

**EXPLORING SPEECH FUNCTION IN LEARNERS'  
INTERACTION IN EFL SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL  
CLASSROOM GROUP WORK**

**An Undergraduate Thesis**

**Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the completion of the  
Degree of *Sarjana Pendidikan* (S.Pd) in English Language Education**



**By:**

**Linda Cynthia Sipayung**

**1901271**

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM  
FACULTY OF LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE EDUCATION  
UNIVERSITAS PENDIDIKAN INDONESIA**

**2023**

**EXPLORING SPEECH FUNCTION IN LEARNERS' INTERACTION IN  
EFL SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL CLASSROOM GROUP WORK**

Oleh  
Linda Cynthia Sipayung

Sebuah skripsi diajukan sebagai salah satu syarat untuk memperoleh gelar  
Sarjana Pendidikan pada Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Fakultas  
Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra

© Linda Cynthia Sipayung  
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia  
Agustus 2023

Hak Cipta dilindungi undang-undang  
Skripsi ini tidak boleh diperbanyak seluruhnya atau sebagiannya, dengan diketik  
ulang, fotokopi atau cara lainnya tanpa izin dari penulis.

**PAGE OF APPROVAL**

“EXPLORING SPEECH FUNCTION IN LEARNERS’ INTERACTION IN EFL  
SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL CLASSROOM GROUP WORK”

An Undergraduate Thesis

By

Linda Cynthia Sipayung

Approved by:

Supervisor



Dr. Lulu Laela Amalia S.S., M.Pd.

NIP. 197504092007102001

Head of English Language Education Study Program

Faculty of Language and Literature Education

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia



Prof. Emi Emilia, M.Ed., Ph.D.

NIP. 196609161990012001

## STATEMENT OF AUTHORIZATIONS

I, Linda Cynthia Sipayung, state that this paper entitled “exploring speech function in learners’ interaction in EFL senior high school classroom group work” is my own work. I am aware that I have cited a couple of some statements and theories from a number of sources to support my thesis by following the science ethics. If there is any violation regarding my thesis, I am willing to bear the risk.

Bandung, August 2023



Linda Cynthia Sipayung

## PREFACE

The current study is submitted as a part of the partial fulfilment of the requirements for Sarjana Pendidikan degree. This paper focuses on the speech functions in learners-learners' interactions. The purposes of the current study were to explore the speech function utilized by the students as well as the challenges and strategies they encountered. One of public senior high school in Bandung was chosen as the research site in this study. 12 students were participated in the current study. Moreover, case study research design is employed to obtain an-depth understanding of the speech functions in students' interaction as well as the challenges and strategies they encounter. There are three observation sessions and two interview sessions to obtain the data. After that, the data are thematically analysed.

I hope the current give benefit to English language teaching field. Moreover, I also hope the current study contribute to enrich existing literature and give valuable input to teacher education. Furthermore, there may be some mistakes in this study. Therefore, any constructive feedback and comments are appreciated.

Bandung, August 2023



Linda Cynthia Sipayung

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, I would like to express my gratitude to Jesus Christ, my Lord and Savior, whose unwavering love has made it possible for me to complete this undergraduate thesis. I certainly went through ups and downs while working on my thesis, but with His love and support, I am able to get through it all.

I would like to thank my supervisor, Ibu Dr. Lulu Laela Amalia S.S., M.Pd. who has guided me patiently for all these times. Thank you for the feedback, advice, and support in conducting and writing this undergraduate thesis. I am very grateful to have such a great supervisor.

I would like to thank my academic adviser Bapak Drs. Deddy Suryana, M.A. who had helped me during the study time. Thank you for your assistance, advice and moral value that you shared for these four years.

I would like to thank all the lectures and staff of English education study program who had taught during the study time. Thank you for the academic and moral lessons that were imparted.

I would like to express my gratitude to my family. Thank you for always there for me whenever I had ups and downs in my academic time. Thank you for supporting me for my every decisions I have made. Thank you for convincing that I could finish my study whenever it seemed too difficult for me. Again, thank you for being such a supportive family.

I would like to thank my friends who always supported in writing this undergraduate thesis. Thank you for Wilma, Sarah and Aghniya who always helped me in the academic life and always support me to everything I do. Thank you for Rahel, Rima and Noel who convinced me I could do all of the difficult things in my life. Thank you for Nabila, Izzat, Haniya who helped me in the academic life and always support me whenever it seemed difficult for me. Thank you for all of my friends who always there for me in my ups and downs.

## ABSTRACT

Students' interaction is regarded as important in language learning. Therefore, speech function can be used to explore the interaction of learners' groupwork. Speech function is a function which determines the speaker role within the commodity exchanged in a verbal interaction or conversation. Thus, the present study aims to explore types of speech functions and mood learners use in group work interaction and the challenges and strategies that students encounter to perform speech function in group work interaction. The present study is based on Halliday (2014) speech function framework. Moreover, the present study employs case study research design. The participants in this study are twelve students from senior high school class in which were divided into two groups; higher English level group and lower English level group. To obtain the data, this study utilized observation and focus group interview. The data from observation is used to find the speech functions that students used. The data from interview is used to gain the challenges and strategies that students encountered. The results showed that students in high English level performed 12 speech functions. In contrast, students in low English level performed 10 speech functions. Therefore, majority of the speech functions were realized congruently. Furthermore, the result shows that the two groups performed the initiation speech function more than the responding speech functions. Majority of the participants encounter inhibition and not know what to say as the challenges. Thus, there are several strategies they perform in the interactions. The strategies were helping someone when they had to demand someone. Another strategy found were strengthened their ideas when they had fearful of critics. They use tools for translation whenever they encountered not know what to say. For further study, it is suggested to involve variety of respondents characteristics in the study. By involving the variety of respondents characteristics, the data will get richer and more reliable.

**Keywords:** *Groupwork interaction, speech function, student-student interaction.*

## ABSTRAK

Interaksi siswa dianggap penting dalam pembelajaran bahasa. Oleh karena itu, fungsi tuturan dapat digunakan untuk mengeksplorasi interaksi peserta didik di dalam kerja kelompok. Fungsi tuturan adalah fungsi yang menentukan peranan penutur dalam komoditi yang dipertukarkan dalam suatu interaksi verbal atau percakapan. Oleh karena itu, penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengeksplorasi jenis fungsi tuturan dan *mood* yang digunakan pelajar dalam interaksi di dalam kerja kelompok serta tantangan dan strategi yang dihadapi peserta didik untuk melakukan fungsi tuturan dalam interaksi di dalam kerja kelompok. Penelitian ini didasarkan pada kerangka fungsi tuturan Halliday (2014). Selain itu, penelitian ini menggunakan desain penelitian studi kasus. Partisipan dalam penelitian ini adalah dua belas siswa SMA yang dibagi menjadi dua kelompok; kelompok tingkat bahasa Inggris tinggi dan kelompok tingkat bahasa Inggris rendah. Untuk memperoleh data, penelitian ini menggunakan observasi dan *focus group interview*. Data dari observasi digunakan untuk menemukan fungsi bicara yang digunakan siswa. Data dari wawancara digunakan untuk mengetahui tantangan dan strategi yang dihadapi siswa. Hasilnya menunjukkan bahwa siswa dengan tingkat bahasa Inggris tinggi melakukan 12 fungsi tuturan. Sebaliknya, siswa dengan tingkat bahasa Inggris rendah melakukan 10 fungsi tuturan. Oleh karena itu, sebagian besar fungsi tuturan diwujudkan secara kongruen. Lebih lanjut, hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa kedua kelompok lebih banyak melakukan fungsi tuturan inisiasi dibandingkan fungsi tuturan respons. Mayoritas peserta membatasi diri dan tidak tahu harus berkata apa sebagai tantangannya. Oleh karena itu, ada beberapa strategi yang mereka lakukan dalam berinteraksi. Strateginya adalah membantu seseorang ketika mereka harus memerintahkan seseorang. Strategi lain yang ditemukan adalah memperkuat ide-ide mereka ketika mereka merasa takut terhadap kritik. Mereka

menggunakan alat penerjemah setiap kali mereka tidak tahu harus berkata apa. Untuk penelitian lebih lanjut, disarankan untuk melibatkan berbagai karakteristik responden dalam penelitian. Dengan melibatkan keragaman karakteristik responden, data akan menjadi lebih kaya.

**Kata kunci:** fungsi tuturan, interaksi dalam kerja kelompok, interaksi siswa-siswa.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE OF APPROVAL .....	i
STATEMENT OF AUTHORIZATIONS .....	ii
PREFACE .....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT .....	iv
ABSTRACT .....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	vii
LIST OF TABLES .....	ix
LIST OF FIGURES .....	xi
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 Background of the Study .....	1
1.2 Research Questions .....	3
1.3 Research Objectives .....	4
1.4 The Scope of the Study .....	4
1.5 The Significance of the Study .....	4
1.6 Clarification of Terms .....	4
CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW .....	6
2.1 Systemic Functional Grammar (SFL) .....	6
2.2 Interpersonal Meaning .....	7
2.3 Speech Function .....	7
2.4 Speech Function Realization in Mood .....	11
2.5 Classroom Interaction .....	15
2.6 Types of Classroom Interactions .....	16
2.7 Learner-learner Interaction .....	18
2.8 Group work .....	19
2.9 Review of Related Studies .....	20
CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....	22
3.1 Research Design .....	22
3.2 Research Site and Participants .....	23
3.3 Data Collection .....	25
3.4 Data Analysis .....	27

CHAPTER IV FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION .....	30
4.1 Finding.....	30
4.1.1 Types of Speech Function Students Use in Group Work Interaction...	30
4.1.2 The challenges and strategies students faced in the interaction.....	42
4.2 Discussion .....	47
4.2.1 Types of Speech Function Students Use in Group Work Interaction...	47
4.1.2 The challenges and strategies students faced in the interaction.....	68
CHAPTER V CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION .....	72
5.1 Conclusions. ....	72
5.2 Implication of the Study .....	73
5.3 Limitations of the Study .....	73
5.4 Suggestions.....	73
REFERENCES.....	75
APPENDICES .....	84
APPENDIX A .....	85
APPENDIX B.....	103

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1. Example of exchanging goods and services .....	8
Table 2.2 Giving or demanding, goods and services or information of basic speech function.....	8
Table 2. 3 Initiation speech function and responding speech function .....	10
Table 2.4 Example of Congruent Realization, Metaphorical Realization and Minor Clause.....	15
Table 3.1 The participants involved in the study .....	25
Table 4.1 The number of speech function of the high English level group and low English level group .....	30
Table 4.2 The distribution of the High English Level Group and Low English Level Group .....	31
Table 4.3 The distribution of offer speech function.....	31
Table 4.4 The distribution of command speech function.....	32
Table 4.5 The distribution of statement speech function .....	32
Table 4.6 The distribution of question speech function.....	32
Table 4.7 The distribution of acceptance speech function.....	33
Table 4.8 The distribution of compliance speech function.....	33
Table 4.9 The distribution of acknowledgement speech function .....	34
Table 4.10 The distribution of answer speech function .....	34
Table 4.11 The distribution of rejection speech function. ....	35
Table 4.12 The distribution of refusal speech function.....	35
Table 4.13 The distribution of contradiction speech function .....	35
Table 4.14 The distribution of disclaimer speech function.....	36
Table 4.15 The distribution of mood realization of speech function .....	36
Table 4.16 The distribution of mood types and speech function realization in offer speech function.....	37
Table 4.17 The distribution of mood types and speech function realization in command speech function.....	37
Table 4.18 The distribution of mood types and speech function realization in statement speech function .....	38
Table 4.19 The distribution of mood types and speech function realization in	

question speech function .....	38
Table 4.20 The distribution of mood types and speech function realization in acceptance speech function .....	39
Table 4.21 The distribution of mood types and speech function realization in compliance speech function .....	39
Table 4.22 The distribution of mood types and speech function realization in acknowledgement speech function .....	40
Table 4.23 The distribution of mood types and speech function realization in answer speech function .....	40
Table 4.24 The distribution of mood types and speech function realization in rejection speech function.....	41
Table 4.25 The distribution of mood types and speech function realization in refusal speech function.....	41
Table 4.26 The distribution of mood types and speech function realization in contradiction speech function .....	42
Table 4.27 The distribution of mood types and speech function realization in disclaimer speech function.....	42

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1 The semantic system.....	9
Figure 2.2 Realization of speech functions .....	12
Figure 2.3 Diagram of Mood types .....	12
Figure 2.4 Interaction of teacher and students .....	17
Figure 2.5 Interaction among learners .....	17

## REFERENCES

- Agirdag, O., & Vanlaar, G. (2016). Does more exposure to the language of instruction lead to higher academic achievement? A cross-national examination. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 22(1), 123–137. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006916658711>
- Alfares, N. (2017). Benefits and difficulties of learning in group work in EFL classes in Saudi Arabia. *English Language Teaching*, 10(7), 247. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n7p247>
- Al-smadi, O. A., & Rashid, R. A. (2017). A theoretical review of classroom discourse. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education And Development*, 6(3), 164–173. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v6-i3/3169>
- Al-Zoubi, S. M. (2018). The impact of exposure to English language on language acquisition. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 5(4), 151–162. <http://jallr.com/index.php/JALLR/article/download/851/pdf851>
- Andriani, N. (2018). An analysis of speech function on the cigarette's advertisement. *Journal MELT*, 3(2), 190–200.
- Arumdani, R., & Rosalina, U. (2022). Speech functions of teacher talk in classroom interaction in politeknik harapan bersama tegal. *Teaching English as a Foreign Language Journal*, 1(1), 1–44. <https://doi.org/10.58660/edutrack.v1i1.37>
- Basra, S. M., & Thoyyibah, L. (2017). A speech act analysis of teacher talk in an efl classroom. *International Journal of Education*, 10(1), 73.

- Batubara, M. H. (2020). An analysis of speech functions on the banking and daily need billboard texts. *International Journal of Humanity Studies*, 4(1), 110–121.
- Bing, O. B., Mustofa, A., & Anam, S. (2022). Language exposure and Indonesian secondary students' language accuracy. *ELTLT*.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Brown, H. Douglas. (2001). *Teaching by Principle and Interactive Approach to language pedagogy*. New York: Longman Inc.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education*. (5th Edition). Routledge Falmer: London.
- Coulthard, M. (1983). *An introduction to discourse analysis*. England: Longman.
- Creswell, J. W. (2002). *Educational research. Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. London: Pearson Education.
- Creswell, J. W. (2011). *Educational research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. New Jersey: Pearson Education International.
- Damayanti, W. N., & Sujatna, M. L. (2022). Speech function in the “Moxie” movie sociolinguistics study. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute Journal*, 5(3), 18877–18882.
- De Wilde, V., Brysbaert, M., & Eyckmans, J. (2020). Learning English through out-of-school exposure: which levels of language proficiency are attained

- and which types of input are important?. *Bilingualism-language and cognition*, 23(1), 171–185. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1366728918001062>
- Denscombe, M. (2007). “Critical incidents and learning about risks: The case of young people and their health” In M. Hammersley (ed) *Educational Research and Evidence-based Practice* (204-219). London: Sage and The Open University.
- Eggs, S. (1994). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics*. London: Pinter Publisher.
- Eggs, S., & Slade, D. (1997). *Analyzing casual conversation*. London: Cassell.
- Emilia, E. (2014). *Introducing functional grammar*. Bandung: Pustaka Jaya.
- Fahmi, R. N., & Rustono. (2018). Types of speech acts in Indonesian debate argumentative discourse. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 7(1), 28–37.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Language and power: Relasi bahasa, kekuasaan dan ideologi*. Malang: Boyan Publishing.
- Fikri, F., Dewi, D., & Ni, N. (2014). Mood structure analysis of teacher talk in EFL classroom: A discourse study based on systemic functional linguistic theory. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Indonesia*, 20(3), 1–22.
- Garrett, P., & Shorttall, T (2002). Learners’ evaluation of teacher-fronted and student-centered classroom activities. *Language Teaching Research*, 25-27
- Gay, L., Mills, G. and Airasian, P. (2012) *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications*. 10th Edition, Pearson, Toronto.
- Gibson, J. W., & Brown A. (2009). *Working with qualitative data*. London: Sage.



- Goronga, Pedzisai. 2013. The nature and quality of classroom verbal interaction: Implication for primary school teachers in Zimbabwe. *Savap Journal*,4(2),
- Hadiningrum, I. (2020). Speech functions realized by the first speakers of an English debate competition. *J-Lalite: Journal of English Studies*, 1(1), 53–67. <http://jos.unsoed.ac.id/index.php/jes>
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar*.(2<sup>nd</sup> Edition). London: Edward Arnold
- Halliday, M. A. K. (2002). What do you mean? In J. Webster (Ed.), *On grammar: Volume 1 in the Collected Works of M.A.K. Halliday* (pp. 352-368). London, New York: Continuum
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar*. (3rd ed.). USA: Oxford University Press Inc.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar* (4th ed.). Oxon: Routledge.
- Harmer, Jeremy. (2003). *How to teach English*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited
- Hitchcock, G. & Hughes, D. (1996). Research and the teachers: A qualitative introduction to school-based research. *British Journal of Educational Studies* 44 (3):347-348.
- Johansson, Rolf (2003). Key note speech at the international conference "Methodologies in Housing Research," Royal Institute of Technology in cooperation with the International Association of People–Environment Studies, Stockholm, September 22-24, 2003

- Lohman, M. C., & Finkelstein, M. (2000). Designing groups in problem-based learning to promote problem-solving skill and self-directedness. *Instructional Science*, 28, 291-307
- Maalamah, A. T. (1991). *Classroom interaction*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Mack, N., Woodsong, C., MacQueen, K., Guest, G. and Namey, E. (2005) qualitative research methods: a data collector's field guide. Family Health International (FHI): USA.
- Mackey, A. (2007). The role of conversational interaction in second language acquisition. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational Interaction in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 1-26). Oxford: Oxford University Press
- MacMillan, J.H. and Schumacher, S. (2001). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction*. (5th Edition). Longman: Boston.
- Mahendra, Y. B. C., & Zulham, F. (2017). The analysis of speech functions used by an ELESP lecturer in English for young learner class. *ELTR Journal*, 1(1), 44–53.
- Masykuri, E. S., Widodo, S., & Perez, M. (2020). Understanding personal intention by elaborating speech function using social media international WhatsApp group. *EAI*, 578–587.
- McCrorie P (2006). *Association for the study of medical education: Teaching and leading small groups*. Edinburgh
- McDonough, K. (2004). Learner-learner interaction during pair and small group activities in a Thai EFL context. *System*, 32(2), 207–224.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2004.01.003>

- McLean, M., Van Wyk, J., Peters-Futre, E. M., & Higgins-Opitz, S. B. (2006). The small group in problem-based learning: more than a cognitive 'learning' experience for first-year medical students in a diverse population. *Medical Teacher*, 28(4), e94–e103. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01421590600726987>
- Mohajan, H. (2018). Qualitative research methodology in social sciences and related subjects. *Journal of Economic Development, Environment and People*, 7(1), pp. 23-48
- Moust, J., Roebertsen, H., Savelberg, H., & De Rijk, A. (2005). Revitalising PBL Groups: Evaluating PBL with Study Teams. *Education for Health*, 18(1), 62–73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13576280500042705>
- Naegle, P. (2002). *The new teacher's complete sourcebook*. USA: Scholastic Professional Book.
- Nastri, J., Peña, J. E., & Hancock, J. T. (2006). The construction of away messages: A speech act analysis. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 11(4), 1025–1045.
- Nunan, David. (1992). *Research methods in language learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Oktadistio, F., Aziz, M., & Zahrida. (2018). An analysis of direct and indirect speech acts performed by main character in the movie revenant script. *Journal of English Education and Teaching*, 2(1), 59–67. <https://doi.org/10.33369/jeet.2.1.59-67>
- Oliveira, L. C. (2015). Using Systemic-Functional Linguistic Analysis to Explain Expectations of Academic Discourse. In *Teaching U.S.-Educated*

- Multilingual Writers (1st edition, pp. 108–131). University of Michigan press.
- Pambudi, B. D., Sutopo, D., & Bharati, D. a. L. (2022). The construction of interpersonal meaning realized in a conversation between EFL students. *English Education Journal*, 12(1), 27–37.
- Richards, J. C. (2008). Second language teacher education today. *RELC Journal*, 39, 158-177. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0033688208092182>
- Rivers, W. M. (1987). *Interaction as the key to teaching language for communication in interactive language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sadeghi, K., & Richards, J. C. (2015). Teaching spoken English in Iran’s private language schools: issues and options. *English Teaching*, 14(2), 210–234. <https://doi.org/10.1108/etpc-03-2015-0019>
- Salas, M. R. (2005). Grouping techniques in on EFL classroom. *Actualidades Investigativas En Educación*, 5(3). <https://doi.org/10.15517/aie.v5i3.9167>
- Saragih, A. (2014). *Discourse analysis. A systemic functional approach to the analysis of texts*. Faculty of Languages and Arts. The State University of Medan.
- Saragih, A., & Saragih, M. (2021). *Discourse Analysis: (A Study On Discourse Based On Systemic Functional Linguistic Theory)*. Umsu press.
- Scrivener, J. (2005). *Learning teaching*. Oxford: MacMillan.
- Sharp, J. H., & Huett, J. B. (2006). Importance of learner-learner interaction in distance education. *Information System Education Journal*, 4(46), 1–10.

- Sheppard, V. (2022). *Research methods for the social sciences: An introduction*. In Pressbook (3rd ed.). Retrieved July 20, 2023, from <https://pressbooks.bccampus.ca/jibcresearchmethods/#main>
- Siddig, B. E., & Alkhouday, Y. A. (2018b). Investigating classroom interaction: teacher and learner participation. *English Language Teaching*, 11(12), 86. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v11n12p86>
- Sulistyowati, T. (2012). The speech functions in the conversations between the fourth semester English department students of Muria Kudus University and some foreigners. *English Education Journal*, 1(1). Retrieved from <https://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/eej/article/view/149>
- Sunardi, S., Tarjana, M. S. S., Poedjosoedarmo, S., & Santosa, R. (2018). Interpersonal realizations of pedagogic discourse in Indonesian EFL classrooms. *International Journal of Language Teaching and Education*, 2(3), 205–215. <https://doi.org/10.22437/ijolte.v2i3.5678>
- Taridi, M., Fitria, W., Supriusman, & Deska, R. (2022). Speech function in teaching speaking skill: Evaluation, analysis, and recommendation. *English Language Teaching and Research Journal*, 7(2), 349–362.
- Tuan, L. T. & Nhu. (2010). Theoretical review on oral interaction in EFL classrooms. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 1(4), 29-48.
- Ur, P. (1996) *A course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy, and authenticity*. London: Longman.

- Walton, H. (1997). Small group methods in medical teaching, *Medical Education*, 31, pp. 459–464
- Webster, J. J. (2019). Key Terms in the SFL Model. In G. Thompson, W. L. Bowcher, & L. Fontaine (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Systemic Functional Linguistics* (1st ed., pp. 35-54; By D. Schönthal). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wiyanto, M. S. (2020). Using speech function on EFL classroom. *Journal of English Teaching Research*, 5(2), 143–148.
- Yin, R. K. (2011). *Qualitative research from start to finish*. New York: Guilford
- Yuliana, Suhartini, L., & Rohmana. (2019). The analysis of speech function used by English teachers at SMAN 5 Kendari. *Journal of Teaching of English*, 4(2), 219–225.