

**DEVELOPING RECOUNT TEXT WRITING ABILITY BY USING  
STUDENT-GENERATED TEXT OF LANGUAGE  
EXPERIENCE APPROACH (LEA)**

**A RESEARCH ARTICLE**

**BY:**

**NANANG**

**F42111059**



**ENGLISH EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM  
LANGUAGE AND ART EDUCATION DEPARTMENT  
TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION FACULTY  
TANJUNGPURA UNIVERSITY  
PONTIANAK  
2016**

**DEVELOPING RECOUNT TEXT WRITING ABILITY  
BY USING STUDENT-GENERATED TEXT  
OF LANGUAGE EXPERIENCE APPROACH (LEA)**

**Nanang, Iwan Supardi, Endang Susilawati**

The English Education Study Program of The Language and Art Education Department of  
Teacher Training and Education Faculty of Tanjungpura University Pontianak  
Email: nanang.mj77@gmail.com

*Abstrack*

*The objective of this reserach is to study how the student-generated text of Language Experience Approach (LEA) develops recount text writing ability of Year 11 students of SMK PGRI Pontianak in academic year of 2015/2016 in terms of vocabulary, sentence fluency, and ideas. This research is a Classroom Action research. The sample is 18 students of Year 11 of Audio-Visual Technique Class of SMK PGRI Pontianak. The results showed that student-generated text of LEA developed recount text writing ability of the students. Students' mean score is increased from non-proficient performance level to proficient performance level. It is particularly developed vocabulary, sentence fluency, and conceptual creativity in writing. Besides, it also helped in strengthening speaking, listening, and reading skills, as students had to volunteer information verbally or dictate verbal sentences to the teacher, do some extended writing of the dictated account, listen to teacher reading the text, read and comprehend the text, and write a recount text with their own words. Student-generated text (dictated account) of Language Experience Approach (LEA) is hereby seen as an effective strategy to teach not only recount text writing, but also the other 3 skills of English language. To conclude, student-generated text of Language Experience Approach (LEA) is an alternative strategy that can develop students' recount text writing ability in many areas, at the same time strengthen speaking, listening, and reading skills.*

*Key Word: Recount Text, Teaching Writing, Student-Generated Text, Language Experience Approach, Classroom Action Research*

## **INTRODUCTION**

Writing ability has profound importance in English language communication. As one of language productive skills, it holds the key to all kinds of messages recording and knowledge transmission. Somehow the quality of one's writing product determines the progress of their learning, which is why most evaluation is proven in the form of writing. Mainly, when it comes to writing in a foreign language, everything becomes easier said than done, because the accurate

spelling, punctuation, conceptual, vocabulary and grammar mastery are judged very seriously. Moreover, writing a well-organized text must go through some extended stages, including planning, drafting, revising, and editing. Accordingly, EFL student's writing ability has to be well-developed, or else it would be a failure in communication when they are not able to write effectively in the target language.

In senior high school level, students are introduced to several kinds of texts, where

recount text is one of them. Formerly, they read texts written in prepared books. Later, they would be expected to produce texts with their own words. In this process, the teaching and learning can be either intriguing or intricate which depends on what materials and how the way the teacher leads the classroom activities. Interestingly, student-generated text is no less engaging than the prepared one. This student-generated text which is also known as dictated account is used in a teaching approach called Language Experience Approach (LEA).

Based on the informal observation on writing class in SMK PGRI Pontianak, Year 11 students had overabundance of new vocabularies and complex sentence structure from the model of recount text presented in their textbook. As a result, it impressed student negatively that a recount text is difficult and it was stressful for students to get the ideas from the model of the text. Subsequently, students did not enjoy their writing activities because they were bothered with the thoughts of writing as well as the example of text given to them. In the end, the students' writing performances were predominantly low, because they unable to use appropriate words, to construct meaningful sentences and to organize the ideas well. This also indicates that so far the strategies implemented by the teacher were not very contributive to the teaching and learning vocabulary and sentence structure for writing. Students gained very little knowledge of English from the expert-made text.

This situation brought the researcher into an idea of teaching recount text writing by using student-generated text of Language Experience Approach (LEA). According to Cameron (2011:157), Language Experience Approach promotes literacy learning by the combination of reading and writing in order to help students to absorb how a particular language sets meaning in written symbols. It

demonstrates how students-generated text allows for more meaningful and creative learning to support both writing and reading. Particularly writing, students can be actively engaged themselves for creating the text through the use of their own language and experience. As a result, the text may have familiarity of content, vocabulary used and language patterns from which the teacher can have access to student's prior English knowledge and so the teacher can provide them with more advanced input.

In order to address the problem of recount text writing in the target teaching situation, the researcher attempts to use student-generated text of Language Experience Approach (LEA) to develop student's writing ability of recount text. The curriculum for teaching writing to SMK emphasizes on real world tasks, rather than text-based instruction. Students learn to write a personal letter in which the letter includes past activities or experiences to tell as the recount text is written for. The researcher will ensure that the learning based on student-generated text can create less stressful and more enjoyable learning. It will help students to learn at ease and encouraging because they learn from vocabulary and language pattern they already know to a higher level of input from teacher's language and the extension activities. On the whole, it is hoped that the findings of this research can be of much benefits to develop the teaching and learning of English writing skill to senior high school students, particularly the students' writing performance

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

### **Research Design**

This research will be stepped over the following phases: (1) Planning, (2) Acting and observing and (3) Reflecting

### Target Population and Sample

Target population and sample indicates the representative area of research subject. Cresswell (2009:152) identifies a target population as “a group of individuals (or a group of organizations) with some common defining characteristic that the researcher can identify and study.” This research’s target population is a group of Eleventh grade students of SMK PGRI Pontianak. The researcher identifies a number of Year 11 students from *Audio-Visual Technique Department* of SMK PGRI Pontianak to be the sample of this research. Based on the pilot observation, the class consists of 18 students.

### Procedure of Data Collection

Data collection in this research will be performed through the following order of steps: Setting and activating the video camera, Initiating the classroom activities. During the lesson, the researcher records: 1) the students participations in the tally system of recording observation, and 2) classroom activities or events are happening in the descriptive observation schedule. Giving an individual recount text writing activity (testing) and collecting the worksheets. Editing information from descriptive observation schedule by seeing the video camera recording. Writing a field note.

Simultaneously, “throughout the process of data collection, the action researcher analyzes the information gained, draws conclusion, and makes plan for change.” (Spector et al, 2014:165)

### Data Analysis

After the data are completely collected, the next step is to analyze them. “Analytical strategies help the researcher make sense of the data and answer the overarching research

questions.” (Spector et al, 2014:166) there are Two way in Data analysis: Technique for Data Analysis and Tool for Data Analysis. Accordingly, tools for data analysis fall into the following areas: Qualitative data analysis (Observational data) and Quantitative data analysis ( Artifacts data).

### Mean

A mean is the sum of all the scores in a distribution of options divided by the number of scores. The *mean* or average score of student’s writing achievement is given as:

$$\bar{x} = \frac{\sum x}{N}$$

#### Note:

$\bar{x}$  : The mean or average score of student’s writing product

$\Sigma$  : The sum of

$x$  : scores in a distribution

$N$ : The number of writing aspects/ the number of scores

(Modified from Best & Kahn, 2006:359)

Mean formula is used to count the students’ test score. The criterion of minimum achievement is the judgement for student’s writing ability development, where students of eleventh grade is required to achieve at least 75 in every test of English subject.

## RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

### Research Findings

Findings of this research are written as answers to research question of how the student-generated text of Language Experience Approach (LEA) develops students’ recount text writing ability in terms of vocabulary mastery, grammatical creativity, and conceptual creativity (ideas).

## Findings of Cycle 1

**Table 4.4 Result of Cycle 1's Reflection**

Test Result	General Problems	Specific Problems
Average score = 54	Students lacked of vocabulary knowledge	1. Some words are used incorrectly
		2. Some words are spelled incorrectly
Point = 4 ( <i>Capable</i> )	Students' sentences are not fluent	3. Repetition is occurred frequently
		4. Vocabulary is limited (Text is shorter than it should be)
Performance level = <i>Proficient</i>	Idea is not well-generated	1. The writing provides incorrect sentence pattern.
		2. The writing provides a limited sampling of sentence pattern.
		3. Sentence beginnings are not varied
		4. Connective transitions are used inadequately
		1. The big idea is stated in the text, but less supports/details
		2. Focus is limited to one sentence (or repeats the same idea)
		3. Development of idea (plot) is simplistic/ inadequate

## Findings of Cycle 2

**Table 4.8 Result of Cycle 2's Reflection**

Test Result	General Problems	Specific Problems	Solved
Average score = 65	Students lacked of vocabulary knowledge	1. Some words are used incorrectly	✓
		2. Some words are spelled incorrectly	
Point = 4 ( <i>Capable</i> )	Students' sentences are not fluent	3. Repetition is occurred frequently	
		4. Vocabulary is limited (Text is shorter than it should be)	✓
Performance level = <i>Proficient</i>	Idea is not well-generated	1. The writing provides incorrect sentence pattern.	
		2. The writing provides a limited sampling of sentence pattern.	
		3. Sentence beginnings are not varied	✓
		4. Connective transitions are used inadequately	✓
		1. The big idea is stated in the text, but less supports/details	✓
		2. Focus is limited to one sentence (or repeats the same idea)	✓
		3. Development of idea (plot) is simplistic/ inadequate	

The table describes what problems found in the first cycle were solved in cycle 2. It is clear that the second cycle of teaching had solved 6 out of 11 problems. Students' writings show these developments; (1) words are used correctly, (2) vocabulary is expanding (the text is appropriate length), (3)

sentence beginnings are varied; connective transitions show some variation; (4) the Big Idea is clear, but general – a simple story or explanation, (5) support is presented in the text; and (6) focus is generally on topic, with a few missteps.

### Findings of Cycle 3

**Table 4.10 Result of Cycle 3's Reflection**

Test Result	General Problems	Specific Problems	Solved
Average score = 73,5	Students lacked of vocabulary knowledge	1. Some words are used incorrectly	✓
		2. Some words are spelled incorrectly	✓
		3. Repetition is occurred frequently	✓
		4. Vocabulary is limited (Text is shorter than it should be)	✓
Point = 5 ( <i>Experienced</i> )	Students' sentences are not fluent	5. The writing provides incorrect sentence pattern.	✓
		6. The writing provides a limited sampling of sentence pattern.	✓
Performance level = <i>Proficient</i>	Idea is not well-generated	7. Sentence beginnings are not varied	✓
		8. Connective transitions are used inadequately	✓
		4. The big idea is stated in the text, but less supports/details	✓
		5. Focus is limited to one sentence (or repeats the same idea)	✓
		6. Development of idea (plot) is simplistic/ inadequate	✓

The good news is all students' writing problem was solved in cycle 3. Students' vocabulary knowledge was developed, students could produce fluent sentences, and they could generate their ideas in writing quite well. In other words, the use of student-generated text of Language Experience Approach (LEA) successfully developed students' recount text writing ability.

### Discussion

Having findings presented, a discussion on teaching process and learning outcome is made. Based on the findings, 3 cycles of teaching had developed students' recount text writing ability. Developed writing skills are result of developed teaching method. In cycle 2 and 3, teacher maximized interaction with students and among

students, and gave students opportunity to initiate talks and questions. So, teacher did not dominate the classroom activities like in the cycle 1.

From cycle to cycle, students were given opportunities to strengthen their speaking, listening, writing, and reading skills, as they had to volunteer information verbally or dictate verbal sentences to the teacher, do some extended writing of the dictated account, listen to teacher reading the text, read and comprehend the text, and write a recount text with their own words. Student-generated text (*dictated account*) of Language Experience Approach (LEA) is hereby seen as an effective strategy to teach not only recount text writing, but also the other 3 skills of English language. This kind of input can be stimulus material for activities, new language items, correct and intelligible model of language use, a topic for communication, and it provides students

Based on the above diagram, cycle 1 had 8 (eight) non-proficient writing performances. In cycle 2, it decreased to 2 (two) non-proficient writing performances before it finally dropped off to 0 (zero). It indicates that problems were completely solved in cycle 3. A good result can also be seen from the change of mean score, where it raised from 54,3 in cycle 1 to 65 in cycle 2 to 73,5 in cycle 3. This number can be higher, as long as teacher

with opportunity to use their information processing skills and opportunities to use their existing knowledge both of the language and subject matter. (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987:109).

The researcher also discovered that this teaching strategy promotes learning autonomy and collaborative learning because they work collaboratively to construct a text for their own learning needs. Besides, it made the learning encouraging to students because they learn from English language that are familiar to them to new language items.

It is supported by the fact that students' writing performance scores were improved. The following chart clearly describes the change of students' mean score, number of student in proficient level and number of student in non-proficient level from cycle 1 to cycle 3.

and students can keep up the good works. Student-generated text particularly developed vocabulary mastery, sentence fluency, and conceptual creativity (ideas), as the followings:

**1. Student-generated text developed vocabulary mastery**

The following table shows the increase in score of vocabulary aspect.

**Table 4.11 Change of mean score of vocabulary**

No	Student Code	Cycle 1		Cycle 2		Cycle 3	
		Point	Score	Point	Score	Point	Score
1	BR	2	33	4	67	4	67
2	HN	3	50	4	67	4	67
3	IM	3	50	4	67	4	67
4	JA	3	50	3	50	4	67
5	LD	5	83	5	83	5	83
6	MP	4	67	4	67	5	83
7	MI	3	50	4	67	5	83

8	NA	4	67	4	67	4	67
9	OD	4	67	4	67	4	67
10	PS	2	33	4	67	5	83
11	PW	3	50	4	67	4	67
12	RM	2	33	3	50	4	67
13	RP	3	50	4	67	5	83
14	RM	3	50	4	67	4	67
15	RR	3	50	3	50	4	67
16	SN	2	33	3	50	3	50
17	SS	4	67	3	50	4	67
18	WW	3	50	3	50	4	67
<b>Mean Score</b>			<b>52</b>		<b>62</b>		<b>70,5</b>

Table 4.11 shows the alteration of mean score of vocabulary from cycle 1 to cycle 3. It is shown in the table that mean score of cycle 1 and cycle 2 are in the range of 51-67, which means the students is considered *capable* and their performance level is *proficient* (See 6-point writing rubric). However, it is dominated by students whose score under 51 by 13 out of 18 students, which means they are *developing* and their performance level is *non-proficient*. Their writing had the characteristics that the word choice makes sense; some basic words are used incorrectly; vocabulary is limited to “known” or “safe” words; and repetition of safe words and phrases.

The score improved to 70,5 in cycle 3. Students performance level upgraded to *proficient* category, dominated by

students writing with the characteristics that the words stand on their own to convey a simple message; words are basic and used correctly; vocabulary is mostly routine, with a few exceptions; and some repetition is present. However, 5 out of 18 students’ writing show the characteristic of *experienced* that the text alone conveys the message in several words; word choice contains moments of sparkle; every words used as well; the vocabulary is expanding; and repetition occurs infrequently

## 2. Student-generated text developed sentence fluency

The following table shows the increase in score of sentence fluency aspect.

**Table 4.12 Change of mean score of sentence fluency**

No	Student Code	Cycle 1		Cycle 2		Cycle 3	
		Point	Score	Point	Score	Point	Score
1	BR	3	50	4	67	4	67
2	HN	3	50	5	83	5	83
3	IM	3	50	4	67	4	67
4	JA	3	50	4	67	4	67
5	LD	5	83	4	67	5	83
6	MP	3	50	4	67	4	67
7	MI	3	50	4	67	4	67
8	NA	4	67	4	67	5	83



9	OD	5	83	5	83	5	83
10	PS	4	67	4	67	4	67
11	PW	4	67	4	67	4	67
12	RM	4	67	4	67	4	67
13	RP	3	50	5	83	5	83
14	RM	2	33	4	67	4	67
15	RR	3	50	5	83	5	83
16	SN	2	33	4	67	4	67
17	SS	3	50	4	67	4	67
18	WW	3	50	4	67	4	67
<b>Mean Score</b>			<b>56</b>		<b>66</b>		<b>72,3</b>

Table 4.12 shows the alteration of mean score of sentence fluency from cycle 1 to cycle 3. It is shown in the table that mean score of cycle 1 and cycle 2 are in the range of 51-67, which means the students is considered *capable* and their performance level is *proficient* (See 6-point writing rubric). However, it is dominated by students whose score under 51 by 13 out of 18 students, which means they are *developing* and their performance level is *non-proficient*. Their writing had the characteristics that most of a sentence is present decodable in the text (“Like bunne becuz their riere Fas”); sentences begin the same way (“I like.....); rhythm is choppy and repetitive; and connective transitions serve as links between phrases (“and”, “then”, etc.)

## 2. Student-generated text developed conceptual creativity (ideas)

The score improved to 72,3 in cycle 3. Students performance level upgraded to *proficient* category, dominated by students writing with the characteristics that the writing provides a limited sampling of sentence pattern; sentence beginnings are varied; rhythm is more fluid than mechanical – easy to read aloud; and connective words show some variation.

However, one third ( $\frac{1}{3}$ ) of students’ writing shows the characteristic of *experienced* that several sentences are present and employ more than one sentence pattern; sentence do not always begin the same way; rhythm is more mechanical than fluid; and connective words do not interfere with the fluency.

The following table shows the increase in score of sentence fluency aspect.

**Table 4.13 Change of mean score of conceptual creativity (ideas)**

No	Student Code	Cycle 1		Cycle 2		Cycle 3	
		Point	Score	Point	Score	Point	Score
1	BR	3	50	3	50	4	67
2	HN	3	50	5	83	4	67
3	IM	4	67	4	67	5	83
4	JA	3	50	3	50	4	67
5	LD	5	83	5	83	6	100
6	MP	3	50	3	50	4	67

7	MI	3	50	3	50	4	67
8	NA	5	83	6	100	6	100
9	OD	5	83	5	83	5	83
10	PS	4	67	4	67	6	100
11	PW	4	67	3	50	5	83
12	RM	3	50	4	67	5	83
13	RP	3	50	5	83	5	83
14	RM	3	50	3	50	4	67
15	RR	4	67	4	67	5	83
16	SN	1	17	3	50	3	50
17	SS	2	33	3	50	4	67
18	WW	2	33	4	67	5	83
<b>Mean Score</b>			<b>56</b>		<b>65</b>		<b>78</b>

Table 4.13 shows the alteration of mean score of sentence fluency from cycle 1 to cycle 3. It is shown in the table that mean score of cycle 1 and cycle 2 are in the range of 51-67, which means the students is considered *capable* and their performance level is *proficient* (See 6-point writing rubric). However, it is dominated by students whose score under 51 by 13 out of 18 students, which means they are *developing* and their performance level is *non-proficient*. Their writing had the characteristics that the Big Idea is stated in text; support is minimal; focus is limited to one sentence (or repeats the same idea); and development is simplistic.

The score improved to 78 in cycle 3. Students performance level upgraded to *proficient* category, dominated by students writing with the characteristics of *capable* and *experienced*. (See 6-point writing rubric. However, 3 out of 18 students' writing shows the characteristic of *exceptional* that the Big Idea is clear and original: the topic is narrowed; supporting details are relevant, accurate and specific; the writing stays on topic; and development is generous and complete.

This result proved the hypothesis right that student-generated text of

Language Experience Approach (LEA) can develop recount text writing ability, including vocabulary mastery, sentence fluency, and conceptual creativity (ideas) of Year 11 students of SMK PGRI Pontianak in academic year of 2015/2016.

## CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

### Conclusion

Based on the findings and discussion, students developed their vocabulary, sentence fluency and ideas through each step of Language Experience Approach (LEA). Students read texts and listened to English speaking videos to accomplish *ashared experience* in which they learned new vocabularies and new ways of expressing ideas in sentences. They proceeded the writing of *dictated account (student-generated text)* with listening to English questions and dictation or speaking activity. They also read the text carefully and write *addition and correction* to the text before they really wrote a text with their own words. So, LEA facilitates the practice of 4 skills of English all at once, which simultaneously developed students' vocabulary mastery, sentence fluency, and conceptual creativity.

From cycle to cycle, student-generated text of LEA developed vocabulary in some aspects, involving whether or not the word choice makes sense, basic or expanding vocabulary, correctness and incorrectness of the word, and whether repetition occurs frequently or infrequently. The mean of vocabulary achievement raised from 52 in cycle 1, to 62 in cycle 2, to 70,5 in cycle 3. The category of performance level was developed from capable to experienced.

The last but not least, student-generated text of LEA developed conceptual creativity (ideas) in the areas of whether or not the Big Idea is clear and the topic is narrowed, whether the supportig details are present, relevant, accurate, and specific, and how well the development of idea is. The mean of ideas achievement increased from 56 in cycle 1, to 65 in cycle 2, to 78 in cycle 3. The category of performance level was developed from capable to experienced.

To conclude, generating text for learning by using students' prior knowledge and following the steps of Language Experience Approach (LEA) is a way of developing students' recount text writing ability in many areas, at the same time strengthen speaking, listening, and reading skills.

### **Suggestion**

To close the writing of this thesis, the researcher would like to suggest some of the following recommendations to be taken seriously for better future teaching practice: 1) Consider to always create circumstances that allows for real and light communicative exchange between teacher and students, students and things around them, and among students, because English language is learned to be used in real context of

communication, 2) It is suggested to involve students in activities that provide various exposures to English, such as English-speaking videos, English games, English procedural activities, and activities that can stimulate students to use English, 3) If expert-made text somehow reduces students' motivation to learn English, try to use student-generative text or dictated account to put them up again, 4) Create a real student-centered learning. It is believed that trusting students' ability can boost their confidence. When teacher gives students freedom to initiate talks and questions in the classroom, learning will become more encouraging.

Allow students to have co-evaluation and self-evaluation before, during, or after the learning process in order they know why they need to be serious in learning things.

### **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Barwick, J.(2006).*Targeting Text: Recount, Procedure, Exposition Upper Level*. Singapore: Blake Education
- Best, J. W, & Kahn, J. V. (2006). *Research in Education* (10th Ed.) . New York: Pearson Education Inc.
- Brookhart, S. M. (2013). *How to Createand Use Rubrics for Formative Assessment and Gradin*. Alexandria: ASCD Publications
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Teaching by Principles: Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. (2nd Ed). New York: Pearson Education Inc
- Brown, K.; & Susan H. (2002). *Writing Matters: Writing Skills and Strategies for Students of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burns, A. (2010). *Collaborative Action Research for English Language*

- Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Biber, D.; & Susan C. (2009). *Register, Genre, and Style*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Cameron, L. (2011). *Teaching Languages to Young Learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Celce-Murcia, M.. (2001). *Teaching English as A Second or Foreign Language* (3rdEd.).Boston: Heinle & Heinle
- Creswell, J. W. (2008).*Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*, (3rdEd.).New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Helmi, F. (2012). *Improving Students' Skill in Writing RecountText by Using A Personal Letter(A Classroom Action Research with the Tenth Graders of MASS ProtoPekalongan in The Academic Year of 2011/2012)*. A Thesis.Pekalongan: Education Faculty State Institute for Islamic Studies Walisongo
- Hutchinson, T.& Alan W. (1987).*English for Specific Purposes : A Learning Central Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University
- Hornby, A. S. (2000). *The Advance Learner's Dictionary of CurrentEnglish*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Johnson, P.; Peter A.; Sandra K.; Kathryn M. P., Elisabeth S.; Alfred W. T.; & Sheila W. V.. (2010). *Standards for The Assessment of Reading and Writing*. Newark: The International Reading Association, Inc. and the National Council of Teachers of English
- Mackey, A.& Susan M.G. (2005).*Second Language Research: Methodology and Design*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers
- Nessel, D. D. & Carol N. D. (2008). *Using The Language Experience Approach with English Language Learners: Strategies for Engaging Students and developing Literacy*. California: Corwin Press.
- Nunan, D. (1991). *Language Teaching Methodology: A Textbook for Teachers*. Sydney: Prentice Hall
- Paltridge, B. (1996). Genre, Text Type, and The Language Learning Classroom. *ELT Journal Volume 50/3 July 1996*. Oxford University Press. Retrieved on August 29 from <http://203.72.145.166/ELT/files/50-3-6.pdf>
- Peck, R.; Chris O.; & Jay D. (2012). *Introduction to Statistic and Data Analysis*, (4th Ed.).Boston: Brooke/Cole Cengage Learning
- Pinter, A. (2006). *Teaching Young Language Learners*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Spector, J. M.; M.David M.; Jan E.; M.J. Bishop.(2014) *Handbook of Research on Educational Communications and Technology*. New York: Springer Science+Business Media
- Wall, T. & Monica L. (Eds.). (2010). *Low Educated Second Language and Literacy Acquisition. Proceeding as The 5th Symposium Banff, 2009*. Calgary: Bow Valley College. Retrieved on August 19, 2015 from [http://www.leslla.org/files/resources/Conference\\_Proceedings\\_FINAL\\_Aug12.pdf](http://www.leslla.org/files/resources/Conference_Proceedings_FINAL_Aug12.pdf)
- Wardiman, A.; Jahur, Masduki B.; & Djusma, M. Sukirman. (2008). *English in Focus for Grade VIII Junior High School (SMP/MTs)*.

Jakarta: Pusat Perbukuan Departemen  
Pendidikan Nasional.