THE EFFECTIVENESS OF ENGLISH DEBATING IN TEACHING SPEAKING FOR SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Rusdin[1], Ismail[2]
[12]STKIP Yapis Dompu
Email : [1]surflakey@gmail.com, [2]ismailadelembo@gmail.com

Abstrak: Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui pengaruh penggunaan debat terhadap motivasi siswa berbicara bahasa Inggris. Populasi penelitian ini adalah siswa kelas II MAN Dompu yang terdiri dari 7 kelas sehingga jumlah seluruhnya 193. Untuk memudahkan peneliti menggunakan random sampling yang terdiri dari 32 siswa. Mereka dibagi menjadi dua kelompok yaitu kelompok eksperimen dan kelompok kontrol, untuk mengumpulkan data peneliti menggunakan dua tes yaitu pre-test dan post-test, peneliti memberikan perlakuan yang berbeda untuk kelompok eksperimen dan kontrol. Dari hasil tes terlihat bahwa nilai rata-rata kelompok eksperimen (24,36) lebih tinggi dibandingkan kelompok kontrol (15,96). Kemudian dilanjutkan dengan menganalisis kedua nilai rata-rata tersebut dengan menggunakan uji-t. Hasilnya menunjukkan bahwa uji-t adalah (1,63), perhitungan korelasi antara skor rata-rata kelompok menghasilkan hasil (8,40). Berdasarkan hasil analisis data, hipotesis alternatif yang mengatakan bahwa "Debat bahasa Inggris mempunyai pengaruh positif dalam pengajaran Speaking siswa kelas dua MAN Dompu" diterima, dan hipotesis nol yang menyatakan, "Debating tidak berpengaruh positif efek dalam pengajaran berbicara siswa tahun kedua MAN Dompu" ditolak. Penelitian ini menyelidiki secara kuantitatif efektivitas program debat bahasa Inggris dalam pengajaran bahasa Inggris. Penelitian serupa yang secara kualitatif mengeksplorasi debat bahasa Inggris dalam pengajaran bahasa Inggris sangat direkomendasikan.

Kata Kunci: Efektivitas, Debat Bahasa Inggris, Pengajaran Berbicara

*Abstract: The aim of this study is to find out the effect of using debating toward students' motivation to speak English. The populations of this study were the second year students of MAN Dompu consists of 7 classes so the total number of them is 193. To facilitate it, the researchers used random sampling consisting of 32 students. They were divided in two groups namely experimental and control group, to collect the data the researcher used two tests they were pre-test and post-test, the researcher gave different treatment for experimental and control group. From the result of the test, it can be seen that the mean score of experimental was (24.36) is higher than the control group (15.96). Then it was continued to analyze both mean score by using t-test. The result shows that t-test is (1.63), the computation of correlation between the mean scores of the groups has a result of (8.40). Based on the result of the data analysis the alternative hypothesis which said that "The English debating has positive effect in teaching speaking of the second year students of MAN Dompu" is accepted, and the null hypothesis which is said, "The debating has not positive effect in teaching speaking of the second year students MAN Dompu" is rejected. This study quantitatively investigated the effectiveness of English debating program in teaching English. Similar studies which qualitatively explore English debating in teaching English are highly recommended.
.*
Keywords: Effectiveness, English Debating, Teaching Speaking

1. **INTRODUCTION**

Language is a tool of communication, and communication is a process in which information is transmitted from someone to another. There's no denying the importance of language in human existence. Even the human life and language cannot be separated, (Ismail et al., 2022). Language plays very crucial role in human lives, (Ismail, et all. 2023). According to Rabiah, (2012) Language is a communication tool used by everyone in their daily life as a means to convey information and arguments to others. Furthermore, (Rusdin, 2022) the whole students should understand and master two important aspects of English devices such as spoken and writing. Moreover Rusdin (2022) state that The English language is being used throughout the school level in Indonesia beginning in elementary school up to the university students.

The human capacity for self-awareness and abstract thought is facilitated by language, if not dependent upon it (R. Fasol, 2006). The four necessities in language or commonly known as the four skills- Reading, writing, listening and speaking plays a vital role in any language learning quest (L.M. Sadiku, 2015). Thus, English is a common medium of communication in the world or has become an international language that is used by most people in the world to communicate with other countries, whether it is in oral or written form. In Indonesia, English is a foreign language that is used as a compulsory subject on the curriculum in school. Today, it starts from elementary school up to university.

Learning language means learning pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar by practicing the four language skills such as listening, speaking, reading, and writing (Collin Dawson, 1984). Speaking is one of the four language skills that play a very important role in transmitting information from one person to another. Rusdin & Diana (2023) explain that speaking proficiency has been the most essential skill for both EFL teachers and EFL learners, this skill is one of the four that must be taught to EFL students. Relating to the key importance of speaking skills, teachers should have a variety of methods or they should use a selection of techniques, such as an approach to teaching English as a foreign language, which has some advantages, for example, by grouping students. Using such techniques, the students will be able to get information by sharing ideas. Students' feelings are more freely expressed, especially when expressing ideas, than individual work. Possessing a positive attitude or drive for learning English will help students identify the approach that will help them overcome obstacles along the way and ultimately result in successful language acquisition, (Ismail, 2022).

Therefore, the researchers have made up their mind to investigate the effectiveness of debating, which is used in teaching, toward the students' ability to speak. Harmer (1986) says that "the students" will communicate when they have something to communicate, in other words, when they have a communicative purpose and when they have enough language in their minds. Therefore, the students should be prepared before they come to oral communication tasks. The use of teaching media in this case is intended to prepare the students for the real communicative tasks. In other words, Collin Dawson (1984: 9) stated, "Students will be more willing to speak if they have something interesting to talk about." Realizing the description above, the teacher of English should find some solution by creating efficient and creative techniques or wise techniques in teaching speaking in order to get a better result in teaching and learning. Considering the explanation above, the researcher intends to carry out the research concerning "the effectiveness of debating in teaching speaking (an experimental study of second-year students at MAN Dompu).

Learning to speak a foreign language is a long process. First, the students must carefully repeat models and imitate the teacher. They may memorize basic sentences to gain confidence

in their ability to speak the second language. They may also practice sentences and do oral drills. These activities are all preliminary requirements for the actual conversation. Students are truly speaking only when they are generating their own sentences. In classroom activities, the teacher should try to allow for some free speaking activity, either aided conversation or, at later stages, free conversation in every unit.

In judging, whether the students are speaking in correct sense f terms, there are two criteria, which must be used:

1. The students have to know the meaning of the words that they use
2. The students must pronounce the words properly.

Previously, people conceived that language in daily terms as spoken. Certainly, it is a reality that speaking has dominated communication activities in any field for a long time. It has been confirmed by Rusdin & Diana (2023) in their article entitled "Speaking Up: A Comprehensive Investigation of EFL Secondary Students' Speaking Skill Problems in Indonesia's Islamic School Context" that in teaching learning activities, for example, speaking proficiency has been the most essential skill for both EFL teachers and EFL learners. This skill is one of the four that must be taught to EFL students.

In many tests or oral productions, it is neither possible nor desirable to separate the speaking skills. Clearly, in a normal speech situation, the two skills are independent. Because it is impossible to hold any meaningful conversation without understanding what is being said and without making ourselves understood at the same time (Heaton 1975),.

2. METHOD

The method used in this research is experimental method (Harrison, 1979) states "Research design dominate to experimental design; researcher measures causal relationship, deals with the relationships between variables, and the development of generalizations, principles, or theories that have universal validity" Experimental research has had a long tradition in psychology and education Gary Morrrison (2024). Moreover Ahsanul, (2023) state that:

"The researcher must develop a research question, state a testable hypothesis, decide how to control variability during the experimental process, choose or develop intervention conditions, a sample from a population to assign them to experimental conditions, and decide what empirical measures will be taken (and how data will be recorded)".

In this research, the researcher did observation to investigate the effectiveness of debating in teaching speaking. These instruments were related to the instructional activities, such as teachers' notes and handouts for students with some debating clues that would be used to teach speaking.

In this research, data means all information that was directly gathered from the subject. The data was obtained through the test relating to the student's speaking activity and their speaking achievement. Research is the methodical and organized accumulation, arrangement, and analysis of data with the ultimate purpose of supporting decision-making through the research's findings, (Ahsanul, 2023).

In the process of collecting data, the researcher comes to the classroom, teaches English, and uses the techniques of debating, such as meaningful or communicative drills, with an experimental group. And for the control group, the researcher gives them different

treatment without debate.

The lessons were held twice a week (for 45 minutes). The researcher also analyzes the student's speaking activity. Soon after the regular treatment, the topic offered to the experimental group was the same as that of the control group. This is because the topics presented during regular instruction are also the same. The scoring system used in the nine scores following Carroll's interview scoring scale is:

Table 1. Interview Scale Scoring

Score	Classification	Description
9	Speaker Competence	Speaker and interact authoritatively. Completely competence in topic discussed. It may have a very slight non-native accent.
8	Very good	Virtual complete mastery of language, able to keep up own side of a dialogue very well. Mother tongue accent and usage will occasionally by noticeable.
7	Good speakers	Virtual complete mastery of language, able to keep up own side of a dialogue very well. Mother tongue accent and usage will occasionally by noticeable.
6	Fare speaker	Interact effectively on the whole but with noticeable hesitation repetition and circumlocution and some errors and appropriative. Obvious non-natives accents but still communicate with reasonable impact and interest.
5	Modes speaker	Can answer question and explain main point in a topic but requires degree of tolerance form interviewer and in appropriate impede communication. Usually gets the gist of discussion and can be interesting at times.
4	Marginal speaker	Although in touch which topic discussed is very dependent on interviewer in the interaction a considerable number of in accuracies and in appropriative. At times a chance impedes major misunderstanding can be eventually cleared up. The interview is not a rewarding experience, strong accent. It requires tolerance from interviewer.
3	Extremely speaker	Level of interaction is just about as low level as possible to be real communication. Many question have to be prepared or rephrase is and some responses not immediately intelligible. Does not develop points or use information getting strategies to many misunderstanding for conform very string accent, given help, communicates basically.
2	Intermittent speaker	Only partial and intermittent contribution to dialogue. Most questions have to be repeated and the replies teased out. Can carry out very simple communicative task
1	Non-speaker	Either have one or two routines phrases do not know which language is being used

(Carroll, 1985:80)

To analyze the data obtained, the researcher used descriptive method of analysis. To analyze of the best, the following steps would be wisely applied:

1. Identifying the sample's score
2. After identifying the score, the researcher continues to calculating the final score by using the following formula:

FS = $\dfrac{p \times 100}{9}$

Where:
   P =   student's individual score based on scoring system
   100 =   highest possible score for final score
   9   =   highest possible student's individual score

3. The data from the test result namely the student's individual score was analyzed statistically following the procedures below. First of all the researcher finds out the mean score of each treatment by using the formula:

MA = $\dfrac{\Sigma \times}{n}$

Where:
            MA = mean score of experimental group
            X   = deviation score
            N   = number of sample
            Σ   = sum of

The mean score obtained through the formula are analyzed and interpreted. Finally, it comes to computation of correlation coefficient of the two mean scores is significant or not. For the sake of computation applies the formula recommended by Arikunto. The formula runs as follows:

$$\dfrac{MX - MY}{\sqrt{\left(\dfrac{\Sigma X^2 + \Sigma Y^2}{Nx + Ny -2}\right)\left(\dfrac{1}{Nx} + \dfrac{1}{Ny}\right)}}$$

Where:
M = mean score of group
N = number of sample
X = deviation score of the experimental group
Σ = sum of

3. FINDING AND DISCUSSION FINDING

This particular chapter deals with the interpretation and analysis of the data obtained since the investigation was conducted. As the researcher stated in the previous chapter, this interpretation will be in quantitative data form. Meanwhile, these quantitative results will be analyzed through well-structured basic statistical computation. It also means the figures of the data presented will be analyzed, respectively, until the researcher finds out the last result of the computation.

Commonly, the last process of the research is aimed at answering the research question, which needs to be proved by data obtained, data computation, and data analysis. So, in this chapter, the researcher tends to report the presentation discussion of the data obtained during the investigation, and the data will be analyzed as the last answer to the research

question as appeared in Chapter I. The question is, "Do the students have a positive effect in using debate toward the students' motivation to speak English?

The question above will be answered, and the data collected during the implementation of the investigation will be analyzed through careful computation and statistical analysis. At the beginning of this stage, the classes were divided into two groups, namely the control group and the experimental group, in order to have different treatments. Firstly, the subjects of the study (students in the control group and experimental groups) were given the same test as a pre-test. This test is used to determine the basic knowledge of the students' speaking performance.

Next, the students in the control group were treated to speaking without being asked to debate. The materials were focused on some topics, such as the fact that technology will become more sophisticated and ever-present in our world, and students who master technology will have more opportunity to get better jobs than those who do not. These materials were taught by the researcher in two meetings and allocated the same period of time for 45 minutes for each meeting.

On the other side, the researcher treated the students in an experimental group by using the debating technique. The materials were focused on the same topics as the students in the control group; those materials were taught by the researcher in two meetings and allocated the same period of time for 45 minutes for each meeting.

After presenting those materials, the students were given a post-test, and the score of the test was analyzed to find out the positive effect of debate on the students' speaking achievement. Analyzing The Deviation Score of Pre-Test and Post-Test

In analyzing of the data, the researcher firstly calculate the final score by using the following formula:

$$FS = \frac{P \times 100}{9}$$

Where:

FS = final score
P = students' individual score based on scoring system
100 = highest possible score for final score
9 = highest possible students' individual score

Second, it is continue to calculate in deviation scores of pre-test and post-test of the two groups of sample can be seen in the following tables.

Table 1 **Deviation score of the pre-test and the post-test for experimental group.**

No.	Pre-test	Post-test	FS pre	Fs post	dev	Dev^2
1.	5	6	55.56	66.67	11.11	123.46
2	4	5	44.44	56.56	11.11	123.46
3	3	5	33.33	55.56	22.22	493.83
4	2	4	22.22	44.44	22.22	493.83
5	3	6	33.33	66.67	33.33	1111.11
6	5	7	55.56	77.78	22.22	493.83
7	4	6	44.44	66.67	22.22	493.83
8	1	5	11.11	55.56	44.44	1975.31
9	4	7	44.44	77.78	33.33	1111.11

10	2	5	22.22	55.56	33.33	1111.11
11	2	5	22.22	55.56	33.33	1111.11
12	3	6	33.33	66.67	33.33	1111.11
13	2	3	22.22	33.33	11.11	123.46
14	3	4	33.33	44.44	11.11	123.46
15	1	3	11.11	33.33	22.22	493.83
16	2	4	22.22	44.44	22.22	493.83
Total					**388.85**	**10987.68**
Mean Score					**24.36**	**686.73**

The table above shows that the total of deviation final score (Ex) of experimental group is 388.85 and the total of deviation quadrate is 10987.68. So, the mean score of experimental group is 24.36

Table 2. The Deviation Score of pre-test and post-test of Control Group.

No.	Pre-test	Post-test	FS pre	Fs post	dev	Dev^2
1.	3	5	33.33	55.56	22.22	493.83
2	2	4	22.22	44.44	22.22	493.83
3	4	5	44.44	55.56	11.11	123.46
4	3	4	33.33	44.44	11.11	123.46
5	5	6	55.56	66.67	11.11	123.46
6	4	6	44.44	66.67	22.22	493.83
7	1	3	11.11	33.33	22.22	493.83
8	4	5	44.44	55.56	11.11	123.46
9	2	3	22.22	33.33	11.11	123.46
10	3	4	33.33	44.44	11.11	123.46
11	3	5	33.33	55.55	22.22	493.83
12	1	3	11.11	33.33	22.22	493.83
13	2	3	22.22	33.33	11.11	123.46
14	2	4	22.22	44.44	22.22	493.83
15	3	4	33.33	44.44	11.11	123.46
16	2	3	22.22	33.33	11.11	123.46
Total					**255.53**	**4567.95**
Mean Score					**15.96**	**285.50**

The table above shows that the total of derivation final score (XY) of control group is 255.53 and the total Deviation quadrate of control score is 4567.95. So, the mean score of control group is 15.96 After the deviation scores of the two groups of the sample have been obtained, the work is continued to the computation of means scores of the two groups. Computation and Interpretation of the Mean Score. As it is stated above that the mean score of each group is obtained by dividing the sum of the deviation scores with the number of sample in the group. So, the mean score of **experimental groups is:**

$$MX = \frac{\Sigma x}{N} \qquad \frac{388.85}{16}$$

$$\mathbf{= 24.36}$$

And the means score of **control group is:**

$$MY = \frac{\Sigma y}{N} \qquad \frac{255.53}{16}$$

$$\mathbf{= 15.96}$$

$$MX - MY = 24.36 - 15.96 = \mathbf{8.40}$$

So the range of mean score between experimental and the control group is **8.40.**

Since the two groups are evaluated using the same test then, what we can see from the mean score is that the greater the mean score obtained by certain group, the better their achievement is; or vice versa.

Comparing and Testing the Means Scores.

The most important in determining whether the experimental treatment is significance or not is by comparing the mean score and the testing the deviation of mean scores of the groups. Regarding this process stated previously, the following formula applied:

$$T = \frac{MX - MY}{\sqrt{\left(\dfrac{\Sigma X^2 + \Sigma Y^2}{Nx + Ny - 2} \right) \left(\dfrac{1}{Nx} + \dfrac{1}{Ny} \right)}}$$

Where:

$$\Sigma X^2 = \Sigma dx^2 - \frac{(\Sigma dx)^2}{Nx}$$

$$= 10987.68 - \frac{(388.85)^2}{16}$$

$$= 1537.40$$

$$\Sigma Y^2 = \Sigma dy^2 - \frac{(\Sigma dy)^2}{Ny}$$

$$= 4567.95 - \frac{(255.53)^2}{16}$$

$$= \mathbf{4869.8}$$

Where:

M	=	mean score of group
N	=	number of sample
X	=	deviation score of the experimental group
Σ	=	sum of

This figure is then, operated into the formula as follows:

$$t = \cfrac{24.36 - 15.96}{\sqrt{\left(\cfrac{1537.40 + 4869.8}{16 + 16 - 2}\right)\left(\cfrac{1}{16} + \cfrac{1}{16}\right)}}$$

$$= \cfrac{8.4}{\sqrt{\left(\cfrac{6407.2}{30}\right)\left(\cfrac{2}{16}\right)}}$$

$$= \cfrac{8.4}{\sqrt{(213.57)(0.125)}}$$

$$= \cfrac{8.4}{\sqrt{26.696}}$$

$$= \frac{8.4}{5.167}$$

$$t = 1.63$$

The student's ability in speaking English by the second year of MAN Dopu are different in ranges. The number of students who got of position in score and in their groups are shown in the following table.

Table 3. **The Number of Students in Various Positions in Their Group (Experimental Group)**

Predicates	Equivalence	Score ranges	Number of students	Percentage
Excellent	A	81 – 100	0	0 %
Very good	B	61 – 80	2	12.5 %
Good	C	41 – 60	9	56.25 %
Poor	D	21 – 40	5	31.25 %
Very poor	E	0 – 20	0	0 %
Total			**16**	**100 %**

The table above indicates that none of the students got excellent, 2 students (12.5%) got very good score, 9 students (56.25%) got good score, 5 students (31.25%) got poor and none of students got very poor scores.

Table 4. **The Number of Students in Various Positions in Their Group (Control Group)**

Predicates	Equivalence	Score ranges	Number of students	Percentage
Excellent	A	81 – 100	0	0 %

Very good	B	61 – 80	0	0 %
Good	C	41 – 60	6	37.5 %
Poor	D	21 – 40	10	62.5 %
Very poor	E	0 – 20	0	0 %
Total			**16**	**100 %**

The table above indicates that none of students got excellent and very good score, 6 students (37.5%) got good score, 10 students (62.5%) got poor and none of students got very poor scores.

4. DISCUSSION

Based on the results of the data analysis of the derivation scores of the pre-test and post-test, it is continued to compute and interpret the mean scores. Since the two groups are evaluated using the same test, what we can see from the mean score is that the greater the mean score obtained by a certain group, the better their achievement is, or vice versa. Interpreting the mean score of the groups, which is 15.96 for the control group and 24.36 for the experimental group, it appears that the speaking achievement of the experimental group is better than that of the control group, although this is only a temporary judgment.

Based on the data analysis above, it was found that the result of the t-test is higher than the t-table. This means the alternative hypothesis, which said that "debating has a positive effect on teaching speaking among the second-year students of MAN Dompu," is accepted. And the null hypothesis, which said, "Debating has no positive effect on teaching speaking among the second-year students of MAN Dompu," is rejected.

These facts lead the researcher to arrive at the conclusion of the study that debate in teaching speaking has a positive effect. It is also stated that the factors that may lead to the positive effect of debate in teaching speaking are as follows: Debating allows the students to speak more freely than in conventional discussions; in other words, the students are actively involved in communication activities. These factors enable the learners to use the language they have learned in nearly real-life situations; it seems that the students are more confident in speaking the target language; the students are more creative in their speaking activities; the teacher does not infer much from the students' communication activities. So the teacher has enough time to monitor the class activities. Hence, he or she could learn the individual performances to be used as feedback for his or her later teaching activities; anda the students can use the interactive activities in debating to measure their learning results. Hopefully, from here on, they will be more motivated to learn. Finally, there must be some other contributions to the effectiveness of debate in teaching speaking. The points above, in the researcher's eyes, are representative enough to ensure and support the use of debate in teaching speaking.

5. CONCLUSION

The statistical analysis of the obtained data resulted in figures of the mean score and the standard deviation of the two groups. Both the mean score and the standard of the experimental group show that the experimental group is more successful than the students in the control group. The derivation of the two mean scores is 24.36–15.96.

Based on the data analysis above, it was found that the result of the t-test is higher than the t-table of 1.63 > 1.328. This means the alternative hypothesis that "debating has a positive effect on the teaching speaking of the second-year students of MAN Dompu" is

accepted. And the null hypothesis, which said, "Debating has no positive effect on teaching speaking among the second-year students of MAN Dompu," is rejected. These facts lead the researcher to arrive at the conclusion of the study that debate in teaching speaking achievement is effective.

REFERENCES

Ahsanul (2023) Experimental Research Design-types & process https://www.researchgate.net/publication/201382131_Experimental_Research_Methods/link/004635266ef06ed3e6000000/download?_tp=eyJjb250ZXh0Ijp7ImZpcnN0UGFnZSI6InB1YmxpY2F0aW9uIiwicGFnZSI6InB1YmxpY2F0aW9uIn19

Colin Dawson 1984 Teaching English as a Foreign Language. https://www.abebooks.com/first-edition/Teaching-English-Foreign-Language-Colin-Dawson/30317847608/bd

Gary R. Morrison, 2014 Experimental research has had a long tradition in psychology and education.https://www.researchgate.net/publication/367044021_Experimental_Research_Designtypes_process/link/63bedc2a7ecd35045c3d5be8/download?_tp=eyJjb250ZXh0Ijp7ImZpcnN0UGFnZSI6InB1YmxpY2F0aW9uIiwicGFnZSI6InB1YmxpY2F0aW9uIn19

Harmer J. 1986. The *Practice of English Language Teaching.* England. Longman. https://www.academia.edu/29550207/How_to_Teach_English_2nd_Edition_Jeremy_Harmer

Heaton, J.B. 1975. *Writing* English *Language Test,* Singapore Long-man Group Limited.

Ismail, I. (2022). Motivational Orientation towards Learning English: The Case of Indonesian Undergraduate Students at University Utara Malaysia (UUM). *Journal of English Language Teaching and Literature (JELTL)*, *5*(2), 184–192. https://doi.org/10.47080/jeltl.v5i2.2188

Ismail, I., Suryaningsih, L., Taufik, T., & Marlina, L. (2022). Dompunese and Bimanese Common Idiom "Kalembo Ade": Morphological, Syntactical, and Semantic Analysis. *INTERACTION: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa*, *9*(2), 534-542. https://doi.org/10.36232/jurnalpendidikanbahasa.v9i2.3417

Ismail, I., Rusdin, R., Prayudi, A., & Taufik, T. (2023). Students' Perception on Game-Based Learning Using Technology: Kahoot! As a Case Study. *INTERACTION: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa*, *10*(2), 966-976. https://doi.org/10.36232/jurnalpendidikanbahasa.v10i2.5653

L.M. Sadiku, (2015). The Importance of Four Skills Reading, Speaking, Writing, Listening in a Lesson *Hour*. https://revistia.org/files/articles/ejls_v1_i1_15/Lorena_Manaj.pdf

Rabiah, 2012. Language as a tool for Communication and Cultural Reality Discloser https://*osf*.io/nw94m/download

R. Fasol, *2006*. An Introduction to Language and Linguistics. https://repository.bbg.ac.id/bitstream/531/1/An_Introduction_to_Language_and_Linguistics.pdf

Rusdin & Diana Purwati (2023). Speaking Up: A Comprehensive Investigation of EFL Secondary Students' Speaking *Skill* Problems in Indonesia's Islamic School Context. DOI: https://doi.org/10.31849/elsya.v5i2.11911

Rusdin (2022). The analysis of signposts words and phrases error in students' writing essay. DOI: https://doi.org/10.47080/jeltl.v5i2.2130