies, two way Anova was applied by SPSS 16. The data shows that the significant value is 0.04, which lower than 0.05. This fact means that the difference between two teaching strategies was significant. Therefore, null hypothesis was rejected. It can be concluded that there is a

significant difference between two teaching strategies on students' speaking competency. In other words, it can be said that there is a significant difference between students' speaking competency taught by using Speaking Random Club and those who were taught by using Panauricon technique. To prove whether or not there was interactional effect between teaching strategies and text types upon students' speaking competency, the ANOVA SPSS 16.00 was used. The result of the analysis mentioned that there is no interaction between two teaching strategies based on text types upon students' speaking competency. Since there is no interactional effect between two teaching strategies based on the text types on students' speaking competency, therefore the third and the fourth hypothesis do not need to be tested.

DISCUSSION

This research concerned on speaking competency of the seventh grade students who were taught using Speaking Random Club and Panauricon technique based on the text types. The sample groups gained different mean scores.

For the descriptive text that was treated by using Speaking Random Club and Panauricon, it was discovered that the mean scores of the students who were taught by using Speaking Random Club was 71.63 while those who were taught by using Panauricon was 73.96. It indicates that the students taught by using Panauricon technique performed better than those who were taught by using Speaking Random Club. It was because Panauricon technique gave more chances to students in practicing the conversation, so the students were able to enrich their vocabularies, pronunciation and fluency in speaking. Those advantages were caused by the powerful activities which were done by the students. The students made two circles in the centre of the classroom. The students who were in the inside circle must have a partner with the students who were in the outside circle. Then, they started to do conversation by showing different photos or pictures to their partners. After each student got their turn to do the conversation, she or he moved to another partner and did the same action. These activities would finish if all students got their turn to speak. They got more chances to practice their speaking and know more about the variation of vocabularies. These activities were different from Speaking Random Club. The students who were treated by using Speaking Random Club were divided into six groups. Each group consisted of five students. The students discussed with their members only. They practiced speaking with their members in each group. As a result, they had a few variation of vocabularies compared with the students who were treated by Panauricon in which they practiced speaking with all students in the classroom. So, through Panauricon the students performed better than those who were treated by using Speaking Random Club based on descriptive text. This finding was supported by the previous research that was done by Kelen (2006). Kelen states that through Panauricon, the teacher is able to create an active classroom in which physical movement is associated with fun practice and fun movement which were associated with learning. Mila (2008) also agreed that Panauricon technique was effectively used for teaching speaking. She conducted a classroom action based research using Panauricon technique. The result showed that the implementation of Panauricon technique was effective to improve the students' speaking ability in five aspects; pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension.

For the procedure text that was treated by using Speaking Random Club and Panauricon it was discovered that the mean score of the students who were taught by using Speaking Random Club was 76.80 while those who were taught by using Panauricon was 74.93. It means that the students who were taught by using Speaking Random Club for the procedure text performed better than those who were taught by using Panauricon. The Speaking Random Club technique consisted of more than four students in a group, so they were able to improve and communicate well by using gestures and expression with their members. This result was approved by

Flynn (2007) and Douglas's (2007) findings. They agreed that Speaking Random Club was suitable to be used for teaching speaking.

Students who were taught by using Speaking Random Club had lower mean scores compared with those who taught by using Panauricon for descriptive text. It indicated that Speaking Random Club was less effective to be used on students' speaking competency for descriptive text. There were some factors that caused Panauricon was more effective. The first, students had more chance to practice their speaking and got lot of different vocabularies compared with Speaking Random Club. Students who were taught by using Speaking Random Club had less chance to practice their speaking because they spoke and discussed the topic with their group only. They did not have chance to know and learn different vocabularies from others. It caused them had less chance to practice, learn and revise their vocabularies, diction and pronunciation on their speaking.

Whilst, students who were taught by using Speaking Random Club got higher mean score than those who were taught by using Panauricon. It indicates that students who were treated by using Speaking Random Club performed better that those who were taught by using Panauricon. Through Speaking Random Club, students were able to improve their speaking and share ideas effectively and efficiently. This technique was not spending much time. Finally, from all findings and the discussion which were discussed previously, it can be concluded that there was a significant difference between two teaching strategies upon students' speaking competency. It was found also there was no interactional effect between two teaching strategies based on text types upon students' speaking competency. This finding indicates that the third and the fourth hypothesis do not need to be further tested.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS
The data were gained by implementing the techniques based on the text types during the research. Generally both techniques were appropriately used in teaching speaking. Based on the mean scores gained by both classes, it could be stated that students who were taught through Panauricon performed better than those who were taught by using Speaking Random Club in descriptive text, meanwhile those students who were taught by using Speaking Random Club performed better than those who were taught by using Panauricon for procedure text. It was proven by the result of the hypotheses which explained there was significant difference between those students who were taught by using Speaking Random Club and those who were treated through Panauricon. However, there was no interactional effect between the strategies based on the text types on students' speaking competency, even though there were slight difference in terms of the scores which indicated that students taught using Speaking Random Club had higher scores for procedure text and Panauricon got higher points for descriptive text.

Even though these findings did not claim that one technique is worse than another one, there is a tendency that the speaking Random Club was appropriately used for teaching procedure text. It was caused by the total of group member in this technique which was more than four students, so the students were able to discuss and share their opinion and extend their topic with their group. Most of students who were taught through Speaking Random Club got higher points compared with those who were treated by using Panauricon. It was proven by the different points that were gained by the students in three major aspects of speaking assessment rubric. These aspects were (1) pronunciation which consisted of accent, clarity and intonation. (2) fluency which consisted of fluency, speed and repetition. (3) improvisation which consisted of expression, gestures and communication. The result showed that there is also a tendency that Speaking Random Club was more effectively used to teach procedure compared with Panauricon technique. While, the Panauricon technique was more suitable used for teaching descriptive text. Based on the previous findings and discussion, it can be concluded that: there

was a significant difference between two teaching strategies (Speaking Random Club and Panauricon) on students' speaking competency but there was no interactional effect between two teaching strategies based on the text types on students' speaking competency.

SUGGESTIONS

This research was done as a comparative study of two different teaching techniques based on text types upon students' speaking competency. There were some suggestions which can be forwarded to the teachers, students and other researchers. Teachers are suggested to use these teaching strategies to make a variation in teaching and learning process. Then, teachers are recommended to design and develop teaching material as interesting as possible. Next, teachers must be aware with the situation in the classroom and students' needs. This research will be beneficial also for other researchers who would like to use this result of study as a review or reference. They must be creative and selective in selecting the good points of this thesis, then using it as an empirical review. The researcher also suggests students in order to practice speaking diligently.

This research can also give implication toward the education field. The result of study can give useful contribution in creating innovative and effective strategy in the teaching and learning process. Through the findings in this research, the English teachers get inspiration to enrich their strategy in teaching English, especially in teaching speaking.

REFERENCES

Adnyani, Desak Putu Deni Putri. 2009. A Comparative Study on the Development of Speaking Students' Pragmatic Competence Taught through Panauricon Technique and Storytelling and Assisted with Series of Pictures (an Experimental Study). Unpublished thesis: Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha

Beebe, Steven A and Beebe Susan J. 2003. *Public Speaking an Audience-Centered Approach. Fifth edition.* United States of America

Baker, Joanna and Heather Westrup. 2003. *Essential Speaking Skills: A Handbook for English Language Teachers.* London: MPG Books Ltd.

Cutting,Joan. 2000. *The Grammar of Spoken English and EAP Teaching.* Great Britain:University of Sunderland press.

Chintya, Putu Ayu Armayu. 2011. Developing Speaking Instruction Strategies for Big Classes of Grade 9 at SMP N 1 Pekutatan. Unpublished thesis: Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha.

Cooper, David. J. 2000. *Helping Children Construct Meaning.* New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Dewi, Ida Ayu Putu Widya. 2006. The Effect of Intensive Dialogue on the First Year Students' Speaking Competency of SMA Negeri 3 Singaraja. Unpublished thesis: Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha.

Douglas, Frederick. 2007. *Group Work in Speaking Class.* http://www.webenglishteacher.com/douglass.html. (Downloaded on July, 25th 2012)

Flynn, Leontia. 2007. *Group Work in Speaking.* http://edinburgh-review.com/extracts/article-leontia-flynn/ (Downloaded on July, 25th 2012)

Fraenkel, J.R. and Wallen, N.E. 1993. *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education.* Singapore: Mc. Graw Hill Inc

Gatzke, Mz. 2003. *Procedure text.* http://alzeinsi.blogspot.com/2011/06/what-is-procedure-text.html (Downloaded on October, 10th 2012)

Hanner, Jeffrey C., Sokolof, Martin A. and Salisch, Sandra L. 2002. *Speaking Clearly, Improving Voice and Diction. Sixth edition.* New York: Mc. Graw.Hill

Kelen, Christopher. 2006. *Perpetual Motion: Keeping the Language Classroom Moving.* Retrieved on July, 12th 2012

in http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Kelen-PerpetualMotion.html

Levine, A., Ferenz, o., Reves, T. 2000. EFL Academic Reading and Modern Technology: How Can We Turn Our Students into Independent Critical Readers? TESL-EJ. Volume 4, Number 4.

Mila, P.A. Indra. 2008. Improving the Students' Speaking Ability through the Use of Panauricon Technique to the Second Grade of Students of SMP N 1 Gerokgak in the Academic Year of 2007.2008. Unpublished Research. Singaraja: Undiksha.

Nunan, David. 2003. *Practical English Language Teaching.* New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc

Richard & Renadyas. 2002. *Speaking English.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon

Setiawati, Ni Ketut Indah. 2009. The Implementation of The Silent Way Method in Improving Students' Speaking Ability of Second Year Students of Language program in SMA 5 Denpasar in the Academic Year 2007/2008. Unpublished thesis: Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha

Tanveer, Muhammad. 2007. Investigation of the Factors that Cause Language Anxiety for ESL/EFL Learners in Learning Speaking Skills and the Influence It Casts on Communication in the Target Language. Published Dissertation. University of Glasgow.

Tomlinson, Brian. 2010. *Materials Development in Language Teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wiersma, W. 1986. *Research Methods in Education: An Introduction 4th Edition.* Toronto: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.

Wilhelm, Jeff. 2012. Understanding Reading Comprehension. http://www.scholastic.com/teachers/article//understandingreadingcomprehension. (Downloaded on November, 5th 2012)