EVALUATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE TEACHING MODULE OF SPEAKING 1

Sri Endah Kusmartini[1], Risnawati[2], Risa[3], Darmaliana[4]
English Department
Politeknik Negeri Sriwijaya

Abstract: In the hospitality industry, English speaking competence is needed in order to be able to compete in this global era. The assignment of the people in an educational institution is to ensure that the students have the teaching module to study. The main objective of this study was to evaluate and develop the teaching Module of Speaking 1. It was a research and development study. The research was conducted in English Department Sriwijaya State Polytechnic. The research applied small-scale project of R & D developed by Gall, Borg, and Gall (2003). The research revealed that based on the evaluation, the existing Speaking 1 module produced in 2014 was not appropriate anymore and needed to be developed. Therefore, lesson plan was designed based on the newest syllabus. The teaching module of Speaking 1 was developed based on the lesson plan. Content validation and construct validation were conducted to the draft. Main product revision was conducted based on the content and construct validation. Main field testing was conducted to see the practicality and the level of difficulties of the draft. The final revision was conducted based on the main field testing. This small-scale project of R & D cycle was conducted due to time and budget limitation.
Keywords: evaluation, small-scale project of R & D, teaching module

Speaking skill in this global era is needed badly especially for the ones who work in hospitality industry. Speaking is an active language activity performed by humans (Gebhard, 1996) where two or more people share ideas, information, thoughts, and opinions during the talks (Harmer, 1984). Speaking is a process of communicating a systematic oral expression in order to express and convey thoughts, ideas, and feelings from one source to another (Nunan, 2003).

This is a big challenge for educational institutions like English Department Sriwijaya State Polytechnic to develop the speaking competence of the students especially in terms of the hospitality industry. For that purpose, many instructional instruments including instructional materials are developed.

Instructional material as one of the teaching instruments plays an important role in order to improve the students' skills. Instructional material which is in accordance with the discipline of the students is needed by the students of English Department Sriwijaya State Polytechnic. ESP is an approach focusing on the students; the substance of the instructional material of ESP is designed and developed based on the concept of need analysis that connects the needs of the instructional material which is in accordance with the discipline of the students with the instructional material given by the lecturers (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; Robinson, 1991).

In 2017, the researchers focused their investigation on evaluation and development of the teaching module of Speaking 1. Teaching module is a set of teaching and learning activities which is designed to help the teachers and the students in the teaching and learning process so that the expected goals that have been determined can be achieved (Prastowo, 2011; Baltazar, 1990).

What kind of teaching module of Speaking 1 was needed? This question showed that need analysis should be conducted. Need analysis is a group of procedures that are systematic which is used in order to collect and analyze information both subjectively and objectively (Nunan, 1988; Mayo & Pillar, 2000). The instruments that can be used

to do need analysis are questionnaire, interview, and observation (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; Richards, 1997).

How was the teaching module of Speaking 1 developed? To answer this question R & D study was conducted. This current research conducted Small-scale project of R & D proposed by Gall, Borg, and Gall (2003). This Small-scale project of R & D cycle was conducted due to the limitation of time and budget.

By having this current research, it is hoped that the researchers understand what kind of teaching module of Speaking 1 is needed including the real condition of the existing Speaking 1 module which was used in teaching and learning process; it is also hoped that the teaching module of Speaking 1 which fits the criteria like it has been proposed by Daoud and Celce-Murcia (1979) can be developed.

The problem was even though English Department Sriwijaya State Polytechnic has applied the new curriculum, i.e., Curriculum 2016, the students and the teachers still applied the previous Speaking 1 module produced in 2014. Of course, the module was out-of-date because English Department has applied new curriculum along with its derivatives like syllabus and learning outcome.

The atmosphere where the students feel comfortable because of the availability of the teaching module which is up-to-date and appropriate with their discipline will influence their achievement (Rahimpour & Hashemi, 2011; Mukundan & Nimehchisalem, 2012). Therefore, the teachers should ensure that the students have the teaching module which is up-to-date and appropriate with their discipline. Moreover, the lesson plan should also be upgraded.

A research conducted by Oradee (2012) shows that the students' ability in speaking increases significantly after applying some activities in their teaching and learning process including role play. A research conducted by Ku nierek (2015) shows that the activity of role play gives a significant contribution towards the development of speaking ability of the students in English class. A research conducted by Kusmartini (2016) shows that Project-based learning model can be used to develop the speaking skill and motivation of engineering students of polytechnic.

METHOD

It is a research and development (R & D) study. The research was conducted in English Department Sriwijaya State Polytechnic. The research applied small-scale project of R & D developed by Gall, Borg, and Gall (2003) which includes: (1) Research and Information Collecting; (2) Planning; (3) Develop Preliminary Form of Product; (4) Preliminary Field Testing; (5) Main Product Revision; and (6) Main Field Testing. This small-scale project of R & D cycle was conducted due to time and budget limitation.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION
Stage 1: Research and Information Collecting

In this stage, the researchers analyzed the curriculum and the syllabus of Speaking 1, evaluated the existing Speaking 1 module which was produced in 2014 and interviewed the students, teacher, and the users in terms of need analyses. The curriculum was analyzed to find out the vision, mission, goals, and profile of the graduates. Syllabus of Speaking 1 was analyzed to find out the objectives of the course, the topics, the teaching method, the sources, the teaching media, time allocated, and the evaluation. Speaking I module was evaluated to find out whether it was appropriate with the newest curriculum and syllabus, and whether the components of the teaching module was appropriate with the format and the elements of a teaching module as it was required. For that purpose, Textbook Evaluation Checklist developed by Daoud and Celce-

Marcia (1979) was used with some modification at the dimension of Exercises suited with the need to evaluate Speaking 1 module. The instrument of the checklist consisted of five dimensions which included four items of Subject Matter, nine items of Vocabulary and Structure, five items of Exercises, three items of Illustrations, and four items of Physical Make-up. Therefore, the whole statement in this checklist was 25 items. The checklist was arranged from 0 (totally lacking) until 4 (excellent).

English Department, Sriwijaya State Polytechnic, periodically upgrades its curriculum which is adjusted to the users' needs. In 2016, English Department Sriwijaya State Polytechnic has revised its curriculum including its vision, mission, goals, and profile of the graduates, syllabus, and the learning outcome. The following was about the course of Speaking 1 (Curriculum of English Department, 2016). The name of the course was Speaking 1. The course code was BI162109. The time allocation was 3 X 50 minutes per week. The unit was 2 (two) credits. The objective of the course was the students were able to produce simple and adequate English for elementary and low intermediate learners, i.e., 'Introductions', 'Directions', 'Requesting Information', and 'Ordering Food'. The topics were 'At the Airport', 'Hotel Reservation', 'Room Service', 'Hotel Facilities', 'Tourism Destination', and 'Check-out'. The Language Expressions were related with 'Greeting', 'Self Introduction', 'Introducing Others', 'Describing People and Things', 'Ordering', 'Asking and Giving Location and Directions', 'Asking and Giving Information', 'Giving Instruction'. The vocabularies taught were the vocabularies related with 'The Airport', 'Hotel Reservation', 'Room Service', 'Hotel Facilities', 'Tourism Destination', 'Check-out'. The structure and grammar taught were the ones related to the topics and the language expressions or the language functions.

Next, the researchers evaluated Speaking 1 module which was available in English Department and used by the teachers and the students in teaching and learning process. The evaluation was conducted to find out whether the content was relevant to the newest curriculum and syllabus. The evaluation was also conducted to find out whether the components of the module were appropriate based on the format and the completeness of the teaching module required. Therefore, Textbook Evaluation Checklist developed by Daoud and Celce-Marcia (1979) was used with little modification on the dimension of Exercises especially to evaluate Speaking 1 module.

The existing Speaking 1 module was written in 2014. The topics were: 'Professions', 'Conversation', 'Presentation', 'Front Desk Check-in', 'Telling Directions', 'Telephone Operator', 'Tour Guide', and 'Reservation in Restaurant'.

The following were the results of the evaluation based on the dimension of Subject Matter. The subject matter of the module which was evaluated did not cover a variety of topics appropriate to the interests of the learners for whom the module was intended. The ordering of materials was not conducted by topics or themes that were arranged in a logical fashion. The content was not graded according to the needs of the students and the requirements of the newest syllabus. Finally, the material was not accurate and up-to-date.

Based on the dimension of Vocabulary and the Structures, the number of new words introduced in every lesson seemed to be unreasonable for the students of that level. The vocabulary items were not controlled to ensure systematic gradation from simple to complex items. The new vocabulary was not repeated in subsequent lessons for reinforcement. Luckily, the sentence length seemed reasonable for the students of that level. The number of grammatical points, as well as their sequence, was not appropriate with the students' needs. The structures did not increase in complexity to suit the growing reading ability of the students. Appreciation should be given to the

writers because they used current everyday language, and sentence structures followed normal word order. The sentences and paragraphs followed one another in a logical sequence. Linguistic items were introduced adequately in meaningful situations to facilitate understanding and ensure assimilation and consolidation.

Meanwhile, based on the dimension of Exercises, the exercises did not facilitate students' use of language expressions or functions by creating situations in which these expressions or functions were needed. The exercises did not provide practice in different types of spoken activities. For this item, it was understood because the module was for the students of semester 1 which had the level of elementary to low-intermediate. Other speaking skills like having a speech and debate will be given in the course of Speaking 2 and 3, and also in the course of Public Speaking 1 and 2. The exercises were not gradated from guided activities to free activities. The exercises promoted adequately meaningful communication by referring to realistic activities and situations. The activities were adequately balanced between individual response, pair work and group work.

Illustrations of the existing Speaking 1 module adequately created a favorable atmosphere for practice reading and spelling by depicting realism and action. Unfortunately, they were not clear and this condition made the students confused. The illustrations printed were close enough to the text but they did not relate directly to the content to help the learner understand the printed text. For example, in unit 2, the topic was 'The Conversation'. The illustration was about two people in action. Another illustration on the same page was about some students writing something in the classroom. The relationship between the illustration and the topic was not clear.

Based on Physical make-up dimension, the cover of the book was durable enough to withstand wear. The texts on the cover, on page appearance, and on binding were interesting. The size of the book seemed convenient for the students to handle and the type size was appropriate for the intended learners.

Next, the researchers conducted need analysis to 15 student respondents who were taking the course of Speaking 1 randomly, the lecturer who was teaching the course of Speaking 1, and the users. Most of the student respondents (73.33%) mentioned that they wanted to work in hospitality industries, and the rest mentioned that they wanted to be civil servants (20%) and entrepreneurs (6.67%). Most of them (86.7%) mentioned that Speaking was the most important skill that they wanted to learn, the rest (13.3%) answered that reading was the most important skill that they wanted to learn. There were 60% of the student respondents who mentioned that their speaking skill was fair and the rest (40%) mentioned that their speaking skill was poor. Most of the student respondents (86.7%) mentioned that the existing module of Speaking 1 was not appropriate to their needs and the rest mentioned that they did not know. The lecturer who was interviewed mentioned that the level of students' Speaking Performance was Elementary to Low-Intermediate. The users who were interviewed mentioned that the activities which needed speaking skill in hospitality industries were the activities conducted by announcer, bell boy, concierge, customer service, driver, event organizer, F & B product supervisor, F & B service supervisor, front office supervisor, information officer, professional conference organizer, public area supervisor, receptionist, restaurant captain, restaurant supervisor, room service, room/floor supervisor, steward, stewardess, telephone operator, teller, ticketing, tour guide, tour leader, tourist agent, waiter, waitress, and all activities which were conducted in tourism offices. Therefore, people who worked in hospitality industries should have speaking skill especially in English and understand words related to their discipline.

Based on document analyses, evaluation towards the existing module of Speaking 1 which was available in English Department Sriwijaya State Polytechnic and the interview conducted to the students, lecturer, and the users, the researchers concluded that the existing module of Speaking 1 was not appropriate with the newest curriculum and syllabus. Furthermore, based on the textbook evaluation checklist suggested by Daoud and Celce-Marcia (1979) which has been modified by the researchers in terms of exercises for the purpose of evaluating the speaking module, the existing module of Speaking 1 should be developed.

Stage 2: Planning
The second stage was planning. Since 2016, English Department Sriwijaya State Polytechnic employed curriculum 2016. Based on the newest curriculum, syllabus and learning outcomes that have been determined by the department, in this stage, the researchers designed a lesson plan for the course of Speaking1. In general, The lesson plan included: Learning Outcome of the study program; Learning outcome of the course of Speaking 1; short description of the course of Speaking 1; the topics of the course of Speaking 1 which included: 'At the Airport', 'Hotel Reservation', 'Room Service', 'Hotel facilities', 'Tourism Destination', and 'Check-out'; bibliographies which inspired the researchers in writing the teaching module of Speaking 1; the teaching and learning strategy; and teaching and learning media. Specifically, the lesson plan of the course of Speaking 1 was described into sub learning outcome of the course of Speaking 1. Each sub learning outcome was followed by the indicator, performance, and the form of evaluation, teaching and learning method, instructional material, and evaluation.

Stage 3: Develop Preliminary Form of Product
Based on the lesson plan that had been designed, the researchers conducted stage number 3. In this stage, the researcher designed the teaching module of Speaking 1 based on the lesson plan that had been prepared on the previous stage. The teaching module of Speaking 1 was designed based on the topics which were arranged consequently as it was designed in Lesson Plan. Each topic consisted of learning outcome for each topic, description per topic, and the instructional material which was started with pre-activity like 'Warming Up'; the main activity which were followed with Language Expression, Vocabulary, Structure and Grammar; and also evaluation which were graded starting from the simplest to the most complicated evaluation. The development of this teaching module of Speaking 1 was conducted by considering the five dimensions as it was suggested by Daoud and Celce-Marcia (1979), they were: Subject Matter, Vocabulary and Structure, Exercises, Illustrations, and Physical Make-up.

Stage 4: Preliminary Field Testing
Stage 4 was preliminary field testing. In this stage, content validation and construct validation were conducted. Content validation was conducted to see whether the product had been designed based on the curriculum, syllabus, and the learning outcome of the study program. Construct validation was conducted to see whether the components of the product had been made based on the indicators, and how were the quality of the organization, the format, and other elements of the teaching module. The teaching module of Speaking 1 that had been developed consisted of the cover page, approval sheet, foreword, Learning outcome of the course of Speaking 1, Contents, Chapter 1: 'At the Airport', Chapter 2: 'Hotel Reservation', Chapter 3: 'Room Service',

Chapter 4: 'Hotel Fasilities', Chapter 5: 'Tourism Destinations', and Chapter 6: 'Check-out', Exercise/Practice/Assignment sheets, bibliographies, and Index and it was completed with syllabus and its lesson plan. Each chapter consisted of learning outcome per topic, description of each topic, the instructional material which was started with 'warming up' to attract the students' attention to the instructional material that will be learned; main activities including the knowledge and skill that should be learned and practiced by the students and evaluation. In main activities, some Language Expressions which were suitable for the topic were also introduced and discussed. Next, the students were also given some vocabularies, grammar, and structure related to the topic they learned. Exercises and practices were given gradually starting from the simplest ones with some guidance to the most complicated ones without any guidance anymore.

For the purpose of content validation and construct validation, the design of teaching module of speaking 1 was given to the institutional management and the experts in education and educational technology. To see the content validation, the teaching module of Speaking 1 was given to the institutional management to see the appropriateness of the newest curriculum, syllabus and the learning outcome.

For the same purpose, the head of English Department as the institutional management also used the dimension of Subject matter from the textbook evaluation checklist proposed by Daoud and Celce-Marcia (1979). He mentioned that the subject matter of the teaching module of Speaking 1 covered a variety of topics appropriate to the discipline of the students, i.e., hospitality industries. The ordering of materials was conducted by topics in hospitality industries that were arranged in a logical fashion for students with the level of performance in elementary to low-intermediate. The content was graded according to the needs of the students and the requirements of the newest syllabus. The institutional management also mentioned that the material was accurate and up-to-date. Next, He also stated that the teaching module of the course of Speaking 1 had the elements as it was required by P3AI as the center who organized academic activities including the development of the teaching module or the course book in Sriwijaya State Polytechnic. Based on that data, the head of the department as institutional management concluded that the teaching module of Speaking 1 was appropriate with the needs of the newest curriculum, syllabus, and learning outcome that had been set. He suggested the researchers test the draft of the module to the students who were taking the course of Speaking 1 to see its practicality and the level of difficulties.

Next, construct validation was conducted. The draft of teaching module of Speaking 1 was given to the expert in education to see whether the components of the product had been designed based on the indicators required. For this purpose, textbook evaluation checklist, especially on the dimensions of Vocabulary and Structure and Exercises, were used. The expert mentioned that the number of new words introduced in each topic seemed to be reasonable for the students of the level of elementary to low-intermediate. The researchers had controlled the vocabulary items so that they gradated systematically from simple to complex items. The new vocabulary in teaching module of Speaking 1 was repeated in subsequent lessons for reinforcement. The sentence length seemed reasonable for the students of that level. Next, the expert mentioned that the number of grammatical points, as well as their sequence, was appropriate for the students on the level of elementary to low-intermediate. The structures gradually increased in complexity to suit the growing reading ability of the students. The researchers used current everyday language, and sentence structures followed normal word order. The sentences and paragraphs followed one another in a logical sequence.

Linguistic items were introduced in meaningful situations to facilitate understanding and ensure assimilation and consolidation.

The expert in education mentioned that the exercises in the teaching module of Speaking 1 had facilitated the students to use language expression or language function on the situation where the language expression or the language function were needed. Unfortunately, the exercises given in this teaching module of Speaking 1 did not give a chance for the students to practice different types of spoken activities; most of the exercises, practices, and assignment were in the form of conversation. It could be understood since this teaching module was for the students of semester 1 whose level of performance was elementary and low-intermediate. A good point was given to this teaching module of Speaking 1 because the exercises given were gradated started from the guided activities to free activities. Moreover, the exercises in this teaching module of Speaking 1 promoted the students to talk with meaningful communication by referring to realistic activities and situations. The activities were balanced between individual response, pair work and group work

Construct validation was conducted by the expert in educational technology to see the quality of the organization, the format, and other elements of the teaching module. For this purpose, the expert in educational technology also used Textbook Evaluation Checklist proposed by Daoud and Celce-Murcia (1979) especially in dimensions of Illustrations and Physical Make-up. The expert in educational technology mentioned that the illustrations in the teaching module of Speaking 1 illustrated what was discussed in each chapter. The illustrations generated awareness of the students about the instructional material discussed in the chapter concerned. Unfortunately, for the point that the illustrations should be clear, simple, and free from unnecessary details that will make the students confused, the expert in educational technology mentioned that there were some illustrations which were not clear with the message that will be conveyed. It was suggested to change the illustrations or to cut misleading and unnecessary part of the illustrations. Finally, it was reported that the illustrations were located adjacent to what will be discussed so that it could help the students understand the text.

According to the expert in educational technology, the cover of the teaching module was strong and good. The texts on the cover, on the pages, and on binding were also interesting. The size of the teaching module was also comfortable for the students to hold. The size of the paper used was A4. The type size of the teaching module of Speaking 1 was also appropriate to the students' needs.

Stage 5: Main Product Revision
Stage 5 was main product revision. In this stage, the revisions were conducted towards the results of content validation and construct validation.

Revision was conducted as it was suggested by the institutional management regarding the newest curriculum, syllabus and the learning outcome; based on the suggestion from the expert of education regarding the components of the product; and based on the suggestion from the expert of educational technology regarding the quality of the organization, format and the elements of the teaching module of Speaking 1.

The revision regarding the appropriateness with the newest curriculum, syllabus, and the learning outcome were not conducted because based on the head of English Department Sriwijaya State Polytechnic as the institutional management, the draft of the teaching module of Speaking 1 was already appropriate with the needs of curriculum, syllabus and the learning outcome. The teaching module of Speaking 1 had already covered various topics which were appropriate with the discipline of the

students in hospitality industries.The arrangement of the instructional materials was logic and it was based on the topics needed by the students in the hospitality industry. The content was also based on the syllabus and the learning outcome. Finally, the instructional materials were accurate. The teaching module of Speaking 1 had the elements required by P3AI as the center which organize the academic activities including the making of the instructional module or the course book at Sriwijaya State Polytechnic.

Revision was conducted with unclear illustrations. Unimportant figures in the illustrations were discarded so that the students can focus their attention on the illustrations given.

Stage 6: Main Field Testing
Stage 6 was main field testing. In this stage, the draft of the teaching module of Speaking 1 that had been revised based on the suggestion from the institutional management, the expert in education and the expert in educational technology was tested to the students of English Department Sriwijaya State Polytechnic semester one (class of 1BA and class of 1BB) to see the practicality and the level of difficulties of the teaching module of Speaking 1. In this stage, the researchers observed and interviewed the implementation of this draft to the students regarding its practicality and the level of difficulties. From the observation, it can be seen that one topic need three weeks (3 X 3 X 50 minutes) to complete it. In week one, the students together with the teacher discussed the topic starting from 'Warming up'. In this step, the students saw the illustrations and answered the questions based on the illustrations. The function of this step was to focus the students' attention on the topic that will be discussed. For example, the topic of chapter one was 'At the Airport'. The illustrations were about the conditions at the airport. The questions were: Who are they? What are they doing? Where are they? Is it the domestic or international airport? It was hoped that the students will answer: They are passengers. They are going to depart. They are at the airport. It is the international airport. After 'Warming up' the next step was main activity. In this step, the students were introduced to the short conversation about the topic and followed with the explanation about the topic. Some language expressions, vocabularies, and structure and grammar regarding the topic were also introduced. The activities in the first week were ended with some exercises and practices. On the second week, the activities started with 'Warming up' to remind the students with the topic that had been discussed in the last meeting, continued with further explanation about the topic, the explanation about the rest of the language expression, vocabularies, and structure and grammar that had not been discussed in the last meeting and ended with conducting the exercises and practices. On the third week, the students worked together in groups. They completed the assignment in terms of role play. When the interview was conducted in terms of the practicality of the teaching module of Speaking 1, the students mentioned that the teaching module was practice for them. They can complete it on time. They also felt enjoy conducting the activities because they were involved actively in the teaching and learning process. In terms of the level of difficulties, the students believed that the instructional materials were appropriate to their needs not too easy or too difficult. Therefore based on the main field testing, the researchers conducted the revision and produced the final product.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION
English Department Sriwijaya State Polytechnic was the research location of this Small-scale project of R & D proposed by Gall, Borg, and Gall (2003). After analyzing

the newest curriculum, syllabus and the learning outcome; evaluating the existing module of Speaking 1 which was produced in 2014 by using textbook evaluation checklist proposed by Daoud and Celce-Murcia (1979) that had been modified by the researchers on the dimension of exercises for the purpose of evaluating the module of Speaking 1; interviewing the students, lecturer, and the users in terms of need analyses, it was concluded that the existing module of Speaking 1 was not appropriate anymore; therefore, the teaching module of Speaking 1 should be developed.

Before designing the teaching module of Speaking 1, the researchers designed the lesson plan first. The development of this teaching module of Speaking 1 was conducted by considering the five dimensions suggested by Daoud and Celce-Marcia (1979). After that, preliminary field testing was conducted by institutional management, the expert in education and expert in educational technology to see the content validation and construct validation of the draft. The draft was validated by using the checklist suggested by Daoud and Celce-Murcia (1979). The result showed that the draft of the teaching module of Speaking 1 was appropriate with some revision especially in terms of illustrations. On the main product revision, the revisions were conducted towards the results of content validation and construct validation. Unclear illustrations were revised and unimportant figures in the illustrations were discarded. Finally, main field testing was conducted to see the practicality and the level of difficulties of the teaching module of Speaking 1. The results of the observation showed that one topic needs three weeks (3 X 3 X 50 minutes) to complete it. When the interview was conducted in terms of the practicality of the teaching module of Speaking 1, the students mentioned that the teaching module was practice for them. They also felt enjoy conducting the activities because they were involved actively in the teaching and learning process. In terms of the level of difficulties, the students believed that the instructional materials were not too easy or too difficult for them to study. Based on the main field testing, the researchers conducted the revision and produced the final product.

It is suggested for the next research to develop this teaching module of Speaking 1 become the course book of Speaking 1 and ready to be published.

REFERENCES

Baltazar, L., C. (1990). *Modules: A strategy in teaching home economics*. Quezon City: Rex Book Store.

Gall, M.D., Borg, W.R. & Gall, J.P.(2003). *Educational research: An introduction.* (Seventh Edition). United States of America: Pearson Education Inc.

Daoud, A.M., & Celce-Murcia, M. (1979). Selecting and evaluating a textbook. In M. Celce-Murcia and McIntosh, eds. *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp.302-307). New York: Newbury House.

Gebhard, J.G. (1996). *Teaching English as foreign or second language: A teacher self-development and methodology guide*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.

Harmer, J. (1984). *The practice of English language teaching*. London: Longman.

Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes: A learning-centered approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kusmartini, S.E. (2016). Project-based learning model to develop speaking skill and motivation of engineering students of polytechnic. *Proceedings of the 63rdTEFLIN International Conference, book 3*, 196-203.

Ku nierek, A. (2015). Developing students' speaking skills through role-play. *World Scientific News, 7*, 73-111.

Mayo, G., & Pilar, M. (2000). *English for specific purposes: Discourse analysis and course design*. Bilbao: Servicio Editorial. Universidad del País Vasco/ Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea.

Mukundan, J. & Nimehchisalem, V. (2012). Evaluative criteria of an English language textbook evaluation checklist. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 3*(6), 1128-1134.

Nunan, D. (1988). *The learner-centered curriculum.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English language teaching*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Oradee, T. (2012). Developing speaking skills using three communicative activities: Discussion, problem-solving, & role-playing. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity, 2*(6), 533-535.

Rahimpour, M., Hashemi, R. (2011). Textbook selection and evaluation in EFL context. *World Journal of Education 1*(2), 62-68.

Robinson, P. (1991). *ESP today*: *A practitioner's guide*. UK: Prentice Hall International Ltd.
Politeknik Negeri Sriwijaya. (2016). *Kurikulum jurusan bahasa Inggris*. Palembang.

Richards, J.C. (1997). *The language teaching matrix*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J.C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Prastowo, A. (2011). *Panduan membuat bahan ajar inovatif*. Penerbit Diva.