DISCOURSE MARKERS FUNCTION IN ORAL FICTION REPORT

Arlez Restika[1], Galang Kesatria Tama[2]
English Literature[1]
English Education[2]

Restika.arlez@gmail.com

Abstract

This research was designed to analyze the functions of discourse markers produced by student in book report presentation. Further, it is also to analyze and describe the function of each discourse marker uttered by student and dig up the most frequently use of discourse markers made by student in oral book report.

Qualitative method is applied in this research because this type of research is based on data expressed mostly in the form of words rather than on number. The writer collected the data from the transcription as the data source which is taken from oral book report in speaking six class. Analyzing the data, the writer employs Brinton's and Alami's theory covering two types of function; they are textual and interpersonal function.

The result of this analysis showed that usage of discourse markers helps the speaker to organize the presentation structurally so that the audiences or listeners will get the subject matters of the presentation. Further, discourse markers also can establish and maintenance the relationship between speaker and listeners.

Key words: discourse markers, textual and interpersonal function, oral book report.

INTRODUCTION

To link words or sentences is what discourse marker functions (Kuswoyo et al., 2020), (Rido et al., 2017), (Eklesia & Rido, 2020), (Al Falaq & Puspita, 2021), (Puspita & Pranoto, 2021). Further, discourse markers also indicate a speaker's attitude to what speaker is saying (Ismail, 2012:2), (Puspaningtyas & Ulfa, 2021), (Muliyah et al., 2020), (WING, n.d.). Written (Mandasari, n.d.) or spoken (Wahyudin, 2017), (Aminatun, 2016) text is where the discourse markers appear from.

Discourse markers play an important role both in oral and written form to help the listener or reader understand what speaker or writer means (Rido & Sari, 2018), (Ivana & Suprayogi, 2020), (Kuswoyo & Rido, 2019), (Evayani & Rido, 2019), (Rido, 2015). Discourse refers to pieces of language larger than a sentence that function together to convey a given idea or information (Amelia & Daud, 2020), (Sinaga & Oktaviani, 2020), (Gulö & Nainggolan, 2021), (Handayani & Aminatun, 2020), (Oktaviani et al., 2020). The linguistic devices that are used to hang the pieces of language or expression together are called discourse markers (Sharndama and Yakubu, 2013). They are used in conversation and writing to show or link the ideas or information in a given context. Swan (2005) defines discourse markers as "a word or expression which shows the connection between what is being said and the wider context". In other word, they assist the listeners to understand the relationship between what is being said is connected to what has been already said and also to indicate the speaker means.

In accordance to Brinton (1996) discourse markers are grammatically optional and semantically empty but they are not pragmatically optional or superfluous, instead they serve a variety of pragmatic function (Hutauruk & Puspita, 2020). She defines ten functions of discourse markers that she groups into two categories, such as textual and interpersonal functions.

Producing well-organized sentences is the goal of every student who learn English as their second language and discourse markers usage is able to make the speech (Azijah, 2020), conversation, or even writing to be more well-organized and understandable. Moreover, students do not speak in their mother tongue. Thus, the subject of this research will be one of the students of STBA Teknokrat 2016 who is categorized as the highest level of speaking class. In this level, the students should be able to deliver a presentation with a good structure. They should deliver it by using proper grammar (Mandasari & Wahyudin, 2021), (Kuswoyo & Susardi, 2016), (Kuswoyo, 2016), well-organized sentences, and also clear and understandable for example by using proper discourse markers. Because they are already taught about grammar and how to deliver a presentation well since they were in the first level. One class consists of 25 students and they should present oral fiction report in front of class.

Regarding background of study, the writer formulate problem formulation such as what are the functions of discourse markers uttered by a student in oral fiction report. The objective of this research is to analyze and describe the function of each discourse marker uttered by a student and dig up the most frequently use of discourse markers by a student in oral fiction report.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Discourse analysis is sometimes defined as the analysis of language beyond the sentences (Mandasari, n.d.), (Gulö, 2019). Zellig Harris an American linguist who first used the term of discourse in 1952 to refer to the analysis of connected speech or writing (Kardiansyah, n.d.), (Sukerti & Yuliantini, 2018), (Putri & Aminatun, 2021), (Suprayogi & Novanti, 2021), (Mulyasari & Putri, 2020).
Connected discourse occurs within a particular situation – whether of a person speaking (Mandasari & Aminatun, 2020a), (Mandasari & Aminatun, 2020b), (Yulianti & Sulistyawati, n.d.), (Oktaviani, n.d.), or of a conversation, or of someone sitting down occasionally over the period of months to write a particular literary or scientific tradition. (Harris, 1952 as cited by Meyerhoff, 2012:2).
Thus, according to Harris (1952) as cited by Meyerhoff (2012:2) there are typical ways of using language in particular situations. He argued that not only share particular meaning, they also have characteristic linguistic features associated with them. What these meanings are and how they are realized in language is of central interest to the area of discourse analysis.

Discourse Markers: Definition, Characteristics, Types, and Functions

Linguistic devices that are used to hang the pieces of language or expression together are called discourse markers (Afrianto & Inayati, 2016), (Aminatun et al., 2019). They are used in spoken or written text to show the relationship between ideas or information in a given context and it can be in form of word or phrase. Examples of discourse markers

include words like *so, right, moreover, um, oh*, etc. The use of discourse markers creates a naturalistic conversational effect and help the hearers in understanding what speaker says.

Discourse markers, according to Lenk, are:
Short lexical items, used with a pragmatic meaning on a multilingual level of discourse in order to signal for the hearer how the speaker intends the present contribution to be related to preceding and/or following parts of the discourse (Lenk, 1997:4 as cited by Fritz, 2007:4).

It means that discourse marker is one of crucial parts in communication in order to make the hearers understand the preceding and following information given by speaker. Discourse markers also help the speaker how to signal the information to the hearer, so that speaker and hearer have the same understanding.

Brinton proposes the definition of discourse markers as phonologically short items that have no or little referential meaning but serve pragmatic or procedural purpose (Brinton, 1996 as cited by Alami, 2015). Therefore, discourse markers helps the listeners to interpret what speaker says. She also proposes the characteristics of discourse markers, such as:

a. Discourse markers are predominantly a feature of oral rather than of written discourse. It becomes one of the most perceptually salient feature of oral style and their occurrence in a discourse as a sufficient condition as impromptu.
b. Discourse markers appear with high frequency in oral discourse, sometimes with more than one occurring in a single sentence
c. Discourse markers are short and phonologically reduced items.
d. Discourse markers may occur sentence initially, sentence medially and finally as well.
e. Discourse markers are considered to have little or no prepositional meaning or at least to be difficult to specify lexically.
f. Discourse markers may occur outside the syntactic structure or loosely attached to it, they have no clear grammatical function.

They seem to be optional rather than obligatory features. Yule notes discourse markers represent optional cues which writers or speakers may use in organizing what they want to communicate (1983: 106 as cited by Brinton 1996: 34). Their absence does not render a sentence ungrammatical and/or unintelligible but does remove a powerful clue (Fraser, 1998: 22 as cited by Brinton, 1996: 34).

Dealing with the lecture discourse, Chaudron and Richards (1986) as cited by Fortuno (2006) define the type of discourse markers into two such as micro markers (lower-order discourse markers) and macro markers (higher-order discourse markers). Micro markers are used as links to signal the internal or ideational relations within sentences so the relations of one clause to another clause or one sentence to another sentence are easier to comprehend (Rido, 2010:2). Further, they function as fillers and they fill pauses giving listeners more time to process individual segments of a piece of discourse. Meanwhile macro markers are essentially used to signal the transition the moves from one phase of a lecture to another phase, to indicate a shifting of one topic to another topic, and to organize the lecture structurally so that students are clear about the subject matters (Rido, 2010:2).

Discourse markers have a number of different functions depending on the context. For example, it is used to signal the relationship of an utterance to the immediate context with

the primary function to draw the listener's attention to a transition or a break in conversational routine.

In addition, Brinton presents an inventory of ten functions which she group into two main categories. First, textual function which is related to the way the speaker structures meaning as text, creating cohesive passage of discourse, using language in a way that is relevant to the context (Brinton, 1996:35-40 as cited by Alami, 2015:6). And second, interpersonal function which refers to the nature of the social exchange, that is, the role of the speaker and the role assigned to the hearer (Brinton, 1996:35-40 as cited by Alami, 2015:6).

In textual function, Brinton divided it into six functions. They are:
1. Opening frame marker is to initiate discourse, including the attention of the hearer.
2. Closing frame marker is to close the discourse.
3. Turn-taker is to aid the speaker in acquiring or relinquishing the floor.
4. Filler is to serve as a filler or delaying tactic used to sustain discourse or hold the floor.
5. Topic switch is to indicate a new topic or partial shift in topic.
6. Information indicator to donate either new or old information.
7. Sequence / relevance marker is to mark sequential dependence.
8. Repair markers is to repair one's or others' discourse.

Interpersonal function deals with the addressor and addressee role, that is, the social exchange. Brinton divided interpersonal function into two, such as:
1. Subjectivity to express a response or reaction to the preceding discourse including also back-channel signals of understanding and continued attention while another speaker is having his/her turn.

Interpersonally to achieve intimacy between speaker and addressee. Further, it function to effect cooperation or sharing, including confirming shared assumptions, checking or expressing understanding, requesting confirmation, expressing difference or saving face (politeness).

METHOD

This research is be conducted by applying qualitative method. It is because this type of research is based on data expressed mostly in the form of words rather than on number (William, 2011:130). The writer collected the data from the transcription of the oral book report presentation. There is only one presentation recording and it was taken from one of the students of speaking class. This student is categorized as an active student in the campus and won some awards in some competitions especially in the field of literature. Analyzing the data, the writer employs Brinton's and Alami's theory covering two types of functions; they are textual and interpersonal function.The data source of this research was the transcription which was taken from oral book report in speaking six class. And the data of this research were in forms of words and phrases.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Regarding the problem formulation, the writer found textual and interpersonal functions in the oral fiction report done by student of STBA Teknokrat 2016. Textual functions of discourse markers are more related to the contraction of the discourse coherence. While the interpersonal functions of discourse markers are precisely more related to the reactions, responses, and relations built by the participants during the interaction, that is, the role of

the speaker and hearer during the social and communicative exchange. Take a look the data analysis and see the function of each discourse markers uttered by student in oral fiction report.

Line	Participants	Utterances
1	S	Assalamualaikum warohmatullahi wabarohaktu/
2	A	Waalikumsalam warohmatullahi wabarokatu/
3 4 5 6	S	**Okay↓**. **Before we go further about**. **u:m** my book report, entitled the authentic story of Pinocchio of Tuscany by Carlo Collo- +Collodi, **maybe** I wanna ask one of you. **Maybe** miss Dena.. **u:m.**

Datum 1

For instance, *okay*, in line three is used by speaker in order to initiate the discourse and to attract the attention from the hearer. This marker is used intentionally in order to persuade the audience to take a part in this presentation. Then, *before we go further about* is used as the starter of the discourse. Further, the speaker used a couple of fillers such as *u:m* in line three and six as delaying tactic to hold the floor. Those markers occurred unintentionally. In line three, the speaker tried to remember about the title of book report. While the speaker recall the memory about it, the speaker deliberately uttered *u;m* marker. And it also happened in line 6. The speaker tried to think about the question that will be asked to the audience. Marker *maybe* in line five included into interpersonal function which is used to check the understanding of the audience about the topic will be discussed. While *maybe* in line six functions as turn taker, in which the speaker gives the chance to audience to tell something about Pinocchio story before the speaker discussed further about it.

Datum 11

Line	Participants	Utterances
65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74	S	**okay↑**, **and the next** (( )) physical description in this -- in this book, the author of this book is Carlo Collodi, **and then** the title is the authentic story of Pinocchio of Tuscany↑. **and then** the year two thousand, publisher Jerry Cross and Pauline Bondonno Cross, Italy. **And then** this book contains of one hundred forty three pages, **and** the genre is fantasy, because **u:m** the writer -- after the – af- +after read this book, **especially**. Pinocchio itself is fantasy

Marks *okay* with rising intonation in line 65 function as the starter of discourse. This marker is used to get the attention from the audience and also to check whether the

audience still pay attention to the speaker or not. It means that this marker is used intentionally by the speaker. To begin the new information marker *and the next* is used. *And then* in line 67, 68, 70 and *and* markers in line 71 are used to signal the continuity information and as the additional information from the discourse. The speaker also used *because* to show causal marker. In which, based on the speaker's understanding after reading the book, the speaker conclude that it has fantasy genre. Thus, *because* marks is used to signal the reason from the speaker.

In this part, the speaker used the same discourse markers during the presentation. It is *and then* marker which is used frequently by the speaker and it makes the way the speaker talked unnaturally and quite boring. The speaker seems like confusing in using discourse markers, so the speaker just repeat the same discourse markers in order to connect between one clause to another clause and one sentence to another sentence. After doing this analysis, the writer conclude that the student still confuses in using the proper discourse marker. As the result, there is repetition markers in student presentation. Thus, the writer hopes that this can be a consideration for the lecturer to be more aware toward the discourse markers used by student and consider the discourse markers as one of the crucial parts in communication. Because the discourse markers usage will influence the way the speaker in delivering the presentation.

Datum 24

Line	Participants	Utterances
249 250 251 252 253 254 255 256 257 258	S	**In conclusion**, Pinocchio was one of fiction story, which WRITTEN with the purpose **or** sociali- socialai- +socializing children to meet {NS} definite normative, expectation at home **and** in the society/ **So** moral – moral lesson, we can get from Pinocchio story, do not tell lie, **and** about the lasting love, {NS} **because** it is – **u:m** -- do not to lie, it is. not good, **and** it will only lead you to some serious problem/

Discourse markers also are found in datum 24. First, there is discourse markers *in conclusion*. It is included into macro markers that can help the audiences' recall and retention the presentation. *Or* in line 250 and *and* marker in 252 marker function as the connector between the clauses. *Or* is used to connect the clause *Pinocchio was one of fiction story, which written with the purpose expectation at home and in the society* to the next clause *socializing children to meet definite normative* to indicate why this fiction book is written.

After talking about the purpose why this fiction book is written, the speaker delivered about moral message that the readers will get after read this fiction book. To initiate the discourse, the speaker used *so* marks. *Because* in line 255 is used as the indication of reason relation. it can be seen from these clauses, *moral lesson, we can get from Pinocchio story, do not tell lie, and about the lasting love, **because** it is – u:m -- do not to lie, it is not good, and it will only lead you to some serious problem.* This book teaches the readers to tell the truth whatever the condition is. There will be bad consequence coming to us, for example in this story 7, whenever Pinocchio is telling lie, his nose will grow abnormally.

Datum 25

Line	Participants	Utterances
259	S	**So**, I have. one quotation from pinocchio, "a lie keeps
260		GROWING AND GROWING, **until**. it is↑ as PLAIN.
261		as the NOSE. on your FACE/
262		**Thank you very much for your nice attention**,
263		wasalamualaikum warohmatullahi wabarokatu/

After delivering the oral book report in front of the class, the speaker should sum up the presentation. The speaker gave the conclusion by illustrating it through the quotation. That quotation illustrates the moral message from Pinocchio's story. To indicate the conclusion, the speaker used *so* marker in line 259. The speaker helped the audiences easier to conclude what a speaker delivered previously. This marker was uttered intentionally in order to make the audiences always remember about moral message that can be taken from this story. While until marker functions as the connector between the first clause of message *a lie keeps GROWING AND GROWING* to following clause *it is↑ as PLAIN. as the NOSE. on your FACE.* Then, the speaker closed the presentation by using discourse marker *Thank you very much for your nice attention.* It was delivered in order to say thank you to the audience for paying attention and participate in during the presentation of oral book report.

CONCLUSION

After analyzing the data by applying the theory from Brinton and referring to the findings that have been elaborated in chapter four about discourse markers made by student in oral fiction report, the writer concluded following:

1. There are two kinds of discourse marker functions uttered by a student in oral fiction report in six D class of 2016. They are textual and interpersonal function. Textual functions are used by speaker in order to link the discourse, structure meaning as text, create a cohesive passage of discourse, and to make the language relevant to the context, so that the sentences will look more organized and easy to understand. Based on Brinton's theory, textual function is divided into eight categories. They are opening frame marker, closing frame marker, turn-taker, filler, topic switch, information indicator, sequence marker, and repair markers. After doing the analysis, the writer found sequence markers becomes the most frequently use of discourse markers by student in oral fiction report. It is used to marks sequential dependence and also to link among the clauses. The result of the analysis showed that sequence markers occurred for 53 times, filler 43 times, information indicator 28 times, repair markers 14 times, opening frame markers 13 times, closing frame marker 10 times, topic switch 9 times, and the least is turn taker only occurred in one time.

2. In contrary, interpersonal function seldom occurs in oral fiction report made by student. These markers are used by speaker as the respond or checking the understanding of the audiences toward the topic. It just occurred 7 times in oral fiction report. It is because this presentation only reporting the result of reviewing fiction novel to convey the findings. The speaker only focus on giving the explanation section during the oral fiction report. In which, the speaker tells or delivers to the audiences about material dealing with some points in a short amount of time. There are two markers which indicates audience's respond and two markers

from speaker. 3 other markers are used by speaker to check the audiences' understanding and asking the agreement from the audiences toward the topic given.

3. Based on the types of discourse markers, micro and macro marker, the most frequently use of discourse markers is micro marker. In which, this markers are used to indicate link between sentences within the presentation, so that the relations of one clause to another clause or one sentence to another sentence are easier to understand. And it occurred 126 times during oral fiction presentation. While for macro markers only occurred 32 times. The purpose of using these markers are to initiate or starter the discourse, as the refresher, or even as meta-statement or to emphasize the important information uttered by speaker. These markers also functions to end the discourse.

Based on the analysis, the researcher also concludes that one marker has more than one functions. It depends on what condition and context of the sentence that speaker uttered. The use of discourse markers also is very useful and helpful for the audiences or listeners in comprehending the presentation, because discourse markers usage helps the speaker to organize the presentation structurally so that the audiences or listeners are clear about the subject matters. Further, discourse markers also can establish and maintenance the relationship between speaker and listeners. They are used as the respond, reaction, or even relation built by the participants during talk in interaction.

On the other hand, the writer concludes that sometimes a student seems like confusing in using the discourse markers in the presentation. As the result, a student only uses the same discourse markers to connect the clause or sentence or even to indicate something in the discourse. Finally, it influences the way the speaker in delivering the presentation and the nature of discourse markers. Thus, the writer also suggests to the lecture to be more aware toward the discourse markers uttered by student and consider it as the crucial part in delivering the presentation in the class.

REFERENCES

Husaini, U. (2013). *Manajemen: Teori, Praktik, dan Riset Pendidikan.* Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Long, M., et.al. (2011). *The Psychology of Education (2nd Edition)*. Oxon: Routledge Falmer.

Santrock, J.W. (2011). *Educational Psychology (5th Edition).* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Afrianto, A., & Inayati, A. (2016). Existential process in Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secret: A systemic functional linguistic study. *Teknosastik*, *14*(1), 26–31.

Al Falaq, J. S., & Puspita, D. (2021). CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS: REVEALING MASCULINITY THROUGH L-MEN ADVERTISEMENT. *Linguistics and Literature Journal*, *2*(1), 62–68.

Amelia, D., & Daud, J. (2020). FREUDIAN TRIPARTITE ON DETECTIVE FICTION: THE TOKYO ZODIAC MURDERS. *Language Literacy: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Language Teaching*, *4*(2), 299–305.

Aminatun, D. (2016). *Eye movements and lexical access in spoken-language comprehension: Evaluating a linking hypothesis between fixations and linguistic processing*. UNS (Sebelas Maret University).

Aminatun, D., Ngadiso, N., & Marmanto, S. (2019). Applying PLEASE strategy to teach writing skill on students with different linguistic intelligence. *Teknosastik*, *16*(1), 34–40.

Azijah, D. P. (2020). *INTERPERSONAL METADISCOURSE MARKERS IN JACINDA ARDERN'S SPEECH AT CHRISTCHURCH MEMORIAL*. Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia.

Eklesia, G., & Rido, A. (2020). Representation of People with HIV/AIDS in The Jakarta Post and Jakarta Globe: A Critical Discourse Analysis. *TEKNOSASTIK*, *18*(2), 120–133.

Evayani, W., & Rido, A. (2019). Representation of Social Actors in Sexual Violence Issue in The New York Times and The Jakarta Post Newspapers: A Critical Discourse Analysis. *Teknosastik*, *17*(2), 43–55.

Gulö, I. (2019). Predicates of Indonesian and English Simple Sentences. *Teknosastik*, *15*(2), 76–80.

Gulö, I., & Nainggolan, T. (2021). The Functions of Nias Personal Pronouns. *The 1st International Conference on Language Linguistic Literature and Education (ICLLLE)*.

Handayani, E. T., & Aminatun, D. (2020). STUDENTS'POINT OF VIEW ON THE USE OF WHATSAPP GROUP TO ELEVATE WRITING ABILITY. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, *1*(2), 31–37.

Hutauruk, M., & Puspita, D. (2020). A METAPRAGMATIC ANALYSIS: A STUDY OF PRAGMATIC FAILURE FOUND IN INDONESIAN EFL STUDENTS. *Linguistics and Literature Journal*, *1*(2), 62–69.

Ivana, P. S. I., & Suprayogi, S. (2020). THE REPRESENTATION OF IRAN AND UNITED STATES IN DONALD TRUMP'S SPEECH: A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS. *Linguistics and Literature Journal*, *1*(2), 40–45.

Kardiansyah, M. Y. (n.d.). *ENHANCING DESCRIPTIVE PARAGRAPH WRITING OF SECONDARY STUDENTS THROUGH SHARED WRITING*.

Kuswoyo, H. (2016). Thematic structure in Barack Obama's press conference: A systemic functional grammar study. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, *7*(2), 257–267.

Kuswoyo, H., & Rido, A. (2019). Process types of transitivity system in engineering lecture introduction: A pedagogic discourse. *Lingua: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*, *19*(2), 85–96.

Kuswoyo, H., Sujatna, E. T. S., Indrayani, L. M., & Rido, A. (2020). Cohesive Conjunctions and and so as Discourse Strategies in English

Native and Non-Native Engineering Lecturers: A Corpus-Based Study. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 29(7), 2322–2335.

Kuswoyo, H., & Susardi, S. (2016). Thematic progression in EFL students' academic writings: A systemic functional grammar study. *Teknosastik*, *14*(2), 39–45.

Mandasari, B. (n.d.). AN ANALYSIS OF ERRORS IN STUDENTS'WRITTEN ENGLISH SENTENCES: A CASE STUDY ON INDONESIAN EFL LEARNERS. *16 November 2019, Bandar Lampung, Indonesia I*.

Mandasari, B., & Aminatun, D. (2020a). IMPROVING STUDENTS'SPEAKING PERFORMANCE THROUGH VLOG. *English Education: Journal of English Teaching and Research*, 5(2), 136–142.

Mandasari, B., & Aminatun, D. (2020b). VLOG: A TOOL TO IMPROVE STUDENTS'' ENGLISH SPEAKING ABILITY AT UNIVERSITY LEVEL. *PROCEEDINGS UNIVERSITAS PAMULANG*, *1*(1).

Mandasari, B., & Wahyudin, A. Y. (2021). Flipped Classroom Learning Model: Implementation and Its Impact on EFL Learners' Satisfaction on Grammar Class. *Ethical Lingua: Journal of Language Teaching and Literature*, *8*(1), 150–158.

Muliyah, P., Rekha, A., & Aminatun, D. (2020). Learning from Mistakes: Students' Perception towards Teacher's Attitude in Writing Correction. *Lexeme: Journal of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics*, *2*(1), 44–52.

Mulyasari, F., & Putri, S. N. (2020). THE IMPACT OF WHATSAPP GROUP ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS'' WRITING IN THE INDONESIAN TERTIARY CONTEXT. *PROCEEDINGS UNIVERSITAS PAMULANG*, *1*(1).

Oktaviani, L. (n.d.). ETHNIC SNAKE GAME: A STUDY ON THE USE OF MULTIMEDIA IN SPEAKING CLASS FOR ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING STUDENTS. *Section Editors*.

Oktaviani, L., Mandasari, B., & Maharani, R. A. (2020). IMPLEMENTING POWTOON TO IMPROVE STUDENTS'INTERNATIONAL CULTURE UNDERSTANDING IN ENGLISH CLASS. *Journal of Research on Language Education*, *1*(1).

Puspaningtyas, N. D., & Ulfa, M. (2021). Students' Attitudes towards the Use of Animated Video in Blended Learning. *The 1st International Conference on Language Linguistic Literature and Education (ICLLLE)*.

Puspita, D., & Pranoto, B. E. (2021). The attitude of Japanese newspapers in narrating disaster events: Appraisal in critical discourse study. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *8*(2), 796–817.

Putri, N., & Aminatun, D. (2021). USING FACEBOOK TO PRACTICE

WRITING SKILL: WHAT DO THE STUDENTS THINK? *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 2(1), 45–50.

Rido, A. (2015). The use of discourse markers as an interactive feature in science lecture discourse in L2 setting. *Teflin Journal*, 21(1), 90–106.

Rido, A., & Sari, F. M. (2018). Characteristics of classroom interaction of English language teachers in Indonesia and Malaysia. *International Journal of Language Education*, 2(1), 40–50.

Rido, A., Sari, F. M., Suri, R. A. M., & Duantoro, H. (2017). Discourse Structure of Lecture in L2 in the Indonesian Tertiary Context. *Proceedings of ISELT FBS Universitas Negeri Padang*, 5, 11–20.

Sinaga, R. R. F., & Oktaviani, L. (2020). The Implementation of Fun Fishing to Teach Speaking for Elementary School Students. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 1(1), 1–6.

Sukerti, G. N. A., & Yuliantini, N. (2018). Learning autonomy in writing class: Implementation of project-based learning in english for spesific purposes. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 953(1), 12101.

Suprayogi, S., & Novanti, E. A. (2021). EFL Learner's Literary Competence Mapping through Reader-Response Writing Assessed using CCEA GCSE Mark Scheme. *Celt: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching & Literature*, 21(1), 1.

Wahyudin, A. Y. (2017). The effect of project-based learning on L2 spoken performance of undergraduate students in English for business class. *Proceedings of the Ninth*.

WING, L. A. S. O. F. F. (n.d.). *IMPLEMENTASI KENDALI LQR UNTUK PENGENDALIAN SIKAP LONGITUDINAL PESAWAT FLYING WING*.

Yulianti, T., & Sulistyawati, A. (n.d.). ENHANCING PUBLIC SPEAKING ABILITY THROUGH FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION. *JURNAL PAJAR (Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran)*, 5(2), 287–295.