

## Toward the Effectiveness of Teaching Descriptive Text at Junior High School

Received: 10<sup>th</sup> Oct 2020; Revised: 12<sup>th</sup> Nov 2020; Accepted: 26<sup>th</sup> Nov 2020  
Permalink/DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15548/.....>

Neni Cahnia, Hadeli, Luli Sari  
Yustina

English Tadris Department, State  
Islamic University (UIN) Imam  
Bonjol Padang, Indonesia

[nenicahnia@gmail.com](mailto:nenicahnia@gmail.com),  
[ha\\_deli@yahoo.com](mailto:ha_deli@yahoo.com),  
[lulyregar@gmail.com](mailto:lulyregar@gmail.com)

\*) Corresponding Author

**Abstract :** Teaching descriptive text for oral and written competences has been quite phenomenal in Junior High School level since students' had very limited access or competence in the target language. Therefore, using Information Gap Technique, several indicators of speaking skills were expected to be explored in the case of students at Grade Eight in Solok West Sumatera. The purpose of this research was to determine whether or not Information Gap Technique gave significant effects to students' speaking skills. Using clustering random sampling, thirty-two students from class VIII.2. and other 32 students of VIII1 became the experimental and control class. Data were collected by using speaking test and analyzed by using Statistical Product and Service Solution (SPSS) procedures. T-test was used to analyze the students' post-test score. The data were analyzed by using simple regression (df .05). The result of this research showed that mean scores of students' speaking in experimental class was 65,81 higher than those of control class (58.15). While, t-calculate (8.3) was also bigger than t-table (1.669). Statistically, it showed that teaching speaking by using Information Gap Technique gave significant effects to students' speaking skill.

*Information Gap : Key Word, Speaking Test, Descriptive Text.*

### INTRODUCTION

Speaking is one of the most important skill in English. Students do not only learn it theoretically but they have to practice it more often. This condition encourages students to actively participate in many activities inside or outside the classroom. Brown (2003: 140) states that speaking is a productive skill that can be directly and empirically

observed, those observations are invariably colored by the accuracy and effectiveness of a test-takers listening skill, which necessarily compromises the reliability and validity of an oral production test.

Oradee (2006: 533) states speaking is essential skills that needs a lot of practice to communicate. People who have the ability in speaking will receive

the information better. Therefore, students of English must be able to speak English well because people identify the English mastery with their English speaking. Moreover, speaking is a major skill to be learned by learners of English as a foreign language in Indonesia. In relation to the importance of English language in all aspects of life today. Indonesia as a developing country has an educational curriculum which includes the instruction of English one of the important subjects to be taught from Junior High School to university level (Samad et al 2017: 97). According to Harmer (2007:45), the teaching of speaking depends on there being a classroom culture of speaking, and that classrooms need to become talking classroom. In other words, students will much more confident speakers (and their speaking will improve) if this kind of speaking activation is a regular feature of lessons. Information Gap can also reinforce vocabulary and a variety of grammatical structures taught in the class. They allow students to use linguistic forms and function in a communicative way. These activities bring the language to life for students, they can use the building blocks of language to speak in the target language (Sartika 2016: 273)

The phenomena in teaching and learning process in the classroom are beyond the expectation. Most of the students still worry to speak in front of the class. The students cannot understand how to speak well, they had lack of vocabularies and the students couldn't speak fluently. The students did not have much opportunity to speak and develop their ideas in their own language, such as by considering the components of speaking. The researcher thought that the students need contributions that make students being active in the learning

process. In this situation, which teachers tend to use Conventional Technique, it makes the students become more passive and almost never express their own ideas optimally. There is an alternative way that can be implemented by the teachers in the classroom in order to make the variation of teaching that is by implementing "students – centered model" in language teaching. It encourages students to interact among them. There are many kinds of techniques which applied by the teachers in classroom to improve students' speaking skill, such as by using Information Gap Technique.

As a language is used as a tool of communication, speaking a second or foreign language well is a very complex task if we try to understand the nature of what appears to be involved (Richard and Renandya 2002: 201). People should know how to express arguments, thoughts, feelings, and ideas through the language (Samad 2017: 99). Information Gap Technique can make students to exchange and provide information to others, such as giving opinions, information obtained from the source or others. It also decrease teacher talks and increase student talks in the classroom (Agus et al 2014: 2). According to Harmer (2007: 287) games which are designed to provoke communicate between students frequently depend on an information gap. So that one students has to talk to a partner in order to solve puzzle, draw a picture (describe and draw), put things in the right order (describe and arrange), or find similarities and differences between pictures. In addition, Information Gap Technique is useful in giving motivation for the students in speaking English, giving roles an duties. Information Gap technique is an activity where learners are missing the

information they need to complete a task and need to talk to each other to find it. It means that all of the participants have functions and significant contribution in learning process (Richards 2008: 17).

Furthermore, Marashi (2017: 30) states that Information Gap technique are communication exercise in which each of two paired students has information which they must orally relate to each other in order to fill the gaps in the information they have. Information gap technique can be applied by using pictures. This technique can create a positive atmosphere in teaching and learning process their speaking. Moreover, Rahimi (2016: 59) states that Information Gap technique are useful for various reasons. The students can provide an opportunity for extended speaking practice, they represent real communication in which motivation can be high, and they require sub-skills such as clarifying meaning and re-phrasing. It can be concluded that a Information Gap has many functions in promoting students to improve their skill and motivation, then to learn English easily, and also can be done by the students to improve their speaking enjoyable.

There are some advantages of Information Gap Technique that will support students on speaking activities. The first, can make students become more active in speaking English. The second, trains students' knowledge about something that students' don't know before. Students can issue ideas and information they know to other students.

The third, this technique able to facilitate languages, especially English. The fourth, students must have goals in providing and asking for the information needed before sharing information with others. The fifth, students can learn well and comfortably when exchanging information, by using several images as learning media, it make students interested in the learning process. The sixth, can also add new vocabulary. The seventh, Information Gap Technique can improve the courage and confidence of students in speaking using English in the classroom (Rosalinah and Khilda 2019: 165).

To teach speaking skill by using Information Gap Technique researcher use genre. Researcher was concern on the descriptive text because this genre was suitable to motivates students more since through descriptive students be able to share their idea of describe the information that has been obtained. Based on this issues, the main problem of this study was "is there any significant differences on students speaking skill between those who were taught through Information Gap Technique and those with Conventional

Technique?"

## **METHOD**

The population of this study were students in grade eight Junior High School 2 Solok who were 352 in number spreading in 10 classes. Using cluster random sampling, we came across to two groups as experiment and control group.

**Table1 .Tests of Normality**

	Kelas	Kolmogorov- <sup>a</sup> Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
MID SCORES	VIII.1	.093	32	.200*	.960	32	.271
	VIII.2	.091	32	.200*	.963	32	.331
	VIII.3	.159	32	.038	.930	32	.040
	VIII.4	.155	32	.048	.924	32	.026
	VIII.5	.154	32	.051	.917	32	.017
	IVII.6	.179	32	.011	.927	32	.033
	VIII.7	.144	32	.089	.916	32	.016
	VIII.8	.157	32	.042	.931	32	.041
	IVII.9	.159	32	.038	.926	32	.030
	VIII.10	.133	32	.164	.925	32	.029
	VIII.11	.154	32	.051	.922	32	.023

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

\*This is a lower bound of the true significance.

**Table2 .Test of Homogeneity of Variance**

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
MID SCORES	Based on Mean	.288	10	341	.984
	Based on Median	.110	10	341	1.000
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.110	10	328.130	1.000
	Based on trimmed mean	.279	10	341	.986

Based on SPSS output above, the value of the variable significance of English students of all classes was more than 0.05. Based on the graphics Q-Q Plot (see in appendix) if the data around and near with the line, it means, the data was normal. After getting population, researcher then took the next step to find

the sample of this research. The instrument of this research was speaking test. The instrument used to get measurement the accuracy of the data (Siregar 2018: 45). In this research, the instrument that the researcher used in collecting the data was speaking skill. It was used to know whether Information

Gap Technique gave significance effect on students speaking skill or not. Especially to increase pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension.

Hughes's (2003: 132) criteria was used to rate students' speaking skill in five categories from 1 to 6 point (point 1 represents the lowest and point 6 represents the highest score. The experimental group was treated by using Information Gap Technique while the control group was taught by using conventional technique. After some treatments, both groups were tested. The researcher implements procedure. First, students are divided into A-B pairs. Second, the teacher gave two sets of pictures, one set (for A students) contains picture of a group of people. The other set (for B students) contains a similar picture but it contains a number of slight differences from the A picture. Third, the student must sit back to back and ask questions to try to find out how many differences there are between the two pictures and students practice a role play in pairs. Fourth, one student is given the information and the other needs to obtain information. The last steps, they role play the interaction without looking at each others cue cards. After that the students, can review with their partners their duties. The teacher asked to describe the results of their assignments in front of the

class and then the other students commented. While for control class, they were taught with the same material but with Conventional Technique (Richards 2008: 165).

The data were collected through post-test score, both of group's different treatment for speaking test. The post-test score was taken in the last meeting after giving the treatment. Finally, both classes would be given the post test. The post test was administered to get final result of the research. To analyze the students score in post test, the researcher use T-test formula taken from Sudjana (2005: 239). T-test here means a statistical procedure used to determine whether there is any significance difference of the mean score between two sets of test from experimental class and control class or not.

## RESULTS

The speaking test was evaluated by considering five components based on Hughes's (2003: 132) theory; pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension. All of the data were analyzed to find out the maximum and minimum scores, means scores and standard deviation of post test of experimental class and control class. The post test data of experimental and control classes were shown as follow:

**Table3**  
**The Scores of Speaking Test of Experimental Class and Control Class**

No	Component	Experimental	Control	Difference
1	Pronunciation	2.59	2.56	0.03
2	Grammar	18.75	16.09	2.66
3	Vocabulary	18.38	16	2.38
4	Fluency	8.94	8.75	0.19
5	Comprehension	17	14.25	2.75

Based on the explanation above, the students' speaking competence in aspects of pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension

were really higher than those of control class, suggesting that the hypothesis of this research was accepted.

Class	Highest Score	Lowest Score	Mean(X)	Total Score	Standard Deviation
Control	86	35	58.15	1861	14.93
Experiment	88	46	65.81	2106	12.75

The total score of speaking test of both classes were significantly different. The total score of control class was 1861 the highest score was 86, the lower score was 35 and standard deviation was 14.93. On the contrary, the total score of experimental class 2106 the highest score was 88 the lowest score was 46 and standard deviation was 12.75.

The analysis used this formula:

a) Control Class

Based on the data above, the data shows that the mean of control class is 58.15 and standard deviation 14.93.

Xmax : 86                      n : 32

R : Xmax - Xmin

Xmin : 35                      I : R/K

K : 1+3,3 log n

Note :

I = Interval

R = Range

K = Number of Classes

R : Xmax - Xmin

= 86-35 = 51

K : 1+3.3 log n

= 1+3.3 log 32

= 1+4.96

= 5.96

I : R/K = 51/5.96 = 8.5 = 9

The interval of students speaking score was 9, then the interval data of control class post test score can be seen in the table below.

**Table5 .The Interval of Data of Post Test Scores of Control Class**

No	Interval	Frequency	Percentage
1	35-43	5	15.6%
2	44-52	10	31.2%
3	53-61	6	18.7%
4	62-70	2	6.2%
5	71-79	6	18.7%
6	80-88	3	9.3%

From the table above, it was found that most of students' speaking descriptive text scores of post test in the control class was about 35-43, there was 5 or 15.6% students got score at that interval, while the interval 44-52 there were 10 or 31.2% students, at interval 53-61 there were 6 or 18.7% students who got score at that interval, at interval 62-70 there were 2 or 6.2% students, at interval 71-79 there were 6 or 18.7% students, and interval 80-88 there were 3 or 9.3% students.

Besides that, based on the table about students' speaking scores of post test control class, the result of speaking score in post-test there were students who standard score (KKM = 77) or higher: 2 students who got score 78, 1 student who got score 81, and 1 student who got score 83 and also 1 student who got score 86. And the rest of students got lower that standard score (KKM). The result of post-test in control class could be seen in the table below:

Control	N	Highest Score	Lowest Score	Mean(X)	Total Score	Standard Deviation
	32	86	35	58.15	1862	14.93

Based on the table above, we know that the highest scores of students' speaking skill in control class after teaching by using Conventional technique was 86, while the lowest score was 35, the mean score was 58.15 and standard deviation was 14.93.

b) Experimental class

Based on the data above, the data shows that the mean of experimental class is 65.81 and standard deviation 12.75.

$X_{max} : 88$                        $n : 32$

$R : X_{max} - X_{min}$

$X_{min} : 46$                        $I : R/K$

$K : 1+3.3 \log n$

Note :

$I = \text{Interval}$

$R = \text{Range}$

$K = \text{Number of Classes}$

$R : X_{max} - X_{min}$

$= 88-46 = 42$

$K : 1+3.3 \log n$

$= 1+3.3 \log 32$

$= 1+4.96$

$= 5.96$

$I : R/K = 42/5.96 = 7.04 = 7$

The interval of students speaking score was 7, then the interval data of experimental class post test score can be seen in the table below.

**Table4.8**

**The Interval of Data of Post Test Scores of Experimental Class**

No	Interval	Frequency	Percentage
1	46-52	6	18.7%
2	53-59	6	18.7%
3	60-66	5	15.6%
4	67-73	5	15.6%
5	74-80	6	18.7%
6	81-87	3	9.3%
7	88-94	1	3.1%

From the table and graph above, it was found that most of students' speaking descriptive text scores of post test in the experimental class was increased. The interval between 46-52, there was 6 or

18.7% student got score at that interval, while the interval 53-59 there were 6 or 18.7% students, then at interval 60-66 there were 5 or 15.6%

**Tests of Normality**

Kelas	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.

students who got score at that interval, at interval 67-73 there were 5 or 15.6% students, at interval 74-80 there were 6 or 18.7% students, at interval 81-87 there were 3 or 9.3% students, at interval 88-94 there were 1 or 3.1% students.

procedure score in post-test there were 8 students who get higher than standard score (KKM = 77), 2 students who got score 79, 2 students who got score 80, 1 student who got score 84, a student who got score 85, a student who got 86 and one student who got score 88, and the rest of students got lower that standard score (KKM). The result of post-test in experimental class could be seen in the table below:

Besides that, based on the table about students' speaking scores of post test experiment class, the result of speaking

**Table9**  
**Post- test scores of experiment class at Junior High School2 Solok**

talExperimen	N	Highest Score	Lowest Score	Mean (X)	Total score	Standard Deviation
	32	88	46	65.81	2106	12.75



Based on the table above, the highest scores of students' speaking descriptive text in experiment class after teaching by Information Gap was 88, while the lowest score was 46, the mean score was 65.81 and standard deviation is 12.75.

**Inferential Data Analysis**

The prerequisite is necessary to determine whether the analysis of data for hypothesis testing can be continued or not. Some data analysis techniques demanding test prerequisite analysis. Analysis of variance requisite that data

come from a population with normal distribution and group compared to homogeneous data.

**The Normality of Distribution Test**

Test of normality English speaking class sample was done by using test liliefors). It was intended to see whether the data normal or not based on steps in chapter III. Based on that step, so the researcher got the test of normality as the table below:

**Table4.10**  
**The Result of Testing Normality Speaking Post-Test**

ajar Hasil	Be Post Test Eksperimen	.099	32	.200*	.953	32	.176
Siswa	Post Test Kontrol	.171	32	.018	.935	32	.054

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

.\*This is a lower bound of the true significance.

The table above was obtained a significance value of experimental class 0.176 and control class 0.054. The significance score > 0.05 and in accordance with the testing criteria that the data was normally distributed if the significance score > 0.05. It can be concluded that the experimental class and control class score normally distributed.

**The Homogeneity of Variance Test**

Variant test of homogeneity experimental and control classes was done by using SPSS. Based on the result, it was got result test of variance homogeneity sample class. It can be seen in the table below :

Based on the table above, obtained a significant score based on the mean 0.256. According to the criteria of testing that the data had homogeneous variances

if significant based on the mean score > 0.05, it can be concluded that the data in the research had homogeneous variance.

After the scoring posttest of experiment and control class had been analyzed, the value of t-calculated was obtained. Then the values of t calculate compared with the value of t-table. If the value of t-calculated less or equal than t-table at the level of significant 0.05, it could be concluded there was no significant difference towards the students speaking ability in both experiment and control class. It means the hypothesis was rejected. Meanwhile if t-calculated is bigger than t-table at level significant 0.05. It can be concluded that there is the significant difference in students speaking between these classes. It means that the hypothesis was accepted. The calculation could be seen as follow:

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

$$\overline{X}_1 = 65.81 \quad n_1 = 32 \quad S_1^2 = 12.75$$

$$\overline{X}_2 = 58.15 \quad n_2 = 32 \quad S_2^2 = 14.93$$

Where:

$\overline{X}_1$  : Mean score of experimental group

$\overline{X}_2$  : Mean score of control group

$S_1^2$  : Standard deviation of experimental group

$S_2^2$  : Standard deviation of control group

$n_1$  : The number of subject of experimental group

$n_2$  : The number of subject of control group

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

$$= \frac{32-1 (12.75) + 32-1 (14.93)}{32+32-2}$$

$$= \frac{31 (12.75) + 31 (14.93)}{62}$$

$$= \frac{395.25 + 462.8}{62}$$

$$= \frac{858.05}{62}$$

$$= 13.84$$

$$= 3.7$$

$$= 13.84$$

$$= S \sqrt{13.84}$$

$$S = 3.7$$

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

$$= \frac{65.81 - 58.15}{3.7 \sqrt{\frac{1}{32} + \frac{1}{32}}}$$

$$= \frac{7.66}{3.7 \sqrt{\frac{2}{32}}}$$

$$= \frac{7.66}{3.7 \sqrt{0.0625}}$$

$$= \frac{7.66}{3.7 \sqrt{0.0625}}$$

$$= \frac{7.66}{3.7 \sqrt{0.0625}}$$

$$= \frac{7.66}{3.7(0.25)}$$

$$= \frac{7.66}{0.925}$$

$$\text{Calculate } t = 8.3$$

$$df = (n_1 + n_2 - 2)$$

$$= (32 + 32 - 2) = 62$$

$$\alpha = 0.05$$

$$t - = t_{table} (1 - \alpha) (df)$$

$$= t_{(1-0.05), 62}$$

$$= t_{(0.95), 62}$$

$$= 1.66980$$

$$t - \text{Table} = 1.66980$$

$$t - \text{Calculate} > t - \text{table}$$

$$8.3 > 1.66980$$

## DISCUSSION

It can be seen from the result above, that t-calculate in this research was 8.3 while t-table was 1.66980 and the level of significance was 0.05. In conclusion, the value of t-calculated is bigger than the value of t-table. It means that the use of the Information Gap technique toward students' speaking skill increased their score significantly, so the hypothesis was accepted. As suggested by Arthur Hughes to success in speaking skill, the students have to consider about components of speaking. In other words the students have to master the speaking skill that related to pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension. Therefore, Information Gap is a technique that give significant effect on students' speaking skill. The applying of this technique in teaching speaking can help the students to develop

and organize their idea from beginning until the end of speak.

Related to the purpose of the research, that is to know whether there is any significant difference on students speaking ability between those taught with Information Gap and those taught with conventional technique at Junior High School 2 Solok. Researcher found that there is significant different on students speaking skill between those taught with Information Gap and those thought with conventional technique. The result of this research has shown that the mean score of experimental class (65.81) is higher than control class (58.13). In general, the students showed that they have significant effect on their speaking skill in presenting all components of speaking that involve pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension after using Information Gap technique. Specifically, the

significant effect on students; speaking skill is in grammar and comprehension.

The first significant effect on students' speaking skill is comprehension. This speaking component is the highest significant. In express information, the students have good comprehension to describe their ideas. The difference score of this component is 2.75. The second is grammar. The differences score between control and experimental class is 2.66, it shows that students are better to construct a sentence structure in speech to describe the pictures.

Based on the procedures above, it can be said that Information Gap technique can be started by paying attention to the picture given by the writer to the student. Students work in pairs and one of them has an incomplete picture. Then, the writer explains that the picture must be equipped with the help of students who have complete pictures, by conducting question and answer to describe the picture. Thus, there are the procedures that must be done to apply the technique in classrooms. This technique helps students in the speaking process.

## CONCLUSION

The researcher concludes that Information Gap Technique affects students' speaking skill on descriptive text significantly at Junior High School 2 Solok. Through Information Gap technique, the students are able to speak better than the students whom were taught without Information Gap technique. The success of this research can be proved by the result of students' score on speaking testing of both classes.

Based on the result of the research, it can be concluded that Using Information Gap technique affects students' speaking skill. It can be seen from the mean score of experimental class. After post-test, experimental class have mean score (65.81) is higher than the students scores in control class (58.15) that were taught without using Information Gap technique. While, the analyzing of data showed that the value of t-calculated 8.3 is higher than the value of t-table 1.669, at the degree of freedom  $(32+32-1) = 52$ . This indicated this hypothesis was accepted.

The data shows that all of components of students speaking also improve after using Information Gap technique in teaching and learning process than not used it. It is proved by the significance differences of students' score in the experimental class and control class in term pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. First, in experimental class, the mean score of post-test of the students' pronunciation is 2.59, while, the mean score of post test of the students' pronunciation in control class is 2.56. with differences 0.03. Second, the mean score of post test of the students' grammar is 18.75. meanwhile in control class, the mean score of post-test of students' grammar is 16.09 with differences 2.66. Third, the means score post test of students' vocabulary is 18.38, in the other, the means score post test of students' vocabulary is 16 with differences 2.38 Fourth, the means score of post test of students' fluency is 8.94. In the other class, the means score of post test of students' fluency is 8.75, differences are 0.19. Fifth, the means score of post test of students' comprehension is 17. In the other class, the means score of post test of students'

comprehension is 14.25. Both of the class, the differences are 2.75.

Related to the conclusions above, researcher know that learning result of teaching speaking through Information Gap technique students' speaking skill. So this technique can recommend to affects' students' speaking skill in teaching speaking. Related to the statements mentioned in conclusion above, the researcher proposes some following recommendations. First, English teacher should consider the implementation of Information Gap technique as an alternative technique on students' speaking skill because by using this technique, the students can be more enjoyable in speaking and hopeful the students' score in speaking is higher too when Information Gap technique is used. Second, for the students, it will make them easier to speak and give the students invaluable benefit because it helps them to speak more fun and fell comfort in speak to their friends. Third, for other researcher in similiar field of study, it is suggested to carry out further studies about the effect of Information Gap Technique on students' speaking skill. The last, to all readers, may this research will bring you into good understanding how to improve the students' speaking skill by using Information Gap Technique.

#### **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Agus I Putu, dkk. 2014. Improving Speaking Skill Through Information Gap Technique. *E-Journal of English Language Teaching Society (IELTS)*. 2 (4): 2-3
- Brown, H. Douglas. 2003. *Language Assessment Principles in Classroom Practice*. New York: Longman.
- Gay et al. 2012. *Educational Research, Competencies for Analysis and Applications*. Pearson Educational.
- Harmer, Jeremy, 2007. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Pearson Longman.
- Hurther, Hughes, 2003. *Testing for Language Teacher*. Cambridge Press
- Marashi, Hamid, 2017. The Impact of Information Gap and Opinion Gap Tasks on EFL Learners Lexical Collocation Achievement, *International Journal of Educational Investigations*, 4 (2): 28-38
- Oradee, Thanyalak, 2006. Developing Skills Using Three Communicative Activities (Discussion, Problem-Solving, and Role-Playing), *International Journal of Social and Humanity*. 14 (97): 533-535.
- Rahimi, Ranti Harvi. 2016. The Use of Information Gap Technique to Improve Speaking Skill. *Journal of English Education, Literature, and Culture*. 1 (1): 57-58
- Richard. Jack C. 2008. *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. Cambridge.
- Richard, J, C. Renandya, W.A. 2002. *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Rosalinah, Yanti et al. 2019. Teaching English Speaking Through Information GAP Technique. *Journal of Education Wanastra*. 11(2): 159-166

Samad, Abdul, Iskandar et al. 2017. The Use of Podcasts In Improving Students' Speaking Skill, *Journal of English Language*. 3 (2): 97-107.

Sartika, Dewi. 2016. Teaching Speaking Using The Information Gap Technique. *English Education Journal (EEJ)*. 7 (3): 276-277

Siregar, Sofiyan, 2018, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif*, (Penerbit: Kencana)

Sudjana, 2005, *Metode Statistik*, (Bandung: Tarsito)

Sugiyono, 2012, *Metode Penelitian Kombinasi (mixed method)*, (Bandung: Alfabet)