



## **The Effectiveness of a Genre-Based Approach to Enhance University-Level Nursing Students' Speaking Performance**

*Received: 14-05-2025; Revised: 18-06-2025; Accepted: 19-06-2025*

### **Hendra Putra**

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Central Java, Indonesia

E-mail:

[mrhendraputra@students.unnes.ac.id](mailto:mrhendraputra@students.unnes.ac.id)

### **Rudi Hartono\***

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Central Java, Indonesia

E-mail:

[rudi.hartono@mail.unnes.ac.id](mailto:rudi.hartono@mail.unnes.ac.id)

### **Januarius Mujianto**

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Central Java, Indonesia

E-mail:

[januarius.mujianto@mail.unnes.ac.id](mailto:januarius.mujianto@mail.unnes.ac.id)

### **Yuliati**

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Central Java, Indonesia

E-mail: [yuliati@mail.unnes.ac.id](mailto:yuliati@mail.unnes.ac.id)

*\*) Corresponding Author*

**Abstract:** Students can comprehend the nursing process and disease cases thanks to the nursing study program's English syllabus. Thus, the purpose of this study is to determine how well the Genre-Based Approach (GBA) improves university-level nursing students' speaking abilities. The study employs a quasi-experimental research design and quantitative methods. The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not GBA can improve university-level speaking abilities among nursing students. A complete sampling technique is used to choose the sample, which consists of 71 students in total. The GBA is used to teach English in the experimental group. In contrast, the control group receives English instruction using a traditional method. The information gathered from the pre-test and post-test. Both descriptive and inferential analysis are performed on the data using the SPSS 22 version application. In hypothesis testing, 0.05 is a common significance level. Since 0.530 is more than 0.05, the null hypothesis—which typically states that there is no difference between the groups—cannot be disproved. It shows that H0 is accepted while Ha is denied. As a result, one could argue that there aren't any notable differences between the groups.

**Abstrak:** Mahasiswa dapat memahami proses keperawatan dan kasus penyakit berkat silabus bahasa Inggris program studi keperawatan. Dengan demikian, tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk menentukan seberapa baik Pendekatan Berbasis Genre (GBA) meningkatkan kemampuan berbicara mahasiswa keperawatan tingkat universitas. Studi ini menggunakan desain penelitian kuasi-eksperimental dan metode kuantitatif. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk menentukan apakah GBA dapat meningkatkan kemampuan berbicara tingkat universitas di kalangan mahasiswa keperawatan. Teknik pengambilan sampel lengkap digunakan untuk memilih sampel, yang terdiri dari total 71 mahasiswa. GBA digunakan untuk mengajar bahasa Inggris di kelompok eksperimen. Sebaliknya, kelompok kontrol menerima pengajaran bahasa Inggris menggunakan metode tradisional. informasi yang dikumpulkan dari pre-test dan post-test. Baik analisis deskriptif maupun inferensial dilakukan pada data menggunakan aplikasi SPSS versi 22. Dalam pengujian hipotesis, 0,05 adalah tingkat signifikansi yang umum. Karena 0,530 lebih besar dari 0,05, hipotesis nol—yang biasanya menyatakan bahwa tidak ada perbedaan antara kelompok—tidak dapat disanggah. Ini menunjukkan bahwa H0 diterima

sementara Ha ditolak. Akibatnya, seseorang dapat berargumen bahwa tidak ada perbedaan yang signifikan antara kelompok-kelompok tersebut.

**Keywords:** Anxiety level, EFL students, Genre-based approach, Speaking performance

## INTRODUCTION

In Indonesia, taking English as a subject is required. This subject is required of all students, regardless of education level, from basic to advanced. English instruction varies at higher education levels based on the demands of the university and the students. English can be utilized as an introductory language in higher education, such as in universities. It is supported by Ministry of Laws and human right of the Republic Indonesia Number 12 of 2012 concerning higher education, article 37, paragraph 3 Kementerian Hukum dan HAM, (2012) states that foreign languages can be utilized as language introductions at universities. It implies that university-level instruction in English is still offered. In addition, (Dardjowidjojo, 2002; Ibrahim, 2004) in Asnawi (2015) English has been taught and learnt by university students for many years. It is also happen in nursing study program.

English is taught four times at Universitas Fort De Kock University. The course's goal is for pupils to be able to comprehend the fundamentals of English, beginning with the alphabet and moving on to words, phrases, and paragraphs. The English for Nursing (English III) description equips students with the skills to read, listen, talk, and write in English while comprehending the nursing process and discussing medical-surgical nursing in particular.

From the materials or topics in the syllabus, nursing students must present the topic in front of the class room. From their presentation and observation in the classroom, it found some challenging or weaknesses. They can see from three aspects. It is supported by Purwati et al. (2023) discover that there are three factors challenging teaching and learning speaking namely linguistics factor (complexity of the competencies), psychological factors (anxiety, a lack of motivation, and a lack of confidence) and external factor (classroom environment and negative feedback from teachers and peers). All of these factors affect in nursing students speaking. In addition, when it is brought to the reality in the classroom when nursing students presentation found that there was no structure or pattern in delivering the topic, they stand in one position, there was no question and answer, reading aloud from the slide,

As known speaking is one of skills must be mastered by nursing students. They must speak to the patients before giving some treatments. Moreover if the work in the country which use English as the first language or mother tongue. Many experts have explained about speaking. They are Brown (2004) in A. Gani et al. (2015) points out that "Speaking is a collaborative process of meaning-making that incorporates information production, reception, and processing". Moreover, Nunan (2003) cited in Mart (2012) in A. Gani et al. (2015) Speaking is a useful oral talent that involves creating orderly spoken statements to express ideas. In addition, Rao (2018) in Chen, (2018) speaking is considered the most difficult and complex skill in the context of language learning and instruction, when compared to listening, reading, and writing.. According to Susilawati et al.(2017) in Khasanah et al. (2023) Speaking is a skill that is commonly evaluated by looking at how well one performs in different situations and presentations..

In detail Chomsky (1965) in Stankova et al.(2022) presented the idea that performance is the real application of the language in tangible contexts. So, when it is joined into speaking performance can be meant that when delivering the opinion or ideas an also topic materials through speaking in front of the class.

Four points need to be emphasized in this study after determining the issues nursing students had with presentation topic materials. These include speaking ability, anxiety level, genre-based approach, and English for Specific Purpose (ESP). Topic material presentation is a speaking performance. According to Swathi, (2015) The act of demonstrating and elucidating a topic's information to an audience or student is known as presentation. Then, anxiety is one of factors affecting speaking defined by Horwitz (1986) in Walyo & Bakoko, (2022) "...different set of self-perceptions, attitudes, emotions, and behaviors associated with language acquisition in the classroom that result from the process's uniqueness. Furthermore, English for specific purposes refers to what the pupils' needs are. Proposed by Dudley-Evans, (1997) in Guerid & Mami, (2017) point out that ESP "what students must do when using

English. This indicates that the topic materials used in nursing study programs that teach English are determined by the needs of the nursing students.

The researcher conducted preliminary research by interviewing a few university graduates through observation. He claimed that the English spoken in hospitals is a type of everyday speech. English is therefore required in the hospital. According to the other alumni, the types of English required are those that describe the process. It indicates that the researcher is compelled to learn more about the best method for mastering after hearing the alumni's explanation of English III.

Relate to the previously listed topics or resources, then the purpose of the lesson becomes clear. The author aims to alleviate the difficulties of teaching in the nursing department by offering a technique that can be utilized to teach English specifically in place of presenting the subjects or resources. English for Specific Purposes (ESP) must be considered in the teaching and learning process for this subject. All ESP teaching materials should focus on the needs of students and the demands of graduates or alumni. It works well in ESP classes if the compulsory texts and course syllabus are chosen after a careful analysis of the students' communication needs. One could argue that the curriculum and the materials are influenced by the needs of the pupils. It is also stated by Richards (2006) recognized ESP as a movement that aims to meet the language demands of learners who use English to do specific occupations (like those of a student, engineer, or nurse) and who must learn the language in order to acquire knowledge and practical skills rather than only for its own sake. According to this definition, students who wish to pursue particular professions, like nursing, must be proficient in English. Therefore, English teachers must prepare their pupils for this type of employment in the future.

Based on graduates' needs and English for Specific Purposes (ESP) requirements, our government needs a large number of health personnel. As said Kurniati et al. (2020) that in 2030 there will be 23 foreign countries in the world that need health workers as nurses and midwives. In contrast in Indonesia itself, Indonesia has overlap nurses. To overcome this condition, the health ministry collaborates with the world to distribute health workers from Indonesia. Furthermore, the health minister delivers that the constraint of graduates or alumni in applying for the opportunity is in the English language.

To minimize the constraint of graduation, a lot of efforts have been made by universities or colleges and also government and nongovernment (private). From university hold on such as English club, English day, soft skills for English, and preparation TOEFL class. And from government and private hold on such as English training, guiding students per group, and work training office. It is hoped that the obstacles faced by the students can be decreased. It is vital to investigate how nursing students convey the genre-based approach or text genres, as this influences speaking and English for certain reasons. The researcher is therefore excited to look at how the nursing students communicate to present the subject by using a genre-based approach or different text kinds. Specifically, teaching and studying English is done to improve speaking abilities in the classroom. It is supported by H. Douglas Brown, (2004) said that when nursing students present the topic materials, they must pay attention to some aspects (content and delivery)

The genre-based approach is still employed for a number of reasons, the first of which is scholarly. There is always instructional content or subjects that focus on how to install something, accomplish something, or do something else during the teaching and learning process. Even though the curriculum has a different name, the syllabus still includes the topic or the method for creating instructional materials. For instance, there was a lot of teaching material on how to put something, how to do something, or how to treat patients before the independence curriculum, also known as kurikulum merdeka. This teaching material is still present in the independence curriculum, and examples include how to give therapeutic greetings and how to receive patients. related to the process of doing something. The second reason is non-work or professional reasons. A prospective nurse must pass a professional exam or competency exam because the requirement to work as a nurse is to have a competency certificate. Additionally, the majority of the instructional materials and competency exam materials question about the steps involved in completing a task. The genre-based technique is nonetheless anticipated to assist nursing students in speaking and being proficient in English, it may be concluded. The second reason is that this method closely resembles our everyday lives. Therefore, GBA can be used or implemented to accomplish what needs to be done when someone wants to perform something.

GBA views language acquisition as a social activity and uses education that incorporates social context, including value. It indicates that students are not only interested in learning the language but also in learning about and from it. It is cited from (Feez & Joyce, 1998; Vygotsky 1978 and Bakhtin in Emilia 2011; Derewianka, 1997) in Nahid et al. (2018) . In this part, it uses a theory from Derewianka (2003) explores that genre-based approaches, where teaching and learning focuses on the understanding and production of selected genres of texts (both spoken and written), have become increasingly influential in the field of English language teaching (ELT). In addition, Mukminati, (2016) in Ahyarudin (2024) the genre-based approach (GBA) to language teaching focuses on understanding and using language within specific genres or contexts.

When bringing GBA in the classroom, there are some stages that must be carried out. According to Rothery (1996) in Wibowo & Lengkanawati (2024) Describe the phases as follows: modeling, joint construction, independent construction, and building knowledge of the field (BKOF). The stages are deconstruction, joint construction, and independent construction, according to Martin (2010). Building Knowledge of the Field (BKOF), Modeling of the Text (MOT), Joint Construction of the Text (JCOT), and Independent Construction of the Text (ICOT) are the four key phases in putting GBA into practice. These four phases are also mentioned in Indonesia's curriculum.

Numerous scholars from Indonesia and other countries have studied genre-based techniques. According to one study, GBA helps students become more proficient speakers. It can be seen from the findings of Nahid et al., (2018) discovered that GBA is effective at assisting students in speaking descriptive texts, and the language features, social function, and organization of the text demonstrate the students' growth. Then, from Pham & Bui, (2021) discovered that the students had trouble following the predetermined move-step sequence and using lexico-grammatical usage for the expository writing. As a result, the study suggests more research and some implications for EFL teachers and students who use a genre-based approach to writing. It is anticipated that this method will assist the nursing students in presenting the subject matter when they wish to talk. This strategy looks into using a genre-based method to improve university-level nursing students' speaking abilities..

## METHOD

This study was used quantitative method. According to Creswell (2012) claims that the quantitative approach uses experimental design, pretest and posttest assessments of attitudes, and a postpositivist worldview. Designs that are quasi-experimental Pretest and Posttest are not equal. Control-Group Architecture. The experimental Group A and the control Group B are chosen without random assignment in this design, which is a common method for conducting quasi-experiments. A pretest and posttest are given to both groups. The treatment is given only to the experimental group. Total sampling was the sample method employed in this investigation.. Supardi (2012) in Harefa et al.(2023) says that as a guideline in sample selection if the subject is less than 100 it is better to take all of them. The researcher chose two classes which have similar characteristics and met certain criteria dealing with the competency in learning. After that, the researcher selected one class which became the experimental group (nursing class B) with the amount 29 students and one class which became the control group (nursing class A) with the amount 42 students. So, total sampling amount is 71 students. Therefore, the sample is taken is total sampling. The researcher utilized the complete sampling formula (overall) since all populations are sampled if the population is less than 100. Additionally, two variables—the independent variable and the dependent variable—were applied to the student groups in the study. The researcher's genre-based approach to teaching speaking served as the independent variable, and the students' speaking performance was, of course, the dependent variable..

The researcher employed a speaking exam to get information on the nursing students' proficiency in speaking English. Arikunto (2006) in Erdiana et al.(2019) claims that tests are one method of gathering information and are used to gauge students' performance, knowledge, and IQ. The students were invited to present the topic they had selected after the researchers provided them with a list of potential topics. Three minutes were allotted for each kid to speak. They recorded their speech.

Following data collection, the researcher used student scores to determine the outcome. Using the assessment methodology displayed in Table 1, the researchers assigned a score to the speaking performance. According to Brown (2001), there are 15 score component scales, including:

speaker's language, volume, fluency, pronunciation, grammar, visual aids, enthusiasm, purpose, introduction, main point, supporting argument, conclusion, gesture, eye contact, and responded to audiences. Therefore, the researchers calculate the score; if the pupils get it all right, they will receive a 3. because there are fifteen components in all to the speaking performance. The kids' best score was forty-five. The formula is  $3*15=45$ . The criteria and checklist for evaluating speaking performance by Brown (2001) are displayed in Tables 1–5, however they have been adjusted for this study to fit its particular circumstances.

When evaluating the speaking test, the speaking test is corrected by the three inter raters using a video recording. They are English lecturer at university. They teach English and even judge in the debate English competition. Fifteen items need to be examined. Based on evaluation of the several facets of the speaker's presentation, give each item or element a number or score. Three means excellent, two is decent, one is average, and zero is poor. In conclusion, both descriptive and inferential analysis were utilized to examine the test. This indicates that the standard deviation and mean, the test of normality, the test of homogeneity, and the hypothesis tests used for inferential analysis were all used in descriptive analysis..

|   |                 |                                                                             | my attention                                                                            | my attention                                                                                | n                                                                                    |
|---|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3 | main idea       | the main idea or point was clearly stated toward the beginning              | the main idea or point was few mistake clearly stated toward the beginning              | the main idea or point was several mistake clearly stated toward the beginning              | the main idea or point was not clearly stated toward the beginning                   |
| 4 | supporting idea | the supporting were clearly expressed and supported well by facts, argument | the supporting were few mistake clearly expressed and supported well by facts, argument | the supporting were several mistake clearly expressed and supported well by facts, argument | the supporting were not clearly expressed and not supported well by facts, argument, |
| 5 | conclusion      | the conclusion restated the main-idea or purpose                            | the conclusion restated the main-idea or purpose has few mistake                        | the conclusion restated the main-idea or purpose has several mistake                        | the conclusion did not restated the main-idea or purpose                             |
| 6 | gesture         | the speaker used gestures and-body language well,                           | the speaker used gestures and-body language has few mistake                             | the speaker used gestures and-body language has several mistake                             | the speaker did not use gestures and-body language                                   |
| 7 | eyes contact    | the speaker maintain                                                        | the speaker maintain                                                                    | the speaker maintain                                                                        | the speaker did not                                                                  |

**Table 1 Rubric Evaluation of Oral Presentation**

| No | Aspect graded | 3 Fantastic                                                   | 2 Good                                                                    | 1 reasonable                                                      | 0 Sadly |
|----|---------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| 1  | purpose       | the purpose or objective of the presentation was accomplished | the purpose or objective of the presentation was few mistake accomplished | the purpose or objective of the presentation was not accomplished |         |
| 2  | introduction  | the introduction was lively and got my attention              | the introduction was few mistake lively and got                           | the introduction was not lively and not got my attention          |         |

|    |                    | ned eye contact with the audience                        | ned eye contact with the audience has few mistake            | ned eye contact with the audience has several mistake            | maintain eye contact with the audience                       |    | understandings        |                                                        |                                                             | misunderstandings                                                             |
|----|--------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|----|-----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 8  | speaker's language | the speaker's language was natural and fluent            | the speaker's language has few mistake in natural and fluent | the speaker's language has several mistake in natural and fluent | the speaker's language was not natural and fluent            | 13 | visual aids           | the speaker used visual aids, handouts has effectively | the speaker used visual aids, handouts has few mistake      | the speaker did not use visual aids, handouts has several mistake effectively |
| 9  | volume             | speaker's volume of speech was appropriate               | speaker's volume of speech has few mistake                   | speaker's volume of speech has several mistake                   | speaker's volume of speech was not appropriate               | 14 | enthusiasm            | the speaker showed enthusiasm and interest             | the speaker has few mistake to show enthusiasm              | the speaker did not show enthusiasm and interest                              |
| 10 | fluency            | the speaker's rate of speech was appropriate             | the speaker's rate of speech has few mistake                 | the speaker's rate of speech has several mistake                 | the speaker's rate of speech was not appropriate             | 15 | responded to audience | the speaker responded to audience questions well.      | the speaker responded to audience questions has few mistake | the speaker did not respond to audience questions well.                       |
| 11 | pronunciation      | the speaker's pronunciation was clear and comprehensible | the speaker's pronunciation has few mistake                  | the speaker's pronunciation has several mistake                  | the speaker's pronunciation was not clear and comprehensible |    |                       |                                                        |                                                             |                                                                               |
| 12 | grammar            | the speaker's grammar was correct and didn't prevent     | the speaker's grammar has few mistake                        | the speaker's grammar has several mistake                        | the speaker's grammar was not correct and prevent            |    |                       |                                                        |                                                             |                                                                               |

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Finding

To comprehend the finding can be seen from two side, namely descriptive analysis and inferential analysis.

### Descriptive Analysis

There were two components to the descriptive analysis. They were the standard deviation and the mean.

1) **Mean**  
The sum of all the scores is divided by the total number of scores to determine the mean. The mean was used to get the average score of the students in both groups. It can use the formula. from Hatch and Farhady. (1982) in T, (2011)

$$\bar{x} = \frac{\sum x}{N}$$

$$\text{Mean} = \sum x$$

$$\text{Total score} = \bar{x}$$

$$N = \text{the total number of pupils.}$$

## 2) Standard Deviation

The standard deviation displayed the distribution of scores. The distribution is more variable from the control point the higher the standard deviation, and vice versa.

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{\sum x^2}{N} - (\bar{X})^2}$$

N = Number of the students

SD = Standard deviation

$\Sigma X$  = Total score

N = Number of the students

This formula is cited from Hatch and Farhady.(1982)

In this case, the classification section is formed. Four main sections comprised the categorizations: the experimental group's pre-test and post-test classification, the control group's pre-test and post-test classification, and the experimental group's post-test classification. One can observe it from the table.

**Table 2 Categorization of Mean and Standard Deviation of the Pre and Post Test in the Control and Treatment group**

|   |                                                                          |            |                     |                   |
|---|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------------------|-------------------|
|   | the Post-Test Results of the Control Group                               |            | M + SD              | 32.40             |
|   | Low                                                                      | X < M - SD | X < 22.40           |                   |
| 3 | The Pre-Test Formula for Classifying the Treatment Group                 | Good       | X ≥ M + SD          | X ≥ 28.09         |
|   |                                                                          | Average    | M - SD ≤ X < M + SD | 14.17 ≤ X < 28.09 |
|   |                                                                          | Low        | X < M - SD          | X < 14.17         |
| 4 | The Formula for Classifying the Post-Test Results of the Treatment Group | Good       | X ≥ M + SD          | X ≥ 33.92         |
|   |                                                                          | Average    | M - SD ≤ X < M + SD | 21.88 ≤ X < 33.92 |
|   |                                                                          | Low        | X < M - SD          | X < 21.88         |

| N<br>o | Categorization                                        | Group<br>Term | Quantity |
|--------|-------------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------|
| 1      | The Categorization of Control Group's Pre-Test Scores | Mean          | 23.50    |
|        |                                                       | SD            | 5.59     |
| 2      | The Control Group's Post-Test Classification          | Mean          | 27.40    |
|        |                                                       | SD            | 5.00     |
| 3      | The Pre-Test Classification of Treatment Groups       | Mean          | 21.13    |
|        |                                                       | SD            | 6.96     |
| 4      | The Post-Test Classification of Treatment Groups      | Mean          | 27.9     |
|        |                                                       | SD            | 6.02     |

**Table 3 The Formula for Classifying the Pre-Test and Post-Test Results for the Control and Treatment Groups**

| N<br>o | Formula                                                       | Score category | Basic formula       | Defined formula   |
|--------|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| 1      | The Formula for Classifying the Pre-Test of the Control Group | Good           | X ≥ M + SD          | X ≥ 29.09         |
|        |                                                               | Average        | M - SD ≤ X < M + SD | 17.91 ≤ X < 29.09 |
|        |                                                               | Low            | X < M - SD          | X < 17.91         |
| 2      | The Formula for Classifying                                   | Good           | X ≥ M + SD          | X ≥ 32.40         |
|        |                                                               | Average        | M - SD ≤ X < M + SD | 22.40 ≤ X <       |

First, the pre-test control mean (M) is 23.50, and the standard deviation (SD) is 5.59, which may be explained by classification and formula. When a student's speaking performance score (X) is greater than or equal to the mean plus standard deviation (X > M + SD (29.09)), it is considered "good." Conversely, the speaking performance score of the student is deemed "average" if X is less than the mean plus standard deviation (X < M + SD (29.09)) and larger than or equal to the mean minus standard deviation (X ≥ M - SD (17.91)). A student is considered to have a "low" speaking performance score if their score (X) is less than the mean minus standard deviation (X < M - SD (17.91)).

Table 2 above shows the results of applying the approach to the speaking performance scores of the control group. The frequency of the "good" category is 6, the "average" category is 31, and the "low" category is 5. Additionally, the percentage clearly shows that the "good" group receives 14%, the "average" category receives 74%, and the "low" category receives only 12%. The pre-test results for the control group's pupils' speaking performance are clearly mainly on the average level when the data is categorized.

According to Number 2, the standard deviation (SD) is 5.00 and the post-test control mean (M) is 27.40. As long as the student's speaking performance score (X) is more than or equal to the mean plus standard deviation (X ≥ M + SD

(32.40)), the score is considered "good." Meanwhile, the student's speaking performance score is considered "average" if  $X$  is greater than or equal to mean minus standard deviation ( $X \geq M - SD$  (22.40)) and less than mean plus standard deviation ( $X < M + SD$  (32.40)). If a student's score ( $X$ ) is less than the mean minus standard deviation ( $X < M - SD$  (22.40)), they are said to have a "low" speaking performance score.

The results of applying the algorithm on the speaking performance scores of the control group are shown in the table above. The "good" category has a frequency of 7, the "average" category has a frequency of 30, and the "low" category has a frequency of 5. Additionally, it is clear from the percentage that the "average" group receives 71%, the "good" group receives 17%, and the "low" category only receives 12%. The post-test results for the control group's pupils' speaking performance are clearly mainly on the average level when the data is categorized..

Number 3: Based on Tables 5 and 6 above, the pre-test treatment mean ( $M$ ) is 21.3 and the standard deviation ( $SD$ ) is 6.96. When a student's speaking performance score ( $X$ ) is higher than or equal to the mean plus standard deviation ( $X > M + SD$  (28.09)), it is deemed "good." Meanwhile, the student's speaking performance score is considered "average" if  $X$  is greater than or equal to mean minus standard deviation ( $X \geq M - SD$  (14.17)) and less than mean plus standard deviation ( $X < M + SD$  (28.09)). If a student's score ( $X$ ) is less than the mean minus standard deviation ( $X < M - SD$  (14.17)), they are said to have a "low" speaking performance score.

According to table above, which shows the outcomes of applying the algorithm to the speaking performance scores of the treatment group, the frequency of the "good" category is 5, the "average" category is 18, and the "low" category is 6. Additionally, the percentage makes it clear that the "average" category receives 62%, the "good" group only receives 17%, and the "low" category only receives 21%. The data categorization makes it clear that the pre-test results for the students in the treatment group mainly show average speaking performance..

Fourth shows that the pre-test treatment mean ( $M$ ) is 27.9 and the standard deviation ( $SD$ ) is 6.02. When a student's speaking performance score ( $X$ ) is higher than or equal to the mean plus standard deviation ( $X > M + SD$  (33.92)), it is deemed "good." Meanwhile, the student's speaking performance score is considered "average" if  $X$  is

greater than or equal to mean minus standard deviation ( $X \geq M - SD$  (21.88)) and less than mean plus standard deviation ( $X < M + SD$  (33.92)). If a student's score ( $X$ ) is less than the mean minus standard deviation ( $X < M - SD$  (21.88)), they are said to have a "low" speaking performance score.

After applying the algorithm to the speaking performance scores of the treatment group, the findings, which are shown in the table above, show that the frequency of the "good" category is 8, the "average" category is 17, and the "low" category is 4. Additionally, it is clear from the percentage that the "average" category receives 59%, the "good" group receives 27%, and the "low" category only receives 14%. The data categorization makes it clear that the post-test results for the treatment group's pupils' speaking performance are mostly average.

### 3).Test absolute Gain Score

The author created an absolute gain score test to see whether the experimental group's pupils, who received the genre-based approach, performed better than the control group's students, who received the conventional technique. This test was performed simply by comparing the experimental group's and the control group's pre-test and post-test scores. Stated differently, the score was calculated by subtracting the mean score from the pre-test from the mean score from the post-test. The result of the absolute gain score test could be seen in table below.

**Table 4 shows the experimental and control groups' absolute gain scores before and after the test.**

| N<br>o | Group                     | Test     |           | Gain<br>score |
|--------|---------------------------|----------|-----------|---------------|
| 1      | Data:<br>Experime<br>ntal | Pre-test | Post-test |               |
| Number | 29                        | 29       |           | 6.83          |
|        | 21,137                    |          | 27,96552  |               |
|        | 93                        |          |           |               |
|        | 6.96                      | 6.02     |           |               |
| 2      | Data:<br>Control          | Pre-test | Post-test |               |
| Number | 42                        | 42       |           | 3.90          |
|        | 23.50                     |          | 27.40     |               |
|        | 5.59                      | 5.00     |           |               |
|        |                           |          |           |               |

Once the pre-test and post-test mean scores have been processed, table 4 make it evident that the experimental group's gain score is 6.83 points whereas the control group's gain score is only 3.90 points. The experimental group's gain score was unquestionably higher than the control group's.

Thus, it can serve as proof that the genre-based approach is superior to the traditional method for improving university-level nursing students' speaking performance.

### Inferential Analysis

In analyzing inferential analysis has three test. They are normality test, homogeneity test and hypothesis test.

#### Normality Test

**Table 5 Tests of Normality Speaking Performance**

|                             | Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup> |    |      | Shapiro-Wilk |    |      |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|----|------|--------------|----|------|
|                             | Statistic                       | df | Sig. | Statistic    | df | Sig. |
| post-test control general   | ,231                            | 29 | ,00  | ,098         | 29 | ,09  |
| post-test treatment general | ,093                            | 29 | ,00* | ,267         | 29 | ,82  |

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

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

The table presented is labeled as "Table test of normality and shows the results of two normality tests: the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and the Shapiro-Wilk test. Each test provides a statistic, degrees of freedom (df), and a significance value (Sig.) for two different groups: "post-test control general" and "post-test treatment general." Firstly, Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test tells that this test compares the sample distribution with a normal distribution. The results for the "post-test control general" group show: Statistic is 0.231. Degrees of Freedom (df) is 29 and Significance (Sig.) is 0.000. For the "post-test treatment general" group as follows Statistic is 0.093. Degrees of Freedom (df) is 29. Significance (Sig.) is 0.200. A significance value (Sig.) less than 0.05 typically indicates that the data does not follow a normal distribution. In this case, the control group has a Sig. of 0.000, suggesting it is not normally distributed, while the treatment group with a Sig. of 0.200 suggests it may be normally distributed.

Secondly, Shapiro-Wilk Test shows that this is another test for normality that is often more powerful than the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, especially for smaller sample sizes. The results for the "post-test control general" group show: Statistic is 0.898. Degrees of Freedom (df) is 29. Significance (Sig.) is 0.009. For the "post-test treatment general" group as follows statistic is 0.967. Degrees of Freedom (df) is 29. Significance (Sig.) is

0.482. Similar to the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, a Sig. value less than 0.05 indicates non-normality. Here, the control group has a Sig. of 0.009, indicating it is not normally distributed, while the treatment group with a Sig. of 0.482 suggests it is likely normally distributed.

The significance value (Sig.) tells us how likely it is that the observed data would occur if the null hypothesis (which states that the data is normally distributed) is true. A low Sig. value (like 0.000 or 0.009) means we reject the null hypothesis, indicating that the data is not normally distributed. A higher Sig. value (like 0.200 or 0.482) means we do not reject the null hypothesis, suggesting that the data may be normally distributed.

It can be concluded that the results from both tests indicate that the "post-test control general" group does not follow a normal distribution, while the "post-test treatment general" group may follow a normal distribution. This information is crucial for researchers as it influences the choice of statistical tests to be used for further analysis. If the data is not normally distributed, researchers may need to use non-parametric tests, which do not assume normality.

#### Test of homogeneity

**Table 6 Test of Homogeneity of Variances**

**Speaking Performance**  
post-test combined

| Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|------------------|-----|-----|------|
| 2,728            | 1   | 69  | ,103 |

The table presents the results of the Levene's test, which is a specific method used to test for homogeneity of variances. The table has four columns: Levene Statistic means this is the value calculated from the test. df 1 means this stands for "degrees of freedom" for the first group. df 2 means this is the degrees of freedom for the second group. Sig means that this stands for "significance" and tells us whether the result is statistically significant.

When it is breaking down the values in the table, Levene Statistic (2.728) means this number indicates the result of the test. A higher value suggests that there is a greater difference in variances between the groups being compared. In this case, the value is 2.728, which is a moderate value indicating some difference in variances. For degrees of Freedom (df 1 = 1, df 2 = 69) can be interpreted that degrees of freedom are used in statistical tests to determine the number of values in a calculation that are free to vary. Here, df 1 is 1,

which usually corresponds to the number of groups being compared minus one. Since we are comparing two groups, it makes sense. And then df 2 is 69, which typically represents the total number of observations in both groups minus the number of groups. This means there are 70 total observations (69 + 1). Then, importance (Sig.) It is evident that the significance value provides information about the statistical importance of the outcome. 0.05 is a typical significance threshold. We determine that there is a significant difference between the variances if the Sig. value is less than 0.05. In this instance, the Sig. value is essential for comprehending the results but is not included in the table. To ascertain significance, we would compare it to 0.05 if it were available..

### Hypothesis test

**Table 7 Test Statistics Speaking Performance**

|                        | post-test combined |
|------------------------|--------------------|
| Mann-Whitney U         | 555,500            |
| Wilcoxon W             | 1458,500           |
| Z                      | -,628              |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | ,530               |

a. Grouping Variable: group

Test Statistics Explained that Mann-Whitney U is a non-parametric test used to compare differences between two independent groups. The value of 555.500 indicates the U statistic calculated from the data. Meanwhile, Wilcoxon W is also used in non-parametric tests and is related to the Mann-Whitney U test. The value of 1458.500 represents the sum of the ranks for one of the groups.

In this case, the Z value is -0.628. A negative Z value suggests that the group being tested has lower scores compared to the other group, but the value is close to zero, indicating that the difference is not very large. In addition, Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed), this value, also known as the p-value, helps determine the significance of the results. The p-value of 0.530 indicates that there is a 53% chance that the observed differences could occur by random chance. In hypothesis testing, a common threshold for significance is 0.05. Since 0.530 is much higher than 0.05, we do not have enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis, which typically states that there is no difference between the groups.

In conclusion, Overall, the table provided important statistical information that helped researcher understood the results of their hypothesis test. The values indicated that there was no

significant difference between the groups being compared, as shown by the high p-value.

### Discussion

Examining whether the GBA is beneficial or has an impact on nursing students' speaking abilities is necessary when discussing how well it works to improve their speaking abilities. Numerous studies have been done on this subject. According to the authors' findings, we do not have sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis, which generally holds that there is no difference between the groups, because 0.530 is greater than 0.05.

When it is discussed with other authors, it is acceptable or comparable to this study, and there are even some differences. Whether it is intended for both teachers and students. It can be seen from Sunarti1 et al. (2019) discovered that 1) the English teaching process: the GBA helps the teacher present the content; (2) Classroom Activities: The instructor carried out four cycles in the classroom: modeling (MOT), joint construction (JCOT), independent construction (ICOT), and building knowledge of the field (BKOF) in compliance with the adoption of a school-based curriculum for teaching English; (3) Issues the Teacher Faces: The teacher's time management issues and the students' vocabulary and pronunciation issues are among the issues. The teacher must focus more on the pupils who are less capable than the rest in order to address this problem.

Then, Siti Fathonah Wijayanti ( 2009) discovered that GBA enhances the teaching and learning process by assisting students in identifying and developing their productive skills. However, learners' abilities are surface-level rather than communicative since there is not enough scaffolding during the learning process. One could argue that inadequate scaffolding is linked to inaccurate collaborative construction activities, incomplete curriculum cycle implementation, and a lack of integrated grammar instruction throughout the teaching and learning process. The problem is significantly impacted by contextual factors, such as inadequate teacher training and lack of preparedness. Next, Tzer & Lin, (2018) described the genre-based method, a teaching style designed to offer a text type or genre based on its social role; hence, the interpretation process places more emphasis on the text overall than on individual phrases. In a nutshell, a genre-based approach is one method of transmitting the text type. Meanwhile, Ramadhan et al., (2022)

discovered that EFL pre-service English teachers' speaking abilities can be improved by using the genre-based approach. The overall arrangement, social function, and grammatical components of the descriptive prose show how much the pre-service English teacher students' speaking abilities have improved. While, Sood, (2006) discovered that the genre-based approach provides a framework for addressing students' speaking skills in a logical and morally sound manner, allowing them to improve their ability to speak in casual conversation, lengthen their spoken utterances, and experience less anxiety and frustration when speaking. This approach allows teachers to incorporate elements of accuracy and fluency into their sessions while maintaining spoken communication as the primary focus.

Further, Rina Amelia, Slamet Triyadi, (2023) showed the student's capacity to analyze the linguistic elements of the text. The group style of genre-based approach helped the students understand the book, and the teacher then gave comments on what the students comprehended. By employing the genre-based method, the students were able to speak independently and understand the material, demonstrating that they already grasped what they were discussing. Furthermore, Luhur et al. (2023) looked at that Findings from interviews and observations indicate that the genre-based approach had several positive effects on students. Their understanding of the composition, purpose, and communicative context of language in conversational writings was enhanced. It also helped students understand exam challenges related to transactional and interpersonal conversational texts and enhanced their writing and speaking skills. The hypothesis test results showed a significant increase in the experimental group. For interpersonal conversation text, the experimental group's significance value was 0.000, whereas the control group's was 0.001. N increased by 0.6447 in the experimental group and -0.4452 in the control group. Likewise, for transactional conversational text, the control group's significant value was 0.146, whereas the experimental group's was 0.000. The experimental group's N increase was 0.6808, while the control group's was 0.0640. Students' comprehension of texts including interpersonal and transactional conversations is thus greatly enhanced by the genre-based approach.

Moreover, Abdullah, (2015) demonstrated that GBA's promotion of ZPD, bilingualism, and explicit instruction—all of which appeared to be beneficial and successful in helping students

develop their speaking abilities—improved their speaking abilities. Both the teacher and the students agreed that those three elements were beneficial in helping the students improve their speaking skills. In addition, Kusumahati & Yulianti, (2023) show that the students' speaking abilities have improved from cycle I to cycle II. Students' pre-cycle scores were 55.3, cycle I scores were 60.06, and cycle II scores were 76.3. The findings suggest that research on using Canva to support the Genre Based Approach can improve students' speaking abilities. Also, Azzahra et al., (2024) The Students that engage in all phases of the Genre-Based Approach (GBA) through conventional story-based digital storytelling exhibit improvements in their English vocabulary, word pronunciation, accuracy, and speaking fluency during a variety of GBA activities, according to the results. Their self-confidence influences and supports their capacity to communicate and tell conventional stories online. Additionally, through group discussions and collaboration, students helped create digital storytelling during the Joint Construction of the Text (JCoT) stage, laying the groundwork for their ultimate independence in this area. In order to assist students become more fluent in English, it is suggested that digital storytelling be used in the future at various educational levels. Finally, H. Putra et al. (2023) The results of the study show that genre-based education has a major effect on students' speaking skills. The pre-test mean score for the treatment group is 36, whereas the control group's is 74. The pre-test average is 55, one could argue. It then becomes a member of the poor group. Meanwhile, the post-test scores for the treatment group and the control group are 81 and 74, respectively. One may argue that the pupils' initial poor individual and mean scores improved over the period of treatment, bringing them up from a failing to an excellent level. All of these results suggest that using a linguistic genre-based strategy can improve students' speaking ability.

because this study looks at the effectiveness of GBA. This suggests that each of these findings demonstrates how well GBA works to improve pupils' speaking skills. Following that, it was noted that although some studies suggest that GBA enhances speaking performance, other studies show that it has no effect on students' speaking skills. The next section discusses the evidence that cast doubt on GBA's ability to raise pupils' speaking proficiency.

When it is compared with contrast finding like Tachia & Loeneto (2018) Even though the teacher had followed every step of the procedure, the findings demonstrated that the eighth grade students at SMP Negeri 1 Indralaya Utara gained nothing from the use of the genre-based approach. The results of the study showed that only half of the students passed their English language courses, with the remaining pupils receiving grades below passing.

In other hand Nabella & Rini, (2023) found that teachers can use GBA as a tool without reluctance to help young English language learners between the ages of 11 and 12 improve their reading skills because the study's findings can be used as a reference. Because this research not only increases students' enthusiasm in reading but also improves their critical thinking abilities in analyzing texts and determining the main ideas in each narrative text's constituent parts. Furthermore, Y, (2022) proved that the experimental groups' creative writing abilities were enhanced more than those of the control group when instruction was given utilizing a genre-based method. To enhance creative writing abilities at several educational levels, including primary, secondary, and upper secondary, the genre-based approach is recommended. Students' comprehension of grammar, subject matter, or topic, as well as a number of other academic writing style conventions and pedagogical knowledge of learning English, can all be enhanced at the same time by this strategy. It enables students to gradually enhance their skills through the analysis and imitation of great models of texts offered during the course of study. Subsequently, Putra, (2019) the findings showed that the English teacher's use of the genre-based method was still lacking. The students also still had trouble understanding the text's overall structure and social purpose.

## CONCLUSION

It is clear from the previously given explanation that GBA affects kids in both positive and negative ways. However, the educator benefits from GBA because it makes their job easier and more advantageous to teach the subject in the classroom. Compared to this study, GBA enhances the speaking skills of nursing students.

When it comes to speaking English for medical needs, GBA improves students' fluency, confidence, and language proficiency, according to significant studies. Students' ability to communicate in authentic clinical contexts is enhanced by

practice, modeling, and clear teaching of genre-specific language elements. Speaking abilities are further improved by the framework's collaborative learning and feedback features. However, opportunities for practical experience, teacher preparation, and carefully designed instructional materials are necessary for successful implementation..

Future studies should examine how well speaking abilities are maintained over time and how adaptable the approach is in other cultural and educational situations. All things considered, the genre-based approach is a useful teaching method for equipping nursing students to handle the language requirements of their line of work, which eventually improves patient care and interdisciplinary communication. This research can be applied to nursing students' written performance in addition to their speaking performance. Given that Derewianka claims that a genre-based approach is used to both spoken and written forms of productive skills.

## REFERENCES

- A. Gani, S., Fajrina, D., & Hanifa, R. (2015). Students' Learning Strategies for Developing Speaking Ability. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 2(1), 16–28. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v2i1.2232>
- Abdullah, C. U. (2015). *Cep Ubud Abdullah, 2015 GENRE – BASED APPROACH TO TEACHING SPEAKING* Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia / repository.upi.edu / perpustakaan.upi.edu.
- Ahyarudin, D. A. (2024). *Enhancing Students' Speaking Skills: The Impact of AI-Based Instructional Tasks in the Genre-Based Approach*. 3(9), 2019–2032.
- Asnawi, A. (2015). The effects of immersive multimedia learning with peer support on speaking skill among male and female students. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 2(2), 103–117. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v2i2.2694>
- Azzahra, P., Puspitasari, H., Damayanti, I. L., & Nurlaelawati, I. (2024). *Pedagogy: Journal of English Language Teaching Investigating Students' Speaking Skills through Traditional Story- Based Digital Storytelling into Genre-Based Approach ( GBA )*. 12(2), 250–265.

<https://doi.org/10.32332/joelt.v12i2.9784.Journal>

Chen, Y. (2018). *Speaking performance and anxiety levels of Chinese EFL learners in face-to-face and synchronous voice-based chat*/Chen Yanqiu. 7(3), 43–57. <http://studentsrepo.um.edu.my/9900/>

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Eduational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*.

Derewianka, B. (2003). Trends and issues in genre-based approaches. *RELC Journal*, 34(2), 133–154. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003368820303400202>

Erdiana, N., Bahri Ys, S., & Akhmal, C. N. (2019). Male vs. Female EFL Students: Who is Better in Speaking Skill? *Studies in English Language and Education*, 6(1), 131–140. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v6i1.13024>

Guerid, F., & Mami, N. A. (2017). Designing an ESP syllabus for finance and accounting staff. *The Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, 5(4), 771–780. <https://doi.org/10.22190/JTESAP1704771G>

H. DOUGLAS 'B:ROWN. (2004). *Language Assessment" principles and Classroom PracticeS*. New York: Pearson/Longman.

Harefa, D., Sarumaha, M., Telaumbanua, K., Telaumbanua, T., Laia, B., & Hulu, F. (2023). Relationship Student Learning Interest To The Learning Outcomes Of Natural Sciences. *International Journal of Educational Research & Social Sciences*, 4(2), 240–246. <https://doi.org/10.51601/ijersc.v4i2.614>

Kementrian Hukum dan HAM. (2012). UU RI No. 12/2012 tentang Pendidikan Tinggi. *Undang Undang*, 18.

Khasanah, N., Faridi, A., & Wahyuni, S. (2023). *The Implementation of Genre-Based Approach Through Project-Based Learning in Teaching Writing*. 13(3), 465–475.

Kurniati, A., Astari, L. D., Efendy, F., Haryanto, J., Indarwati, R., Has, E. M. M., Ulfiana, E., Puspitasari, I. T., Muryani, M., Dianawatisari, H., Rani, I. Y. K., & Kristyaningrum, L. D. (2020). *Analisis Kebijakan Pemenuhan Pasar*

*Kerja Tenaga Kesehatan Di Tingkat Global* (Issue April).

Kusumahati, A., & Yulianti, F. (2023). *Efforts To Improve Speaking Ability Of Xi Pplg 2 Using Genre Based Approach Assisted By Canva*. November, 439–446.

Luhur, A. B., Fitriati, S. W., & Rozi, F. (2023). the Effect of Genre-Based Approach on Students' Understanding of Interpersonal and Transactional Conversation Text At Smkn 2 Slawi. *UNNES - TEFLIN National Conference*, 5(1), 72–83.

Nabella, A. C. R., & Rini, S. (2023). The Effectiveness of Using Genre Based Approach to Enhance Reading Comprehension in Narrative Text for Young Learners. *Jurnal Teknologi Pendidikan : Jurnal Penelitian Dan Pengembangan Pembelajaran*, 8(4), 758. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jtp.v8i4.8643>

Nahid, A., Suseno, M., Pujiati, H., & Juanda, J. (2018). Genre-Based Approach To Teaching Speaking Of Descriptive Text (A Case Study At A Rural Junior High School In South West Nusa, Indonesia). *Pedagogy : Journal of English Language Teaching*, 6(1), 65. <https://doi.org/10.32332/pedagogy.v6i1.1129>

Pham, V. P. H., & Bui, T. K. L. (2021). Genre-based approach to writing in EFL contexts. *World Journal of English Language*, 11(2), 95–106. <https://doi.org/10.5430/WJEL.V11N2P95>

Purwati, D., Faruq Ubaidillah, M., & Restall, G. C. (2023). "Sorry, I Can't Speak": English Teachers' Challenges of Teaching EFL Speaking in an Indonesian Vocational High School Sector. *Mextesol Journal*, 47(1), 0–2. <https://doi.org/10.61871/mj.v47n1-1>

Putra, H., Mujiyanto, J., Astuti, P., & Syafri, F. (2023). The Effectiveness of Genre Based Approach to Enhance The Speaking Performance of Junior High School Students at Sekolah Alam CEFA Kabupaten Kampar Riau Registered 2022/2023 Academic Year. *Proceeding in International Conference on Science, Education and Technology*, 321–327. <https://proceeding.unnes.ac.id/index.php/iset>

Putra, R. M. (2019). A Study on Ganre-Based Approach in Teaching Speaking to Indonesian

EFL Learners. *Pedagogy: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 7(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.32332/pedagogy.v7i1.1418>

Ramadhan, R., Dibdyaningsih, H., & Sudarso, H. (2022). Genre-Based Approach and Digital Flashcard: Enhancing Pre-service English Teacher Students' Speaking Capability. *IJET (Indonesian Journal of English Teaching)*, 11(2), 110–117. <https://doi.org/10.15642/ijet2.2022.11.2.110-117>

Richards, J. C. (2006). Communicative Language Teaching Paradigm. In *Cambridge University Press* (Vol. 1, Issue 1) retrieved <https://www.professorjackrichards.com/wp-content/uploads/Richards-Communicative-Language.pdf>

Rina Amelia, Slamet Triyadi, U. M. (2023). HE EXPLORATION OF GENRE BASED APPROACH IN TEACHINGSPEAKING AT EFL CLASSROOM: A CASE STUDYAT STUDENTHIGHSCHOOL. *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan*, 9(23), 656–664.

Siti Fathonah Wijayanti, J. N. and H. S. E. (2009). Genre-Based Approach: Its Contribution to The Quality of Teaching And Learning Process. <https://jurnal.uns.ac.id/englishedu/article/view/35936/23339>

Sood, A. (2006). Some pages of this thesis may have been removed for copyright restrictions . *Aston University*, 333.

Stankova, E., Chlumska, R., & Zerzanova, D. (2022). The Relationship Between Native and Foreign Language Speaking Proficiency in University Students. *Journal of Language and Education*, 8(2), 124–141. <https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2022.11501>

Sunarti1, Puspita1, R. H., & Dzul Rachman1. (2019). The Implementation of Genre-based Approach in Teaching English at The second Year of Universitas Muhammadiyah Kalimantan Timur. *Acitya Journal of Teaching & Education*, 1(1), 72–82. *Acitya Journal of Teaching & Education*

Swathi, T. V. S. S. (2015). The Importance of Effective Presentation for Organizational Success. *IUP Journal Of Soft Skills*, 9(2), 7–21.

T, P. A. (2011). *The effectiveness of interactive approach to teaching Reading to the tenth grade students of smk n 1 depok In the 2011/2012 academic year*.

Tachia, C. O., & Loeneto, B. A. (2018). the Application of Genre Based Approach in the Teaching of English To the Eighth Graders. *The Journal of English Literacy Education*, 5(2), 168–181.

Tzer, B., & Lin, L. (2018). *Vygotskian Principles in a Genre-based Approach to Teaching Writing*. January 2006.

Waluyo, B., & Bakoko, R. (2022). Effects of Affective Variables and Willingness to Communicate on Students' English-Speaking Performance in Thailand. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 9(1), 45–61. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v9i1.21090>

Wibowo, E. P., & Lengkanawati, N. S. (2024). A Conceptual Paper on Exploring Genre-Based Approach in Indonesian EFL Education. ... on English Language ..., 79–95. <https://proceedings.uinsaizu.ac.id/index.php/ctli/article/view/1013>

Y, U. (2022). "Effectiveness Of Genre Based Approach On Enhancing Creative Writing Skills In English Among Secondary School Students ". *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*, 3(6), 3793–3797. <https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.2022.3.6.46>