# Teacher-Student Consultation as an Oral Device to Improve Speaking Skill

## Sri Hastati[1], Badruddin Kaddas[2]

[1,2] Unversitas Islam Makassar

[1]hastati1802@gmail.com

## Abstract

This study shows how consultation improves students' speaking skills and how SD Inpres Bertingkat Mamajang 1 Kota Makassar third graders are interested in using it. The problem statements were 1) Does teacher-student consultation improve students' speaking skills? and 2) What are students' interests in using consultation? The research aimed to test the use of consultation as an oral device to improve students' speaking skills and describe their interest in it. Consultation was used to discuss learning difficulties and how to improve English, while the speaking test focused on accuracy in grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary; fluency in terms of no time spent researching further words; and comprehensibility in terms of students' ability to understand and be understood. The research used a pre-experimental method with one group pre-test and post-test and two data collectors: a speaking test and a questionnaire to assess students' speaking skills in pre- and post-tests and their interest in using consultation as an oral device. A Likert attitude scale was used to analyze speaking test and questionnaire data. The speaking test and questionnaire were taken from 30 third-grade A1 students at SD Inpres Bertingkat Mamajang 1 Kota Makassar in 2022/2023. The descriptive analysis showed that students' speaking accuracy improved from poor (2,6) to average (3,6) and fluency improved from average (16) to average (17) with mean scores 3,367. Students' speaking comprehensibility improved from poor (2,667) to average (3,467). Students' interest in consultation was high (mean score 79,175). Accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility T-test values were greater than T-table 1,70. It suggested consultation could improve students' speech. There was evidence that consultation improves students' speaking skills and that they are highly interested in it as an oral device.

**Keywords:** Teacher-Student Consultation, Oral Device, Speaking Skill

## Introduction

Learning to solve problems permanently enlarges the individual's capabilities because problem-solving activities, once learned, can be applied to other, similar situations. It is enough, therefore, to teach facts, concepts, and principles; problem-solving techniques should be taught in school. In solving the problems, the students naturally come into contact with language, but this contact happened because the students were actively involved in reaching solutions to tasks (Alm & Hedges, 2021; Nnamani et al., 2023).

Teacher students' consultation as an oral device to improve speaking skill can be introduced as a device in speaking class (Marko & Gounaili, 2021). Students need experiences in using the language in different situations and problems, most of the time they need other people to talk, share and solve their problems. It means that they communicate and use the language (Соколова et al., 2021).

Counselor consultation is an approach that facilitates the alignment of teaching methods with the learning styles of students. Additionally, it employs strategies to influence the entire campus through suggested-consulting, change-agent, and organizing development abilities. The active involvement and support of teachers are essential components of any program that entails students (Mäkelä et al., 2022). They surpass all other professionals within the educational environment. Having an almost daily conversation with the students and being in the best position to get to know them in order to develop a relationship founded on mutual respect and trust.

The consultation function, like the counseling function, is based on communication and human interaction. The relationship between the consultant and the consultee is basic. Acceptance, trust, and understanding are essential (Butt & Arshad, 2021).

As the language, English has four skills and some elements should be integrated to get better comprehension of the language (Ghafor, 2020; Ismailia & Binarkaheni, 2022). But in this proposal the researcher only focuses on speaking skill because it is one of the productive skills as the way to communicate with the other.

Based on the condition above, the researcher interested in solving the problems by using teacher students' consultation as an oral device to improve student's speaking skill in SD Inpres Bertingkat Mamajang I Kota Makassar. And at the end of this research we can know to what extent this method can give contribution to the learners' problem.

## Method

This chapter describes the method of the research design, variable, definition of operational variable, population (sample), instrument of the research, procedure of data collection, technique of data analysis. In this research, the writer applied pre-experimental method with one group pre-test and post test design (Creswell & Creswell, 2017; Purwanto et al., 2021). This design involved one group which is pre-tested, and exposed to the treatment and post-tested

The design is:

O1      X      O2

Where: O1      = Pretest

X      = Treatment

O2      = Posttest

1. The population of this research will be the third class of students in SD Inpres Bertingkat Mamajang 1 Kota Makassar.

2. Sample

The sample of the research will be taken by purposive sampling. The numbers of the sample will be 30 students, which are taken from class IIIA1 (Language class ).

There were three variables in this research, namely independent, dependent variable and intervening variable. The independent variable was teacher-students consultation and the dependent variable was the speaking skill of students on three components by using consultation. The three components were, first; accuracy in terms of grammar, pronunciation and vocabulary, second; fluency in terms no time spent for researching the word, third; comprehensibility, the ability to speak so that it is easier for the listener to understand the speakers' intention and general meaning. The intervening variable was the interest of students toward the use of consultation as an oral device in speaking.

To collect the data, the researcher will use the questionnaire and speaking test.

1. Speaking test

   The speaking test will be applied in the pretest and posttest and the tests were recorded.

2. Questionnaire

   The questionnaire was aimed to know the interest of student toward the use of consultation as an oral device. It was given at the last of the research or after treatment.

   The procedure of collecting data in this research describing as follows:

1. Pretest

   Before giving treatment, pretest was administered to the students. In this part the students were asked to talk about such a problem that they face. It is intended to know the prior knowledge of the students speaking skills.

   Tape recorder was used to record the student who talked about their problems.

2. Treatment

   During the treatment, the students were given a certain problem. They discussed and consulted the problems with the teacher/instructor. Beside that the teacher talked to them one by one, asked the problem relate to the topic. The treatment was conducted for five times.

   The treatment will be conducted with the following procedures:

   a. The students were divided into some groups
   b. The students were asked to discuss and consulted the problems
   c. The teacher controlled the groups and gave contribution.
   d. The students consult their problem, one by one with the teacher.

3. Posttest

   The posttest was given after doing the treatment. The content of the posttest was the same as the pretest. The aim of the posttest was to know the students' speaking development after giving the treatment.

   Tape recorder was used to record the student who talked about their problems.

   The data collected in this research were analyzed through quantitative analysis. The questionnaire, which distributed to the sample, provides the researcher with ordinal data that should be changed into the interval data. The Likert scale was used to transform the interval data. Meanwhile to get the speaking score, the researcher used scoring scale, which includes the accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility on the students speaking.

   To measure the ability of students' speaking on three components observed, the data will be tabulated by referring to the scoring system introduced as follows:

   Score 5            is classified as excellent
   Score 4            is classified as good
   Score 3            is classified as average
   Score 2            is classified as poor
   Score 1            is classified as very poor

   Below are the classification score, and criteria of the components above:

a. Accuracy

| Classification | Score | Criteria |
|---|---|---|
| Very good | 5 | Pronunciation is only very slightly influenced by the mother tongue. *Two or three minor grammatical and lexical errors.* |
| Good | 4 | Pronunciation is still moderately influenced by the mother tongue. *A few minor grammatical and lexical errors but most utterances are correct*. |

| Average | 3 | Pronunciation seriously influenced by the mother tongue but only a few serious phonological errors. *Several grammatical and lexical errors, two or more major error causing confusion.* |
| Poor | 2 | Pronunciation seriously influenced by the mother tongue with the errors causing a breakdown in communication. *Many 'basic' grammatical and lexical errors.* |
| Very poor | 1 | Serious pronunciation errors as well as many 'basic' grammatical and lexical errors. *No evidence of having mastered any of the language skills.* |

b. Fluency

| Classification | Score | Criteria |
|---|---|---|
| Very good | 5 | Speak without too great an effort with fairly wide range of expression. Searches for word occasionally but only one or two unnatural pauses. |
| Good | 4 | Has to make an effort at times to search for words. Nevertheless, smooth delivery on the whole and only a few unnatural pauses. |
| Average | 3 | He has to make an effort and search for words, there are not to many unnatural pauses, occasionally halting delivery and fragmentary but success in conveying the general meaning. |
| Poor | 2 | Long pauses while he searches for the desired meaning frequently fragmentary and halting delivery. Almost gives up making the effort at time. |
| Very poor | 1 | Full or long unnatural pauses, very halting and fragmentary delivery. At times gives up making the effort. |

c. Comprehensibility

| Classification | Score | Criteria |
|---|---|---|
| Very good | 5 | Easy for the listener to understand the speakers' intention and general meaning. Very few interruptions or clarification required. |
| Good | 4 | The speakers' intention and general meaning are fairly clear. A few interruptions by the listener for the sake of clarifications is necessary. |
| Average | 3 | Most of what the speaker says is easy to follow. The attention is always clear but several interruptions are necessary to help him to convey the message or to seek clarification. The speakers more complex or longer sentence. |
| Poor | 2 | Only short sentences and phrases can be understood and then with considerable effort by someone who is used to listening to the speaker. |

| Very Poor | 1 | Anything of what is said hardly can be understood, even when the listener makes a great effort or interrupt, the speaker is unable to clarify anything he seems to have said. |

(Heaton, 2021)

To find out the mean score of pretest and posttest, the researcher apply the following formula:

a. $\bar{X} = \dfrac{\sum X}{N}$

Where :

$\bar{X}$ = Mean score

$\sum X$ = The sum of all scores

$N$ = The number of subject

To find out the significant difference between pretest and posttest of students' speaking ability on consultation, the researcher will calculate the value with the t-test:

$$ t = \frac{\bar{D}}{\sqrt{\dfrac{\sum D^2 - \dfrac{(\sum D)^2}{N}}{N(N-1)}}} $$

Where :

t = The *t*-value for nonindependent (correlated) means

D = The difference between the paired scores

$\bar{D}$ = The mean of the difference

$\sum D^2$ = The sum of the squared difference scores

N = The number of pairs

## Result

The result of descriptive analysis of students speaking skill is clearly shown in appendix 3, which the summary of students' pretest and posttest speaking skill according to accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility is presented as following.

a. Accuracy

The result of data analysis from pretest and posttest of students' speaking skill according to accuracy showed that there were 30 students with the maximum score 4 and minimum score was 2, the mean score was 2,6 from the ideal score 5 and the standard deviation was 0,724. In contrary for posttest, the maximum score they got was 5 and minimum score was 3 and the mean score 3,6 with standard deviation was 0,621.

If this score variable was grouped according to Heaton classification, the distribution of score frequency is shown in the following table.

Table 1. The distribution of frequency and percentage score of students' pretest and posttest for speaking skill according to accuracy

| Score | Category | Pretest | | Posttest | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | F | % | F | % |
| 1 | Very poor | - | - | - | - |
| 2 | Poor | 16 | 53,3% | - | - |
| 3 | Average | 10 | 33,3% | 14 | 46,7 |
| 4 | Good | 4 | 13,3% | 14 | 46,7 |
| 5 | Very good | - | - | 2 | 6,7 |
| | **Total** | **30** | **100** | **30** | **100** |

Based on the table above, pretest shows that there were 16 (53,3%) out of 30 students classified into poor score, 10 (33,3%) out of them classified into average score, 4 (13,3%) out of them classified into good score and none of them classified into very good score. From that result, it can be concluded that students' speaking skill according to *accuracy* in *pretest was poor*.

The table above also shows the result of students' speaking skill according to accuracy in posttest. 14 (46,7%) out of them categorized as average, 14 (46,7%) out of them categorized as good, 2 (6,7%) out of them categorized as very good. The result can be concluded that the students' speaking skill according to *accuracy in posttest was categorized as average*.

  b. Fluency

The result of data analysis from pretest and posttest of students' speaking skill according to fluency showed that there were 30 students with the maximum score 4 and minimum score was 1, the mean score was 2,767 from the ideal score 5 and the standard deviation was 0,728. In contrary for posttest, the maximum score they got was 5 and minimum score was 1 and the mean score 3,367 with standard deviation was 0,718.

If this score variable was grouped according to Heaton classification, the distribution of score frequency is shown in the following table.

Table 2. The distribution of frequency and percentage score of students' pretest and posttest for speaking skill according to fluency.

| Score | Category | Pretest | | Posttest | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | F | % | F | % |
| 1 | Very poor | 1 | 3,3 | - | - |
| 2 | Poor | 9 | 30,0 | 2 | 6,7 |
| 3 | Average | 16 | 53,3 | 17 | 56,7 |
| 4 | Good | 4 | 13,3 | 9 | 30,0 |
| 5 | Very god | - | - | 2 | 6,7 |
| | **Total** | **30** | **100** | **30** | **100** |

Based on the table above, pretest shows that there were 1 (3,3%) out of 30 students classified into very poor score, 9 (30%) out of them classified into poor score, 16 (53,3%) out of them classified into average score, 4 (13,3%) out of them classified into good score, and none of them classified into very good score. From that result, it can be concluded that students' speaking skill according *to fluency in pretest was average.*

The table above also shows the result of students' speaking skill according to fluency in posttest. There were 2 (6,7%) are classified into very poor score, 17 (56,7%) out of them

classified into average, 9 (30,0%) out of them categorized as good, 2 (6,7%) out of them categorized as very good. The result can be concluded that the students' speaking skill according to fluency according to *fluency in posttest was categorized as average.*

   c.   Comprehensibility

The result data analysis from pretest and posttest of students' speaking skill according to comprehensibility showed that there were 30 students with the maximum score was 4 and minimum score was 1, the mean score was 2,667 from the ideal score 5 and the standard deviation 1,028. In contrary for posttest, the maximum score they got was 5 and minimum score was 2 and mean score 3,467 from the ideal score 5 with standard deviation was 0,900.

If this score variable is grouped according to Heaton's classification, the distribution of score frequency is shown in the following table.

Table 3.The distribution of frequency and percentage score of students' pretest and posttest for speaking skill according to comprehensibility

| Score | Category | Pretest | | Posttest | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | F | % | F | % |
| 1 | Very poor | 4 | 13,3 | - | - |
| 2 | Poor | 10 | 33,3 | 4 | 13,3 |
| 3 | Average | 8 | 26,7 | 12 | 40,0 |
| 4 | Good | 8 | 26,7 | 10 | 33,3 |
| 5 | Very god | - | - | 4 | 13,3 |
| | **Total** | **30** | **100** | **30** | **100** |

Based on the table above, pretest shows that there were 4 (13,3%) out of 30 students classified into very poor score, 10 (33,3%) out of them classified into poor score, 8 (26,7%) out of them classified into average score, 8 (26,7%) out of them classified into good score and none of them classified into very good score. From that result, it can be concluded that the students' speaking skill according to *comprehensibility in pretest was categorized as poor.*

The table above also shows the result of students' speaking skill according to comprehensibility in posttest. There was 4 (13,3%) out of 30 students categorized as very poor, 12 (40%) out of them categorized as average score, 10 (33,3%) out of them categorized as a good score, 4 (13,3%) out of them categorized as very good, and none of them categorized into very poor. The result can be concluded that the students' speaking skill according to *comprehensibility in posttest was categorized as average*.

   **2.   *The variable of the student's interest toward the use of consultation as an oral device***

The result of descriptive analysis of students' interest toward consultation as an oral device is completely shown in appendix 4. That result showed that there were 30 students with the maximum score was 90,20 and minimum score was 69,10, the mean score was 79,175 and the standard deviation 5,344.

If the score of students' interest variable above is grouped according to 'method of summated Rating', classified by Azwar (Nurhayati,2003), the distribution of score frequency will be shown in the following table.

Table 4. The distribution of frequency and percentage score of students' interest toward consultation as an oral device.

| Score | Category | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0,00 – 12,22 | Very Low | - | - |
| 12,23 – 32,18 | Low | - | - |
| 32,19 – 49,23 | Fair | - | - |

| 49,24 – 72,60 | High | 3 | 10 % |
| 72,61 – 86,68 | Very High | 27 | 90 % |
| | **Total** | **30** | **100** |

Based on the result of data analysis from students' interest toward the use of consultation as an oral device in increasing students' speaking skill showed that there was 3 (10 %) out of 3 students was classified as high category, 27 (90%) out of them was classified into very high category. So, it can be concluded that students' interest toward the use of consultation as an oral device was very high.

3. *Hypothesis Testing*

The result analysis on appendix 3 showed that T-value for accuracy is 9,33 > T-table = 1,70 and 2-tail sig = 0,00 <a 0,05. While T-value for fluency is 5,29 > T-table = 1,70 and 2-tail sig = 0,00 < a 0,05 and the last T-value for comprehensibility is 9,05 > T-table = 1,70 and 2-tail sig = 0,00 < a 0,05. Based those three components of speaking skill showed that $H^0$ was rejected and $H^1$ was accepted, it means there was a significance difference between pretest and posttest. So, it can be concluded consultation can increase students' speaking skill.

The descriptive analysis forward describes students' speaking skill according to accuracy was improved from the poor category become average category. It can be proved by showing the mean score of pretest was 2,6 minimum score was 2,00 and maximum score was 4,00 while mean score in posttest was 3,6 minimum score was 3,00 and maximum score was 5,00. And the result of students' speaking skill according to fluency also improved from average category become average category, although they were in the same category, there were students who got very good score, It was supported by the mean score in pretest was 2,767 become 3,367 in posttest, while the students' speaking skill according to comprehensibility improved from very poor category with mean score 2,667 become average with mean score 3,467.

The result of descriptive analysis of students' interest toward the use of consultation as an oral device was categorized very high with mean score 79,175, standard deviation was 5,344, minimum score was 69,10 and maximum score was 90,20. This empiric data can be input for English teacher particularly in teaching speaking skill that students have very high interest toward the use of consultation as an oral device.

The T-test was used to evaluate the research hypothesis shows that there were significance difference between the result of students' speaking skill which marked according to accuracy (9,33), fluency (5,29), and comprehensibility (9,05) in pretest and in posttest. It means, students' speaking skill increase after using consultation as an oral device.

## Discussion

The descriptive analysis forward describes students' speaking skill according to accuracy was improved from the poor category become average category. It can be proved by showing the mean score of pretest was 2,6 minimum score was 2,00 and maximum score was 4,00 while mean score in posttest was 3,6 minimum score was 3,00 and maximum score was 5,00. And the result of students' speaking skill according to fluency also improved from average category become average category, although they were in the same category, there were students who got very good score, It was supported by the mean score in pretest was 2,767 become 3,367 in posttest, while the students' speaking skill according to comprehensibility improved from very poor category with mean score 2,667 become average with mean score 3,467.

The result of descriptive analysis of students' interest toward the use of consultation as an oral device was categorized very high with mean score 79,175, standard deviation was 5,344, minimum score was 69,10 and maximum score was 90,20. This empiric data can be input for English teacher particularly in teaching speaking skill that students have very high interest toward the use of consultation as an oral device.

The T-test was used to evaluate the research hypothesis shows that there were significance difference between the result of students' speaking skill which marked according to accuracy (9,33), fluency (5,29), and comprehensibility (9,05) in pretest and in posttest. It means, students' speaking skill increase after using consultation as an oral device.

The results of this study have several important implications in the context of language learning, particularly in the teaching of speaking skills in schools. First, the significant improvements in students' speaking accuracy, fluency and comprehensibility show that consultation as an oral tool is effective in improving students' English speaking skills (Dalilan, 2022; Lestari & Asari, 2023; Yue, 2022). This provides evidence that the consultation method can be integrated into the English learning curriculum to improve students' speaking competence.

Secondly, students' very high interest in the use of consultation as an oral tool shows that this method can motivate students in language learning. This is important because student motivation and interest are often key factors in the success of the teaching and learning process (Özge & Dursun, 2021). Therefore, English teachers can utilize consultation as a way to increase students' engagement and interest in lessons (Nadiia, 2023; Putri, 2021).

Thirdly, the T-test results showing a significant difference in students' speaking skills before and after the implementation of consultation indicate that this method has a measurable positive impact. This provides a basis for educators to apply consultation more frequently in learning, particularly in teaching speaking skills (Hassan et al., 2021; Jalolova, 2023).

Overall, the findings of this study support the use of consultation method as an effective tool in language learning, which not only improves students' speaking skills but also arouses their interest and motivation in learning.

## Conclusion

Based on the findings and discussion in this study, it can be concluded that the use of consultation can improve the speaking skills of third grade A1 students. This is evidenced by the significant difference between the three components of speaking skills, namely accuracy, fluency, and understandability, in the pretest and posttest scores. In addition, third grade A1 students showed high interest in the use of consultation as an oral aid to improve their speaking skills. The findings indicate that consultation as an interaction-based learning method can be an effective approach in education, particularly in developing students' oral communication skills. The high interest of students towards this method also indicates that consultation can be an interesting and motivational tool for them to learn more actively and engage in the learning process. Thus, the use of consultation can be considered as a potential strategy in improving the effectiveness of teaching speaking skills, while enriching students' learning experience in the classroom.

Based on the data analysis and conclusions obtained, the researcher provides several suggestions. First, it is recommended that teachers use consultation as an oral aid in teaching speaking skills. Second, although the use of consultation as an oral aid is proven to be effective in improving students' speaking skills, there is a challenge in that students often feel shy to consult with teachers, including in their native language. Therefore, it is very important for

teachers and students to build a close and trusting relationship like the relationship between parents and children. Third, for future research, it is suggested to examine the effectiveness of using consultation in the English Department, where the use of English is part of their daily lives. This research is expected to provide further insights into the benefits of consultation in different contexts.

## Acknowledgment

## References

Alm, C. O., & Hedges, A. (2021). Visualizing NLP in Undergraduate Students' Learning about Natural Language. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, *35*(17). https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v35i17.17822

Butt, A. K., & Arshad, T. (2021). The relationship between basic psychological needs and phubbing: Fear of missing out as the mediator. *PsyCh Journal*, *10*(6). https://doi.org/10.1002/pchj.483

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. SAGE Publications.

Dalilan, D. (2022). Online Teaching of English for Librarians: Students' Perception of the Use of Voice Note and Its Contribution to Their English Speaking. *JAMI: Jurnal Ahli Muda Indonesia*, *3*(2). https://doi.org/10.46510/jami.v3i2.121

Ghafor, O. F. (2020). Exploring the perceptions of Kurdish EFL university students towards culture as the fifth language skill. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *7*(1). https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v7i1.15813

Hassan, I., Zamzam, I. A. M., Azmi, M. N. L., & Abdullah, A. T. H. (2021). Development of English Speaking Skills Through Task-Based Learning Among Primary School Students in Malaysia. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *11*(11). https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1111.20

Ismailia, T., & Binarkaheni, S. (2022). Implementing a Video Project for Assessing Students' Speaking Skills: A Case Study in a Non-English Department Context. *Journal of English in Academic and Professional Communication*, *8*(1). https://doi.org/10.25047/jeapco.v8i1.3878

Jalolova, S. (2023). Basic Approaches of Teaching Integrated Skills. *IJAEDU- International E-Journal of Advances in Education*. https://doi.org/10.18768/ijaedu.1290672

Lestari, L. H., & Asari, S. (2023). Investigating Students' Motivation in Learning Speaking through Online Learning. *Journal of Digital Learning and Distance Education*, *1*(9). https://doi.org/10.56778/jdlde.v1i9.75

Mäkelä, T., Fenyvesi, K., Kankaanranta, M., Pnevmatikos, D., & Christodoulou, P. (2022). Co-designing a pedagogical framework and principles for a hybrid STEM learning environment design. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *70*(4). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-022-10114-y

Marko, E., & Gounaili, K. (2021). Focusing on Eye Contact: Interpersonal Communication among Students at Eastern Mediterranean University. *Polis*, *20*(1). https://doi.org/10.58944/wjhe2682

Nadiia, V. (2023). Using Ted Talks in Teaching English for Specific Purposes at University Level. *Bulletin of Alfred Nobel University Series "Pedagogy and Psychology»*, *1*(25). https://doi.org/10.32342/2522-4115-2023-1-25-1

Nnamani, O., Hadebe-Ndlovu, B. N., Okeke, C. I., & Ede, M. O. (2023). Effect of Jigsaw and Team Pair-Solo cooperative learning strategies on interest in Basic Science of primary school children with visual impairment. *Psychology in the Schools*, *60*(7), 2430–2446. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22866

Özge, S. M., & Dursun, F. (2021). Why can't we do it as teachers: English language teaching from the perspectives of secondary school teachers. *Research in Pedagogy*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.5937/istrped2101063m

Purwanto, A., Asbari, M., Santoso, T. I., Sunarsi, D., Ilham, D., & Purwanto, A. (2021). *Education Research Quantitative Analysis for Little Respondents: Comparing of Lisrel, Tetrad, GSCA, Amos, SmartPLS, WarpPLS, and SPSS* (SSRN Scholarly Paper ID 3937210; Issue ID 3937210). Social Science Research Network. https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3937210

Putri, M. I. (2021). Fluctuations in willingness to communicate of an EFL lecturer: An observation study in Indonesia. *EnJourMe (English Journal of Merdeka): Culture, Language, and Teaching of English*, *6*(2). https://doi.org/10.26905/enjourme.v6i2.5983

Yue, Q. (2022). Construction of English-Assisted Teaching Mode Based on Multimedia Technique in Network Environment. *Wireless Communications and Mobile Computing*, *2022*. https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/8960104

Соколова, А., Khuchbarova, D. M., & Radyuk, A. (2021). Sociocultural aspects of international students' speech behavior: Mixed method in language teaching. *E3S Web of Conferences*, *284*. https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202128408008

--- This page is intentionally blank---