

**RISK-TAKING, SPEAKING ABILITY, AND AUSTRALASIAN PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE; DO THEY REALLY APPERTAIN?**

By

Roghibatul Luthfiyyah

English Education Department  
Swadaya Gunung Jati University Cirebon  
[lutfinalutfi27@gmail.com](mailto:lutfinalutfi27@gmail.com)

**ABSTRACT**

*The purposes of this study are: (1) to find out whether there is any positive correlation between risk-taking and Australasian Parliamentary English Debate; (2) to find out whether there is any positive correlation between speaking ability and Australasian Parliamentary English Debate; (3) to find out whether there is any positive correlation between risk-taking, speaking ability, and Australasian Parliamentary English Debate of the fifth semester students of English Education Department of Unswagati in academic year 2014-2015.*

*This research is carried out at English Education Departemen of Unswagati Cirebon. This research was conducted in 3 months, from January to March 2015. The population of this research was the fifth semester students of English Education department of Unswagati Cirebon. There were 80 students taken as sample for this study using random sampling technique. The data used for this study were collected using performance tests and questionnaire. The data gained from questionnaire and tests were then being analyzed using simple correlation and multiple linier regression.*

*Based on the result of the study, it can be concluded that: (1) there is significant positive correlation between risk-taking and Australasian Parliamentary English Debate (*

**Introduction**

It cannot be argued that most of the world population use English language as a means of communication. Many non-native countries implement English subject as the compulsory subject start from the early stage up to the higher education, including in Indonesia. One of the reasons beyond those activities is because people believe that someone with English proficiency will achieve the proper welfare in their life. Besides, it is also a demand of globalization era which requires people to be able to communicate in English.

Furthermore, people and English learners consequently often evaluate their success in language learning as well as the effectiveness of their English course on the basis on how well they feel that they have improved in their spoken language competence. It is in line with the statement from Richard (2008: 1) that the mastery of speaking skill in English is priority for many second or foreign language learners. The indicators that students can speak successfully are related to their fluency, vocabulary, pronunciation, grammar, and comprehension. Moreover, the knowledge of how native speakers use the language in different context and situation are also regarded as the requirement of successful communication (Luthfiyah: 2012: 3).

One of the quite challenging activities in speaking is how to negotiate someone's opinion. Debating activity can be implemented in speaking class, because all students will participate in delivering their idea. Debating activity is also appropriated technique for students in higher education, where they should think, do, and act in higher order thinking. One of the debating systems

which is possible to be implemented in University students is Australasian Parliamentary Debate (APD).

Australasian Parliamentary Debate (APD) is a formal method of interactive and representational argument which consists of two teams debating over an issue (motion), more commonly a topic or proposition. This kind of debating system is usually implementing in high schools and colleges (Leonardi: 2000: 2). This kind of debating system consists of two teams; Affirmative (also known as the "Government") and Negative (also known as the "Opposition"). As a result of debate activity, students are eager to involve in speaking, sharing their ideas, and arguing someone opinion, and defending their statements.

Meanwhile, debating activity is very complex. Speaker cannot merely rely on their speaking ability. They should aware of many aspects, what they speak, the materials they bring, their circumstance, the opponents they face, the rules of debate. It assumes that debaters should be able to take a risk in every single steps they take. Therefore, risk taking is regarded as one of the factor of determining the quality of good debaters.

Risk taking, as one of personality aspect, in learning language plays a crucial part. Some experts (Lightbown & Spada, 1998: 3; Brown, 2004: 149; Gass & Slinker, 2008: 434) believe that risk taking is an important characteristic of successful learning of second or foreign language. The personal positive risk taking and attitudes of learners will help them to develop their language ability fast. Learners have to be able to gamble a bit, to be willing to try out practice a new thing, and take risk of being wrong, making

mistakes, and being loss or failure. It assumes that risk taking significantly contributes the successful students in debating activity.

Therefore, in this paper the writer intends to conduct a research to know the positive correlation among those three variables; risk taking, speaking ability, and students' performance in conducting Australasian Parliamentary Debate.

This research can give some contributions for English teachers, students of English Education, and the other researchers. For English teachers, it is expected that the findings of this research can enlighten the understanding of conducting debate, especially Australasian Parliamentary debate. Besides teacher can implement it as one of alternative techniques to teach speaking, to sharpen students' critical thinking, and encourage students' confidence. Furthermore, this study can also be regarded for students, especially students of English education department, as a guidance to conduct Australasian Parliamentary debate. The last but not the least, the findings is expected to be some inputs for the other researchers to conduct similar study with deeper and more comprehensive materials.

#### *Research Design*

This study uses correlational research design. It aims at investigating the possibility of the relationship between two or more variables. Unlike experimental design, there is no manipulation in correlational research design (Frankle Wallen, 328). There are two variables in this research. They are predictor variable or independent variable and response

variable or dependent variable. Students' risk taking and speaking ability are the predictors or independent variable, while students' performance in Australasian Parliamentary debate is response or dependent variable.

#### *Population, Sample, and Sampling*

Tuckman (2008: 227) defines population as a group about which the researcher is interested in gaining information and drawing conclusions. The population of this research is the fifth semester English Education Department students of Unswagati Cirebon in the academic year of 2014 and 2015. There 12 classes in which each class consists of 20 students. The total number of population is 240 students.

Meanwhile, Creswell (2008: 152) states that a sample is a subgroup of the target population that the researcher plans to study for generalizing about the target population. The sample of the research is 80 students who come from four classes. They were chosen randomly by using Cluster Random Sampling. The researcher used cluster random sampling because it is equal probability selection method. That mean of each class in population has an equal chance of being included in the sample so that it can be used to produce representative sample (Burke, 2000: 183). The followings are the steps to conduct cluster random sampling: (i) listing the code of the class; (ii) writing down each code of class in a place of rolled paper; (iii) rolling the paper well; (iv) putting all pieces of paper into a container; (v) shaking the container well; (vi) taking of the rolled papers.

*Techniques of Collecting the Data*

A questionnaire has been defined by Creswell (2008: 394) as a form used in survey design that participants in a study complete and return to the researcher. The participants choose answers to questions and supply basic personal or demographic information.

The purpose of using questionnaire is to get information from research participants about their risk-taking. The researcher used statements as the item stems to indicate the students' degree of risk-taking. The questionnaire is consisted of 30 statements with four-point rating scale measuring their risk-taking. The questionnaire must be valid and reliable before it is distributed to the respondents. To check the validity and the reliability of the questionnaire, firstly, the researcher will try it out to the students of the class who do not belong to the sample. Then, the writer calculates the validity and reality of the items.

Furthermore, the researcher used a *Likert* scale using four points scale instead of five points, in which the interval between each point on the scale is assumed to be equal. The undecided point is omitted to avoid neutral answers, since mostly students tend to choose the neutral answers. It is used to register the extent of agreement and disagreement to a particular statement. The points are:

**3.1 : Likert Scale Point**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Positive</b>	<b>Negative</b>
Strongly Agree	4	1
Agree	3	2
Disagree	2	3
Strongly Disagree	1	4

The second technique is test. Brown (2004: 3) defines test as a method of measuring a person's ability, knowledge, or performance in a given domain. In this study, the writer will use subjective test in a form of performance test as an instrument to assess students' speaking ability and students' competence in conducting Australasian Parliamentary debate. The first test is to measure students' speaking ability. The researcher will give presentation task to the students, and score it based on the following scoring rubric adapted from Weir, 1998: 147-148:

**Table 3.2 : Scoring Guide for Assessing Speaking**

<b>Indicators of Speaking</b>	<b>Scores</b>	<b>Criterion</b>
<b>Fluency</b>	<b>4</b>	Communicates effectively, responds well to the topic. Explain well, gives some examples.
	<b>3</b>	Some hesitation which disturbs flow but not matter much. Responds to topic,
	<b>2</b>	Speech halting and lack coherence. Frequent hesitation, needs prompting but shows attempt.
	<b>1</b>	Speech disconnected and difficult to follow. Unable to respond topic even when prompted.

<b>Vocabulary</b>	<b>4</b>	Appropriate range and flexibility of vocabulary to deal with topic, enough to express ideas.
	<b>3</b>	Range of vocabulary adequate, though experiences difficulty expanding on the topic.
	<b>2</b>	Limited vocabulary makes communication difficult, though shows some attempts.
	<b>1</b>	Vocabulary not adequate even for minimal communication.
<b>Pronunciation</b>	<b>4</b>	Individual sounds sufficiently well-articulated, easy to understand and follow.
	<b>3</b>	Some individual sounds poorly articulated but does not disrupt comprehension.
	<b>2</b>	Poor pronunciation puts strain on listeners and causes misunderstanding.
	<b>1</b>	Impossible to understand at all.
<b>Grammar</b>	<b>4</b>	Good use of variety of structures with topic even in complex ones
	<b>3</b>	Basic structures accurate but complex ones cause little difficulty
	<b>2</b>	Basic structures often inaccurate, more complex ones not even attempted.
	<b>1</b>	Basic structures always distort and no awareness of any grammatical rules.
<b>Ideas/Content</b>	<b>4</b>	The content is clear, focused and well-suited to audience and purpose. Main ideas stand out and are developed by strong supporting detail.
	<b>3</b>	The content is clear, focused and appropriate to audience and purpose. Support is present although it may be limited in general.
	<b>2</b>	The content requires extensive inferences by the audience. Development is attempted but is minimal or may be unsuited to audience and purpose.
	<b>1</b>	The content lacks an apparent purpose or central theme.

On the other hand, for gathering the data from students' performance in conducting Australasian parliamentary debate, the writer will use debate task where the students will perform how to conduct Australasian Parliamentary debate in a good Manner, Matter, and Method.

#### Techniques of Analyzing the Data

After the data are gathered, then the writer will analyze them to know whether there is or not a significant correlation between speaking ability (X1) and students' performance in Australasian Parliamentary debate (Y); Risk taking(X2) and students' performance in Australasian Parliamentary debate (Y); and between risk taking (X1), speaking skill (X2), , towards students' performance in Australasian Parliamentary debate (Y). There are some techniques which are used to analyze the data. They are:

- 1) To test the first and second hypothesis, whether there is or no a positive correlation between students' risk-taking and students' performance in Australasian Parliamentary debate; speaking ability and students' performance in Australasian Parliamentary debate, the researcher uses simple correlation technique using the Product Moment Formula as follows:

$$r_{xy} = \frac{n\sum XY - (\sum X)(\sum Y)}{\sqrt{[n(\sum X^2) - (\sum X)^2] \times [n(\sum Y^2) - (\sum Y)^2]}}$$

Where:

R = the coefficient of correlation between X1 and Y;

X = the independent variables;

Y = the dependent variable;

N = the number of sample

The value of  $r_{xy}$ , then, is compared with product-moment table ( $r_t$ ) at the level of significance

5% and N= the number of respondent. If  $r_{xy}$  is greater than  $r_t$  ( $r_{xy} > r_t$ ) it means that  $H_0$  is rejected and therefore  $H_a$  is accepted.

- 2) To test the third hypothesis of the study, the writer computes and analyzes the correlation between three variables, those are: students' risk taking, speaking ability, and students' Australasian Parliamentary debate. Multiple Linier Regression Technique will be used to asses it. The formula is as follow:

$$R^2 = \frac{SS_{reg}}{\sum y^2}$$

Where:

$R^2$  = correlation coefficient between  $X_1$ ,  $X_2$ . And  $Y$

$SS_{reg}$  =  $a_1 \sum x_1 y + a_2 \sum x_2 y$

$a_1$  = Coefficient of Predictor  $X_1$

$a_2$  = Coefficient of Predictor  $X_2$

$\sum x_1 y$  = Sum of product moment between  $X_1$  and  $Y$

$\sum x_2 y$  = Sum of product moment between  $X_2$  and  $Y$

- 3) To find out whether or not the coefficient of Ray (1,2) is significant the writer uses the formula of Regression Line analysis as follow:

$$F = \frac{R^2/k}{(1-R^2)/(n-k-1)}$$

Where:

F = the value of regression line

R = the coefficient of correlation between  $X_1$ ,  $X_2$ , and  $Y$

K = the number of independent variable

n = the number of sample

## Research Findings and Discussion

### Data Description

Description of speaking ability, Australasian Parliamentary Debate ability, and Risk Taking data were counted by using SPSS r. 16. The obtained data for each variable of students' speaking skill, AP debate ability, risk-taking are described in the table 4.1. as follow:

*Table 4.1. The Descriptive Statistic of Each Variable*

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Risk-Taking	80	59.00	81.00	68.0375	5.19602
Speaking	80	50.00	98.00	77.5375	10.52898
Australasian Parliamentary Debate	80	50.00	95.00	73.3625	9.05712
Valid N	80				

The whole data are statistically presented at the table above. It is found that the subject of the study is symbolized as N, which consists of 80 students. The highest score of each variable is described in the maximum score and the lowest one is described in the minimum score. The mean is the result of whole scores divided into the whole respondents. The standard deviation describes the description value.

#### a. Risk-Taking

The writer obtained the data of students' risk-taking score by distributing some closed-ended questionnaire items. The maximum score was 81, the minimum score was 59, mean was 68, median was 67.5, mode was 65, and standard deviation was 5.19.

#### b. Speaking

The writer obtained the data of Students' Speaking score by conducting presentation test. The maximum score was 95, the minimum score was 50, mean was 77.5, median was 78.5, mode was 70, and standard deviation was 10.52.

#### c. Australasian Parliamentary Debate

The writer obtained the data of students' risk-taking score by conducting Australasian Parliamentary Debate. The maximum score was 95, the minimum score was 50, mean was 77.5, median was 78.5, mode was 80, and standard deviation was 9.06.

### Hypothesis Testing

In this section, the writer tested the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) against the alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ). In addition Sudarmanto (2015: 162) states that there are three points which will be found in testing hypothesis. They are: (1) to know whether there is correlation between dependent and independent variable; (2) to know whether its coefficient correlation is significant or not; (3) to know the effective contribution of each independent variables. In this study, the computation result of each hypothesis is described as follows:

#### 1. The correlation between Risk-Taking ( $X_1$ ) and Australasian Parliamentary Debate (Y)

$$H_0 = r_{x_1y} < 0$$

There is no positive correlation between Risk-Taking ( $X_1$ ) and Australasian Parliamentary Debate (Y)

$$H_a = r_{x_1y} > 0$$

There is positive correlation between Risk-Taking ( $X_1$ ) and Australasian Parliamentary Debate (Y). The technique used here was simple correlation.

Based on the simple correlation computation using Pearson Product Moment formula of  $X_1$  and Y, the coefficient of correlation is  $r_{x_1y} = 0.229$ . Then, this value is compared to r table at significance level ( $\alpha = 0.05$  for  $N=80$ ). It is found that r table is 0.220. This means that r observation is greater than r table ( $0.229 > 0.220$ ). It can be concluded that r observation is significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis is accepted; meaning that the result of the debate test proved that risk-taking has correlation with the ability of Australasian Parliamentary Debate. It is concluded that there is significant positive correlation between students' risk-taking ( $X_1$ ) and Australasian Parliamentary Debate (Y).

### 3. The correlation between Speaking Ability ( $X_2$ ) and Australasian Parliamentary Debate (Y)

$$H_0 = r_0 \leq 0$$

There is no positive correlation between Risk-Taking ( $X_1$ ), Speaking Ability ( $X_2$ ), and Australasian Parliamentary Debate (Y)

$$H_a = r_0 > 0$$

There is positive correlation between Risk-Taking ( $X_1$ ), Speaking Ability ( $X_2$ ), and Australasian Parliamentary Debate (Y). The technique used here was multiple linear regression formula using SPSS.

From the multiple linear regression analysis of Risk-Taking ( $X_1$ ), and speaking ability ( $X_1$ ), with Australasian Parliamentary Debate (Y), it was found that the coefficient of correlation ( $R_{y12}$ ) is 0.746. According to Sugiyono (2008:257) the degree of relationship can be categorized as follow:

**Table 4.7. The Degree of Correlation**

0	-	0,199	Very weak
0,20	-	0,399	Weak
0,40	-	0,599	Average
0,60	-	0,799	Strong
0,80	-	1	Very Strong

It can be seen that the degree of relationship among Risk-Taking ( $X_1$ ), and speaking ability ( $X_1$ ), with Australasian Parliamentary Debate (Y) is strong. It means that the correlation among Risk-Taking ( $X_1$ ), and speaking ability ( $X_1$ ), with Australasian Parliamentary Debate (Y) is strong.

Furthermore, the value of F-observation is 48.425, the value of F-table with degree of freedom (df) is 2:80 at  $\alpha = 0.05$  is 3.11. It is clearly seen that the value of F-Observation is greater than F-table (48.425 > 3.11). It is also means that F observation is significant. So, it can be said that the regression of equation is also significant. From the result of analysis, it is obvious that the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) is accepted. The conclusion is that there is significant positive correlation between Risk-Taking ( $X_1$ ), and speaking ability ( $X_1$ ), with Australasian Parliamentary Debate (Y).

The value of coefficient correlation or R is 0.746 and the value of coefficient determination or  $R^2$  is 0.557. It means that 55.7% Australasian Parliamentary Debate can be explained by students' risk-taking and students' speaking ability.

### The Discussion of the Research Findings

From the result of the data analysis, it shows that there is positive correlation between students' risk-taking, speaking competence, and australasian parliamentary english debate. A positive correlation means that the increase of students' risk-taking and speaking ability is followed by the increase of the ability of conducting Australasian parliamentary English Debate. This kind of correlation creates an assumption that Australasian parliamentary English Debate can be regressed, explained, and predicted from students' risk-taking, and speaking ability.

By considering the result of the hypothesis testing, it can be explained as follows:

1. The first finding of the hypothesis testing shows that there is positive correlation between Risk-Taking ( $X_1$ ) and Australasian Parliamentary Debate (Y) of the fifth semester students of English Education Department of Teacher Training and Education Faculty of Swadaya Gunung Jati University Cirebon in academic year of 2014/2015. The finding is in line with Anggita (2011: 17) statements that risk-taking encourages students to perform bravely and get involved in learning activities quickly. It motivates students to participate actively without being afraid of



making mistakes. Allowing student to take a risk is obviously essential to achieve language competence.

Furthermore, Bang (1999: 13) states that learning is the reward for taking risks. Learners have to be able to gamble a bit, to be willing to try out practice a new thing and take a risk of being wrong, making mistakes, being loss or failure. Furthermore, in learning speaking students need a high risk-taking in order to get a significant progress. Unfortunately, learning speaking of foreign language in public, especially in front of the class or, is often anxiety-provoking. It probably occurs when learners become tongue-tied or loss of words in unexpected situation, which often leads to discouragement and a general sense of failure.

On the other hand, debate is a highly effective activity for developing argumentation skills for persuasive speech and writing. Davidson (1996) Debate is an important educational tool for learning analytic thinking skills and for forcing self-conscious reflection on the validity of one's ideas. In conducting debates, students should work cooperatively, brainstorm ideas, develop vocabulary and read to support an opinion. They also should take a risk to produce the different linguistics elements and produce their ideas.

In short, it can be concluded that there is positive correlation between Risk-Taking ( $X_1$ ) and Australasian Parliamentary Debate ( $Y$ ). It means that the improvement of students' risk-taking will be followed by the improvement of Australasian parliamentary debate.

2. The second finding of the hypothesis testing shows that there positive correlation between Speaking Ability ( $X_2$ ) and Australasian Parliamentary Debate ( $Y$ ) of the fifth semester students of English Education Department of Teacher Training and Education Facultu of Swadaya Gunung Jati University Cirebon in academic year of 2014/2015. One of the important factor in conducting Australasian Parliamentary Debate is speaking skill. They cannot be seperated one another. Both fluency and accuracy play an important role. Moreover, in debate the students are required to fullfill three criteria; manner, matter, and method which all of them cover the ability of speaking aspects. In addition, Beiber (2011: 2) states that debate provides a platform for students to express themselves and can help boosting students' confidence and speaking skill. This can be one technique in teaching speaking since it includes the techniques of collaboration and persuasion to convince the audience and adjudicators that one's arguments outweighing its opposition. This technique also promotes students to be active speaker. In short, speaking skill is one of the influencing factor in debate. Based on the hypothesis testing, it can be concluded that there is positive correlation between speaking skill and Australasian parliamentary debate. It means that the improvement of students' speaking skill will be followe by the improvement of Australasian parliamentary debate.

3. The third finding of the hypothesis testing

shows that there positive correlation between Risk-Taking ( $X_1$ ), Speaking Ability ( $X_2$ ), and Australasian Parliamentary Debate (Y) of the fifth semester students of English Education Department of Teacher Training and Education Facultu of Swadaya Gunung Jati University Cirebon in academic year of 2014/2015. The success of conducting Australasian Parliamentary English Debate correlated with risk-taking and speaking ability. Lightbown & Spada, 1998: 38, Brown, 2004: 149, Gass & Selinker, 2008: 434 believe that risk-taking is an important characteristic of successful learning of second language. The personal positive risk-taking and attitudes of learners will help them to develop their language ability fast. Learners who have high risk-taking would have to be able to gamble a bit, to be willing to try out practice a new thing and take a risk of being wrong, making mistakes, being loss or failure. Therefore, they will be easier to perform debate. They will be very confident to reveal their arguments and to defend their opinion. Debaters should not reluctant with their arguments. They need to convince the audience in a good manner, matter, and method.

On the other hand, Bailey (2005: 2) defines speaking as a productive skill, which consists of producing systematic verbal utterances to convey meaning. Someone who can speak English well is able to use the language both accurately and fluently. Accurate speakers do not make mistakes in grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation, while fluent speakers can

express themselves appropriately and without hesitation. They do not usually worry unduly about making mistakes. It is in line with the procedure of Australasian Parliamentary Debate which requires the speakers to speak communicatively.

From the explanation above, it is obviously seen that there positive correlation between Risk-Taking ( $X_1$ ), Speaking Ability ( $X_2$ ), and Australasian Parliamentary Debate (Y). It means that he improvement of students' risk-taking and speaking skill will be followe by the improvement of Australasian parliamentary debate.

### 5.1. Conclusion

Based on the result of the study, it can be conluded as follows:

- a. There is significant positive correlation between students' risk-taking and Australasian Parliamentary Debate of the Fifth semester of English Education Department Students in academic year of 2014-2015 (

### 5.2. Suggestion

Based on the result of the study and implication above, tthe writer proposes some sugestions as follow:

- a. The students' risk-taking should be maintaned and elevated. Students' risk-taking can decrease during the process of learning and teaching. There are some factors related to the decrease and increase of risk-taking. For instance by giving a chelanging activities and a comfort atmosphere in the teaching learning proces.
- b. The students' speaking competence should

be increased. This can be realized by encouraging students to speak more without ignoring their accuracy and fluency. The teacher should give the students opportunities to practice their speaking, to provide some related vocabularies, to give an interesting activities. Those will make the students' speaking ability increased.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bailey, K.M. 1998. *Learning about Language Assessment: Dilemmas, Decisions, and Directions*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Bang, Youngjoo. 1999. *Factors Affecting Korean Students' Risk-Taking Behaviour in EFL Classroom*. Dissertation of Ohio University. Retrieved from Ohio University Databased.
- Brown, H. Douglas. 2001. *Teaching by Principles-An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2004. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching-Second Edition*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Burgees, Sally, and Head, Katie. 2005. *How to Teach for Exams*. England: Longman Group.
- Byrne, Donn. 1997. *Teaching Oral English*. England: Longman group.
- Creswell, John W. 2008. *Educational Research: Planning Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative, and Qualitative Research*. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc..
- Firdaus,
- Frankel, J.R. & Wallen, N.E. 2008. *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*. Seventh Ed. New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Florez, M.A.C. 1999. Improving Adult English Language Learners' Speaking Skills. *ERIC Digest ED435204*. Retrieved in July 7, 2011 from ERIC Database.
- Freeman, Diane Larsen, and Long, Michael H. 1993. *An Introduction to second language acquisition research*. New York: Longman Education.
- Gass, Susan M. & Selinker, Larry. 2008. *Second Language Acquisition: an Introduction Course*. Third Edition. New York: Taylor & Francis e-Library.
- Harmer, Jeremy. 2007. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Fourth Edition. Edinburgh: Pearson Education Limited.
- Lightbown, Pasty M & Spada, Nina. 1999. *How Language are Learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Long, M.H. 1991. *Second Language Needs of Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge university Press.

Louma, Sari. 2004. *Assessing Speaking*. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Luthfiyyah, Roghibatul. 2012. *The Effectiveness of Meaning-Focused Instruction to Teach Speaking Viewed from Students' Risk Taking*. A Thesis. Surakarta.

Nation, I.S.P. and Newton, Jonathan. 2008. *Teaching ESL/EFL Listening and Speaking*. New York: Taylor & Francis Group.

Ngadiso. 2006. *Educational Statistics*. Surakarta.

Nunan, David . 1991. *Language Teaching Methodology*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Richard, Jack C. 2008. *Teaching listening and Speaking From Theory to Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. & Rodgers, T. 2001. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

\_\_\_\_\_. in *Current Trend in Teaching Listening and Speaking*. Available at [www.oup.com/elt](http://www.oup.com/elt).

Shalabi, M. Fadi. 2003. Study of Theories of Personality and Learning Style. *Desertation Paper of the university of Edinburgh. Moray House School of Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.era.lib.ed.ac.uk/handle/1842/193>

Tuckman, Bruce W. 1978. *Conducting Education Research*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Inc.

Wieir, Cryril J. 1998. *Communicative Language Testing*. New York: Prentice Hall