USING *DEBATE* TO IMPROVE STUDENTS' VOCABULARY AND SPEAKING ACHIEVEMENTS

Hartini Agustiawati
hartiniagustiawati@yahoo.co.id

Ismail Petrus
ismailpetrus@yahoo.com

Margaretha Dinar Sitinjak
magiedinar@yahoo.com

Abstract: The purposes of this study were to find out (1) whether there was a significant difference in vocabulary achievement between students who were taught through debate, and those were taught without debate, (2) whether there was a significant difference in speaking achievement between the students who were taught through debate and those were taught without debate, (3) whether there was a significant correlation between vocabulary and speaking achievements of the fourth semester, English education study program students of Tridinanti University and how much the contribution of vocabulary to speaking is. The population of this study consisted of the fourth semester English education study program students of Tridinanti University. The total number of the population was 49 comprising four classes, while the sample consisted of 30 students who were divided into two groups, fifteen students were in the experimental group and another fifteen students were in the control group. In collecting the data, the pretest, treatment and posttest were used. However, the data were analyzed by using t-test. It was found that (1) there was a significant difference in vocabulary achievement where the sig value (2 tailed) was lower than 0.05, (2) there was a significant difference in speaking achievement where the sig value (2 tailed) was lower than 0.05, (3) there was a significant correlation and contribution between vocabulary and speaking. It could be concluded that debate could improve the students' vocabulary and speaking achievements.

Key words: *vocabulary, speaking, and debate, fourth semester students of English Education Study Program*

Speaking is one of the basic language skills that has an important role in communication. Clark and Clark (1977) state that " in speaking, people put ideas into words and talk about perceptions they want other people to grasp" (p. 3). Additionally, Nunan (1999) states that "communication is a collaborative achievement in which the speakers negotiate meaning with the listeners in order to achieve the goals" (p. 236).

There is a big problem that was faced by the students to speak English

as a foreign language. They cannot speak English well, correctly, and fluently. In general, some people realize that there are some factors that cause difficulties of speaking ability. Foreign language learners learning to acquire the oral proficiency in the target language may have some problems, both internal and external. Internally, they may experience the feeling of anxiety. Students in class also experienced the poorest condition of speaking (Chamot, 1993). According to English Proficiency Index (2014), Indonesia is the 24th rank among 63 countries in the world. This result shows the ability of speaking practice is still low. It is important for teachers to encourage and motivate them to speak English, especially in class.

In speaking skill students can explore and improve their vocabulary. They will learn and enrich their vocabulary. It will improve students' knowledge. Learners do not have enough knowledge about the vocabulary learning techniques and they have difficulty in dealing with this problem themselves (Akin & Seferoglu, 2004). In spite of various studies in vocabulary learning, learners show very little effort to deal with their problems about newly learned words (Meara, 1982).

Vocabulary is the knowledge of words and encompasses all of the words we know and use when speaking (Stahl & Nagy, 2006). Vocabulary is needed for expressing meaning and in using the receptive (listening and reading) and the productive (speaking and writing) skills. "If language structures make up the skeleton of language, then it is vocabulary that provides the vital organs and the flesh" (Harmer 1991, p. 104). "Vocabulary work can be directed toward useful words and can give learners practice in useful skills" (Nation, 1990, p. 1). Students need assistance and practice with the academic words that help them think, write, and speak with precision in school even if those terms are not specific to the content area (Marzano & Pickering, 2005).

To solve those problems, in this research debate was used. Krieger (2005) comments that debate is an excellent activity for language learning because it engages students in a variety of cognitive and linguistic ways (p. 25). "In addition to provide meaningful listening, speaking and writing practice, debate is also highly effective for developing argumentation skills for persuasive speech and writing". (Krieger, 2005, p.25). Nisbett (2003) states that "debate is an important educational tool for learning analytic thinking skills and for forcing self-conscious reflection on the validity of one's ideas" (p. 210). Stewart (2003) states that "75 per cent of his unmotivated and reserved students' ranked debate as their most favorite classroom activity" (p. 10).

Based on the description above, observation was used. Generally the fourth semester English education study program students of Tridinanti University had problems in speaking achievement. Based on the mini review with the lecturer, there were some students who had low score in speaking subject. The lecturer stated that students had problems on the strategy of making good arguments, how to deliver arguments. Based on the students' scores in speaking two, observation and interview with the lecturer of Tridinani University, this study was conducted to improve their vocabulary and speaking

achievements. Therefore, this study would like to promote the use of debate in order to improve vocabulary and speaking achievements of the fourth semester English Study Program Students of Tridinanti University.

Based on the outlines above, the problems of this study were formulated in the following questions: (1) Was there any significant difference in vocabulary achievement between the students who were taught through debate and those were taught without debate?, (2) Was there any significant difference in speaking achievement between the students who were taught through debate and those were taught without debate?, (3) Was there any significant correlation between vocabulary and speaking achievements of the fourth semester English education study program students of Tridinanti University? How much was the contribution of vocabulary to speaking?

METHODOLOGY

To conduct this study, quasi experimental research using non equivalent control group pretest-posttest design was used. Fraenkel and Wallen (1991) state, "an experiment usually involves at least two groups of subjects: an experimental group and a control or comparison group" (p. 191). The study was conducted by using two groups: experimental and control groups. The experimental group received a treatment of some sort (a new text book, a different method of teaching, and so forth), while the control group did not have treatment.

The population of this study was the fourth semester of English education study program students of Tridinanti University. At this university, there were 4 classes of the fourth semester English education study program students. In this study, purposive sampling technique was used. In selecting the sample, lecturer's judgment and results of speaking subject in the second semester were used. Finally, there were 30 students were taken as the sample and divided into experimental and control groups.

There were two groups in this study. In the experimental group, the students had debate as a treatment. In the debate session, there were two groups as affirmative and negative groups. They had some topics of education. First round, the students gave general statements about the topic. Second, they gave arguments about the topic and the reasons of their arguments. Third, rebuttal is the process of providing that the opposing team's argument should be accorded less weight than is claimed for them. Fourth, adjudication is the process of determining which team wins the debates.

In collecting the data, this study applied two tests: vocabulary test and speaking test. There were 31 valid questions in the form of multiple choices in the theme of education for the vocabulary test. In collecting the data of speaking test, the students performed a short monolog in five minutes in the theme of education.

To analyze the vocabulary test, raw scores were used. The scoring focused on the number of correct answers. The scores and the grades of the students' vocabulary achievement were grouped as follow: 27-31(excellent), 22-26 (good), 17-21 (average), 12-16 (poor), 0-11 (very poor). For the speaking test, in order to score the students' speaking achievement, the scoring scale from Mid-continent comprehensive center

(SOLOM) was used. The scoring focused on five main aspects: pronunciation, fluency, comprehensibility, vocabulary, and grammar (See Appendix 1). The speaking test was recorded and then scored by two raters who fulfill the requirements of English background and have at least 525 TOEFL scores. The scores and the grades of the students' speaking achievement were grouped as follow: 21-25 (excellent), 16-20 (good), 11-15 (average), 6-10 (poor), <16 (very poor)

FINDINGS
Vocabulary Achievement

The results of the vocabulary achievement in the experimental group was presented in the following table.

Table 1
Score Distribution of the Vocabulary Achievement in the Experimental Group

Score	Category	Pretest		Posttest	
		N	%	N	%
27-31	Excellent	0	0	0	0
22-26	Good	0	0	2	13.3
17-21	Average	9	60	13	86.7
12-16	Poor	6	40	0	0
0-11	Very poor	0	0	0	0
Total		15	100	15	100

In the vocabulary pretest in the experimental group, there were 6 students (40%) in the poor category, 9 students (60 %) in the average category. In the vocabulary posttest in the experimental group, there were 2 students (13.3%) in the good category and 13 students (86.7%) in the average category.

The results of the vocabulary achievement in the control group were presented in Table 2.

Table 2
Score Distribution of the Vocabulary Achievement in the Control Group

Score	Category	Pretest		Posttest	
		N	%	N	%
27-31	Excellent	0	0	0	0
22-26	Good	0	0	0	0
17-21	Average	2	13	8	53.3
12-16	Poor	13	87	7	46.7
0-11	Very poor	0	0	0	0
Total		15	100	15	100

In the vocabulary pretest of the control group, there were 13 students (87%) in the poor category, 2 students (13%) in the average category. In the vocabulary posttest of the control group, there were 7 students (46.7%) in the poor category and 8 students in the average category.

Speaking Achievement
The results of the speaking achievement in the experimental group was presented in the following tables.

Table 3
Score Distribution of Speaking Achievement in the Exp Group

Score	Category	Pretest		Posttest	
		N	%	N	%
27-31	Excellent	0	0	7	53
22-26	Good	6	40	7	47
17-21	Average	9	60	0	0
12-16	Poor	0	0	0	0
0-11	Very poor	0	0	0	0
Total		15	100	15	100

Table 4
Score Distribution of Speaking Achievement in Control Group

Score	Category	Pretest		Posttest	
		N	%	N	%
27-31	Excellent	0	0	4	26
22-26	Good	13	86.6	9	60
17-21	Average	2	13.4	2	13.4
12-16	Poor	6	0	0	0
0-11	Very poor	0	0	0	0.6
Total		15	100	15	100

In the speaking pretest of the control group, there were 2 students (13.4%) in the average category, 13 students (86.6%) in the good category.

In the speaking posttest of the control group, there were 2 students (13.4%) in the average category, 9 students (60%) in the good level, 4 students (26.7%) in the excellent category.

Normality and Homogeneity Tests

To check the normality and homogeneity of the tests, Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Levene's tests were applied. Santoso (2010) states,"The data can be categorized as normal data if the value is higher than 0.05" (p.204). The results showed that all the Sig-Values of the normality and homogeneity tests exceeded 0.05, it can be concluded that all the data of speaking and vocabulary tests were both normal and homogeneous

Paired Sample t-Test Analysis for Students' Vocabulary and Speaking Achievements

The results of paired sample t-test of vocabulary and speaking tests in the experimental groups were presented in the following table.

Table 5
Results of Paired Sample t-Test of Vocabulary and Speaking Achievements in Exp Group

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev	Sig. 2-tailed
Vocabulary	2.26	2.12	.001
Speaking(total)	6.10	3.34	.000
Comprehension	1.46	.876	.000
Fluency	1.10	.573	.000
Vocabulary	1.36	.743	.000
Pronunciation	1.10	.849	.000
Grammar	1.06	.678	.000

In the vocabulary pretest and posttest in the experimental group, t-value was 4.141, and Sig. value was lower than 0.05. It could be concluded that there was a significant difference in vocabulary achievement after the treatment. In the speaking pretest and posttest in the experimental group, t-value was 7.064, and sig. value was lower than 0.05. In terms of speaking aspects, all aspects gave significant differences with sig. values (2 tailed) were lower than 0.05. It could be concluded that there was a significant difference in speaking achievement after the treatment.

The results of paired sample t-test of vocabulary and speaking achievements in the control group were presented in the following table.

Table 6
Results of Paired Sample t-Test of Vocabulary and Speaking Achievements in the Control Group

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev	Sig. 2-tailed
Vocabulary	1.20	.414	.000
Speaking(total)	1.30	.561	.000
Comprehension	.433	.458	.003
Fluency	.233	.372	.029
Vocabulary	.267	.417	.027
Pronunciation	.033	.229	.582
Grammar	.367	.442	.006

In the vocabulary pretest and posttest in the control group, t-value was 11.225 and sig. value was lower than 0.05. It means that there was also a significant difference in vocabulary achievement between pretest and posttest in the control group.

In the speaking pretest and posttest in the control group, t-value was 8.981 and sig. value was lower than 0.05. In terms of speaking aspects, there were four aspects which gave significant differences namely comprehension (.003), fluency (.029), vocabulary (.027), and grammar (.006). Meanwhile, there was a difference in pronunciation (.582) but it was not significant. It means that there was a significant difference in speaking achievement between pretest and posttest in the control group, but one of speaking aspects (pronunciation) did not give any significant difference.

Independent Sample t-Test

The results of independent sample t-test of vocabulary and speaking achievements were presented in the following table.

Table 7
Results of Independent t-Test of Vocabulary and Speaking Achievements

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev	Sig. 2-tailed
Vocabulary	2.00	.640	.004
Speaking(total)	2.06	.791	.014
Comprehension	.467	.191	.021
Fluency	.533	.150	.001
Vocabulary	.500	.181	.010
Pronunciation	.200	.190	.301
Grammar	.400	.193	.047

In the vocabulary posttest in the experimental and control groups, mean difference was 2.000, t-value was 3.125 and sig. value (2tailed) was lower than 0.05. It could be concluded that there was a significant difference in vocabulary achievement between the students who were taught through debate and those were taught without debate

In the speaking posttest in the experimental and control groups, mean difference was 2.067, t-value was 2.612, and sig. value (2tailed) was lower than 0.05. In terms of speaking aspects, there were four aspects which gave significant differences namely comprehension (.021), fluency (.001), vocabulary (.010), grammar (.047). Meanwhile, there was a difference in pronunciation (.301) but it was not significant.

It could be concluded that there was a significant difference in speaking achievement between the students who were taught through debate and those were taught without debate

Correlation between Vocabulary and Speaking

The correlation value between vocabulary and speaking was 0.662. and sig value (2-tailed) was lower than 0.05. It means, Ho3 was rejected and Ha 3 was accepted. It could be concluded that, there was a significant correlation between vocabulary and speaking.

Table 8
Correlation between Vocabulary and Speaking

Variables	Pearson Correlation	Sig. Value 2-tailed
Vocabulary Speaking	.662	.007

Contribution of Vocabulary to Speaking

In analyzing the contribution of vocabulary (variable) to speaking in the experimental group, regression

analyses was used. The result showed that the contribution of vocabulary was 43.8%. It means, vocabulary gave contribution to speaking even the score was not high, but the value still existed although it was small.

Table 9
Contribution of Vocabulary to Speaking

Model	R	R Square	Change Statistics	
			R Square Change	Sig. F Change
1	.662	.438	.438	.007

a. Predictors: (Constant), Vocabulary
b. Dependent Variable: speaking

Contribution of Aspects of Speaking to Speaking Achievement

In analyzing the contribution of aspects of speaking to speaking achievement in the experimental group, stepwise regression was used. The results showed that the highest contribution was comprehension (84.2%). The contribution of pronunciation was 9.2%, vocabulary 4.9%, grammar 1%, and fluency 0.7%. It means, vocabulary gave contribution to speaking even the score was not as high as comprehension, but the value still existed although it was small.

Table 10
Contribution of Speaking Aspects to Speaking Achievement

Model	R	R Square	Change Statistics	
			R Square Change	Sig. F Change
1	.918[a]	.842	.842	.000
2	.967[b]	.934	.092	.001
3	.991[c]	.983	.049	.000
4	.997[d]	.993	.010	.003
5	1.000[e]	1.000	.007	.

a. Predictors: comprehension
b. Predictors: comprehension, pronunciation
c. Predictors: comprehension, pronunciation, vocabulary
d. Predictors: (Constant), comprehension, pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar
e. Predictors: comprehension, pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, fluency
f. Dependent Variable: speaking

DISCUSSION

Based on the above mentioned findings, some interpretations could be described that teaching by using debate can improve students' vocabulary and speaking achievements. There were some statements to explain why debate could improve students' vocabulary and speaking achievements. The following is the interpretation in detail.

First, it might be influenced by some activities in teaching by using debate such as cases, arguments, rebuttals, listening, research and advanced issues. in which requires the students to discuss, learn, search the information to respond and answer to the topic or to defend their argument, and to stimulate their interest in the topic. This is also supported by Krieger (2005) that "debate is assembling and organizing effective arguments, persuading and entertaining an audience, and using the language to convince people that your arguments outweigh your opposition's." (p. 1). In addition, after having debate, the students can conclude and share their ideas to one another in a group, and finally, it will improve vocabulary and speaking achievements among students.

Second reason why debate could improve students' vocabulary and speaking achievements was because the topics of debate which exposed to real-life that can attract students' attention and make the teaching and learning process more alive. This statement is strengthened by Halversen (2005) that debate is a method to force students to think about the multiple sides of an issue and it also forces them to interact not just with the details of a given topic, but also with one another. The other

reasons why debate could improve students' vocabulary and speaking achievements might be caused by its implementation, the students seemed excited and enthusiatic to speak in a group discussion.

In addition, in relation to the results of findings of each aspect of speaking achievement by using the Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis, there were some aspects in the aspect of speaking achievement such as comprehension, fluency, vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar. Based on the results, vocabulary gave significant contribution to speaking. This statement is strengthened by Thornbury (2002) who claims, "without grammar very little can be conveyed, without vocabulary nothing can be conveyed. It means that grammar gives a role in conveying something, but vocabulary gives a role in conveying everything" (p. 3). As stated before, this might be caused by some activities by using debate such as cases, arguments, rebuttals, listening, research and advanced issues activities which require the students to be more actively participate in the teaching and learning process.

Third reason why debate could improve students' vocabulary and speaking achievements was because debate explores their critical thinking. This is relevant to the results of such studies as Kurniati (2010), Arpani (2011) and Iman (2013) that there was a significant improvement in critical thinking and speaking skill, there was also significant mean difference between the experimental and control groups and there was high contribution of the debate toward the student critical thinking and speaking skill achievement.

The other reasons why debate could improve students' vocabulary and speaking achievements were because the use of debate has been an effective technique for strengthening students' speaking and critical thinking abilities. This statement is strengthened by Ebata (2009) that "when learning a new language for global communication, students are required to confidently express their thoughts (p. 35). This is relevant to the result of an investigation of debate technique done by Fukuda (2003) with Japanese students showed that before the practice of debate only 30.8 per cent of the students were not afraid of expressing their opinions. After the debate, this figure rose to 56.7 per cent. It means that the knowledge and skills which came from the practice of debate led students to become more accustomed to expressing opinions.

Furthermore, in terms of vocabulary achievement in the experimental group, the students made progress. The use of debate could improve their knowledge about the words in the theme of education. This statement is strengthened by Marzano and Pickering (2005) that students need assistance and practice with the academic words that help them think, write, and speak with precision in school even if those terms are not specific to the content area. Furthermore, in the vocabulary pretest and posttest in the experimental group, In the vocabulary pretest and posttest in the experimental group, t-value was 4.141, and Sig. Value (2tailed) was lower than 0.05. It means that Ho1 was rejected, and Ha 1 was accepted. It could be concluded that there was a significant difference in vocabulary achievement between the students who were taught through debate and those were taught without debate.

In term of speaking achievements, experimental group students made significant differences for all aspects. By doing so, they could explore and share their ideas. In addition, in relation to the results of speaking achievements of experimental group by using the Stepwise Regression Analysis, it was found that comprehension gives highest contribution to the students' speaking achievements. As stated before, this might be caused by using some activities in debate such as as cases, arguments, rebuttals, listening, research and advanced issues which require the students to be more actively participate in the teaching and learning process. In cases activity, the students discuss the issue and search the information about the issue. In arguments, the students prepare arguments of the issue, and give the reason to defend their statements. In rebuttals, the students try to argue their friends' statements, and defend their statements as well as possible. In listening, students listen their friends and find the main point of their friends' statements. In research, the students search the information, source, and statements to give and defend their position as affirmative and negative group. In advanced issue, the adjudicator will decide which team wins the debates. In the speaking pretest and posttest in the experimental group, t-value was 7.064, and sig. value (2tailed) was lower than 0.05.

In terms of correlation between vocabulary and speaking, the correlation was 0.662. It means there was correlation between vocabulary and speaking achievement. In terms of contribution of vocabulary to speaking achievement, the result showed that the contribution of vocabulary was 43.8%. It means, vocabulary gave contribution to speaking achievement although the score was not high.

In terms of speaking aspects, all aspects gave contribution to speaking. The results showed that the highest contribution was comprehension (84.2%). The contribution of pronunciation was 9.2%, vocabulary was 4.9%, grammar was 1%, and fluency was 0.7%. It means, vocabulary gave contribution to speaking achievement though the score was not as high as comprehension. In terms of contribution of vocabulary to speaking aspects, the highest contribution was grammar (53.4%). The contribution of comprehension was 42.3%, fluency was 24.2%, vocabulary was 23.7%, and pronunciation was 12.3%.

It could be concluded that there was a significant difference in speaking achievement between the students who were taught through debate and those were taught without debate. In addition, because the population was the fourth semester English education study program students, other subjects gave significant differences to the students' achievement namely reading, writing, grammar and etc.

Finally, it stands to the point that there was a significant difference in the students' vocabulary and speaking achievements through debate.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on the results of the analyses there was a significant difference in vocabulary achievement between the students who were taught through debate and those were taught without debate, and there was a

significant difference in speaking achievement between the students who were taught through debate and those were taught without debate.

Moreover, based on the results of analyses there was a significant correlation between vocabulary and speaking achievement of the fourth semester English education study program students of Tridinanti University, and there was contribution of vocabulary in speaking achievement. In terms of speaking aspects, there was contribution of speaking aspects to speaking achievement. The highest contribution was comprehension, but other aspects still gave contribution to speaking. Meanwhile, there was a contribution also of vocabulary to speaking aspect. The highest contribution was grammar, but vocabulary still gave contribution to other aspects. Finally, it could be concluded that debate can improve students' vocabulary and speaking achievement.

Based on the conclusions above, some suggestions are given to teachers and learners in learning English. First, the learners should be given more method in relation to the English speaking activity for instance using debate in the classroom which explores critical thinking and arguments. Second, the teachers should help the students to have self confidence to speak English by using group discussion and games. Third, teachers should be able to select appropriate and effective instructional technique and material to support the teaching and learning activities in the classroom.

REFERENCES

Akin, A., & Seferoglu, G. (2004). Improving learners' vocabulary through strategy training and recycling the target words. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, *9*(10), 1-10

Arpani. (2011). *Developing students' speaking skills and public speaking performance using high school debating championship (WSDC) technique at SMA Negeri 17 Palembang* (Unpublished *Magister*'s thesis). Sriwijaya University, Palembang, South Sumatera.

Chamot, A. U. (1993). *Learning strategies and listening comprehension.* San Diego, CA: Dominie Press

Clark, H. M., & Clark, E.V. (1977). *Psychology and language: An introduction to psycholinguistics.* New York, NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Ebata, M. (2009). Using debate in EFL classes. *English Language Teaching*, *6*(1). 1-6.

English Proficiency Index. (2014). *English proficiency in profile.* Retrieved from http://www.ef.co.id/__/~/media/centralefcom/epi/v4/downloads/full-reports/ef-epi-2014-indonesian.pdf

Fraenkel, J. R., & Norman, E. W. (1991). *Educational research: A guide to the process*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, Inc

Fukuda, S. (2003). Attitudes toward argumentation in college EFL classes in japan. *TESL Journal, 11*(2), 417-418

Halversen, A. (2005). Incorporating critical thinking skills development into ESL/EFL course. Retrieved fromhttps://debate. uvm.edu/ dcpdf / LD Introduction _to_ LD_Debate_ % 28NFL %29.pdf

Harmer, J. (1991). *The practice of English language teaching*. New York, NY: Longman

Hatch, E., & Farhady, H. (1982). *Research design and statistics for applied linguistics*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Iman, J. N. (2013). *Using debate to improve critical thinking and speaking skill of the tenth grade students of MAN 3 Palembang* (Unpublished *Magister*'s thesis). Sriwijaya University, Palembang, South Sumatera.

Krieger, D. (2005). Teaching debate to ESL students*: A six-class unit. The Internet TESL Journal*, *11*(2), 25-45.

Krieger, D. (2005). Teaching debate to ESL students*: A six-class unit. The Internet TESL Journal*, *11*(2), 25-45.

Kurniati, S. M. (2011). *Improving speaking skill through Australian parliamentary debate technique at SMA Negeri 12 Palembang* (Unpublished *Magister*'s thesis). Sriwijaya University, Palembang, South Sumatera.

Marzano, R. J., & Pickering, D. J. (2005). *Building academic vocabulary for student achievement: Teacher's manual Alexandria*. Paper presented at the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria. Retrieved from

http:// www. ascd.org /ASCD/pdf/ Building%20 Academic %20 Vocabulary/ bav_report_2.pdf.

Marzano, R. J., & Pickering, D. J. (2005). *Building academic vocabulary for student achievement: Teacher's manual Alexandria*. Paper presented at the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria. Retrieved from http:// www. ascd.org /ASCD/pdf/ Building%20 Academic %20 Vocabulary/ bav_report_2.pdf.

Meara, P. (1982). Vocabulary acquisition: A neglected aspect of language learning. *Language Teaching and Linguistics*, *13*(4), 221-246. Retrieved fromhttp ://digitalcolle ctions.sit.edu /cgi/ viewcontent.cgi? article=1503& context= ipp_collection

Nation, P. (1990). *Teaching and learning vocabulary*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle

Nesbett, R. E. (2003). *The geography of thought*. New York, NY: The Free Press

Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching and learning.* Boston*, MA: Heinle & Heinle

Santoso, S. (2010). *Mastering SPSS 18*. Jakarta: Elex Media Komputindo.

Stahl, S., & Nagy, W. (2006). *Teaching word meanings*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum

Stewart, T. (2003). Debate for ESOL students. *TESOL Journal*, *12*(1), 9-15. Retrieved from http://www.mc3edsupport. org /community/ knowledgebases /student-oral language -

observation- matrix- solom-1 061.html

Thornbury, S. (2002) *How to teach vocabulary*. Harlow, UK: Pearson Education Limited.

Tuckman, B. W. (1978). *Conducting educational research* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

About the Authors:

Hartini is the graduate of the Graduate Program of Language Education Sriwijaya University.

Dr. Ismail Petrus, M.A., and Dr. Mgt. Dinar Sitinjak, M.A., are the lecturers at the Graduate Program of Language Education Sriwijaya University.