An investigation of verbal interaction between teacher and students in teaching English as a foreign language

Mandra Saragih*, Khairun Nissa, M. Afiv Toni S Saragih

Universitas Muhammadiyah Sumatera Utara, Indonesia

The study of verbal interactions between teachers and students in English foreign language classes focuses on understanding the dynamics and communication patterns that occur during the language teaching and learning process. The current study reveals the issues about investigating types of verbal interaction realized and also investigating its impact on students' speaking achievement by an English teacher and students in the classroom. This study included 43 students from MTS Negeri 3 Medan grade VII-3 and one English teacher. The data was probed through classroom observation, recording the teaching classroom interaction. The finding exposed that firstly, teacher talk was dominantly practiced English in the teaching classroom interaction rather than students' talk. Secondly, the types of verbal interaction that occurred in the teaching classroom interaction by which realized by an English teacher were: 1. Asking Questions interaction 33%, 2. At lecturing classroom interaction 9%, 3. Giving Direction interaction 11%. The total percentages of all types of scores are about 53%. The types of verbal interaction that were applied by the students as follows; 1. The students' talk responses 23%, 2. The students' talk initiation 10% by which accumulated about 33%. They were 14 percent of students not giving any feedback (Silence). The speaking score at final test showed that 34,88% or 15 students who were able in verbal interaction between teacher and students. Consequently, this scholarly paper also provides advice on English teacher to highlight effective teaching practices and provide insight into how language learning can be enhanced through meaningful and engaging interactions.

Keywords: Classroom Verbal Interaction, Teacher Talk and Student Talk

INTRODUCTION

English learning strongly needs much verbal engagement and interaction for students to demonstrate their ability and practice target language (Brevik & Rindal, 2020; Menggo et al., 2019). Classroom verbal interaction plays a significant role to create a very enjoyable learning and democratic learning at achieving the qualified learning outcome. The successful learning is creating a productive environment that is one of the teachers' important roles supported by doing a good process of how to make learners feel in real society and feel enjoyable and comfortable (Isrokatun et al., 2021; Putro et al.,2020). These are potentially acquired depending on how strong of teacher and student commitment.

In general, a common problem for a foreign English teacher (EFL) is dealing with passive students who are not responsive and incentive in responding to teacher voice contacts in discussions (Some-Guiebre, 2020). Teaching should focus on facilitating the learning process; the teacher is expected to not only formulate but also manage activities to enable the pupils to obtain the objective (Hien, 2021). In the classroom, interaction is essential to the teaching and learning process. Excluding this process, may not allow the pupils to comprehend the lesson effectively.

The challenge in the learning process is the difficulty of creating a communication interaction between teacher and student (Munawaroh, F., Sutrianingrum, S., & Khairi, 2023). During the lesson, sometimes the teacher does not get a reaction from the student, even though the student is consciously willing to give a response (Mardiningsih et al., 2023). The position of teachers in such actions is as a controller and initiator, the teacher must successfully adopt interactive ways and construct an interactive classroom (Siallagan, 2021). In this case, in order to have a good learning process, teachers and students must make agreements and collaborate so that learning can go according to the purpose of learning (Ginting et al., 2021; Syafrayani et al., 2022).

According to Maiza (2021) verbal interaction is one of the steps that can be taken to demonstrate the skills of the target student's language practice. Additionally, some experts advise that interaction will provide opportunities for pupils to practice their competencies and aid in their learning (Afifah, 2012; Handayani et al., 2019; Zubaidah, 2020). Through conversing with this activity, having an active communication, students may acquire their competencies. The cooperative sharing of ideas, beliefs, or thoughts by two or more individuals that has a mutually reinforcing effect on them will enable interaction. When teachers engage in reciprocal interaction, they are encouraging students to participate as well as helping them learn (Hwang et al., 2023).

Teacher when interacting not only emit language sounds, but also have a specific purpose or purpose from the speech delivered to the students. The discourse study model classroom interaction has been conceptualized by many experts such as (Erlangga Heri, 2021; Knapik et al., 2019; Ma et al., 2021; Prayitno et al., 2019).

METHODS

The research was conducted through a qualitative research design in which FIACS strategies analysis was applied to investigate the whole data. The FIACS technique covers the interaction between teacher and students. The FIACS can change the teacher teaching style (Inamullah et al., 2011). This research aims to investigate the types of classroom verbal interaction used by an English teacher and student and to investigate its impact on the student's English-speaking achievement. The subject of this research was an English teacher and 43 students in grade VII-2.

The research was carried out in Madrasah Tsanawiyah Negeri 3 Medan. The data for this research are verbal interactions in the classroom between the English teacher and students which were taken authentically through classroom observations, the teacher's verbal interactions influence student learning activities (Lutfitasari & Sudarto, 2023; Puspitasari & Putra Danaya, 2022). So classroom teaching interactions, interviews and speaking tests in the final semester were recorded collaboratively by English teacher and researcher.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Investigation of Verbal Interaction in the Classroom
In this research, the data were taken from teacher-student interaction during the classroom. The researcher also examined the observed data using Flanders' Interaction Analysis Categories (Odiri Amatari, 2015). The data result, is the interaction of every meeting in the English class including the teacher's conversation and the student's talk.

Teacher Talk Analysis
The first recording; There was a teacher talk. However, the teacher only gave an opinion about the lesson. Therefore, it caused some elements of classroom interaction to disappear such as the use of encouragement, giving clues, giving feedback, cooperative, collaborating and creating a democratic environment. Although the students weren't very engaged in the lesson, they still provided the teacher with feedback because the teacher kept asking them to.

Second recording; There was a teacher talk. However, The student is inactive because the student does not follow the instructions of the teacher so the class is was unfavorable, such as some of them did not do the homework, and some others worked on their homework and did not listen to their teacher which led to the teacher's anger. This may affect the classroom interaction that does not run well. In the second meeting, there was hardly any communication between the teacher and the students. The teacher reflected on the previous meeting and suggested that the students complete their homework at home rather than in class. Then, the students remained silent. At that point, the classroom environment was essentially passive.

In the third recording; There were five out of seven teaching effectiveness aspects appeared during in the classroom interaction including asking questions, giving directions, expressing gratitude or encouragement, lecturing and accepting feelings.

Fourth recording; The teacher required students to memorize some grammatical rules such as present, past tense and participle verb. While doing this, the educator listened and scored their performance. Through the process, the teacher talk was less than student talk, the students actively focused on the task given and the teacher only observed and gave the score to the students.

Student Talk Analysis
First recording: at the time of learning the student does not focus after the first minute of the recording. The first minute

of silence was undoubtedly spent in silence, but after reading a book, they could respond to the teacher's questions and feedback. The predominant feature of student discourse is Student Talk Response refers to the way in which students respond to the teacher's remarks. The teacher poses a question, and the student provides an answer.

Second recording; students were nearly passive since they had not completed their assignment. They listened to the teacher's advice without responding. As a result, on the second recording of the lessons in the classroom, the teacher still gets a fraction of the student's response.

Third recording; The students' talk occurred during the classroom interactions. Silence, pause, or confusion; student talk response; student talk initiation was observed during the meeting. Compared to the first and second recordings, students were more engaged in the third recording and were eager to learn. The teacher noticed this at the start of the meeting and was moved by their enthusiasm.

Fourth recording: Students are more active in learning, and students are more confident because teachers have been given the task of mentioning verb forms as homework. As a result, at the fourth recording, student talk outweighed teacher talk.

TABLE 1 | The proportion of the aspect of classroom interaction between teacher and students

No.	Aspect of classroom Interaction Teacher Talk (Indirect influence)	Frequency	Percentage	Percentage of teacher Talk
1	Accepts Feelings (AC)	1	1%	1
2	Praise or Encouragement (PE)	1	1%	2
3	Accepts or Uses ideas of Students (UI)	3	3%	3
4	Asking Questions (AS) Teacher Talk (Direct influence)	24	25%	4
5	Lecturing / Lecture (LE)	9	9%	5
6	Giving Directions (GI)	11	11%	6
7	Criticizing or Justifying Authority (JA)	2	2%	7
	Student Talk Percentage			Percentage of Student Talk
8	Student Talk Response (STA)	22	23%	
9	Student Talk Initiation (STI)	10	10 %	
		32	33%	
				Percentage of silence
10	Silence or Pause or Confusion (SPC)	13	14%	14%
Total		96	100%	100%

Based on the findings table 1, it is possible to conclude that the most prominent qualities in the classroom interaction were teacher discourse, implying that the instructor was the most actively involved in the classroom interaction.

Marzano & Marzano (2003) found that teacher talk control had a high rate of classroom involvement It indicates that teachers spend significant time controlling students, such as by offering guidance and criticizing or defending activities This indicates that a students was expected to follow instructions, commands, or orders from the teacher in a significant way. The outcome also showed how much time the teacher spent accepting the students' feelings, praising or motivating them, and accepting or utilizing their ideas. Seldom did the teacher clarify, build upon, or develop concepts that a student had proposed. It is suggested that the teacher should give more encouragement in order to boost student involvement in class discussions. Also, the pupils did not participate actively in class discussions. The result presents that during the entire teaching-learning period, student participation—that is, talk response and talk initiation—was more modest.

As part of the analysis of teacher talk types, forms of teacher talk should be identified and categorized into seven patterns, and their relationships should be broadly understood (Sistyawan et al., 2022). According to the results, the teacher most commonly employed six different approaches: accepting feelings, praising or encouraging, using students' ideas, posing questions, lecturing, and providing instructions.

The findings of the class observation are presented in this section, detailing the activities that the teacher and the students engaged in during the process of teaching and learning. The percentage calculation is done using a record of what is done, how often each chat, and then the result is to determine the average for teachers and students.

The data above clearly shows that teacher discourse predominated in the process of teaching and learning, with the instructor being more active in the classroom verbal engagement. The teacher's speech did not fully emerge from students' input, such as offering an opinion that is directly relevant to the content discussion, but it largely emerged from asking the question that is often asked in the classroom. Teacher speaking took up a considerable percentage of class time, and the teacher predominately used Bahasa Indonesian in classroom verbal engagement (Ummah & Bisriyah, 2022).

Based on the result from the students' final test in table 2, the total score of the students was 2770, with the number of students 43. The mean score was $\overline{X} = 2740/43 = 64.41$. Where the student got to score more 70 was 34.88% or 15 students and the students got score less than 70 was 61,11% or 28 students. It can be said that learning English in class between students and teacher did not do much interaction; teacher was dominantly talking in the class. There was the reason that caused students to speak less in class, such as students did not interested in participating in learning

English so they did not focus on the teacher and student prefer to exchange ideas with their friends and this is consistent with studies research from (Lestari et al., 2023; Yelvita, 2022).

TABLE 2 | Students' Speaking Achievement in Final Test

No.	Students' Initial Name	Pronounciation	Grammar	Vocabulary	Fluency	Comprehensibility	Total Score	Able	Unable
1	DSYP	10	13	12	12	13	60		
2	RRD	10	11	12	10	10	53		
3	RPM	8	9	8	10	12	47		
4	RMY	11	14	12	14	14	65		
5	RDI	9	11	11	11	13	55		
6	SSI	13	14	13	13	14	67		
7	SNI	12	14	14	13	15	68		
8	SSA	9	11	8	10	12	50		
9	SPN	8	11	9	10	12	42		
10	SN	12	14	13	14	15	68		
11	SML	13	14	13	14	14	68		
12	SYA	13	15	14	15	14	81		
13	SAA	7	9	10	11	12	49		
14	SOA	13	15	14	15	16	73		
15	SYH	14	15	16	14	15	74		
16	SSL	14	15	16	16	16	77		
17	SPM	10	12	11	10	13	56		
18	SMD	14	15	14	15	15	73		
19	SLN	14	14	13	14	15	70		
20	SLA	16	17	16	16	18	83		
21	SDY	13	15	14	13	17	72		
22	SFL	13	14	13	14	16	70		
23	SDW	11	10	9	11	15	56		
24	SMD	11	14	13	13	15	66		
25	SPM	13	15	14	15	15	71		
26	SLR	10	14	13	13	15	65		
27	SPL	14	15	16	16	17	88		
28	SAS	9	10	12	11	13	55		
29	SAR	8	10	9	11	12	50		
30	SNH	9	9	10	11	13	52		
31	SK	12	13	14	14	15	68		
32	SH	13	15	14	15	17	74		
33	SG	7	9	10	11	13	50		
34	TR	12	13	14	15	16	70		
35	TWD	13	14	13	13	14	67		
36	TDN	10	12	13	14	16	65		
37	TAD	14	13	14	14	15	70		
38	TAA	10	12	11	11	12	56		
39	TBG	12	13	14	14	16	69		
40	TWI	11	13	14	14	16	68		
41	TKA	13	14	14	16	16	83		
42	UAI	10	12	13	13	13	61		
43	VAR	7	8	8	10	12	45		
	Total Number						2770	15	28
	Mean						64,41		
	Percentage of Able							34,88%	
	Percentage of Unable								65,11%

However, students who got a score above 70 dominantly interacted verbally with the teacher because they also attend the private English course program. Based on the indicator of speaking assessment, it could be concluded that the English proficiency of students in interactions was low, especially in pronunciation. So, the verbal interaction between teachers and students was measly.

The Effect of Oral Interaction on Students' Speaking Attainment

According to observations, recordings made during classes, and interviews with students, showed a higher proportion of Indonesian language usage than English. This showed no visible impact of oral interaction between teachers and students on student speaking performance in the classroom, which can be seen from their recorded discussion. The teacher-student conversation was primarily in Indonesian. It indicates that the pupils did not practice their English-speaking skill and may not speak well when they were learning the language.

The data analysis above suggests the teacher dominate the verbal interactions with the students in the classroom. When instructing her students, the teacher employed indirect influence more often than direct influence. It was evident in nearly all of the conversations. Indirect influence is the question asked by the teacher to the student in the classroom. The teacher posed the question in an attempt to get the students to speak up, but she spoke primarily in Indonesian rather than English. This is in line with research conducted by Hui, (2023) and Waloyo et al., (2023) where teachers dominate verbal interactions more than their students

Bambaeeroo & Shokpour (2017) noted that there was no positive impact of oral interaction between teachers and students in the classroom on student speaking achievement. Based on the above references and the results of the research that has been carried out, it can be inferred that students are unable to respond to the researcher's questions in English, but in Indonesian. Evidence clearly found from the dialogue between teacher and student during the learning process: the findings found that students always speak using the Indonesian language to communicate with teachers, and teachers also use the Indonesian language when explaining the material, resulting in students not being able and unfamiliar with the use of English.

1. Asking Questions interaction 33%, 2. At lecturing classroom interaction 9%, 3. Giving Direction interaction 11%. The total percentages of all types of scores are about 53%. The types of verbal interaction that were applied by the students as follows; 1. The students' talk responses 23%, 2. The students' talk initiation 10% by which accumulated about 33%. They were 14 percent of students not giving any feedback (Silence). The speaking score at final test showed that 34,88% or 15 students who were able in verbal interaction between teacher and students. From the data above, the classroom verbal interactions were dominantly performed by teacher's talk and it also was clearly described that the students were passively learnt in the classroom.

CONCLUSION

After analyzing the data, it can be concluded that: The teacher's talk reaches more than fifty percent which is 53%, while the student's talk is a third or 33%, and the silence student is 14%. It shows that the teacher was dominated the classroom verbal interaction. While the students are less active, the teacher is more involved. The majority of the student talking period is devoted to answering questions from the teacher. There was no favorable impact of teacher-student contact in the classroom on students' verbal interaction. The percentage of students who scored higher than 70 was 34.88%, or 15 students, and the percentage of students who scored lower than 70 was 61.11 percent, or 28 students, who were unable to speak English.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Afifah, D. S. N. (2012). Interaksi Belajar Matematika Siswa Dalam Pembelajaran Kooperatif Tipe STAD. *Pedagogia : Jurnal Pendidikan, 1*(2), 145–152. https://doi.org/10.21070/pedagogia.v1i2.37

Bambaeeroo Fatemeh, & Shokpour Nasrin. (2017). The impact of the teachers' non-verbal communication on success in teaching. *Journal of Advances in Medical Education & Professionalism, 5*(2), 52. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5346168/pdf/JAMP-5-51.pdf

Brevik, L. M., & Rindal, U. (2020). Language Use in the Classroom: Balancing Target Language Exposure With the Need for Other Languages. *TESOL Quarterly, 54*(4), 925–953. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.564

Erlangga Heri, E. al. (2021). Effect Of Digital Marketing And Social Media On Purchase Intention Of Smes Food Products. *Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education (TURCOMAT), 12*(3), 3672–3678. https://doi.org/10.17762/turcomat.v12i3.1648

Ginting, P., Hasnah, Y., & Husni Hasibuan, S. (2021). Pkm Pelatihan Tindakan Kelas (Ptk) Berbasis Student Centered Learning (Scl) Bagi Guru Smp Di Kecamatan Medan Deli. *JURNAL PRODIKMAS Hasil Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat, 4*(1), 58–72.

Handayani, E. N., Ismiyatin, L., & Setiyowati, D. (2019). Tindak Tutur Ekspresif Humanis dalam Interaksi Pembelajaran. *Buletin Pengembangan Perangkat Pembelajaran, 1*(1), 111–122. https://doi.org/10.23917/bppp.v1i1.9289

Hien, L. T. N. (2021). Communicative Language Teaching in Teaching ESL for University Students. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics, 3*(6), 49–57. https://doi.org/10.32996/jeltal.2021.3.6.7

Hui, S. M. (2023). Revisiting Communicative Language Teaching Approach in Teaching ESL Speaking Skills. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 14*(6), 1515–1523. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1406.09

Hwang, W. Y., Wu, T. H., & Shadiev, R. (2023). Applications of Reciprocal Teaching in Flipped Classroom to Facilitate High Level of Cognition for Sustainable Learning Practices. *Sustainability (Switzerland), 15*(7). https://doi.org/10.3390/su15075848

Inamullah, H. M., Ud din, M. N., & Hussain, I. (2011). Teacher-Student Verbal Interaction Patterns At The Tertiary Level Of Education. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research (CIER), 1*(1), 45. https://doi.org/10.19030/cier.v1i1.1209

Isrokatun, I., Yulianti, U., & Nurfitriyana, Y. (2021). Analisis Profesionalisme Guru dalam Pelaksanaan Pembelajaran Daring di Masa Pandemi Covid-19. *Jurnal Basicedu, 6*(1), 454–462. https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v6i1.1961

Khamim Zarkasih Putro, Muhammad Adly Amri, Nuraisah Wulandari, D. K. (2020). Pola interaksi anak dan orangtua selama kebijakan pembelajaran di rumah. *Fitrah: Journal of Islamic Education, 1*(1), 125–126. http://jurnal.staisumatera-medan.ac.id/index.php/fitrah

Knapik, D., Kołek, K., Rosół, M., & Turnau, A. (2019). Autonomous, reconfigurable mobile vehicle with rapid control prototyping functionality. *IFAC-PapersOnLine, 52*(8), 428–433. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifacol.2019.08.041

Lestari, Y., Hartono, R., Yuliasri, I., & Pratama, H. (2023). Implementasi Model Pembelajaran Flipped Classroom terhadap Peningkatan Kemampuan Berbicara Siswa: A Literature Review. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Pascasarjana (PROSNAMPAS), 6*(1), 939–944.

Lutfitasari, W., & Sudarto, Y. D. (2023). Problematika Kompetensi Verbal Guru Bahasa Indonesia di Kelas. *Journal of Education For All (EduFA), 1*(16), 51–60. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.61692/edufa.v1i1.13

Ma, P., Liu, J., Shen, F., Liao, X., Xiu, M., Zhao, H., Zhao, M., Xie, J., Wang, P., Huang, M., Li, T., Duan, M., Qian, K., Peng, Y., Zhou, F., Xin, X., Wan, X., Wang, Z. Y., Li, S., Zhang, Z. (2021). Individualized resuscitation strategy for septic shock formalized by finite mixture modeling and dynamic treatment regimen. *Critical Care, 25*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13054-021-03682-7

Maiza, S. (2021). Pola Kesantunan Berbahasa Tindak Tutur Direktif dalam Interaksi Belajar Mengajar di SMP Negeri 4 Sungai Penuh. *Transformatika: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Pengajarannya, 5*(1), 14. https://doi.org/10.31002/transformatika.v5i1.3623

Mardiningsih, M., El Sulukiyyah, A. A., & Santoso, B. H. (2023). Tindak tutur guru dalam Project Based Learning (PjBL) DI SMAN I Kota Pasuruan. *Prosiding SANTIMAS, 1*(1).

Marzano, R. J., & Marzano, J. S. (2003). The Key to Classroom Management. *Educational Leadership, 61*(1), 6–13.

Menggo, S., Suastra, I. M., Budiarsa, M., & Padmadewi, N. N. (2019). Needs analysis of academic-English speaking material in promoting 21 st century skills. *International Journal of Instruction, 12*(2), 739–754. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12247a

Munawaroh, F. ., Sutrianingrum, S., & Khairi, K. (2023). Keterampilan Guru Berkomunikasi Dalam MengajarAnak Usia Dini Di TK Negeri Pembina Tembilahan. *Ar-Raihanah : Jurnal Pendidikan Islam Anak Usia Dini, 3*(2), 251–256. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.53398/arraihanah.v3i2.396

Odiri Amatari, V. (2015). The Instructional Process: A Review of Flanders' Interaction Analysis in a Classroom Setting. *International Journal of Secondary Education, 3*(5), 43. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijsedu.20150305.11

Prayitno, H. J., Ngalim, A., Sutopo, A., Pangestu, D. W., Jamaluddin, N., & Ali, A. H. (2019). Directive politeness act strategy in the discourse of education column in national newspaper as the formation of students' character in Indonesia. *Humanities and Social Sciences Reviews, 7*(2), 349–362. https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2019.7241

Puspitasari, D., & Putra Danaya, B. (2022). Pentingnya Peranan Komunikasi Dalam Organisasi: Lisan, Non Verbal, Dan Tertulis (Literature Review Manajemen). *Jurnal Ekonomi Manajemen Sistem Informasi, 3*(3), 257–268. https://doi.org/10.31933/jemsi.v3i3.817

Putro, K. Z., Amri, M. A., Wulandari, N., & Kurniawan, D. (2020). Pola interaksi anak dan orangtua selama kebijakan pembelajaran di rumah. *Fitrah: Journal of Islamic Education*, 1(1), 124-140.

Siallagan, T. (2021). Mengembangkan Etika Sosial Antara Siswa dengan Guru dalam Pembelajaran Pendidikan Agama Kristen Sistem Daring. *Sanctum Domine: Jurnal Teologi, 11*(1), 37–54. https://doi.org/10.46495/sdjt.v11i1.105

Sistyawan, Y. N. I., Purnamasari, I. I., Azizah, W., & Mardiningrum, A. (2022). Teacher Talks and Their Importance for EFL Learners. *JEES (Journal of English Educators Society), 7*(2), 182–189. https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v7i2.1652

Some-Guiebre, E. (2020). Foreign Language Classroom Interaction: Does it Promote Communicative Skills? *International Journal of Educational Methodology, 6*(3), 497–505. https://doi.org/10.12973/ijem.6.3.497

Syafrayani, P. R., Ginting, P., Hasnah, Y., & Saragih, M. (2022). Unpacking the opportunities and challenges in learning speaking online during Covid-19 outbreak: A case-study of Indonesian EFL college students. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education,*

and Humanities, 9(2), 109. https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v9i2.10940

Ummah, L. K., & Bisriyah, M. (2022). EFL students' perception of Grammarly's feedback and how they deal with the inaccuracy. *JEES (Journal of English Educators Society), 7*(2), 163–172. https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v7i2.1687

Waloyo, E., Lestari, S., & Mutiaraningrum, I. (2023). Exploring Studies on Cooperative Principle in English Language Teaching: A Literature Review. *Metathesis: Journal of English Language Literature and Teaching, 7*(1), 17–30. https://doi.org/10.31002/metathesis.v7i1.157

Yelvita, F. S. (2022). Analysis of the constraints of classroom-based speaking instruction: A literature study. *Jurnal Komunikasi & Bahasa, 3*(2), 171–180. https://proceeding.unnes.ac.id/index.php/snpasca/article/view/2243/1726

Zubaidah, S. (2016). Keterampilan abad ke-21: Keterampilan yang diajarkan melalui pembelajaran. In *Seminar Nasional Pendidikan. 2*(2), 1-17.

Conflict of Interest Statement: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.