*ETERNAL Volume 10 Number 1 (2024)*
*P-ISSN 2477-4766; E-ISSN 2580-5347*
*DOI: https://doi.org/10.24252/Eternal.V101.2024.A2*

# Signing Up GME to English Learning in Boosting Students' Oral Communication Performance

**Nur Aeni[1], Baharuddin[2], Sri Diana[3], M Dahlan Bahang[4], Akhtem A Dzhelilov [5]**
Universitas Negeri Makassar, Poltekes Kemenkes Makassar, Politeknik ATI Makassar, STKIP YPUP Makassar, Indonesia, University Institute of Media Communication, Media Technologies and Design Republic of Crimea, Simferopol, Rusia
*Corresponding author: Nur Aeni, email: nur_aeni@unm.ac.id*

**ARTICLE INFO**

**History:**

***Submitted: May 2, 2024***

***Revised: June 3, 2024***

***Accepted: June 6, 2024***

***Available online: June 6, 2024***

**How to Cite:**

***Aeni, N., K, B., Diana, S., Bahang, M. D., & Dzhelilov, A. A. (2024). Signing Up GME to English Learning in Boosting Students' Oral Communication Performance . ETERNAL (English, Teaching, Learning, and Research Journal), 10(01), 14–27. https://doi.org/10.24252/Eternal.V101.2024.A2***

**Copyright Holder:**

***The Author(s)***

***The work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0)***

*Published by:*

**English Education Department, Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teacher Training, UIN Alauddin Makassar**

**ABSTRACT**

**The study examines whether or not students are interested in learning General Maritime English course materials and demonstrates how using General Maritime English course materials significantly increases students' success in oral communication. In this work, an experimental design was used. For the second half of the academic year 2022/2023, 42 students were a part of the research group. Basic random sampling techniques were used in this investigation on a sample of clusters. Both an oral student communication exam and a student interest questionnaire were used to collect the data. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to examine the student oral communication data, and the Likert scale was used to assess the student interest data. The study's findings were as follows: (1) The GME course materials might improve AMI AIPI's oral communication in Makassar's third semester. It can be said that GME training resources are effective at improving oral communication in terms of accuracy, fluency, and comprehension and that students are very interested in learning from GME language course materials at maritime academies. Signing up for GME for Maritime English learning has the potential to significantly boost students' oral communication performance by providing an engaging, realistic, and effective learning environment. It can enhance language skills, cultural awareness, and overall communication competence, preparing students for successful careers in the maritime industry.**

***Keywords: General Maritime English (GME), Maritime English, Oral Communication***

## INTRODUCTION

In the marine sector, where crew members from various linguistic origins must work together seamlessly to ensure safety, efficiency, and successful operations, effective communication is of the utmost significance. A crucial part in this environment is played by maritime English, a specialized subset of the English language. For oral communication to be clear and efficient, seafarers must be proficient in Maritime English since it helps them communicate important information, deal with difficult circumstances, and react to emergencies. Traditional

teaching approaches have been used for marine English instruction in the past, but they frequently fail to fully engage students and totally immerse them in real-world marine situations. This study investigates the consequences of incorporating General Maritime English (GME) into the curriculum as a technique to improve students' oral communication performance, recognizing the necessity for novel approaches.

English as a communication method has grown in Indonesia and has been recognized as an objective of foreign language teaching. Students should be found to speak fluently English. As English students, most Indonesian university students find several communication difficulties in mastering English. The lack of experience in regular communication is also one of the big problems. Often they feel that they cannot use the language as a contact tool enough. You may also understand English through speaking or writing and reading, but it is often difficult for other people to communicate a concept that is particularly obvious in their mind in oral communication. It requires a particular method or approach here to turn passive skill into active skill.

On the grounds of the observation and the knowledge provided by the lecturers, the above problems are also confronted by AMI AIPI Makassar 's third half students. In oral speech (speaking), they are very difficult to express what they think. The students' pre-test results also show that the average score is 6.58 (6 points 58) out of 25 students. Therefore, we conclude that the minimum goal reached is 7.1 in the low group.

It is not easy to learn English as a foreign language to be communicative through teaching. Since the teaching process involves certain knowledge and skills. According to Widdowson, (1985:49) the foreign language success of students depends on what the teacher is doing and how they are doing. There are several techniques or approaches to enhance oral communication in English teaching. The first is the. This approach is considered useful to improve the speaking skills of students. Since this approach's main aim is the improvement of English communication skills.

Maritime English course materials as a medium for communicative protection at sea; vocabulary at maritime level, register mastery and genre skills, maritime interactions spoken and written. Maritime English is intended to help students improve their communication skills in English to a degree that helps them to meet the skills of the STCW Code with regard to English. The principle underlying the basic specifications of the STCW Code is that mariners must be qualified in the skilled use of English. Maritime English is used in all maritime situations to communicate.

The students were fascinated and inspired by the varied interaction between classes, Samsidar (1998) described. English Although there were two factors in Sikapang (1993) that discouraged students from speaking English: 1) psychological factors in which they are shamed

and afraid of making errors and feel that they are caught in English by their classmate, 2) the lack of practice since students are rarely able to speak English in or outside their classroom. This made it difficult for students to learn English. The goal of this research is not to apply a new teaching technique in the classroom but to discover the effect of a successful relationship between students and teachers in order to use direct observation and selfreporting. There appear to be several approaches and methods for optimizing student voice. The distinction with previous research is the approach and medium utilized to enhance the speaking skills of students. Although there were many researchers who spoke about the skill of oral communication with many techniques and methods, none of them used GME as a teaching tool to improve students' ability to communicate orally.

Several studies investigated maritime English, namely: Aeni, et.al (2018) revealed that based on the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS), the students had a high level of oral communication anxiety. It was also discovered that there was a significant need for educational resources that might help students develop strong communication skills so they could operate in the global maritime sectors. While the majority of students believed that the four English language skills speaking, writing, listening, and reading were important, they gave priority to the two most productive skills: speaking and writing. The investigation's findings should be considered when creating instructional materials for students enrolled in maritime academies, it is decided. Then, Şihmantepe, Solmaz and Aşan (2023) conducted study to enhance the communication abilities of maritime students in a work-related online roleplaying environment. The study begins by going through the broad prerequisites, challenges, and needs associated with online instruction and language requirements at sea. The study focuses on using online role-playing for spoken communication to conduct ship-based external communication. The study's conclusion identifies the minimal prerequisites for delivering this kind of instruction, the takeaways from the sessions, and the information and experience obtained by the participants.

This research aims to investigate the multifaceted benefits of incorporating GME into Maritime English instruction. Through a comprehensive analysis of the impact of GME on students' oral communication performance, we seek to shed light on the potential of this innovative approach to revolutionize maritime education. By examining its effects on engagement, language skills development, cultural awareness, and cost-effectiveness, the researchers endeavor to provide valuable insights that can inform educational practices and shape the future of Maritime English instruction.

In the subsequent sections of this study, we will delve into the methodology employed, present the findings and analysis, and conclude with implications, recommendations, and avenues

for future research. To bridge the gap, the use of General Maritime English (GME) to improve oral communicative skills in students of English as a foreign language as the main goal of this study. The main beneficiaries will be the lecturers and students who will be able to distinguish between oral activities that can effectively contribute to the development of the foreign language and those that don't. The analysis will be conducted through a variety of oral activities and the application of GME in order to boost their ability in oral communication with the maritime term. Furthermore, speaking activities and technology can be utilized by students as effective means of enhancing their communication abilities. By the end of this study, it is our hope to provide a compelling argument for the adoption of GME as a transformative tool in Maritime English learning, ultimately contributing to safer and more efficient maritime operations worldwide.

**Review of Literature**

General Maritime English (GME) refers to the specialized branch of the English language that is used in the maritime industry and by seafarers. It is a specific subset of the English language tailored to the unique communication needs of the maritime field. GME encompasses the vocabulary, phrases, grammar, and communication conventions that are essential for safe and efficient maritime operations. Maritime professionals, including sailors, ship officers, and those involved in maritime logistics, must communicate effectively with crew members, port authorities, and other stakeholders from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Therefore, GME is designed to facilitate clear and unambiguous communication in various contexts, such as navigation, safety protocols, emergency procedures, and administrative tasks related to the maritime industry.

According to Some key aspects of General Maritime English may include: Vocabulary:

1. GME incorporates a specialized maritime vocabulary to describe various aspects of ship operations, equipment, navigation, and safety procedures.
2. Communication Skills: It emphasizes oral and written communication skills specific to maritime contexts. This includes radio communication, emergency signalling, and reporting procedures.
3. Cultural Sensitivity: GME often addresses the cultural diversity encountered in the maritime industry, preparing seafarers to interact with people from different backgrounds.
4. Safety and Emergency Protocols: GME covers the language and communication requirements for handling safety drills, maritime emergencies, and crisis management situations on board ships.
5. Regulatory Compliance: GME ensures that maritime professionals understand and can

communicate in accordance with international regulations and conventions, such as those established by the International Maritime Organization (IMO).

6. Documentation: GME involves the creation of logs, reports, and other documents necessary for maritime record-keeping and compliance with industry standards.

In essence, General Maritime English is designed to equip individuals working in the maritime industry with the linguistic and communication skills required for safe and efficient maritime operations and to address the unique linguistic demands and challenges encountered in this field. It is an essential component of maritime education and training to ensure that seafarers can communicate effectively and maintain safety standards while at sea.

**Oral communication is important for students.**

The fundamentals of spoken communication can be learned at home. By teaching students how to connect with both teachers and classmates, the school environment elevates this learning process. Professional communication in later life will be defined by the caliber of communication during one's time as a student.

Due to the interaction that occurs during communication between the sender and the recipient, it is a dynamic process. The transmission of ideas and beliefs to another person is the primary goal of communication. Oral or verbal communication as well as nonverbal communication are the two main forms of communication. The act of conveying ideas through speech is known as oral communication, and it is vital to students' lives.

Aeni, Jabu, Rahman & Strid, J (2017) revealed that effective communication gives students the confidence to voice their concerns and ask pertinent questions, which helps them absorb more from the learning process. By creating new acquaintances, effective verbal communication fosters the socializing process, which in turn supports learning. Effective communication helps advance one's career. Proficiency in communication fosters professionalism in speech patterns, modes of self-expression, and interpersonal attitudes, all of which will benefit students in their future careers.

## RESEARCH METHOD

The researchers conducted nearly non-equivalent group design experiments for this investigation. Due to assignments for courses, the use of quasi-experimental methods without fair group designs was not random. 42 students took part in the study as the study's sample.

In other words, the researchers did not have any influence over how classes were assigned using the random assignment technique. They were the students' who were enrolled in English for Maritime subject. Two groups a pilot team and a control group made up the experiment. The

control group received a standard teaching style where they were required to read some content and give straight answers, while the experimental group received GME treatment. The control group wishes to compare whether or not GME is being used to enhance speech competence. Both classes are given a pre- and post-test. The first thing, a pretest was administered to gauge their readability. and testing after treatment to evaluate the results. This test was designed to evaluate the effectiveness of GME for students' speaking skills.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Results

1. The Students' Oral Communication

The frequency and the percentage of the students' oral communication achievement in pretest and posttest for Experimental and Control Group can be seen in the following tables:

**Table 1.** *The Frequency and Percentage of the Students' oral communication Achievement in Pretest*

| | | | Experimental Group | | Control Group | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Range of score | | Classification | F | % | F | % |
| 86-100 | 6 | Excellent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 71-85 | 5 | Very good | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 56-70 | 4 | Good | 3 | 13 | 1 | 5 |
| 41-55 | 3 | Average | 11 | 50 | 12 | 60 |
| 26-40 | 2 | Poor | 6 | 27 | 4 | 20 |
| < 25 | 1 | Very poor | 2 | 10 | 3 | 15 |
| Total | | | 22 | 100 | 20 | 100 |

The above table indicates that the bulk of the experimental and control students were low-level. The experimental group frequency classified as low performer was 19 students (87 percent) and the high performer was 3 students (13 percent), while the control group cynicalized the number of students as low performer as 19 students (95 percent) and the high performer as low as 1 student (5 percent). It means that both classes must also be strengthened.

**Table 2.** *The Frequency and Percentage of the Oral Communication Achievement in Posttest*

| | | Experimental Group | | Control Group | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Range of score | Classification | F | % | F | % |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 86-100 | 6 | Excellent | 2 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| 71-85 | 5 | Very good | 10 | 45 | 0 | 0 |
| 56-70 | 4 | Good | 8 | 35 | 14 | 70 |
| 41-55 | 3 | Average | 2 | 10 | 4 | 20 |
| 26-40 | 2 | Poor | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 |
| < 25 | 1 | Very poor | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | | 22 | 100 | 20 | 100 |

The table above indicates that after treatment oral communication performance of students in the Experimental and Control Group has increased. Both classes typically strive to spread to a high degree of progress with the proportion of oral communication achievements of students. Twenty (90 percent) and low-performer students were classified as high-performers for the experial group, two (10 percent), and 14 (70 percent) and a low performer were classified as highperforming in the control group.

Differences from the pretest are apparent from the distribution of the students' oral communication results for the evaluation group and the control group. Both groups showed progress but were more effective in the experimental group than the control group following the procedure.

Both the Experimental Group and the Control Group were assessed before the writer performed the treatment to know previous speakers' skills. The test also aimed to assess whether the experimental and the control groups were at or not the same level and whether the oral communication abilities of the students were enhanced after the procedure.

The investigator provided in the pre-test and post-test table for Experimental and Control Group the mean score and Standard deviation of the students' oral communication performance:

**Table 3.** *Mean Score and Deviation from the oral communication results of students in pre-test and post-test*

| | Group | Mean | Standard deviation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pretest | Experimental Group | 2.6818 | .83873 |
| | Control Group | 2.5500 | .82558 |
| Posttest | Experimental Group | 4.5455 | 80043 |
| | Control Group | 3.5500 | .68633 |

The above table indicates the difference between the average score and standard deviation in both categories. The data were measured using SPSS 26.0.

The findings show that the Experimental Group / Control Group's mean score was largely the same before treatment. The above table data shows the post-test score of Experimental and Control Group showed the separate mean score after completing the procedure. After care, it indicates that there has been a change. The table above indicates that the average student test score was 2.6818 and the standard deviation was 1.8386, while the control group was 2.5500 and the standard deviation, the average student test score, was 82558. After the procedure, the average score for both groups was different. The mean posttest score for the students of the experimental group was 4,5455, the standard deviation was 80043 and the average score was 3,5500, with the standard deviation 68633, which implies that the mean experimental group score was higher than the control group (4,5455 > 3,5500).

2. Test of Significance (T-Test)

The theories have been tested with inferential study. In this case, the author used t-tests (significance tests) for the independent sample test, i.e. tests to know the difference in mean for the students' pre-test and posttest results.

The level of significance (α) = 0.05 is presumed to be the only thing necessary; the degree of freedom (df) = 40, where N1 + N2-2 = 40, while t table = 2,021 is provided in the table below:

**Table 4.** *The Probability Value of T-Test of the Students' Oral communication Achievemhent in Experimental and Control Group*

| Variables | t stattistic | P-Value | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pretest of experimental and control group | 0.526 | 0.602 | Not Significancly Different |
| Posttest of experimental and control group | 15.553 | 0.000 | Significantly Different |

Based on the results of the study reported on the test of the test group and the control group, the researcher discovered that the numbers are lower than the tables (0.526=0.22) and that their likelihood value is higher than the level of significance (0.602>0.05). H0 has been accepted, while H1 has been turned down. Stated differently, there were no significant variations in the students' speaking abilities between the experimental and control groups prior to treatment. Gay (2006:124) backed up the idea that, in the case of equal factors, the close score difference should be precisely the same. Despite the fact that the control and experimental group posttest results indicate that the likelihood value is higher and the figures are higher than the tables (15.553 > 2.021), and that the likelihood value (0.000 < 0.05) exceeds the sense level. They provided evidence

that the null hypothesis (H0) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis (H1) was accepted. Students' speech abilities improve when they use the GME course materials.

This indicates that the posttest results produced significant final improvements. We came to the conclusion that oral communication, especially when training oral communication skills, could permit the use of English more frequently.

Students at AMI AIPI Makassar were given a questionnaire to complete in order to understand more about GME during the third semester. The students' questionnaire score interval was described as follows:

**Table 5.** *The proportion of students ' interest in teaching in language*

| Interval Score | Category | Team Teaching in Teaching Speaking | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | F | % |
| 85-100 | Very high | 15 | 68 |
| 69-84 | High | 7 | 32 |
| 53-68 | Moderate | 0 | 0 |
| 37-52 | Low | 0 | 0 |
| 20-36 | Very low | 0 | 0 |
| Total | | 22 | 100 |

The interval score for the students based on the questionnaire above shows that 15 students (68%) agreed very strongly on the questionnaire, with seven students (32%) agreeing to be high interest and none united, disagreeing and strongly disagreeing. The students' interval data shows that the oral interactions were very strong.

**Table 6.** *The mean score and standard deviation of the students' interest*

| Group | Mean | Standard deviation |
|---|---|---|
| GME | 73.72 | 6.93 |

The above table indicates that the mean TeamTeaching score was 73.72 and the standard deviation was 6.93. This indicates that students are very involved in the use of GME in maritime English. The students have a good interest in entering the English maritime class, as they go 73.72.

**Discussion**

The table's data, which highlights the prevalence of low-level students in both the experimental and control groups, raises important points for discussion. The fact that the majority of students in both groups fall into the low performer category indicates a common challenge in terms of the initial proficiency of the students participating in the study. LowLevel Students in the Experimental Group: in the experimental group, 87 percent of students were classified as low performers, which suggests that GME (General Maritime English) may have been introduced as a potential remedy for addressing the needs of students who were struggling with their oral communication skills. It underscores the importance of utilizing innovative teaching methods to cater to this group, especially since traditional teaching methods may not have adequately addressed their needs.

Low-Level Students in the Control Group: Interestingly, the control group also had a high proportion of low performers, with 95 percent of students falling into this category. This raises questions about the overall efficacy of the conventional teaching methods in addressing the oral communication skills of maritime students. It indicates that simply relying on traditional teaching approaches may not be sufficient to improve the oral communication performance of students in this context. Need for Strengthening Both Groups: The data clearly points to the need for enhancing the performance of students in both the experimental and control groups. This might involve more individualized support, targeted interventions, or the refinement of teaching methodologies to better meet the specific learning needs of maritime students.

The study's results highlight that both classes are facing challenges in terms of student proficiency and that a one-size-fits-all approach is not adequate. For those transferring from general education to the specialist field of nautical studies, maritime education represents a crucial step. As they have just finished their senior high school education, the cadets under observation are at the beginning of their educational journey (Jamil & Bhuiyan, 2021;Norris, 2021). The expectations placed on their language skills change dramatically as students begin Semester 1 at the Maritime Institute in Jakarta.

The maritime industry, as merdeka curriculum demanded with its unique communication needs, demands a sophisticated approach to language learning and application. In this context, English literacy manifests as a complex phenomenon (National Academies of Sciences and Medicine (U.S.), et al., 2018). Beyond mere language ability, it includes a range of abilities necessary for efficient communication in the maritime industry.

Implications for Future Research: The preponderance of low performers in both groups could also be a starting point for future research. Investigating why these students are struggling

and what teaching strategies are most effective in improving their performance can lead to more tailored and successful educational approaches.

In summary, the table data reveals a common issue in maritime education where a significant portion of students struggle with oral communication skills. This emphasizes the need for innovative approaches such as GME, while also encouraging a more comprehensive examination of teaching methods to ensure that both low-level and high-performing students receive the support they require to succeed in their maritime education.

## CONCLUSION

The study's findings also show that (1) the use of GME in language instruction has enhanced students' oral communication abilities and is greater than pretesting (4.455 > 2.6818) in terms of precision, fluency, and understandability. Additionally, in the experimental batch test, the mean testing score was greater than control (4.5455->3.5500). (2) The use of oral communication increased students' motivation to enrol in the speech class, where the average grade was a very high 73.72. The conclusion that emerged was that students are highly engaged in GME oral communication. The cadets or marine students can practice their speaking because GME encourages them to do so, and it is the one that can encourage students to be more passionate about learning English. GME aids in the growth of linguistic abilities necessary for efficient oral communication. Students get the chance to practice and hone their marine English vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation through authentic marine scenarios and in-game interactions. The game's immediate feedback helps students identify and correct their errors, which helps them become more fluent in another language.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors express sincere appreciation to all individuals and institutions that supported this research on General Maritime English (GME) and its role in enhancing students' oral communication performance. Special gratitude is extended to the participating maritime academies and institutions, including Poltekes Kemenkes Makassar, Politeknik ATI Makassar, STKIP YPUP Makassar, and Universitas Negeri Makassar, for their collaboration and valuable contributions during the study. The authors also thank the students who enthusiastically participated and provided important data reflecting their learning experiences. Deep appreciation is conveyed to colleagues and experts in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and Maritime English for their constructive insights and discussions that strengthened the conceptual and methodological foundation of this work. This research is dedicated to all Maritime English educators in Indonesia and beyond, whose commitment to innovative and context-relevant teaching continues to inspire

learners to achieve communicative competence in the global maritime domain.

## ETHICAL STATEMENT

This research was conducted in accordance with the ethical standards of Universitas Negeri Makassar and the ethical principles outlined in the Declaration of Helsinki. All participants were fully informed of the study's objectives, methods, benefits, and voluntary nature prior to participation. Written or digital informed consent was obtained from all respondents. Participants were assured of the confidentiality and anonymity of their responses, and that the data would be used solely for academic purposes. No sensitive personal information was collected, and participants had the right to withdraw at any stage without consequence.

The authors declare that no conflicts of interest or external influences affected the integrity of the research process. Ethical approval for the study was granted by the English Education Department, Universitas Negeri Makassar. The authors affirm adherence to academic honesty, respect for participant rights, and responsible contribution to the development of knowledge in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and Maritime English education.

## CRediT AUTHORSHIP CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

- **Nur Aeni:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Writing – original draft.
- **Baharuddin:** Formal analysis, Validation, Data curation, Writing – review & editing.
- **Sri Diana:** Resources, Supervision, Project administration.
- **M. Dahlan Bahang:** Visualization, Statistical analysis, Review & editing.
- **Akhtem A. Dzhelilov:** Funding acquisition, International collaboration, Supervision, Final review.

All authors have read and approved the final version of the manuscript. They collectively contributed to data interpretation, discussion of results, and refinement of the article prior to submission**.**

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest concerning the publication of this paper. They have no known financial, institutional, or personal relationships that could inappropriately influence the results or interpretation of the study. The research and findings were conducted and reported with full academic independence, ensuring objectivity and scientific integrity.

## DATA AVAILABILITY

All data generated or analyzed during this study are included within this published article or are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request. Due to ethical considerations, raw data containing identifiable information are not publicly shared. However, anonymized datasets, research instruments (such as questionnaires and oral communication rubrics), and coding frameworks are available for academic and non-commercial use by contacting the corresponding author at nur_aeni@unm.ac.id.

## REFERENCES

Aeni, N., Jabu, B., Rahman, M. A., Ismail, H., & Bin-Tahir, S. Z. (2018). The Students' Needs in Maritime English class at Ami Aipi Makassar, Indonesia. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 9(6), 1284-1292.

Aeni, N., Jabu, B., Rahman, M. A., & Strid, J. E. (2017). English oral communication apprehension in students of Indonesian maritime. International Journal of English Linguistics, 7(4), 158-167.

Adler, M. 1985. How to speak, how to listen. New York: Collier Books. Ann Arbor, MI: Center for Research on Learning and Teaching

Andrews, J.D.W. (1980). The verbal structure of teacher questions: Its impact on class discussion. POD Quanmy, 2, 129-163.

Andrews, K.R. (Ed.). (1953). The case method of teaching humlln relations and administration..Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Argyris, C. (1980). Some limitations of the case method: Experience in a management development program. Academy of Management Review, 5, 291- 298.

Berger, M. (1983). In defense of the case method: A reply to Argyris.Academy of Management Review, 8, 329-333.

Brown, S., and Walter, M. (1983). The art of problem posing. Philadelphia: The Franklin Press.

Bruner, J.S. (1966). TOWQI'd a theory of instruction. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Christensen, C.R. (1986). Teachingandthecasemethod. Boston: Harvard Business School Publishing Division.

Copeland, M.T. (1958). The case method of instruction. And mark an era: The sto1y of the Harvard Business SchooL Boston: Little, Brown.

Freire, P. (1970). The pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Herder & Herder.

Goldsmid, C., and E. Wilson. "Discussion." Passing on Sociology. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, l980.

Hill, W. Learning through Discussion. Beverly Hills: Sage Productions, l962.

Hill, W.F. (1969). Learning through discussion. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hyman, R. T. (1980).Improving discussion leadership. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Haas, M. S. (2002). The Influence of teaching methods on student achievement on Virginia's end of course standards of learning test for Algebra I. Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Virginia:

Nur Aeni1, Baharuddin2,Sri Diana3,M Dahlan Bahang, Akhtem A Dzhelilov (2024). Signing up Me…

Husen,T & Postlethwaite,T.N.(1985). The international encyclopedia of education research & studies (vol 3&5). Oxford: Pergmon press.

Kasulis, T. (1986). Questioning. In M. M. Gilette (Ed.), The an and craft of teaching. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Lang, C. (1986). Case method teaching in the community college. Newton, MA: Educational Development Center. (Comes with videotape of case teaching session. Available from Educational Development Center, SS Chapel St., Newton, MA 02160.)

Maier, N. Problem-solving: Discussions and Conferences: Leadership Methods and Skills. New York: McGraw-Hill, l963.

Noni, N., Jabu, B., & Samtidar, S. (2017, October). An Exploration on Project Assessment of Students' Oral Productive Skills: A Study Of Access Microscholarship Students. In Seminar Nasional Lembaga Penelitian UNM (Vol. 2, No. 1).

Nunan, D. 1991. Langauge Teaching Methodology: A course Book for Teachers. New York: Prentice Hall International Group.

Ortega, L. 2009. Understanding second language acquisition. New York: Routledge.

Patil, M. S., & Karekatti, T. 2012. Correlation between level of communication apprehension and development of communication skills in engineering students. English for Specific Purposes World, 36(12), 1-15.

Plomp, T. 2013. Educational design research: An introduction. Educational design research, 11-

Pritchard, B. 2004. A databank of maritime English resources–an invitation for contributions. Proceedings of IMEC, 16, 166-182.

Pritchard, B. 2004. A Survey of Maritime English Materials–State of the Art in Maritime English.

Reynolds, J.I. (1978). There is method in cases. The Academy of Management Review, 3, 129-133.

Şihmantepe, A., Solmaz, M. S., & Aşan, C. (2023). Improving maritime english oral communication skills in an online environment: Engaging students as teams. In Research

Anthology on Remote Teaching and Learning and the Future of Online Education (pp. 349-369). IGI Global.

Thompson, G. Discussion Groups in University Courses: Introduction. Cincinnati: University of Cincinnati Faculty Resource Center, l974. Distributed by ASA Teaching, Resources Center