INNOVATIVE: Journal Of Social Science Research
Volume 4 Nomor 3 Tahun 2024 Page 5438-5451
E-ISSN 2807-4238 and P-ISSN 2807-4246
Website: https://j-innovative.org/index.php/Innovative

The Effect of Instructional Conversation Method to Improve English Speaking Skills in The Tenth Grade Science One at Global Madani Senior High School Bandar Lampung

Afrizal Hidayatullah[1✉], Dameria Magdalena Sidabalok[2]
University of Bandar Lampung
Email: afrizalhidayatullah2104@gmail.com[1✉]

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui apakah terdapat pengaruh yang signifikan penggunaan Metode Percakapan Instruksional terhadap peningkatan keterampilan berbicara siswa. Dalam penelitian ini saya menggunakan penelitian kuantitatif, Desain penelitian ini akan dilakukan dengan menggunakan desain quasi eksperimen, khususnya desain non-equivalent control group design. Metodologi penelitian ini menggunakan dua desain kelompok yaitu kelas eksperimen dan kelas kontrol dengan perlakuan yang dilakukan setiap kelas satu kali pre-test, tiga kali treatment, dan satu kali post-test. Desain ini menggunakan pre-test untuk mengetahui kemampuan siswa sebelum diberikan treatment. Dan post test untuk melihat hasilnya setelah diberikan treatment. Populasi penelitian ini adalah siswa kelas X IPA Satu di SMA Global Madani Bandar Lampung. Dari hasil analisis data diketahui hasil keterampilan berbicara siswa dengan Metode Instruksional Percakapan. Dibuktikan dengan skor siswa pada hasil posttest kelompok eksperimen menunjukkan signifikansi pada hasil 0,000 [0,000<0,050]. Dengan selisih hasil skor kelas eksperimen adalah (Mean: 12.3333) sedangkan kelas kontrol memperoleh skor adalah (Mean: 4.5789). Maka dapat disimpulkan (H1) dapat diterima. Sedangkan (H0) tidak dapat diterima. Dengan kata lain dari penelitian ini. Diketahui bahwa Metode Percakapan Instruksional dapat meningkatkan keterampilan berbicara siswa.

Kata Kunci: *Metode Percakapan Instruksional, Keterampilan Berbicara Bahasa Inggris, Penelitian Kuantatif*

Copyright @ Afrizal Hidayatullah, Dameria Magdalena Sidabalok

Abstract

This study aims to determine whether there is a significant effect of using the Instructional Conversational Method on improving students' speaking skills. In this study I used quantitative research, The design of this study will be carried out using a quasi-experimental design, specifically the non-equivalent control group design. This research methodology used two group designs, namely the experimental class and the control class with the treatment carried out for each class once pre-test, three times treatment, and one time post-test. This design used a pre-test to determine students' abilities before being given treatment. And post-test to see the results after being given treatment. The population of this study is The Tenth Grade Science One at Global Madani Senior High School Bandar Lampung. From the results of data analysis it is known that the results of students' speaking skills with the Instructional Conversational Method. Evidenced by the students' scores on the posttest results of the experimental group showed a significan in results 0,000 [0.000<0.050]. With the difference in the results of the experimental class score was (Mean: 12.3333) while the control class got a score was(Mean: 4.5789). So it can be concluded (H1) can be accepted. Meanwhile (H0) is unacceptable. In other words from this research. It is known that the Instructional Conversational Method can improve students' speaking skills.

Keywords: *Instructional Conversation Method, English Speaking Skills, Quantative Research*

INTRODUCTION

General discussion of this research is discussed in this chapter. This chapter explains about the research background, questions of research, objectives of research, as well as the scope and limitations of this research. The research background is to discuss the topic of this research, why this topic is important to research. In the research problems in this chapter, there are questions that guide this research. The purpose of this study discusses the expected results. Scope and limitation is the section on the general description and brief of the research.

According to Rao (2018) stated that in the process of learning a language, the main goal of the learner is to acquire four language skills, namely listening, speaking, reading and writing. Therefore, as language learners we must make these four skills, as the achievement of the results of language learning. The most important thing is that language students must be able to master speaking skills in a particular language.

Speaking is one of the important skills for students learning English as a foreign language. Rao (2019) stated that Speaking skills are the most important skills to acquire in speaking a foreign language or learning a second language. Based on that statement, Learners must be able to prioritize speaking skills in learning a foreign language or second language other than their mother tongue.

Copyright @ Afrizal Hidayatullah, Dameria Magdalena Sidabalok

English as a foreign language for students who study it, they must be able to master the four skills that have been mentioned. what is most prioritized for students of English is speaking skills, because these skills are very necessary in socializing using that language. English students must be able to improve vocabulary in order to speak well.

Several senior high schools in Indonesia, especially at a school in this study used The 13 curriculum (K13) for English lesson. The four skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) mentioned earlier are also the main objectives of learning in this curriculum. Speaking skill is one of important result obtained by students of English in this curriculum. Luoma cited in Taslim, Asrifan, Chen & Nurdania (2019) mentioned that speaking skill is an important part of the curriculum in language teaching, and this makes for them an important object and also about good apprasial.

Various learning methods to improve sudents' English Speaking skills have probably been tried by many teachers at school. One of the reasons the teacher wants to improve students' English speaking skills maybe the teacher has seen that their students are more passive or silent, especially in practicing speaking English. Regarding speaking English, of course there is one method that can be used to improve English speaking skills.

According to Goldenberg (1991) stated Instructional Conversation Method (ICM) is a discussion-based learning method directed at creating opportunities for contextual development and language learning of students. With this Instructional Conversation method, it is expected to be able to build broad student knowledge and understanding. For example by building cooperation between students, building thoughts about knowledge and experience gained from interactions in the environment, and developing new understandings from previous understandings in conversations that will be discussed by students and the teacher instructs them. Students are also expected to be able to develop their ideas and want to improve themselves in speaking English.

One of the main characteristics of Instructional Conversation Method (ICM) is ensuring that students play an important role in the construction of new knowledge about understanding the environment. Teachers provide guidance to students in the process of acquiring knowledge by encouraging them to express their own ideas with correct answers for better performance. The instructional conversation method in English skills also aims to achieve educational goals, specifically to produce graduates with good English qualifications.

The interesting about this conversation method is that the teacher gives instructions to students in understanding something that they want to talk about, and students are required to think critically and talk to each other continuously and according to the facts

Copyright @ Afrizal Hidayatullah, Dameria Magdalena Sidabalok

that are happening. Not only that, with this method, the teacher can join in the conversation, ask questions about the conversation being discussed, and can also ask how basic things the student's opinion is expressed like that. This conversation method is very useful for students who are passive or silent when learning in terms of speaking is aimed at students. With this method many of them received the opportunity to speak and express opinions orally. this method also increases the skills and knowledge of students.

For this reason, this study wants to examine the process of improving students' speaking English method skills through this method, namely the instructional conversation method. In addition, the learning method also aims to provide opportunities for language development. Based on the things mentioned earlier, a researcher argues that the use of these learning methods in the teaching and learning process of English helps teachers to overcome students in learning English, especially in speaking. Therefore, a researcher chose "The Effect of Instructional Conversational Method to Improve English Speaking Skills in The Tenth Grade Science One at Global Madani Senior High School Bandar Lampung" as the title of this study.

RESEARCH METHOD

According to Creswell (2014) stated that Research designs are plans and procedures for research that cover decisions from broad assumptions to detailed data collection and analysis methods. The design of this study will be carried out using a quasi-experimental design, specifically the non-equivalent control group design. Sugiyono(2012) stated that the non-equivalent control group design is almost the same as the pretest-posttest control group design, only in this design the experimental group and the control group are not randomly selected. In this design, both the experimental and control groups are compared, even though the groups are selected and assigned without randomization. This method used purposive sampling to select samples . There are two classes in this method: experimental class and control class. In the experimental class, learning is carried out with treatment using the instructional conversation method, beforehand a pretest will be given and a posttest will be given after the treatment is carried out for the experimental class. Different with the control class, this class does not use treatment like the experimental class, but in this class only gets a pre-test and post-test. Therefore, this method is suitable for use in research because it can explain whether the Instructional Conversational Method is effective or not.

Experimental Group = A : (01 ---- (X) ---- 02)

Copyright @ Afrizal Hidayatullah, Dameria Magdalena Sidabalok

Control Group = B : (03 ---------- 04)

Where :

A 01 = pre-test for experimental group

A 02 = post-test for experimental group

B 03 = pre-test for control group

B 04 = post-test for control group

X = treatment

Population And Sample

Population is the total number of objects that must be observed in this research. The researcher concluded that the population was from the tenth grade science at Global Madani Senior High School Bandar Lampung, with a total of 56 students in the 2022/2023 academic years.

The tenth grade science one has a total of 18 students, and has a total the tenth grade science three of 19 students. Sampling technique is taken with reason: a quasi-experimental design requires two classes, in class selection is done by discussing with the English teacher at school, and the number of samples is sufficient with a total of 37 students. This class competition is also subject to the tenth science class average value. Where, the tenth grade science one and also science three have a smaller average value than grade ten science two. In this design, both the experimental and control groups are compared, even though the groups are selected and assigned without randomization. For this reason, it is hoped that it can improve speaking skills, especially in tenth grade science one and tenth science three.

Variable and Instrument

There are two variables consist in this research. The first variable as independent variable and the second variable as dependent variable. The independent variable is Instructional Conversation Method, and the dependent variable is student's English speaking skills.

In this research using a pre-test at the first meeting, and a post-test at the last meeting. This is used to measure or to determine the score of students' English speaking skills. The instruments used in this study were a speaking test.

Research Procedure

In this study, this researcher focuses on the application of the Instructional Conversation Method which is focused on students' speaking skills, and data collection is carried out by means of tests (pre-test and post-test) that are adapted to the learning

Copyright @ Afrizal Hidayatullah, Dameria Magdalena Sidabalok

material being taught. Because this study used the Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design, the pre-test was carried out in two selected classes. The initial test is adjusted to the material used in school.

1. Pre-test

Before carrying out the treatment, the researcher gave a pre-test to two classes. The researcher asked students to talk about the topic of their spiritual experience in front of the class for a maximum of 5 minutes using the minimum number of words needed. After being given a pre-test, then the experimental class was given treatment. The treatment used is Instructional Conversation Method (ICM) Based Learning, where students will provide conversational learning using the Instructional Conversation Method based, while the control class is taught with non-Instructional Conversation Method based conversation learning (students only learn ordinary conversation). The conversation project is presented in front of the class. After that, a post-test will be conducted on students from both classes, who will be scored.

2. Post-test

After doing the treatment, students are given a post-test. experimental and control classes, which were given the same test in the pre-test to find out the increase in students' speaking ability. The post-test runs at 5 minutes. After conducting the pre-test and post-test assessments, the researcher will perform data analysis of the value obtained.

Data Analysis

The data obtained from the primary evaluation test results is processed using Instructional Conversation Method. Data interpretation included various types of analysis, including : descriptive statistics, independent t test, paired t test, and difference test.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

The pre-test is given for the experimental class and the control class. To measure speaking ability, by doing the same pre-test to the two classes. The purpose of the pre-test is to determine the level of students' speaking ability well at the beginning before being given treatment.

After doing the pre-test, I carried out the experimental treatment of the instructional conversation method in the experimental class, while in the control class I used a different technique, namely conventional learning. I teach an experimental class using the math

Copyright @ Afrizal Hidayatullah, Dameria Magdalena Sidabalok

conversation learning method as one of the lessons to improve students' speaking skills, and teach my control class using the usual teaching method as a conventional method. At the end of the lesson, I gave a post-test for both classes. The post-test was conducted to analyze the extent to which students' speaking skills improved after being given treatment.

The post test was given after students were given different treatments to find out the results of the different treatments. The test instrument used in the post-test is different from the test instrument used in the pre-test. Before calculating the score, I collect data from pre-test and post-test scores.

Scores from the pre-test and post-test then the scores were analyzed using SPSS, after that I made a table to represent the list of students' pre-test and post-test scores.

The list of speaking student' score from experimental class and control class after pre-test and post-test.

Table 1. Students'Score before and after they were given by Conventional Teaching (Control Group)

No.	Subject	Pre-test score	Post-test score
1.	Abdurrahman Dzaky M.	53	53
2.	Ananda Arido Pratama	66	66
3.	Deby Safitri Yusra	60	66
4.	Diannisa Ramadhani	50	53
5.	Firda Aulia	50	56
6.	Galang Septian R.	66	70
7.	Ilham Sabriansyah	46	50
8.	Khadafi Azizi	43	46
9.	Lintang Waranggani	76	86
10.	Muhammad Fadhil N.P.	86	90
11.	Muhammad Rasya A.R.	40	50
12.	Nadif Lintang R.	53	56
13.	Nadiffah Aulia Akhmad	53	66
14.	Nadine Wulan R.	90	96
15.	Nadya Monalicha W.P.	50	56
16.	Nazifah Zahran G.	90	93
17.	Radika Rahmat H.B.S.	36	36
18.	Wira Putro Hartono	43	46
19.	Ammar Nibras	43	46

Copyright @ Afrizal Hidayatullah, Dameria Magdalena Sidabalok

Table 2. Students'Score before and after they were given by The Instructional Conversation Method (Experimental Group)

No.	Subject	Pre-test score	Post-test score
1.	Achmad Rizky A.	80	83
2.	Addriane Jannah T.	96	100
3.	Ahmad Wafa Arkana	36	53
4.	Alfia Nurul Qolbi	46	53
5.	Arkan Fadhil Mulyatama	53	63
6.	Arrizki Rachmanda I.	50	76
7.	Atiqa Aqeela Akbar	66	73
8.	Aulia Diva Risanti	40	63
9.	Aulia Dwi Mahartanto	40	53
10.	Bagas Satria Pratama	36	53
11.	Elsa Claudya Putri	40	66
12.	Gilang Septian R.	40	50
13.	Moch . Sultan Fawaz K	43	50
14.	Muhammad Ronald A.A.	43	63
15.	Naila Izza Amoera	50	66
16.	Nurjihan Rihhadatul A.	63	66
17.	Salwa Marghfiroh	66	66
18.	Subhan Syahrezal	70	83

Desciptive Analysis

Group = Control class

Descriptive Statistics[a]					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pretest	19	36	90	57,58	16,962
Posttest	19	36	96	62,16	17,623
Valid N (listwise)	19				

a. Group = Control class

Group = Experimental class

Descriptive Statistics[a]					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pretest	18	36	96	53,22	16,847
Posttest	18	50	100	65,56	13,492
Valid N (listwise)	18				

Copyright @ Afrizal Hidayatullah, Dameria Magdalena Sidabalok

a. Group = Experimental class

Independent-Samples T Test

Pre- test

Group Statistics					
	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pretest	Control class	19	57,58	16,962	3,891
	Experimental class	18	53,22	16,847	3,971

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Pretest	Equal variances assumed	,007	,932	,783	35	,439	4,357	5,561	-6,932	15,646
	Equal variances not assumed			,784	34,917	,439	4,357	5,560	-6,931	15,645

Post test

Group Statistics					
	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Posttest	Control class	19	62,16	17,623	4,043
	Experimental class	18	65,56	13,492	3,180

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Posttest	Equal variances assumed	2,056	,161	-,656	35	,516	-3,398	5,181	-13,916	7,121
	Equal variances not assumed			-,661	33,560	,513	-3,398	5,144	-13,856	7,061

Paired-Samples T Test

Control Class

Paired Samples Statistics[a]					
		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Posttest	62,16	19	17,623	4,043
	Pretest	57,58	19	16,962	3,891

a. Group = Control class

Copyright @ Afrizal Hidayatullah, Dameria Magdalena Sidabalok

Paired Samples Test[a]

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Posttest - Pretest	4,579	3,469	,796	2,907	6,251	5,753	18	,000

a. Group = Control class

Experimental Class

Paired Samples Statistics[a]					
		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Posttest	65,56	18	13,492	3,180
	Pretest	53,22	18	16,847	3,971

a. Group = Experimental class

Paired Samples Test[a]

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Posttest - Pretest	12,333	8,029	1,893	8,340	16,326	6,517	17	,000

a. Group = Experimental class

Difference

Group Statistics					
	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Difference	Control class	19	4,5789	3,46916	,79588
	Experimental class	18	12,3333	8,02936	1,89254

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower	Upper
difference	Equal variances assumed	13,841	,001	-3,850	35	,000	-7,75439	2,01430	-11,84364	-3,66513
	Equal variances not assumed			-3,777	22,869	,001	-7,75439	2,05308	-12,00284	-3,50593

Discussion

For the control class above, it can be seen that after the pre-test and post-test was given. The total result for pre-test in the control class was with a total of nineteen (N:19) students, with the average score of (Mean: 57,58). The standard deviation of the pre-test was (Std. Deviation: 16.962) and the standard error mean (Std.Error Mean: 3,891) . And the average post-test score was (Mean: 62,16), for the standard deviation of the post-test is (Std. Deviation: 17,623) and the standard error mean is (Std. Error Mean: 4,043). From the

Copyright @ Afrizal Hidayatullah, Dameria Magdalena Sidabalok

results above, it can be seen and compared with the average scores of mean in the pre-test and post-test from the control class, there was an increase. The results of the Paired Sample Test above show an average score was (Mean: 4,579). And also shows the results of a significant control class (Sig (2-tailed): 0,000) with a significant standard below 0,050 (0,000 <0,050). The results of the control class are significant. That way, the control class experienced an increase in comparison from after the pre-test to after the post-test. There was a significant increase after being given conventional teaching treatment or teaching methods commonly used. For The results of The Paired-Sample Statistics for the experimental class above, with the number of students (N: 18). It can be seen and compared the results after the pre-test and after the post-test. For the pre-test, the average score of the experimental class was (Mean: 53,22), the standard deviation was (Std. Deviation: 16,847) and the average standard error was (Std. Error Mean: 3,971). For after the post-test, the average experimental class score was (Mean: 65,56), the standard deviation score was (Std.Deviation: 13,492) and the mean standard error value was (Std. Error Mean: 3,180). it can be seen and compared with the average mean score after the pre-test to the post-test has an increase in value reasults. it has shown the average score was (Mean: 12,333). It also showed significant control class with significant standard results was Sig(2-tailed): 0,000. (0,000<0,050). Which means that the experimental class experienced a very significant increase after being given the instructional conversation method treatment.

Difference analysis was used to see which model improves students' abilities more. The control class and the experimental class both experienced an increase from the pre-test and post-test, with an average score of (Mean: 4.5789) for the control class and (Mean: 12.3333).

CONCLUSION

From the results of the difference in the increase, it can be concluded that the two learning methods from the treatment carried out by researchers to the control class and the experimental class experienced the same increase. However, the most significant increase occurred in the experimental class with the Instructional Converstion Method. With the difference in the results of the experimental class score was (Mean: 12.333) while the control class got a score was (Mean: 4.5789). So it can be concluded (H1) can be accepted. Meanwhile (H0) is unacceptable. with the value of Equal variance assumed and not assumed were sig (2-tailed): 0.000. Which is below 0.005 (0.000 <0.050).

Copyright @ Afrizal Hidayatullah, Dameria Magdalena Sidabalok

REFERENCES

Aidinlou, N. A., & Tabeei, S. (2012). The effect of using instructional conversation Method on Reading Comprehension of Iranian EFL Learners. *International Journal of Modern Education and Computer Science*, *4*(9), 45.

Bsharat, T. R., & Barahmeh, M. Y. (2020). The Influence of Applying Educational Active Drama in Enhancing Speaking Skills in Teaching-Learning English Language: A Theoretical Response. *Technium Soc. Sci. J.*, *14*, 10.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Dakhi, S., & Fitria, T. N. (2019). The principles and the teaching of English vocabulary: A review. *Journal of English teaching*, *5*(1).

Depdikbud. (2004). Petunjuk Pelaksanaan Proses Belajar Mengajar dan Petunjuk Penilaian. Jakarta

Derwing, T. M. (2019). Utopian goals for pronunciation research revisited. *Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching Proceedings*, *10*(1).

Fitriani, D. A., & Apriliaswati, R. (2015). A study on student's English speaking problems in speaking performance. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran Khatulistiwa*, *4*(9).

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). How to desIgn and evaluate research In educatIon (8th ed.). New York: Mc Graw HIll.

Palupi, R., Yulianna, D. A., & Winarsih, S. S. (2021). Analisa Perbandingan Rumus Haversine Dan Rumus Euclidean Berbasis Sistem Informasi Geografis Menggunakan Metode Independent Sample t-Test. *JITU: Journal Informatic Technology And Communication*, *5*(1), 40-47.

Goldenberg, C. N. (1991). *Instructional conversations and their classroom application* (Vol. 2). National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.

Goldsmith, W. (2013). Enhancing classroom conversation for all students. Phi Delta Kappan 94(7),48-52

Hendy, E., & Cuevas, J. (2020). The Effects on Instructional Conversations on English Language Learners. *Georgia Educational Researcher*, *17*(2), 5.

Hughes, A. (2003). Testing for language teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Irawati, D. (2016). Supporting student's English speaking achievement using Video. *IJEFL*, *1*(1), 45-60.

Kurniawan, I., Syafrizal, S., & Fernandita, G. J. (2018). AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS'ENGLISH SPEAKING SKILLS AT COASTAL SCHOOLS OF BENGKULU CITY, INDONESIA. *The*

Copyright @ Afrizal Hidayatullah, Dameria Magdalena Sidabalok

Journal of English Language Studies, *3*(1), 19-31.

Leong, L. M., & Ahmadi, S. M. (2017). AN ANALYSIS OF FACTORS INFLUENCING LEARNERS'ENGLISH SPEAKING SKILL.

Mustakim, M., & Ismail, I. (2018). The influence of English camp in improving speaking skill of English House Course students in Maroangin Kabupaten Enrekang. *Edumaspul: Jurnal Pendidikan*, *2*(2), 61-70.

Namaziandost, E., Nasri, M., & Esfahani, F. R. (2019). Pedagogical efficacy of experience-based learning (EBL) strategies for improving the speaking fluency of upper-intermediate male and female Iranian EFL students. *International Journal of Research in English Education (IJREE)*.

Oyakhirome, A. H., & Orheruata, M. U. (2021). Effect of Instructional Conversation Strategy on Secondary School Student's Academic Performance in Chemistry. *British Journal of Education*, *9*(5), 22-33.

Pamungkas, F. D. (2019). HOW VIDEO DUBBING CAN IMPROVE STUDENTS'SPEAKING PRONUNCIATION. *ETERNAL (English, Teaching, Learning, and Research Journal)*, *5*(1), 41-53.

Widiyanto, Mikha Agus. (2013). *Statistika Terapan. Konsep dan Aplikasi dalam Penelitian Bidang Pendidikan, Psikologi dan Ilmu Sosial Lainnya.* PT Elex Media Komputindo. Jakarta.

Rao, P. (2018). Developing speaking skills in ESL or EFL settings. *International Journal of English Language, Literature and Translation Studies*, *5*(2), 286-293.

Rao, P. S. (2019). The importance of speaking skills in English classrooms. *Alford Council of International English & Literature Journal (ACIELJ)*, *2*(2), 6-18.

Rizqiningsih, S., & Hadi, M. S. (2019). Multiple Intelligences (MI) on Developing Speaking Skills. *English Language in Focus (ELIF)*, *1*(2), 127-136.

Saputra, E. (2020). Improving Reading Comprehension and Speaking Performance of the Eight Graders Using ICM. *Linguists: Journal Of Linguistics and Language Teaching*, *6*(1), 89-100.

Sugiyono. (2021). Metode Penelitian Pendidikan. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Sugiyono, S. (2012). Metode penelitian kuantitatif dan kualitatif dan R&D. *Alfabeta Bandung*.

Sullivan, R. A., & Ojeda Alba, J. (2010). Criteria for EFL course book's vocabulary selection: does it have any practical consequences?. *El Guiniguada*.

Tarigan, K. E., & Stevani, M. (2022). English Teachers' Beliefs in Teaching English Grammar to Improve Students' Speaking Skill. *Journal of English Language and Education*, *7*(1),

Copyright @ Afrizal Hidayatullah, Dameria Magdalena Sidabalok

130-139.

Taslim, T., Asrifan, A., Chen, Y., & Nurdania, N. R. (2019). Correlation Between Student's Vocabulary Mastery And Speaking Skill. *Journal of Advanced English Studies*, *2*(2), 65-76.

Ur, P. (1996). A course in language teaching: Practice and theory. Ernst Klett Sprachen.

Copyright @ Afrizal Hidayatullah, Dameria Magdalena Sidabalok