USING PICTURE-SERIES BASED INSTRUCTION TO IMPROVE SPEAKING AND WRITING ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE EFL UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Jaya Nur Iman[1),] **Nike Angraini**[2)]

[1)2)] *English Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education,Indo Global Mandiri University*
Jl. Jend. Sudirman No. 629 KM.4 Palembang Kode Pos 30129
Email : jaya.nur.iman95@gmail.com[1)]*, nikeangraini210191@gmail.com*[2)]

ABSTRACT

Speaking and writing skills are very prominent for the students to actively interact and to get involved in spoken and written communication. However, these are regarded as difficult skills to master by the students. The researchersthen would like to carry out the research in terms of using picture-series to cope with the students' speaking and writing problem. The objective of this research were: (1) to find out whether picture-series significantly improve the speaking and writing achievement of the EFL undergraduate students, (2) to find out the significant difference in speaking and writing achievement between the students who were taught by using picture series and those who were not. A quasi-experimental study of non-equivalent pretest- posttest control group design or comparison group design was used in this research. The population of this research was all undergraduate students of Civil Engineering study program of Indo Global Mandiri University in the academic year of 2014/2015. Forty students were taken as sample and selected by using purposive sampling technique in which each group consisted of 20 students, respectively. The findings showed that (1) there was a significant improvement on the speaking and writing achievement of the experimental group where the $t_{obtained}$ of the speaking and writing achievement were 12.197 (p<0.000) and 18.710 (p<0.000), (2) there was also a significant difference between the speaking writing and achievement of the experimental and control group where $t_{obtained}$ were 2.916 (p<0.000) and 3.949 (p<0.000). Therefore, it could be concluded that the picture series-based instruction statistically and significantly improves the speaking and writing achievement of the EFL undergraduate students.

Key words: picture series, speaking achievement, writing achievement

1. Introduction

The teaching of English is necessarily regarded as a prominent subject in educational system in Indonesia. In learning English, there are four language skills that should be learnt, they are listening, reading, speaking, and writing. Listening and reading belong to receptive skills in which the language users require the ability to receive spoken and written language, while speaking and writing belong to productive skills in which the language users require the ability to produce language both spoken and written (Harmer, 2001). In order to actively communicate in English teaching and learning environment, the students should master the speaking and writing skills. This is emphasized by the standpoint of Chomsky (1965) that the learners are demanded to master the linguistics competence and linguistics performance. Hence, it could be concluded that it is very crucial for the language learners to master English both the language itself (Linguistic Competence) and how to practice oral and written communication (Linguistic Performance) in order to get involved in communicative activities.

To actively interact with other people and understand what they spell out in the conversation, speaking skill has a vital role to cope with it. According to Gert and Hans (2008, p. 207), speaking is speech or utterances with the purpose of having intention to be recognized by the speaker and the receiver processes the statements in order to recognize their intentions. Similarly, Richard (1990) asserts that the mastery of speaking skills in English is a priority for many second and foreign language learners. It is therefore important for the EFL learners to possess the speaking skill in relation to socially and actively interacting with other people and perceiving what they intend to. Apart from that, like speaking, writing is considered as a productive skill in which it is required to have a good communication in written forms and understand them, writing skill has an important role to come across with it.

Nunan (2003, p. 88) defines writing as both physical and mentalactivity that is aimed to express and impress. It iscategorized as the physical activity because a writer is required to be ableto do the act of committing words or ideas. As a mental work, the activitiesof writing focus more on the act of inventing ideas, thinking about how toexpress and organize them into clear statements and paragraphs that enablea reader in understanding the ideas of the written work.Having the same thought, Brown(2001, p.322) also says that writing is the written products of thinking,drafting, and revising that requirespecialized skills on how to generateideas, how to organize them coherently, how to use discourse markers andrhetorical conventions coherently into a written text, how to revise text forclearer meaning and how to edit text for appropriate grammar and how toproduce a final

product. It is then very necessary to have a good writing competence due to expressing our thoughts or feelings in minds and impressing others with them.

However, the mastery of English speaking and writing ability should be taken into account because the complexity increases when the students encounter the speaking and writing tasks as they, EFL learners, must speak and write in English. However, the English speaking and writing ability of EFL learners especially in Indonesia are currently facing the problems. On one hand, in terms of speaking problems, Adhikari (2010) reveals that EFL learners are not as communicative and expressive in English as it is expected. Their English speaking ability are at the poor level in the courses given. In line with that Marcelino' study (2005, p. 33), he states that most of the students as EFL learners are passive. A lot of them are shy to use English in real communication. Many of them pay attention to forms and rules when they communicate with others. Most of them do not practice English in real communication and situations. Only few practice English in the classroom. Most of the learners fail in acquiring English because of lack of motivation.

On the other hand, in terms of writing problems, in the classroom we frequently find that the students might get some difficulties to write the composition in a spontaneous and easy way such as how to construct a good sentence, how to organize good ideas, how to use appropriate vocabularies. This is in line with Nirmala' study (2008, p. 185) which implies that (1) the learners are not able to write simple and complete sentences in English. Also, they do not have the knowledge of language skills, (2) students are not aware of rules in L2 writing, (3) they have major problems with punctuation, tenses, spellings, prepositions and other aspects of language, (4) they are not aware of organization, cohesion, coherence and such other concepts of writing, and (5) learners are cognitively matured but linguistically poor. In addition, Indonesia is not included as Top 100 Asia University which publishes research-based paper internationally (Times Higher Education, 2014). Therefore, it is obvious that in Indonesia the students still have some problems in their speaking and writing skills.

To cope with the speaking and writing problems, the teacher should use an appropriate media to teach in English teaching and learning environment. Picture-series is one of the instructional media that can be applied in the classroom. This is in line with Lutfiyah (2009) states that the use of pictures in the classroom provides a stimulating focus for the students' interest because everybody likes to look at pictures. Besides, pictures can translate abstract ideas into more realistic form, can be easily obtained, can be used in different academic levels, and can attract students' interests (Latuheru, 1988). Hence, it stands to the point that pictures can help the learners to generate, express, and stimulate their feeling or thoughts in English teaching and learning activity particularly on speaking and writing activity.

In accordance with the background, the writer would like to carry out the research which is related to Pictures-series to improve the speaking and writing achievements of the undergraduate students of Civil Engineering study program of Indo Global Mandiri University.

A. Research Questions

Based on the above-stated background, the research questions were formulated as follows:
1) Was there any significantimprovement ofstudents' speakingachievement after being taught by using picture series?
2) Was there any significantimprovement ofstudents' writing achievement after being taught by using picture series?
3) Was there any significant difference in speaking achievement between the students who were taught by using picture series and those who were not?
4) Was there any significant difference in writing achievement between the students who were taught by using picture series and those who were not?

B. Objectives of the Research

In relation to the problem above, the objectives of this research could be formulated as follows:
1) To find out the improvement of students' speaking achievement after being taught by using picture series.
2) To find out the improvement of students' writing achievement after being taught by using picture series.
3) To find out the significant difference in speaking achievement between the students who were taught by using picture series and those who were not.
4) To find out the significant difference in writing achievement between the students who were taught by using picture series and those who were not.

C. Research Hypotheses

In conjunction with the problems and objectives of the research, the researchers proposed hypotheses as follows:

Null Hypotheses (H_o1) : There was no significant improvement in speaking achievement between the students who were taught by using picture series and those who were not.

Alternative Hypotheses ($Ha1$): There was significant improvement in speaking achievement between the students who were taught by using picture series and those who were not.

Null Hypotheses (H_o2) :There was no significant improvement in writing achievement between the students who were taught by using picture series and those who were not.

Alternative Hypotheses (Ha2) :There was significant improvement in writing achievement between the students who were taught by using picture series and those who were not.

Null Hypotheses (H_o3) :There was no significant difference in speaking achievement between the students

who were taught by using picture series and those who were not.

Alternative Hypotheses (Ha3) :There was significant difference in speaking achievement between the students who were taught by using picture series and those who were not.

Null Hypotheses (H₀4) :There was no significant difference in writing achievement between the students who were taught by using picture series and those who were not.

Alternative Hypotheses (Ha4) :There was significant difference in writing achievement between the students who were taught by using picture series and those who were not.

C. Research Methodology

In this study, the writer used the quasi-experimental design and would be primarily concerned on the *nonequivalent groups pretest- posttest-control group design or comparison group design.* This method would indeed require two groups that are actually experimental and control groups. In the experimental group, the writer gave a pre-test, treatment by using picture-series and then post-test. Meanwhile in the control group, the writer only gave a pre- test and post-test without any treatment.

McMillan and Schumacher (2010, p. 278) reveal that *nonequivalent groups pretest- posttest-control group design or comparison group design* is very prevalent and useful in education. Because it is often impossible to randomly assign subjects. The researcher uses intact, already established groups of subjects, gives a pretest, administers the intervention condition to one group, and gives the post test.

D. Population and Sample

The population of this research was all the undergraduate students of civil engineering study program of University of Indo Global Mandiri in the academic year of 2014-2015. Since the number of population distribution was 46 students, purposive sampling technique was used in this research.

To select the number of sample, the structure test was given to get the students who had high, average, and low score. The all population were then given the time for 45 minutes to finish the 40 items of the multiple-choice question. After getting the result of the test given, the researchers classified the students' result into three categories that is high, average, and low.

Table 1. *The Sampling Result*

No	Category	Scale	Number of Students
1.	High	80-100	14
2.	Average	70-79	17
3.	Low	≤ 69	15
Total			**46**

From the sampling result, the number of the students who had high score was 14, the number of the students

who had average score was 17, and the number of the students who had low score was 15. The researcher only took 40 students from each category and then grouped them equally into experimental and control group. Hence, the sample of research was as follows:

Table 2. *The Sample of Research in the Experimental and Control Group*

No.	Group	Average	Total
1.	Experimental Group	20	20
2.	Control Group	20	20

E. Procedures of Picture Series Instruction

In the teaching and learning process in the classroom, the researchers highlighted the three steps of teaching activities. First, pre-viewing activities. Second, viewing activities and the last is post-viewing activities. In the experimental group, the researcher implemented the picture series in improving the speaking and writing achievements. Meanwhile, in the control group, the researcher did not give any treatment in the classroom. The activities were completed in 12 teaching sessions in which each lasted for 90 minutes excluding the pretest and posttest. The following are the teaching procedures implemented:

F. Pre-teaching activities
1) The researchers exposed general thematic topic of picture series and and explained the speaking and writing instruction.
2) The researchers displayed the picture series on the slides and let the students make a preparation in terms of the the person, activity, and setting in the pictures.

G. Whilst- teaching activities
1) In terms of speaking activity, the researchers exposed the pictures on the slides and had the students generate the vocabularies and other information they know about the topic given.
2) If the students got problem in the middle of the picture series description, the researchers helped them by giving the question and clues in conjunction with the pictures being exposed.
3) In terms of writing activity, the researchers required the students to gather all the information by writing the clues and picture sequences from one picture to another ones.
4) If the students came across with the problems of writing especially ideas, vocabulary, structures, and the like, the researchers helped them by giving direct answer and put them into group in order to make them help each other.

H. Post-teaching activities
1) The researcher asked the students to describe the picture series being exposed in front of the class.
2) The researcher explained to the students how to write descriptive text (for example: planning,

drafting, revising,and editing including the tenses and the organization of text)
3) The teacher asked the students to write descriptive text consist of 150-250 words.
4) The students drafted their desriptive writing.
5) The students gave their draft to the members in a group to be corrected (peer editing).
6) The students revised their composition.

On the other hand, the researchers did not give any treatment to the students in the control group. They were only given pretest and posttest.

I. Data Collection

In collecting the data, the writer gave a test with speaking topics in the form of a monologue. In this study, there will be two classes as the sample, one class is the experimental class, and the other is the control class. Both of the classes were given a pre-test and a post-test. Pre-tests were given to each class before experiment and post-test after the experiment,both of tests were the same and taken from certain references. Then, the writer noted down the aspects of speaking ability such as, comprehension, vocabulary, pronunciation grammar, and fluency in a table of paper and make a note about the score.

To rate the students' speaking ability, the researcher used SOLOM (Student Oral Language Observation Matrix). The SOLOM is a rating scale that teachers can use to assess their students' command of oral language on the basis of what they observe on a continual basis in a variety of situations. The teacher matches a student's language performance in comprehension, vocabulary, fluency, grammar, and pronunciation to descriptions on a five-point scale for each. On the other hand, in collecting the data of writing, the researcher also noted down the aspects of writing ability, such as: grammar, vocabulary, mechanic, organisation, and fluency in a table of paper and make a note about the score. To rate students' writing ability, the researcher used analytical writing rubric suggested by Hughes (2004). Analytical writing rubric is a rating scale that teachers can use to identify students' strengths and weaknesses in writing and assess their writing product. The teacher matches a students' language production in grammar, vocabulary, mechanic, organisation, and fluency to descriptions on a six-point scale for each.

G. Validity and Reliability

In relation to pursuing a high degree of content validity, the researcher usedtests to measure the students' speaking and writing achievements. In order to know whether the topic of speaking and writing tests given were valid, the researcher formulated the topic for speaking and writing tests by considering English textbook used by the concerned lecturer. Meanwhile, in order to figure out the reliability of the test, inter-rater reliability was used. The inter-rater reliability would be checked by using raters' judgements on the language produced by students in terms of oral and written forms

of English. After giving test, the students' scores were produced by two raters independently and a correlation coefficient was calculated between them for each; speaking and writing. And the result of Pearson correlation was reliable.

H. Data Analysis

The data analyses were taken from the tests. In analyzing the data of students' speaking and writing achievements, the rubrics were used and the writer used the Paired Samples T-test in which the data were analyzed by SPSS program. It was used to know the significant difference between pretest and posttest for each group, the Independent Samples T - test was be applied to know the significant difference between the two groups.

To interpret the students' individual score, the range of speaking achievement used is as follows: excellent, good, average, poor, and very poor (See Table 3). Meanwhile the range of writing achievement used is as follows: excellent, good, average, poor, and very poor (See Table 4).

Table 3. *The Scores and the Grades of the Students' Speaking Achievement*

Score Range	Grade	Students' Competency Level
21-25	A	Very Good
16-20	B	Good
11-15	C	Average
6-10	D	Poor
<6	E	Very Poor

Table 4. *The Scores and the Grades of the Students' Writing Achievement*

Score Range	Grade	Students' Competency Level
25-30	A	Very Good
19-24	B	Good
13-18	C	Average
7-12	D	Poor
<7	E	Very Poor

2. Findings and Discussion

A. Descriptive Analyses

In terms of speaking achievement, the pretest of experimental group showed that 7 students (35%) were in the poor speaking achievement level, 11 students (55%) were in the average speaking achievement level, and only 2 students (10%) were in the good speaking achievement level. The mean score and standard deviation of the pretest in experimental group were 11.475 and 2.3479. Therefore, it could be concluded that the speaking achievement level of students in the pretest of experimental group was in the average speaking achievement level. Meanwhile, in the posttest of experimental group showed that 13 students (65%) were

in the average speaking achievement level, 5 students (25%) were in the good speaking achievement level, and only 2 students (10%) were in the very good speaking achievement level. The mean score and standard deviation of the posttest in experimental group were 16.725 and 2.2389. Therefore, it could be concluded that the speaking achievement level of students in the posttest of experimental group was in the average speaking achievement level. On the other hand, in the pretest of the control group showed that 12 students (50%) were in the poor speaking achievement level, and 8 students (50%) were in the average speaking achievement level. The mean score and standard deviation of the pretest in experimental group were 10.500 and 2.8423. Therefore, it could be concluded that the speaking achievement level of students in the pretest of control group was in the poor speaking achievement level. Meanwhile, in the posttest of control group showed that 6 students (30%) were in the poor speaking achievement level, 11 students (55%) were in the average speaking achievement level, and only 3 students (15%) were in the good speaking achievement level. The mean score and standard deviation of the posttest in experimental group were 12.225 and 2.7932. Therefore, it could be concluded that the speaking achievement level of students in the posttest of control group was in the average speaking achievement level.

In addition, in terms of writing achievement, the pretest of experimental group showed that 13 students (65%) were in the poor writing achievement level, 6 students (30%) were in the average writing achievement level, and only 1 student (5%) was in the good writing achievement level. The mean score and standard deviation of the pretest in experimental group were 12.250 and 3.0284. Therefore, it could be concluded that the writing achievement level of students in the pretest of experimental group was in the poor writing achievement level. Meanwhile, the posttest of experimental group showed that 17 students (85%) were in the average writing achievement level, and 3 students (15%) were in the good writing achievement level. The mean score and standard deviation of the posttest in experimental group were 16.725 and 2.2389. Therefore, it could be concluded that the writing achievement level of students in the posttest of experimental group was in the average writing achievement level. On the other note, the pretest of control group showed that 12 students (60%) were in the poor writing achievement level, 8 students (40%) were in the average writing achievement level, and only 1 student (5%) was in the good writing achievement level. The mean score and standard deviation of the pretest in control group were 11.600 and 2.5163. Therefore, it could be concluded that the writing achievement level of students in the pretest of control group was in the poor writing achievement level. Meanwhile, the posttest of control group showed that 6 students (30%) were in the poor writing achievement level, 13 students (65%) were in the average writing achievement level, and only 1 student was in the good writing achievement level. The mean score and standard

deviation of the posttest in experimental group were 13.800 and 2.4409. Therefore, it could be concluded that the writing achievement level of students in the posttest of control group was in the average writing achievement level.

B. Statistical Analyses

The statistical analyses were used to know whether or not there were any significant improvements and significant difference on the students' speaking and writing achievements after giving a treatment by using picture series. To find out the answer of the research questions, the researcher used two statistical analyses in this research namely Paired sample t-test and Independent sample t-test. ***Paired samples t-test*** was used to find out: (1) the significant improvements on the students' speaking $_{(total)}$ and writing $_{(total)}$ skill achievements before and after they were taught by using picture series. ***Independent samples t-test*** was used to find out: (1) the significant difference on the students' speaking achievement between the experimental group and control group; (2) the significant difference on the students' writing achievement between the experimental group and control group.

C. The Results of Paired Samples and Independent Samples t-test

In conjunction with the results of speaking and writing achievements of both experimental group and control group before and after intervention. In conjunction with the result of the progress analysis by using paired samples t-test in the experimental group, the mean score of the students' speaking achievement in the pretest of experimental group was 11.47 and the standard deviation was 2.3479. Meanwhile, the mean score of the students' speaking achievement in the posttest of experimental group was 15.00 and the standard deviation was 3.2118. The ouput data of progress analysis revealed that mean difference of speaking achievement between the pre-test and post-test in experimental group was 3.525 and the standard deviation was 1.2924. On the other note, the mean score of the students' writing achievement in the pretest of experimental group was 12.25 and the standard deviation was 3.0284. Meanwhile, the mean score of the students' writing achievement in the posttest of experimental group was 16.72 and the standard deviation was 2.2389. The ouput data of progress analysis revealed that mean difference of writing achievement between the pre-test and post-test in experimental group was 4.475 and the standard deviation was 1.0696. Since the Sig.$_{value}$ (2-tailed) of both speaking and writing achievements in the experimental group were less than 0.05, therefore, it could be concluded that the null hypotheses (Ho1 and Ho2) were rejected and the research hypotheses (Ha1 and Ha2) were accepted. It stands to the point that statistically there was a significant improvement made by the experimental group.

Additionally, in conjunction with the result of the progress analysis by using paired samples t-test in the

control group, the mean score of the students' speaking achievement in the pretest of control group was 10.50 and the standard deviation was 2.8423. Meanwhile, the mean score of the students' speaking achievement in the posttest of control group was 12.22 and the standard deviation was 2.7932. The ouput data of progress analysis revealed that mean difference of speaking achievement between the pre-test and post-test in control group was 1.725 and the standard deviation was 0.7860. On the other note, the mean score of the students' writing achievement in the pretest of control group was 11.60 and the standard deviation was 2.5163. Meanwhile, the mean score of the students' writing achievement in the posttest of control group was 13.80 and the standard deviation was 2.4409. The ouput data of progress analysis revealed that mean difference of writing achievement between the pre-test and post-test in control group was 2.200 and the standard deviation was 1.0687. Since the $Sig._{value}$ (2-tailed) of both speaking and writing achievements in the controlgroup were less than 0.05, therefore, it could be concluded that the null hypotheses (Ho1 and Ho2) were rejected and the research hypotheses (Ha1 and Ha2) were accepted. It stands to the point that statistically there was a significant improvement made by the control group.

From the result of difference analysis by using independent samples t-test, it showed that the mean difference speaking post-test between the experimental and control group was 2.775 and the t-obtained was 2.916 (p<0.000). Meanwhile, the mean difference writing post-test between the experimental and control group was 2.925 and the t-obtained was 3.949 (p<0.000). Since the p value of speaking and writing achievements (0.000) were less than 0.05. Hence, the null hypotheses (Ho3 and Ho4) were rejected and the research hypotheses (Ha3 and Ha4) were accepted. It means that there was a significant mean difference in speaking and writing skill achievements between the students who were taught by using picture series and those who were not.

D. Discussion

In accordance with the above findings, some interpretation could be drawn that teaching by using picture series statistically and significantly improves the students' achievements both speaking and writing. There were some reasons why picture series could improve the students' speaking and writing achievements. The following is the interpretation in detail.

In terms of speaking, first, when the students were given the time to yield their ideas and thoughts before being exposed to some pictures on the instructional slides in the teaching and learning environment, the lecturer then asked to to describe the picture in front of the class and if they came across with the barriers to describe, the lecturer assisted them by asking the questions related to the picture described in order that the students could elaborate their mind to speak up more. When one student described the pictures, the lecturer controlled the others to pay more attention and stay

focused to what their friend speak about. This is supported by Wright (1989, p. 17) that picture can stimulate and provide information to be referred to in conversation, discussion, and storytelling. In line with that, Lutfiyah (2009) also states that the use of pictures in the classroom provides a stimulating focus for the students' interest because everybody likes to look at pictures. Besides, pictures can translate abstract ideas into more realistic form, can be easily obtained, can be used in different academic levels, and can attract students' interests (Latuheru, 1988). Second, when the students were asked to describe the picture, they had more opportunities to use their imagination to tell the pictures chosen because during this phase they could relate the pictures with what they had ever felt and experienced before. It also gave them more time to speak up in front of the class. Since the picture being displayed in the series, they were more challenging and more self-motivated to tell and generate more interesting ideas to describe them. This is supported by Harmer (2004) that pictures are often used to present situations to help students work with grammar and vocabulary. But their potential to bring students to different worlds also means that they can be used to encourage students to fly in their creative imagination. Bardos (2000) also asserts that the importance of visualization lies in the fact that it has both a motivating effect and the capacity for creating associations. Apart from that, Mumford (2008) highlights the use of pictures as a powerful source in the elicitation process that involves the teacher's prompting and encouraging the learners to create meaningful acts of speech.

In terms of writing, first, when the students were exposed to the pictures series, they wrote many interesting ideas and made associations to their personal experiences. Besides, they were also more interested and active to write their ideas since they were displayed colourful and thematic pictures although they still had problems with grammar and vocabulary. This is strengthened by Smaldino et al. (2005, p. 9) who suggests that the use of picture series will make the students interested in writing English. Wright (1989) also further reveals that picture series contribute to interest and motivation, a sense of the context of the language, and a specific important point or stimulus. In line with that, Sa'diyah (2010) also states that the motivation and the writing performance of the students were positively affected by the implementation of picture series. Second, in the process of writing, the students really got involved actively in the class, since they needed to generate ideas and relate them from one picture to the others in terms of the picture series exposed in order that they could start their writing. This is strengthened by Uematsu (2012) who summarizes that pictures help teachers to teach better and students to learn better. He has also found that pictures have the attribute to engage students in their learning given that they are appealing resources for students. Additionally, students can become more actively involved through the use of visual materials. It has been registered that

students seems to be more motivated and involved in the writing tasks when using pictures because these resources provide a stimulating focus for students' attention (Raimes, 1983). Hence, from the findings and interpretation above, it could be concluded that the picture series-based instruction statistically and significantly improved the students' speaking and writing achievements.

3. Conclusion

On the basis basis of the descriptive statistics, statistical analyses and descriptive analysis, some conclusions and suggestions were about to be pondered. Firstly, the results of the speaking and writing achievement level of the experimental group were better than those of the speaking and writing achievement level of the control group. It could be vividly viewed from the frequency, percentage, and mean score increments made by the experimental group compared to those made by the control group. Secondly, from the results of the paired samples t-test, the experimental group had a higher improvement than control group in the pretest and posttest. Thirdly, from the results of the independent samples t-test, there was a significant mean difference on the speaking and writing achievements between the students who were taught by using picture series and those who were not. Hence, it could be concluded that picture series-based teaching statistically and significantly improved the students' speaking and writing achievements. In relation to the above-made conclusions, some suggestions are drawn to develop the teaching and learning activities to the EFL learners in the communicative setting. First of all, the EFL learners should be frequently exposed to the activities which require them to have more opportunity to speak up for example using pictures in the EFL classroom particularly on seeking out and creating the interesting and thought provoking pictures. This could make the EFL learners speak up and elaborate their ideas related to the pictures provided. Second of all, the English lecturer assigned should be able to use, to select, or even to modify the suitable teaching materials, media, and technique to support the teaching and learning process in the EFL classroom. Third of all, both the English lecturer and EFL learners should be well-facilitated in the communicative setting in order that the implementation of teaching materials, media, and technique could be running accordingly. Last of all, the other researchers could carry out the similar research, yet concerning on not only the productive skills but also the receptive skills.

References

[1] Adhikari, B. R. (2010). Teaching speaking in the Nepalese context: Problems and ways of overcoming them. *Journal of NELTA, 15*(1), 1-9.

[2] Bardos, J. (2000). Azidegennyelvektanításánakelméletialapjaiésgyakor lata (The Theoretical Foundations and Practice of Teaching Foreign Languages). Budapest: NemzetiTankönyvkiadó.

[3] Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: an Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. (2nd edition). New York: Addison Westley Lonman, Inc.

[4] Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press. Retrieved from http://faculty.georgetown.Edu/irvinem/theory/Chomsky-Aspects-excerpt. pdf

[5] Gert, R., & Hans, S. (2008). *Handbook of communication competence*. Berlin, Germany:University of Bielefeld.

[6] Harmer, J. (2004). *How to teach writing*. New York: Pearson Education Ltd.

[7] Hughes, A. (2004). *Testing for languageteachers*(2nd edition.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[8] Latuheru, J. D. (1988). *Media pembelajarandalam proses belajarmengajarmasakini*. Retrieved from http://endonesa.wordpress.com/ ajaranpembelajaran/media-pembelajaran.

[9] Lutfiyah, L. (2009). Teaching descriptive texts using still pictures. In B. Y.Cahyono (Eds.), *techniques in teaching EFL writing: Practical guidesfor English teachers of SMP/MTs in Indonesia*. Malang: State Universityof Malang Press.

[10] Marcellino, M. (2005). Competency-based language instruction in speaking classes: Its theory and implementation in Indonesian contexts. *Indonesian Journal of EnglishLanguageTeaching, 1*(1), 33-44.

[11] McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2010). *Research in education: Evidence-based inquiry* (7th edition).New York, NY: Pearson.

[12] Mid-Continent Comprehensive Center. (2012). *Student o ral language observation matrix (SOLOM)*. Retrieved from http://www.mc3edsuppor t.org/community/knowledgebases /student-oral language-observation-matrix-solom-1061.html.

[13] Mumford, S. (2008). Picture This! Modern English Teacher, *17*(2), 40-42.

[14] Nirmala, Y. (2008). *Teaching writing using picture stories as tools at the high school level: The movement from other regulation to self-regulation*. The English and Foreign Languages University.

[15] Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English language teaching*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

[16] Raimes, A. (1983). *Techniques in teaching writing*. Cambridge: Oxford University Press.

[17] Richard, J. C. (1990). *Conversationally speaking approaches to the teaching of conversation*: The language of teaching matrix. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

[18] Sa'diyah, H. (2010). Improving students' ability in writing descriptive texts through a picture series aided learning strategy. *The English Teacher*, 164-182.

[19] Smaldino, E. Sharon.et al. (2005). Instructional Technology and Media for Learning. Boston: Pearson.

[20] Times Higher Education (2014). The world university rankings. Retrieved from https://www.timeshighereducation.com/world-university-rangkings/2014/reputation-rangking.

[21] Uematsu, H. (2012). The use of pictures and illustrations in teaching English. 21st Century Education Forum, 45-50.

[22] Wright, Andrew. (1989). *Pictures for language Learning*. Cambridge. CUP.