



## Teaching Simple Past Tense Using Numbered Head Together (NHT) Strategy to Teenagers

Nur Afifa<sup>1</sup>, Hilal Mahmud<sup>2</sup>, Muhammad Iksan<sup>3</sup>

*Institut Agama Islam Negeri Palopo*

*miksan@iainpalopo.ac.id*

### Abstract

*This paper is intended to find out the effectiveness of Numbered Head Together (NHT) strategy in teaching Simple Past Tense to Teenagers. This study is experimental study which applied the pre-experimental design in one group pre-test and post-test design. The writer collected data by giving pre-test and post-test which are formulated in multiple-choice items contained 10 items. The data collected through pre-test and post-test which were firstly tabulated and analyzed in percentage. The sample of the research was the students from different high school in Masamba categorized as a teenager aged 15-16 years old consisting of 10 students. This study revealed that the use of numbered head together strategy is effective in teaching simple past tense for teenagers. It is proved by the result of the data indicating that there was a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test. The mean score in the pre-test was 39,00 and the mean score in the post-test was 82,00. The value of  $t_0$  ( $t_{count}$ ) = 7,435, the value of  $t_t$  ( $t_{table}$ ) = 1,833 at the level of significance 5% (0,05) with degree of freedom (df) = 9. Based on the result, 7,435 > 1,833 or  $t_0$  ( $t_{count}$ ) was higher than  $t_t$  ( $t_{table}$ ),  $t_0 > t_t$ , it means that the numbered head together strategy is effective in teaching simple past tense to teenagers.*

**Keywords:** *English Language Teaching, Simple Past Tense, Numbered Head Together Strategy*

### 1. Introduction

Grammar in the English language is one of the important sub-skill, especially in speaking and writing because to get good communication with the people when we are speaking, the people have to make the correct structure or grammar in order people do not appear misunderstanding in speaking and writing. Hartono (2003) said that language is a means of communication. To communicate well, we must know about the grammatical language. Grammar is one of the language features that learn about a way to arrange the word to become a sentence. So, if we want to learn about the English language, we must understand grammar material that has been explained.

The writers chose teenagers from different schools as research subjects because the writers wanted to know what problems the tenth-grade teenagers had while studying formally in their respective schools. Based on the observation and interview of the ten grade students from some senior high schools in Salulemo village, district Baebunta, Luwu Utara on Thursday, 25-27<sup>th</sup> April 2019, the writer found that learning grammar has still become a problem for them. Most of the students find difficulties in learning grammar. The students sometimes get bored with the teaching-learning process employed by the teacher

in teaching grammar. The students are usually confused about rules and the use of tenses, especially in the simple past tense. The students did not know to make the correct structure of the sentence. Moreover, the teacher uses the genre-based approach to teaching English.

In the genre-based approach, the teacher uses some texts like descriptive text, narrative text, recount text, and procedure text. The tense used in the descriptive text is a simple present tense. Then, the tense used in narrative and recounts text is simple past tense. Students are confused about how to use the correct tenses in the text. To make the students more understand the different times in the tense. Therefore, teachers should be more creative in delivering learning materials by using various learning strategies, methods, and techniques that are interesting and fun for students. One of learning strategies considered suitable for delivering learning material is cooperative learning called numbered heads together (NHT).

The NHT (Numbered Heads Together) strategy is designed to influence the pattern of student interaction. In the delivery of learning material, not only the material needs to explain by the teacher but it must also balance with practice questions so that students had a better understanding of the material. Implementation of the practice will be more meaningful if done in groups because they can help each other especially for students who do not understand the material delivered by the teacher.

Hikmawandini & Kurniawati (2017) found that the numbered head together strategy is effective to improve students' ability in the simple past tense teaching and the students' response toward this strategy were positive because it helps students to be more confident in term of participating because of group encouragement and benefits them to understand the hard concept of the learning material.

In the cooperative learning, numbered head together provides an opportunity for students to share ideas and consider the most appropriate answers. Besides, it also encourages students to improve their cooperation. The role of students in the NHT cooperative learning model occupies a very dominant position in the learning process and cooperation occurs in groups, namely thinking together to discuss answers and questions from the teacher. The main characteristic of this learning is the numbering of each student so that students try to understand every material that is taught and is responsible for each member and is fully responsible for the questions given.

Based on the problem above, the writer decided to conduct experimental research to overcome the problem of the student in learning English particularly in learning simple past tense. The use of the numbered head together (NHT) strategy can motivate the students in learning grammar and understand the usage and the use of the simple past tense. The students can learn grammar with fun because the teacher uses interesting media and strategy.

Based on the problem explained in the background above, the writer formulates the problem statement with research question: is the numbered head together (NHT) strategy effective in teaching simple past tense to teenagers? Related to the research question, the objective of the research is to find out whether the numbered head together (NHT) strategy is effective or not in teaching simple past tense to teenagers.

## **2. Method**

This experimental study applied the pre-experimental design with pre-test and post-test. The population of this study was the tenth-grade students from different senior high schools who were categorized as teenagers in Salulemo Village, Baebunta District, Luwu

Utara, South Sulawesi. The writer used purposive sampling. The writer took 10 teenagers aged 15-16 years old as a sample. The students have a lack of understanding in formulating simple past recount text.

In this study, the writer used grammar test in collecting data during process of the study. Grammar test consists of pre-test and post-test are using to measure the students' simple past tense before treatment and after giving treatment. The form of the grammar test is multiple choices contain test in the verbal and nominal sentence in simple past tense. The test contains 10 numbers in the positive, negative and interrogative in incomplete sentence.

In collecting data, the writer took the procedure of collecting data such as the writer gave a pre-test to students before giving treatment. The form of the test is multiple choices. There were ten numbers in each test. The writer gave one minute to do each number of the test. So, the students had ten minutes to do the test. Then, in treatment, the writer conducted two meetings. The steps were firstly, the writer introduced herself and explained the material about recount text as a tool to teach simple past tense to the students. Then, the writer taught the text structure of the simple past tense. Next activity, students were divided into three groups. Each student in the group had a number for themselves. The writer gave the recount text about "Good Weekend" for each group. Each group identified a simple past tense in the text. Next, the writer asked students to change the sentence from the positive form into the negative and interrogative form in a verbal and nominal sentence. The writer gave 20 minutes to discuss it and find the answers. Each student in the groups did the task that has been given. After doing the task, each student collected their answer and discussed together to found the correct answer to the presented. After the discussion, the writer called one number to determine the student in each group to present the result of discussing in their group. Another group has an opportunity to give a response.

Secondly, the writer reviewed the material in the first meeting before continuing to the next treatment. The writer explained about nominal and verbal sentence structure in the simple past tense. Then, the writer divided students into 3 groups. Each student in the group was given a number for themselves. The writer gave recount text about "Carlo" for each group. Next, the writer asked each group to make a recount text based on the example text that has been given before. The writer gave 20 minutes to discuss and find the answers. Each student in the groups did the task that has been given. After doing the task, each student collected their answer and discussed together to found the correct answer to the presented. After the discussion, the writer called one number to determine the student in each group to present the result of discussing in their group. Another group had an opportunity to give a response.

After giving treatment, finally, the writer gave a post-test. The post-test contains ten numbers in the multiple-choice test. The writer gave one minute for each number, so the students have ten minutes to do the test. Give a post-test to find the result of implementing the numbered head together (NHT) strategy in the treatment.

Quantitative data collected and analyzed by computing the score of pre-test and post-test. All data finding through this study would be analyzed by conducting scoring the students' answer.

$$\text{Score} = \frac{\text{total correct answer}}{\text{total test items}} \times 100$$

Computing frequency of the rate percentage, the writer applied the following formula by (Ridwan, 2003):

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100\%$$

Where:

P = Percentage

F = Frequency

N = the number of samples (total respondents)

To understand the level of the students score the following classification were used:

- a. 96 – 100 is classified as excellent
- b. 86 – 95 is classified as very good
- c. 76 – 85 is classified as good
- d. 66– 75 is classified as fairly good
- e. 56 – 65 is classified as fairly
- f. 36 – 55 is classified as poor
- g. 0 – 35 is classified as very poor

The researchers use SPSS 20 to calculate the mean score and standard deviation of students, the paired sample statistic, the paired sample correlation of pre-test and post-test, and the pairs sample test.

### **3. Results**

#### **3.1. Findings**

In this section, the writer showed the complete score of students in the simple past tense (students' correct answer), the mean score and standard deviation of students, and the rate percentage of students' scores of simple past tense in the pre-test. The writer presented the data in the tables and calculates the score by using SPSS 20. Then, the writer showed the students' complete score of simple past tense in the pre-test. The tabulation of students' score in the pre-test can be seen in the table below:

**Table 1.** The Score of Students in Pre-Test

Respondent	Correct answer	Score
R1	2	20
R2	4	40
R3	5	50
R4	4	40
R5	5	50
R6	4	40
R7	3	30
R8	6	60
R9	2	20
R10	4	40
$\Sigma$ 10		

Table 1 showed that two students got the lowest score (20) and two students got the highest score (60).

On the other side, the writer also had written the students' scores of the correct answer in the pre-test. It was presented through the table rate percentage score. It can be seen in table 2:

**Table 2.** The Rating Percentage Score of the Students' Correct Answer in Pre-Test

Classification	Score	Frequency	Percentage
Very good	86-100	-	0%
Good	76-85	-	0%
Fairly good	66-75	-	0%
Fairly	56-65	1	10%
Poor	36-55	6	60%
Very poor	0-35	3	30%
		10	100%

Table 2 indicated that students' score in the frequency of pre-test. It showed that there was none of the student (0%) who got very good, good, and fairly good. The other showed that there was 1 student (10%) who got fairly. While there were 6 students (60%) who got poor and 3 students (30%) who got very poor. Based on the data above, it can be seen on the table above there is no one student got very good, good, and fairly good indicated that the students' ability in simple past tense still low.

The writer showed the complete score of students in the simple past tense (students' correct answer), the mean score and standard deviation of students, and the rate percentage of students' scores of simple past tense in the post-test. The writer presented the data in the tables and calculates the score by using SPSS 20. Then, the writer showed the students' complete score of simple past tense in the post-test. The tabulation of students' score in the post-test can be seen in table 3:

**Table 3.** The Score of Students' in Post-Test

Respondent	Correct answer	Score
R1	10	100
R2	9	90
R3	8	80
R4	9	90
R5	7	70
R6	8	80
R7	7	70
R8	8	80
R9	8	80
R10	8	80
$\Sigma$ 10		

Table 3 showed that two students got the lowest score (70) and there was one student who got the highest score (100).

The writer also had written the students' score of correct answer after giving treatment through the NHT strategy (post-test) and is presented through the table rate percentage scores. It can be seen in table 4:

**Table 4.** The Rating Percentage Score of the Students' Correct Answer in Post-Test

Classification	Score	Frequency	Percentage
Very good	86-100	3	30%
Good	76-85	5	50%
Fairly good	66-75	2	20%
Fairly	56-65	-	0%
Poor	36-55	-	0%
Very poor	0-35	-	0%
		10	100%

Table 4 indicated students score in the frequency of the post-test. It showed that none of the student (0%) who got fairly, poor, and very poor. The other showed that there were 3 students (30%) who got very good score. It also showed that there were 5 students (50%) who got good score. And there were 2 students (20%) who got fairly good score. Based on the data above, it can be seen that there was no one student got fairly, poor, and very poor indicated that the students' ability in simple past tense has improved.

Looking at the mean score of students' in pre-test and post-test, the writer calculated the data by using SPSS 20. The result was presented in the table descriptive statistic as follows:

**Table 5.** The Mean Score and Standard Deviation in Pre-Test (T1) and Post-Test (T2)

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pretest	10	20.00	60.00	39.0000	12.86684
Posttest	10	70.00	100.00	82.0000	9.18937
Valid N (listwise)	10				

Table 5 indicated that the standard deviation in the pre-test was 12,86 and in the post-test was 9,18. It also showed that the mean score of students in the pre-test is 39 and the mean score of the students in the post-test is 82. The result of the table above showed that the mean score of students in the post-test was higher than the mean score of students in the pre-test. It concluded that using the numbered head together (NHT) strategy was effective in teaching simple past tense.

To find out whether the pre-test and post-test were significantly different, and also to know the acceptability of the hypothesis of this study, the writer used  $T_{test}$  analysis and calculated it by using SPSS 20. The result could be shown in the table of paired sample statistics, paired sample correlations, and paired sample test. It presented in the following table:

**Table 6.** The Paired Sample Statistic of Pre-Test and Post-Test

<b>Paired Samples Statistics</b>		<b>Mean</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>	<b>Std. Error Mean</b>
Pair 1	Pretest	39.0000	10	12.86684	4.06885
	Posttest	82.0000	10	9.18937	2.90593

Table 6 indicated that the value of standard deviation in the pre-test was 12,86 and 9,18 in the post-test. Besides, the standard deviation error in the pre-test was 4,06 and 2,90 in the post-test. The table above also showed that the mean score in the pre-test was 39 and in the post-test was 82. It concluded that the students' scores improved from 39 to 82.

**Table 7.** The Paired Sample Correlation of Pre-Test and Post-Test

<b>Paired Samples Correlations</b>		<b>N</b>	<b>Correlation</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
Pair 1	Pretest & Posttest	10	-.357	.311

Table 7 presented that the correlation of the students' ability before and after treatment is -0,357. It means that there was a significant correlation between students' ability in the simple past tense before and after treatment.

To find out whether the pre-test and post-test were significantly different, and also to know the acceptability of the hypothesis of this study, the writer used  $T_{test}$  analysis and calculated it by using SPSS 20. The result could be shown in the table of paired sample test.

The hypothesis was tested by using inferential statistics. In this case, the writer used a t-test (testing of significance) for paired sample t-test that is a test to know the significant difference between the results of students' mean scores in the pre-test and post-test.

Assuming that the level of significance ( $\alpha$ ) = 5% (0,05), the only thing which is needed; the degree of freedom (df) =  $N - 1$ , where  $N = 10$ , then the t-test is presented in the following table 8:

**Table 8.** The Pairs Samples Test

Paired Samples Test		Paired Differences					T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Posttest – Pretest	43.0000 0	18.28782	5.78312	29.91768	56.08232	7.435	9	.000

Table 8 presented that the correlation of the students' ability before and after treatment was  $-0,357$ . It means that there was a significant correlation between students' ability in the simple past tense before and after treatment.

From the analysis, the writer conducted that there was a significant difference between pre-test and post-test in improving students' simple past tense by using the numbered head together strategy. The result of statistical analysis for level of significance ( $\alpha = 0,05$ ) with degree of freedom ( $df = N - 1$ , where  $(N) = 10$ ,  $df = 9$ ). The probably value was smaller than  $\alpha$  ( $0.00 < 0,05$ ). It indicated that the alternative hypothesis  $H_1$  was accepted and the null hypothesis  $H_0$  was rejected. It means that teaching simple past tense by using a numbered head together strategy is effective in improving the students' ability in simple past tense.

### 3.2. Discussion

The result showed that the mean score of the students' pre-test is 39 and the mean score of the post-test is 82. The standard deviation of the pre-test is 12,86 and the standard deviation of the post-test is 9,18. It means that using the numbered head together with a strategy in teaching simple past tense could improves the students' ability in simple past tense.

After analyzing the data of students' in the simple past tense test, it showed that  $t_{count}$  ( $t_0$ ) with value (7,435) was higher than  $t_{table}$  ( $tt$ ) with value (1,833) with a degree of freedom ( $df = 9$ , and on the level significance 0.05, so the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) was accepted. It means that there is a significant difference between the results of the pre-test and post-test.

In summary, based on the study result above, there were also previous study results that found the numbered head together (NHT) strategy is effective in teaching simple past tense as for the previous study conducted by Hikmawandini & Kurniawati (2017) found the implementation of the numbered head together is effective in teaching simple past tense to improve the students' mastery. In addition, Hamidah (2017) found that the use of Numbered Heads Together could improve the students' understanding of simple past tense by guiding them to think critically, creatively, and sharing their difficulty with their group. Anggraini (2016) found that the use of the numbered head together technique is useful to improve the students' active participation in the teaching-learning process of simple past tense. While, Syarifah (2016) found that using numbered head together is a good way to improve the students' mastery of simple past tense because the findings of this study showed that that the use of Numbered Heads Together to improve students' mastery on simple past tense was successful. Similarly, those previous study results prove that the numbered head together (NHT) is an effective strategy in teaching



simple past tense. As said by Cayabyab (1999) that the numbered head together can encourage positive independence because the members depend on each other to arrive at a good answer and to help each member to be able to explain the answer. Individual accountability is also emphasized because everyone needs to be ready to represent the team and to help others to be ready.

Also, the writer found ways to give significant increase for students by giving explanation material repeatedly and did not continue the next activity if there were still students who did not understand the material. As described by Syah (2010) that the habits arise because of the process of shrinking the response tendency by using repeated stimulation. In addition, the unique of numbered head together strategy is it gives each students opportunity to explore their ideas by doing task or other activities. For the next every answer or ideas, the students would discuss them again in the group discussion. Therefore, the students will be more active in learning process.

In this study, by using the numbered head together strategy, the students could understand the text structure of simple past tense that is difficult through recount text. Students can differentiate the main verb (verbal sentence) and auxiliary verb (nominal sentence) and students can make sentences in the simple past tense and change the sentence from the positive form into the negative form and interrogative form

#### **4. Conclusion**

Based on the findings and discussions in the previous chapter, the writer concludes that using the numbered head together (NHT) strategy is effective in teaching simple past tense to teenagers who are the students from different senior high school. It can be seen after doing treatments. The result showed that there is a significant difference between the students' mean score in pre-test and post-test. In the pre-test, the students' mean score is 39,00 and the students' mean score in the post-test is 82,00. Also, The result can be seen from data have been analyzed by using T-test in the level of significance ( $\alpha$ ) 5% (0,05) with a degree of freedom ( $df$ ) = 9, obtained  $t_t = 1,833$  and  $t_0 = 7,435$ . From this, the writer gives an interpretation that  $t_0$  ( $t_{count}$ ) was higher than  $t_t$  ( $t_{table}$ ),  $7,435 > 1,833$ . It means that the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) is accepted that the numbered head together is effective in teaching simple past tense for teenagers.

The success in teaching does not depend on the lesson program only, but more important is how a teacher serves to learn and using a variety of methods, technique, or strategy to manage the class to make it more fun. The numbered head together strategy used in English teaching provides many opportunities for the student to be active in the process of teaching and learning. After conducting this research, the writer could give some advices and recommendations to teachers and students as follows:

Firstly, in learning English, an English teacher should give appropriate methods, techniques, or strategies to the students that can make them relax, enjoy, and easy to understand the material in the learning process. Secondly, the writer suggests to the English teacher to apply kinds of interesting strategies and media in teaching tenses, especially simple past tense. The writer suggested using Numbered Head Together as a strategy and media in teaching tenses. Thirdly, to make students pay attention to the lesson the teacher should provide a strategy that makes students focus again. for example by asking questions about lessons to students who do not pay attention to the teaching and learning process. Fourthly, the students should be active in the learning process. So the students can improve their skills in English. The last, the researchers who want to

conduct similar study in the next research may take this study as a reference and a benefit to developing the study about teaching simple past tense in other material.

## References

- Alter, J.B. (1991). *Essential English Usage and Grammar 4*. Jakarta Barat: Binarupa Aksara.
- Anggraini, R.M. (2016). *Improving the Eighth Grade Students' Simple Past Tense Achievement and Their Active Participant by Using Numbered Heads Together Strategy at SMPN 1 Jelbuk*. Jember: Jember University
- Arends, R. I. (2008). *Learning to Teach*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Azar, B.S. (1997.) *Understanding and Using English Grammar, 3rd edn*. Washington DC: Prentice-Hall International
- Ba'dulu, Abdul Muis. (1997). *Basic Sentence Pattern of English*. Ujung Pandang: IKIP Ujung Pandang.
- Brown and Douglas. (2001). *Teaching by Principles an Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*
- Cayabyab, E. C., & Jacobs, G. M. (1999). Making small groups work via cooperative learning. *The ACELT Journal*, 3(2), 27-31.
- Cook, S.J. (1980). *The Scope of Grammar: A Study of Modern English Grammar*. New York: Mc. Graw-Hill Publishing
- Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL quarterly*, 40(1), 83-107.
- Hadley, Ommagio. (1983). *Teaching Language in Context*. Boston: Heinle Publisher.
- Hamidah, F. (2017). *Improving The Eight Grade Students' Understanding on Simple Past Tense by Using Numbered Heads Together Technique at SMP Nurul Jadid in 2016/2017 Academic Year* (Doctoral dissertation).
- Harmer, Jeremy. (2010). *How to Teach English*. Longman
- Hartono, Rudy. (2003). *Complete English Grammar*
- Hikmawandini, M. I., & Kurniawati, N. (2017). A Quasi-Experimental Study at the Tenth Grade Students of SMA Negeri 1 Cibeber. *Jurnal JOEPALLT (Journal of English Pedagogy, Linguistics, Literature, and Teaching)*, 5(2).
- Hizbullah. (2010). *Teaching Simple Past Tense by Using Cooperative Learning*
- Hornby, A.S. (1975). *Guide to Pattern and Usage in English*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Huda, M. (2010). *Cooperative Learning: Metode, Teknik, Struktur, Dan Model Penerapan*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Hughes, A. (2003). *Testing for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hurlock, E. B. (2003). *Psikologi Perkembangan*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Ibrahim, Muhammad. (2015). *Common Grammatical Errors in Students' Writing at MAN 1 Parepare in Academic Year 2013/2014*. S2 Thesis. Universitas Negeri Makassar
- Iksan, M., & Dirham, D. (2018). The Influence of the Economic Students' Motivations and Language Learning Strategies towards Their English Achievement in STIE

- Muhammadiyah Palopo. *Ethical Lingua: Journal of Language Teaching and Literature*, 5(1), 110-121.
- Iksan, M., & Duriani. (2015). A Survey of Students' Language Learning Strategies and Their English Learning Achievement in SMA Negeri 1 Palopo. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 3(2), 12–27. <https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v3i2.146>
- Kagan, S. (2009). *Kagan Cooperative Learning*. San Clemente, California: Kagan Publishing.
- Knapp, P., & Watkins, M. (2005). *Genre, text, grammar: Technologies for teaching and assessing writing*. UNSW Press.
- Krohn, R. (1990). *English Sentence Structure*. Jakarta: Binarupa Aksara.
- Kurniawan and Erwin. (2010). *Basic English Grammar*. Kediri: SMA Negeri 3 Kediri Press.
- Lesiak, K. (2015). *Teaching English to Adolescents*. Paznan, Poland: World Scientific News.
- Lie, A. (2014). *Cooperative Learning*. Jakarta: PT. Grasindo.
- Masruddin (2009). *A Teaching Book and Exercise (Error Analysis)*. Palopo.
- Meenadevi, M. (2017). Strategies in teaching English grammar. In *The National Conference o Teaching of English Language and Literature* (Vol. 17, No. 11, pp. 89-94).
- Numan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology: A textbook for teachers*. Prentice Hall.
- Pramudiharjo, F. S., Suharjito, B., & Sukmaantara, I. P. (2014). Improving the 8-A Students' Active Participation and Their Recount Text Writing Achievement by Using Clustering Technique at SMPN 1 Tanggul.
- Penny Ur. (1988). *Grammar Practice Activities: A Practical Guide for Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rasyid, A., & Nur, H. (1997). Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) in Indonesia. *Theory, Practice, and Research, Department of English Language*.
- Richards, J. C., Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (Eds.). (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge university press.
- Ridwan. (2003). *Dasar-Dasar Statistika*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Santrock, J. W. (2003). *Adolescence: perkembangan remaja*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Suryabrata, S. (2012). *Metodologi Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Swan, M. (1980). *Practical english usage*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Syah, M. (2010). *Psikologi Pendidikan Dengan Pendekatan Baru*. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Syamsinar & Sarif. (2017). Developing Grammar Exercises by Using Hot Potatoes Authoring Software. *Proceeding ICONSS, Book 1*, 181-190. <https://journal.uncp.ac.id/index.php/iconss/article/view/495>
- Syarifah, N. L. (2016). *The use of numbered heads together to improve students' mastery of simple past tense (a classroom action research at the eight B grade of MTs*

*Manabi'ul Falah Pati in the academic year of 2015/2016*) (Doctoral dissertation, UIN Walisongo).

Syukur, A., & Supraba, A. (2020) Using Quickwriting in Improving the Students' Ability to Write Paragraph. *LETS: Journal of Linguistics and English Teaching Studies*, 2(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.46870/lets.v2i1.51>