THE EFFECT OF REFORMULATION TECHNIQUE ON STUDENTS' WRITING ABILITY

Henny Septia Utami
IAIN Curup
hennyseptiautami@iaincurup.ac.id

Abstract: The purpose of this research is to investigate whether reformulation technique gives significant effect on student's writing ability. The design of this research is an experimental research that is classified into a randomized pretest and posttest group design. There are two groups involved in this research: experiment and control group. Those two groups are chosen based on the normality and homogenity calculations. The instrument used is writing test which is given as pretest and posttest. To ensure the validity and reliability of the instrument, it was tried out before being used and the students' writings were scored by three raters. The data were analyzed by using T-test. The result shows that this technique gives positive significant effect on students' ability in writing.

Keywords: *Reformulation Technique, Writing Ability*

BACKGROUND

The techniques of teaching English in Indonesia have changed during the years following the change of the curriculum. Nowadays, some schoolsstill implementthe 2006 curriculum, which is called the school-based curriculum or Kurikulum Tingkat SatuanPendidikan (KTSP), while others have already implemented K-13. However, according to those curriculum, the purpose of teaching English is similar, that is to develop students' ability in the four basic skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing) in order to make the students able to communicate well both in the oral and written form. Unfortunately, it seems that teaching English at Junior High School today neglects the urgency of teaching writing. In teaching the genre of the texts, most of the teachers only focus on making the students able to comprehend the texts and answer several questions related to the texts. This problem might appear because writing is not tested in national examination.

Consequently, writing skill of junior high school students is still poor and far from what the curriculum expects. This phenomenon happens in SMP N 3 Batang Anai. The students are not able to produce a good composition. Their writings contain many content, rhetorical and grammatical problems. When the students are given a writing task to write a simple recount text about their experience in last holiday, most of them cannot produce a good writing. It seems that they have many ideas to express but do not know how to express it in English.

Most of the students have difficulties in arranging ideas, using appropriate grammar, writing the correct spelling and punctuation, and choosing proper vocabulary. These difficulties make their writings have content, rhetorical and grammatical problems.

Sometimes, they translate the Indonesian words into English which make their writing ridiculous to read and incommunicative. For example, one of the students writes:*"Last day I with friend I go to Bukittinggi"*. This sentence contains many errors. "Last day" is supposed to be yesterday. "I with friend I" is supposed to be My friend and I. The sentence is supposed to be in the simple past tense, not in the simple present tense because the adverb of time is yesterday, showing past time. In short, this sentence actually should be "Yesterday, My friend and I went to Bukittinggi." or "My friend and I went to Bukittinggi yesterday".

The students seemed only translate Indonesian Language words order into English. In fact, the grammar of Indonesian Language and English are completely different. It makes the student's writing incommunicative. The choice of vocabulary used by the students was also not appropriate. In addition, in writing their composition, the students do not use adequate transition to connect and organize their ideas. A native speaker of English will not be able to understand the meaning that the students want to convey in their composition.

Responding the problems above, the teacher has done some efforts. One of the teacher's efforts was trying to correct the students' composition by using the red pen syndrome technique. The teacher collected the students' composition, marked the mistakes in students' composition with red pen, corrected it, and gave it back to the students. However, it did not make any change. Students only got the correction without knowing why it was wrong and why it was supposed to be like the teacher's correction. So, they neglected the correction. When students were asked to write in the same topic again, they still made some mistakes related to wording, punctuation, and use of proper vocabulary in expressing their ideas. Moreover, they also cannot put correct transition words to connect their ideas.

Actually, the correction of mistakes in students' compositions as feedback can help much because feedback technique is a central element in writing pedagogy. However, only telling the mistakes and giving the correction is not enough. The correction should be done communicatively. It means that teacher do not only tell which one is right and which one is wrong, but also give some rationales. The teacher and students may have discussion about the mistakes to make the students understand more. So, it can be a real long-term learning because the students can understand completely how to communicate their own ideas in English well. One of the techniques providing the criteria above is Reformulation Technique.

Herrel (2008:177) illustrates the reformulation as the process in which the non-native has produced an incomprehensible utterance, and the native adults or the caretaker of children will attempt to make sense of what he or she has heard, then they take the form of a reformulated question, of using some of the non native's words in a possible sentence, or simple restating what he believes the non-native has said. This techniques is popular in writing context as Thornbury (2008:123) defines reformulation is a technique by which the teacher takes the meaning the learners are attempting to express in English and translates these into an acceptable form. It is a technique that has been used in the teaching of writing. Students write a first draft, which the teacher then reformulates, not just at the level of individual words and sentences, but in terms of the organization of the text as a whole.Krashen and

Krashen in Bartram and Walton (2002:53-54) claims that formulation technique is better that formal correction. Reason underlying Krashen's claim is if the teacher responds naturally, reformulating, students are exposed immediately to language which they will understand. The satisfaction of successful communication will relax the students and open the student to real, long-term learning. This may be more effective than formal correction. The effectiveness of formal correction is reduced because of the anxiety it may induce. Therefore, reformulation technique is better for students' real long-term learning. In addition, James (1998:255) argues that reformulation involves naturalization. It means that the process is natural to happen in real-life communication. Sometimes, the corrector does reformulation without realizing there was a mistake. This idea is confirmed by Bartram and Walton (2002:52), who say that reformulation attempts to imitate the way in which real-life correction happens. It means that this technique provides a long-term learning to the students.

Based on the background of the problem above, this technique is believed to be able to help the teacher increase students' ability in writing. Therefore, through this research, the researcher wants to investigate whether Reformulation Technique contributes much to students' writing skill or not. In addition, The objective of the research is to find out whether reformulation technique gave positive significat effect on students' ability in writing a recount text or not. Therefore, the objective of the research is to test these hypothesis:

H_o: Students who are taught by reformulation technique have no better ability in writing a recount text.

H_1: Students who are taught by reformulation technique have better ability in writing a recount text.

METHOD

The design of this research was an experimental research that was classified into a randomized pretest and posttest group design. There were two groups involved in this research: experimental and control group (Cresswell, 2008). A pretest was given to both groups to see their ability at the beginning. Then, the experimental group received treatment, while the control group was treated as usual. After eight meetings, the both groups were given posttest whose scores were compared to determine the effectiveness of reformulation technique in writing (Gay and Airasian, 2000:392)

The design of this research can be figure out by this following table:

Table 1. Design of the Research

Class	Pretest	Treatment	Posttest
Experiment	O1	X	O2
Control	O1	-	O2

Where: X: Teaching writing by reformulation technique
            O1: Pre-test of experimental and control class
            O2: posttest of experimental and control class

Population and Sample

The population of this research was the second year or grade VIII students of SMP N 3 Batang Anai. There were 292 students who are divided into nine classes. The nine classes were assumed to have the same characteristics in term of writing ability in recount texts because there was no superior class. The average of the latest writing test scores of

each class was also same. It showed that all the eight classes were in the same level of ability in writing. So, cluster random sampling technique was done to choose the sample classes and to determine the experimental and control class.

According to Gay and Airasian (2000:129), cluster random sampling is the process of selecting the sample based on the groups, not individuals. All the members of the selected groups have similar characteristics. There were two classes as the sample groups: experimental and control. So, the sample groups in this research were taken by writing the name of the each class on nine separated pieces of paper, then rolling them. After that, one of the pieces of the paper was taken as the experimental group. Then, the second piece of paper taken was the control group. After doing that procedure, two classes, class VIII-1 and VIII-3 were chosen as the experimental and control group. To ensure the normality and homogenity of both classes, the statistical testings: liliefords and F-testing were conducted.The calculation of both class shows that Lo <Lt, so the data are normally distributed, and Fcalculated<Ftable, so it is interpreted that the two groups were homogen.

Instruments

The instrument used in this research was a writing test. The writing test was used as both pretest and posttest. The pretest was administered to both experimental and control groups to see their ability before having different treatment. Students were assigned to write a recount text about their last experience. The posttest was administered to know whether the reformulation technique was useful or not to increase students' ability in writing. The posttest was the similar writing test with the pretest.

There are two aspects which should be considered in creating a good test. The first one was the validity of the test. Brown (2004:22) states a test is said to be valid if it measures accurately what is intended to be measured. To ensure the validity of the test, the content validity was used. Since the test was aimed to measure the writing ability, the form of the test used in this research was direct writing test. Then, this test was validated by the writing lecturers and teacher.The first validator was Drs. Saunir Saun, M.Pd., a writing lecturer in State University of Padang. The second validator was Muhd. Al-Hafizh, S.S., M.A. He was also a writing lecturer in State University of Padang. The last validator was Netwa Kesriati, M. Pd., the English teacher in SMPN 3 Batang Anai. In addition, the test was also tried out to another class which was neither the control group nor experimental group before it was given to the control and experimental group.

The second aspect which should be considered was reliability of the test. Brown (2004:20) explains that reliable test is consistent and dependable. If the same test is given to the same student or matched students on two different occasions, the test should give similar results. To ensure the reliability of the test, the research used inter-rater reliability. It means that the scorers were more than one. There were three raters in scoring the pretest. The first rater of the pretest was Muhd. Al-Hafizh, S.S., M.A, a writing lecturer in State University of Padang. The second rater was Netwa Kesriati, M. Pd., the English teacher of SMP N 3 Batang Anai. The last rater was the researcher herself. Furthermore, there were also three raters in scoring the posttest. The first rater of the posttest was Witri Oktavia, S.Pd., a writing lecturer in State University of Padang. The second and third raters were the same with the pretest. Furthermore, in giving score, the raters used a clear scoring rubric.

Data Analysis

To analyze the data collected, the hypothesis testing was doneby using t-test. The average test score of the two groups were then compared to determine the effectiveness of the techniques. To know the effectiveness, the hypothesis was formulated as follows:

Ho: $\mu_1 = \mu_2$
H1: $\mu_1 > \mu_2$

H_o: Students who are taught by reformulation technique have no better ability in writing a recount text.

H_1: Students who are taught by reformulation technique have better ability in writing a recount text.

Those hypotheses were tested by using t-test to see the effectiveness between the experimental group and the control group. The t-test formula was as follows:

$$t = \frac{(\overline{X}_1 - \overline{X}_2)}{S\sqrt{\dfrac{1}{n_1} + \dfrac{1}{n_2}}}$$

$$S^2 = \frac{(n_1 - 1)S_1^2 + (n_2 - 1)S_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}$$

Where:
t	: The value of t-calculated
X_1	: Mean of experimental group
X_2	: Mean of control group
S	: Standard deviation
S_1^2	: Variance of the experimental class learning result
S_2^2	: Variance of the control class learning result
n_1	: Number of students in experimental group
n_2	: Number of students in control group

(Sudjana, 2005)

From the calculation of t-test, t-observed was compared with t-table by using level of significance 0.05. If the t-observed was equal to or greater than t-table value, then the null hypothesis (H_o) was rejected. This meant that the research hypothesis (H_1) was statistically accepted. In other words, if the t-observed was smaller than t-table value, then the null hypothesis (H_o) was accepted and research hypothesis (H_1) was rejected.

FINDINGS

Prior to the beginning of the research, the pretest, which was about writing a recount text was given to the both groups in order to check the group equivalence.Before the pretest was administered to both groups, it was validated by using content validity. This test had been examined by three validators: Drs. SaunirSaun, M.Pd.,Muhd. Al-Hafizh, S.S., M.A, and NetwaKesriati, M. Pd. After the test was examined by the three validators,

the test was tried out to another population group which was not the sample groups to choose the topic used on the test.

To ensure the reliability of the test, the research used inter-rater reliability. To make sure that each rater had the same criteria in giving score, the raters used a scoring rubric for composition in StandarKompetensiLulusandan SpesifikasiUjianAkhirSMP/MTS (Depdiknas, 2014). The lowest possible score was 0 and the highest one was 100.

As it had been valid and reliable, the test was administered to both sample groups: experimental and control group. Then, at the end of the research, the posttest was given to the both sample groups. The posttest was the same test with the pretest. The number of the students in the experiment group was 32. There were 32 students too in the control group, but one of them did not take the test and did not attend the class for five meetings. So, the data from him were discarded. The pretest and posttest scores of the experimental group (n:32) and the control group (n:31) can be seen in the following table:

Table 2. Students' score

Students' code	Experimental Group			Control group		
	Pre-test	**Post-test**	**Gain**	**Pre-test**	**Post-test**	**Gain**
1	77.8	85.2	7.4	70.4	83.3	12.9
2	72.2	75.9	3.7	59.3	64.8	5.5
3	48.1	75.9	27.8	59.3	63	3.7
4	18.5	42.6	24.1	57.4	68.5	11.1
5	81.5	96.3	14.8	38.9	53.7	14.8
6	83.3	87	3.7	14.8	27.8	13
7	55.6	68.5	12.9	42.6	55.6	13
8	59.3	79.6	20.3	74.1	74.1	0
9	53.7	64.8	11.1	61.1	68.5	7.4
10	63	83.3	20.3	70.4	75.9	5.5
11	22.2	46.3	24.1	53.7	68.5	14.8
12	50	66.7	16.7	61.1	70.4	9.3
13	57.4	61.1	3.7	35.2	48.1	12.9
14	66.7	68.5	1.8	33.3	42.6	9.3
15	51.9	83.3	31.4	44.4	59.3	14.9
16	81.5	88.9	7.4	33.3	53.7	20.4
17	42.6	68.5	25.9	72.2	77.8	5.6
18	57.4	63	5.6	61.1	61.1	0
19	50	55.6	5.6	55.6	68.5	12.9
20	57.4	81.5	24.1	53.7	64.8	11.1
21	50	72.2	22.2	50	59.3	9.3
22	51.9	72.2	20.3	66.7	66.7	0
23	72.2	96.3	24.1	31.5	53.7	22.2
24	22.2	57.4	35.2	72.2	66.7	-5.5
25	46.3	63	16.7	74.1	77.8	3.7
26	51.9	66.7	14.8	64.8	70.4	5.6
27	55.6	81.5	25.9	50	59.3	9.3
28	44.4	55.6	11.2	72.2	68.5	-3.7
29	44.4	90.7	46.3	70.4	72.2	1.8
30	46.3	77.8	31.5	66.7	70.4	3.7
31	38.9	68.5	29.6	50	53.7	3.7
32	55.6	75.9	20.3			

	1729.8	2322.9	590.5	1720.7	1987.2	266.5
$\overline{x}$	54.06	72.59	18.45	55.51	62.10	8.59

From the table above, it could be seen clearly that the scores of the both groups from pretest to posttest increased. The table shows that the mean score of experimental group in pre-test was 54.06, while in posttest it increased to 72.59. Meanwhile, the mean score of the control group was 55.51, while in posttest it also increased to 62.10. So, mean of gain scores of the pretest and posttest in experiment group was 18.45 while the gain scores of the pretest and posttest in control group was 8.59.

The lowest scores of pretest and posttest in the experimental class were 18.5 and 42.6 while the highest scores were 83.3 and 96.3. Meanwhile, the lowest scores in the control group for pretest and posttest were 14.8 and 42.6 while the highest scores were 74.1 and 83.3.

Data Analysis
Analysis of Pretest Scores

To determine which statistical formula would be used in this research, the pretest scores were analyzed. The normality and homogeneity of the data will be analyzed first, before testing whether the both sample groups were in the same ability or not. To test the normality, the pretest scores of the experiment group (n:32) and the control group (n:31) were analyzed by using Lilliefors formula. Then, value of the $L_{observed}$ of the experimental group (0.1356) was compared to Lt_{able} (0,1565). Since $L_{observed}$ was smaller than L_{table}, the data in this experimental group were normally distributed. The data in control group were also normal because L_o: 0.1112 was smaller than L_t: 0,1590. Clearly, the normality of each sample group was described as follows:

Table 3. Mean and standard deviation of pretest scores

	Experimental group	Control Group
Mean	54.06	55.51
Standard deviation	16.02	15.23

Then, from the mean and standard deviation above, Z formula was calculated. The result of the calculation was as in the following:

Table 4. The normality of the pretest scores of the two sample groups

	L-observed	L-table	Interpretation
Experimental Group	0,1356	0,1565	Lo<Lt Normal
Control Group	0,1112	0,1590	Lo<Lt Normal

Then, the homogeneity of the two sample groups was also calculated by using variance test. The following table shows the calculation.

Table 4. The homogeneity of the pretest scores of the two sample groups

	Experimental Group	Control Group	F-Observed
S (Variance)	256.53	231.95	1.1059

F_o (1,1059) stated on the table above was compared to F_{table}(1.84) with df 0.05. This indicated that $F_{observed}$ was smaller than F_{table}. Therefore, it was interpreted that the two group treatments were homogeneity.

Because the both sample groups were normally distributed and homogeneity, the pretest score was then tested by using t-test to find out whether the two sample group scores were different or not. The following table summarized the result of statistical analysis of pretest scores for both groups.

Table 5. Statistical Analysis of Pretest Scores in Experimental and Control Group

	Experimental Group	Control Group	
n	32	31	t observed = -0.3710
Mean ($\overline{x}$)	54.06	55.51	
S^2	256.53	231.95	

The t-testing indicated that $t_{observed}$ (-0.3710) was smaller than t_{table} (1,67) with df 0.05. This meant that there was no significant difference in the term of ability between experiment and control groups. Therefore, two randomly selected groups of students, who had been classified into experimental and control groups, had the same ability at the beginning of the research.

Analysis of the Posttest Scores

Gay (2000:287) points out that the data of pretest posttest group design can be analyzed by comparing the scores of pretest and posttest. However, if the scores in pretest are balance, which indicates that the sample groups have the same ability in the beginning of the research, posttest scores can be directly compared by using t-test. Because the students' scores in the pretest showed the experiment and control groups had the same ability at the beginning of the research, posttest scores were directly compared by using t-test. However, before doing hypothesis test, the normality and homogeneity of the data should be analyzed first.

1) Normality of the Data

As it has been stated in the technique of data analysis, the normality in this research was tested by using Lilliefors with df 0.05. The result was that the data in experimental group were normally distributed because $L_{observed}$:0.0905was smaller than L_{table}: 0,1565. As in experimental group, in control group the data was also normally distributed because $L_{observed}$:0.1496was smaller than L_{table}: 0,1590. In sum,

the data in both experimental and control group were normally distributed. Clearly, the normality was revealed as in the following table:

Table 6.Normality of Posttest Scores in the Two Sample Groups

	L-observed	L-Table	Interpretation
Experimental group	0.0905	0,1565	Lo<Lt Normal
Control Group	0.1496	0,1590	Lo<Lt Normal

2) Homogeneity of the Data

As the data in each sample group had been distributed normally, homogeneity testing was calculated to see whether the data were homogeny or not. To know this, Variance testing (F-testing) was calculated. The calculation of $F_{observed:}$ 1.7349 indicated that the two sample groups were homogeny after it was compared to F_{table}: 1,84. In brief, the data in both experimental and control groups were homogeny. The description of the homogeneity is as follows:

Table 7. Homogeneity of Posttest Scores in The Two Sample Groups

	Experimental Group	Control Group	F-Observed
S (Variance)	169	97.41	1.7349

3) Hypothesis Testing

The research hypothesis was tested by applying t-test. From the calculation of the t-test, the $t_{observed}$ was 3.6297. The total case degree of freedom was 61. The t_{table} at the level of significance 0.05 and degree of freedom 60 (the closest df) was 1,67. This calculation revealed that the $t_{observed}$ is higher than the t_{table}It means that the null hypothesis was rejected and research hypothesis was statistically accepted. The interpretation was students who are taught by reformulation technique in JCOT stage have better achievement in writing a recount text. In short, the hypothesis testing was described in the following table:

Table 12. Result of the Calculation of the Hypothesis Testing

	N	Mean	The closest df	t-observed	t-table	Interpretation
Experiment Group	32	72.59	60	3.6297	1,67	$t_{observed}$> t-$_{table}$
Control Group	32	62.10	60			Therefore, students' scores in experiment group significantly better than those in

control group

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the research was to find out whether reformulation technique gave better effect on students' ability in writing a recount text or not. The hypothesis testing of this research proved statistically that Reformulation Technique gave better effect on students' ability in writing a recount text. There were some possible explanations for the result found in this research.

The first one, students were motivated more in learning process because in reformulation technique teacher corrected their composition into a good form English, but still maintained the original ideas. It made the students felt interested and wanted to know more about how to communicate their ideas by using correct English. It also made the students involved themselves fully in the learning process. As the result, their scores became better. This finding was consistent with the theory, stated in the review of related literature, proposed by Krashen (in Bartram and Walton 2002:53-54) who says that the satisfaction of successful communication in reformulation technique will relax the students and open the student to real, long-term learning.

The research finding was also similar to the theory of Bartram and Walton (2002:52) who claims that the success of reformulation depends on two principles. If one of the principles is not fulfilled, the reformulation technique will not contribute much in teaching writing. The first principle is progress in second language learning is gradual, and often indirect. It is based on the idea that learning takes place all the time, not just when the teacher is explicitly teaching.

During the research, this first principle appeared clearly and contributed much in the success of teaching writing a recount text by using reformulation technique. The students did not only pay attention when their composition was being reformulated. When the researcher, as the teacher, reformulated a composition of one group, the other groups also paid attention to the process. It made not only the students whose composition was being reformulated who picked up the correction, but the other students altogether.

Another principle is students need to be interested in the subject matter. If they are not involved, they will find learning harder. Since the material taught in this research was recount text, students felt that they were involved emotionally. Students loved to share their experiences to their friends and teacher. They also enjoyed the feeling of accomplishment in communicate their ideas in a good English.

In addition, from the six categories scored in students' writing test (content, grammar, generic structure, vocabulary, punctuation, and spelling), grammar seemed become the category which increased the most. Since in the reformulation technique teacher took the meaning the students want to express in English and translate it into an appropriate form, it gave the best effect on grammar aspect. Students got many grammatical inputs from the teacher by using this technique. Students did not only learn about the grammar system, but also know how and when to use it properly to express meaning.

Since in the reformulation technique teacher reformulated the composition made by students, the teacher directly taught what grammar rules the students really needed at the time. This was better than only taught grammar separately by only giving the rules, patterns and some examples without telling in what circumstances it could be implemented. Consequently, it created a meaningful learning atmosphere which let students put the grammar rules into their long term memory. In short, this technique is actually best to be implemented in teaching grammar rule, whether it is integrated into teaching writing a text or just independently.

In short, using Reformulation Technique could help the students to improve their writing ability and increase their mastering in grammar aspect.It gave positive significant effect to the students' ability in writing a recount text. Moreover, the findings also supported the theories about reformulation technique proposed by the experts.

CONCLUSION

The data collected has been tested statistically by the calculation of t-test. The result of the calculation indicates that $t_{observed}$ is higher thatt_{table}. Referring to this result, the research hypothesis is accepted. It means that Reformulation technique gives positive significant effect on students' writing. Therefore, it can be concluded that students who are taught by Reformulation technique have better achievement in writing.

REFERENCES

Bartram, Mark, and Walton, Richard. 2002. *Correction: A Positive Approach to language Mistakes*. London: Heinle.

Brown, H. Douglas. 2004. *Language Assesment: Principles and Classroom Practices.* New York: Pearson Education, Inc.

Celce-murcia, Marianne. 2001. *Teaching English as A Second or Foreign Language, Third Edition*. US: Heinle& Heinle.

Creshwell, J. W. 2008. *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research (3rd)*. New Jersey: Pearson Education.

Depdiknas. 2004. *StandarKompetensiLulusandanSpesifikasiUjianAkhirSMP/MTS*. Jakarta: Pusatpenilaianpendidikan, badanpenelitiandanpengembangan Depdiknas

Gay, L. R., and Airasian, P. 2000. *Education Research: Competencies of Analysis and Application (6th)*. Collombus : Merrill Publishing Company.

Harmer, Jeremy. 2007. *How to Teach English*. England: pearson education limited.

Herrel, Adrienne L., and Jordan, Michael. 2008. *Fifty Strategies for Teaching English Language Learners*. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.

Hughes, Arthur. 2003. *Testing for Language Teachers.* UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, Ken. 2002. *Teaching and Researching Writing*. London: pearson education.

James, Carl. 1998. *Errors In Language Learning And Use: Exploring Error Analysis*. England: Addison Wesley Longman limited.

Krashen, Stephen D., and Terrel, Tracy D. 1988. *The Natural Approach: Language Acquisition in The Classroom*. UK: Prentice Hall International.

Luchini, Pedro Luis, and Roldán, Valeria. Monitoring the implementation of the reformulation technique in the EFL writing class: A case study in Argentina.*Iranian Journal of Language Studies (IJLS),* Vol. 1(4), 2007 (pp. 227-248) from http://www.ijls.net/volumes/volume1issue4/luchini1. pdf

Nunan, David. 1999. *Second Language Teaching and Learning.* USA: Heinle.

Sudjana. 2005. *Metoda Statistiika*. Bandung: Tarsinto.

Thornbury, Scott. 2008. *How to Teach Grammar*. England: Pearson Educational Limited.