



SNAP TO READ

## AN ANALYSIS OF THE LINGUISTIC COMPETENCE OF MORPHOLOGY TEACHING ON YOUTUBE VIDEO SERIES

Lailatul Maya, Ratna Dewanti, Muchlas Suseno

*Departement of Master Program in English Language Education*

*Universitas Negeri Jakarta*

*lailatulmaya\_1212821039@mhs.unj.ac.id, rdewanti@unj.ac.id, muchlas-suseno@unj.ac.id*

First received: January 3, 2023

Final proof received: June 1, 2023

### **Abstract:**

*Linguistic competence has had a significant influence on English language teaching. Linguistic competence is largely concerned with a notion shared by language teachers and learners when using language knowledge in real performance. English teachers are expected to have this competency. The present study aimed to examine linguistic competence in morphology teaching, which was demonstrated by an English teacher. The morphology teaching was sourced from a series of YouTube videos which were broadcast by a teacher on a Youtube channel. This study was carried out by analyzing the linguistic competence of the teacher in each video by analogizing the teacher's knowledge with the theory from the linguistics book written by some experts. The selected books which were used to analyze were: "How English Works, A Linguistic Introduction" (Curzan & Adams, 2012); "Linguistics, An Introduction" (Radford et al., 2009); and "Contemporary Linguistic Analysis, An Introduction" (O'Grady & Archibald, 2016). The study's findings revealed that the teacher had sufficient linguistic competence while delivering the course. The findings also assisted in recognizing that linguistic competence is a significant part of the analysis in terms of how a teacher may remain competent while providing the course. In short, linguistics is considered valuable because it may increase teacher's awareness of*

*language, making the teacher more competent and, hence, a better language teacher.*

**Keywords:** *linguistic competence, morphology teaching, video series*

## INTRODUCTION

Language is a form of expression as well as a technique of communication. In terms of communication, many people agree that language merely serves as a tool for expressing ideas, expressing emotions, and so on (Syarif, 2016). As emphasized by Martínez del Castillo (2013) that people lead language: it is surmised, constructed, enacted, expressed, utilized, and appraised by people. Whatever language are employed and the way they are delivered, as long as people get the message and comprehend it, that is acceptable. It is necessary for others to see how a language is organized in order to grasp it. Others look at how a language is organized from words to paragraphs. They focus on clauses and phrases. They are concerned with the linguistic system, or how a language works. This second viewpoint considers language as a science, notably linguistics. From the advancement of language science, these two sides have emerged in language teaching as a result of the evolution of language learning.

Meanwhile, English is one of the most learned languages because of its widespread use and popularity (Liu & Biao, 2021). The demand for studying this language is growing fast, and thousands of teachers are specializing in the English language every day to suit the demands of such a large population. Every day, hundreds up to thousands of teachers may graduate with a wealth of experience and expertise to take over the world of English language learners and make them “language-expert.” However, in order to generate more refined teaching materials for language learners and make them “language-expert,” teachers must have a good understanding of linguistics, otherwise have linguistic competence.

Linguistic competence is defined as grammar and vocabulary expertise (Kharchenko et al., 2021). Further, Martinez del Castillo (2016) designates linguistic competence as “the ability of speakers to communicate”. In language teaching, linguistic competence is related with three components: cohesiveness and consistency, lexicon (vocabulary resource), reinforced by grammatical rules, and accurateness (Chathamkulam Abdulrahman & Abu-Ayyash, 2019; Varpe, 2013).

From those definitions, it can be interpreted that linguistics is the study of languages, and as such, it is crucial for language teachers. Linguistics assists teachers in communicating the origins of words and languages, as well as their historical uses and present significance. Linguistics confirms and proves that language is a tool for communication, one of the most significant, fundamental, and distinctive conditions for societal progress and success (Shaykhislamov & Makhmudov, 2020). It also assists the learner in developing creative thinking, thinking in the mother tongue and the uniqueness of the mother tongue’s structure, and being fundamentally different from other languages. This method to language education, when combined, allows learners to develop a deeper, more in-depth grasp of their assignments and work product objectives (McQuerry, 2018).

In addition, Chomsky conveys the method he proposes for studying linguistics; linguists examine, analyze, and interpret (Finch, 2003). It means that linguistics and science can be distinguished by the empirical technique of investigation. Thus, teacher should have linguistic competence while teaching language. To be linguistically competent is to have the ability to produce and understand an endless number of words, including those that are novel and foreign to the speaker. At the same time, people could realize that certain expressions did not belong in their language (O’Grady & Archibald, 2016). Later, Chomsky portrayed that linguistic competence can be considered as a

linguistic knowledge system. It differs from a linguistic performance in that it focuses on the way the language system is employed in communication (Chathamkulam Abdulrahman & Abu-Ayyash, 2019). Therefore, linguistic competence is largely concerned with a notion shared by a speaker and a listener when using language knowledge in real performance.

Linguistics must be totally implanted in English teachers since they function as correspondents, school teachers, and assessors when on duty. They also work as educated people and are pioneers in building a sense of negotiating skills for their learners (Lucas et al., 2008). It is to say that teachers must improve their conversational ability in order to communicate with learners from a variety of backgrounds. They must be their own communication designers in order for teachers to understand how to structure information and transmit it to learners. The linguistic output should be deliberately and clearly constructed so that learners comprehend and communicate successfully both in and out of class. Thus, linguistics is extremely vital for teachers to impart since the manner of instruction is continually changing.

Knowing the fact that nowadays, classrooms are becoming increasingly diverse, especially in international classrooms, with more learners of various ethnic origins and, most crucially, different languages. This implies that teachers will have to deal with a great number of learners whose first language is not English. Moreover, a greater understanding of linguistics can help teachers see that the speech forms they respect are traits of their own culture and background (Fillmore & Snow, 2000). They are not more general nor more effective in any way than other feasible speech styles.

If teachers do not understand the cultural differences, they will believe that there is something wrong with the learners' methods of using language, and the teachers may not expect the learners to use the language in this manner totally, resulting in more difficult challenges.

If teachers are unable to recognize the success of other modes of communication, their learners' self-esteem in their own abilities to communicate may suffer.

A variety of studies have investigated the diverse applications of teaching methods to enhance linguistic competence in the context of online language learning (Ernest et al., 2013; Gruba, 2004), learn foreign languages (Golonka et al., 2014; Jeong, 2017; Quintana-Lara, 2014; Shield & Kukulska-Hulme, 2006), learn and interact in CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) settings for continuous learning (Pařternak et al., 2016; Smythe & Neufeld, 2010). Most studies focus on learners' use of technology for promoting the development of their linguistic competence, but rarely on teachers' capability to portray their own competencies and techniques in linguistic teaching. As a result, more specific studies of linguistic competence being employed as a type of teaching in practice are required.

Linguists investigate linguistic competence by concentrating on the mental mechanism that allows people to make and understand the sounds, words, and sentences of their language. (O'Grady & Archibald, 2016). This framework, known as a grammar by linguists, consists of the components shown in the following table.

Table 1. The components of grammar

Component	Description
Phonetics	how sounds in language are produced and understood
Phonology	how sounds in language are structured
Morphology	how words and phrases are formed
Syntax	how sentences are developed
Semantics	word meanings and sentence comprehension

Source: (O'Grady & Archibald, 2016)

As can be seen, the term grammar is employed in linguistics in a unique way. The focus of a grammar is on correcting errors in sentence and word construction. Instead, it is the intricate system of information that allows us to speak with one another. Learning grammar is crucial for understanding both what a language is and what it means to be a linguist.

Taking into consideration, nothing is more essential than words in language. Words have meaning, as opposed to phonemes and syllables, which are just parts of sound. Words, on the other hand, are stored in the lexicon of a speaker's mind rather than being deleted after being spoken. They are the foundation of all communication and cannot be overstated. (O'Grady & Archibald, 2016). Specifically the study focused on this area. Morphology is the linguistic term for "the study of the structure of words and the processes by which they are constructed" (O'Grady & Archibald, 2016). Morphology is a vital field of study because it reveals fundamental facts about the nature of language, such as the need for different types of words, the availability of internal structure within words, and the prevalence of processes that generate and alter words in various ways.

In brief, English teachers must understand how the language works and how it contributes to the four English Proficiency skills. Knowing basic English entails knowing how to differentiate between components of speech such as nouns, verbs, studys, adjectives, and a few more. If the teachers are unable to comprehend them, this information will not reach the learners in a timely manner, resulting in incorrect language usage. A solid grasp of linguistics can assist both teachers and learners avoid such a major issue. Phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, discourse, sociolinguistics, and psycholinguistics are all areas of linguistics. But in this study, the reseracher focused on the scope of morphology.

To sum up, the study's goal is to investigate the teacher's qualifications of linguistic competence in teaching morphology to learners. To accomplish the objective, the researcher specified several critical goals, such as identifying how the procedures of the analytical framework may be used and clarifying what applied linguistic theory is being implemented. The study's rationale is to promote for teaching language as a linguistic reality through which linguistic competence may be demonstrated. The significance of this research lies in its capacity to understand linguistic competence and integrate it with a pedagogical approach.

## **METHOD**

The study design was descriptive qualitative. The researcher gathered the data from a series of YouTube videos which were broadcasted by a teacher on a Youtube Channel. The series involved episode 1 through 4 videos ranging from 9-16 minutes in duration. The researcher started to analyze the linguistic competence of the teacher in each video by analogizing the teacher's knowledge with the theory from the linguistics book written by its expert. The selected books which were used to analyze are "How English Works, A Linguistic Introduction" (Curzan & Adams, 2012); "Linguistics, An Introduction" (Radford et al., 2009); and "Contemporary Linguistic Analysis, An Introduction" (O'Grady & Archibald, 2016).

## **FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

The study's findings assisted in realizing that linguistic competence and the recognition of verbal and nonverbal features are significant parts of the analysis in terms of which a teacher may remain competent while providing the course. The following were the results of analysis that have been done by the researcher from Episode 1 – 4.

## Morphology Episode 1: Introduction



### Morphology Ep1 Introduction

5,7 rb x ditonton · 1 thn lalu

Source: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bhD4wxidyho&t=69s>

Morphology, according to the teacher, is one of the subsystems of language. The study of how words are produced is known as morphology. Morphemes are the smallest meaningful components of a word. To clarify, the teacher compared the words morpheme and syllable as well as their roles. Furthermore, the teacher demonstrated how to define morpheme and syllable by using various instances of words, such as:

Pumpkin	: 2 syllables, 1 morphemes
Vowed	: 1 syllables, 2 morphemes
Sunglasses	: 3 syllables, 3 morphemes
Unmask	: 2 syllables, 2 morphemes

Regarding the teacher's understanding of the term "morphology," Curzan & Adams (2012) described it as "the study of word structure." Later on O'Grady added, "Morphology refers to the element of the grammar that is concerned with words and word production" (O'Grady



& Archibald, 2016). While, Morphology, according to Radford et al. (2009), is the discipline of linguistics that analyzes the internal structure of words and the processes of word formation. As a result, it is apparent that the teacher comprehends the definition of morphology. Furthermore, the teacher reviews the comparison between morphem and syllable, which is significantly essential for assisting learners in fully understanding the subject.

### Morphology Episode 2: Free Vs Bound Morphemes



Morphology Episode 2 Free vs Bound Morphemes

Source: <https://youtube.com/watch?v=NSqwojB7T0E>

In this episode, the teacher talks about free morpheme and bound morpheme. Simply, the teacher explains that a free morphem can stand alone, while a bound morpheme cannot. As in the case of the word “dogs,” which contains both free and bound morphemes, “dog” as the free morpheme that can stand alone, and “s” as the bound morpheme that merely shows the function and doesn’t carry out meaning, and cannot stand alone. Other examples are:

*Un***happiness**

*A***moral**

*C***uriosity**

Notes: The italic letters are bound morpheme and the bold one is free morpheme.

Later, the teacher discusses afixes, which include prefix (front), suffix (end), infix (in), and circumfix (front and end), all of which have no standard variation. The way the teacher explores the concept is by giving quizzes to determine which words contain free morphemes and bound morphemes.

As per the theory of linguists, a free morpheme is one that may stand alone as a word, whereas a bound morpheme must be connected to another element (O'Grady & Archibald, 2016). Further, free morphemes mean the word form is made up of exactly one morpheme, and that morpheme operates as an English word on its own. While "bound morphemes" are morphemes that cannot stand alone as words (Curzan & Adams, 2012). Another concept that comes from Radford et al. is that a free morpheme is one that may stand alone as a word. On the other hand, words that cannot function as free-standing words, on the other hand, are referred to as "bound morphemes" (Radford et al., 2009). As can be seen, the researcher then infers that in this episode, the teacher depicts her expertise in linguistic competence. There is no single doubt, nor any mistake revealed in her explanation. This shows that the teacher has transferred her linguistic knowledge properly to the learners.

### **Morphology Episode 3: Lexical and Functional Morphemes**



Morphology Episode 3 Lexical & Functional Morphemes

Source: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=N\\_irzQgVzcc](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=N_irzQgVzcc)

This episode concerns the classification of free morphemes, which consist of lexical morphemes and functional morphemes. The teacher tries to link the subject with the notion of parts of speech that are divided into two categories: open class (noun, lexical verb, adjective, and adverb) and closed class (conjunction, preposition, auxiliary verb, pronoun, determiner, and interjection). As mentioned by the teacher, the open-class words belong to the free lexical morphemes, while the closed-class words are part of free functional morphemes.

The following is the chart of each morpheme's category:

Table 1. Morphemes Category

<b>Lexical Morphemes</b>	<b>Functional Morphemes</b>
Noun, Lexical Verb, Adjective, Adverb	Determiner, Pronoun, Preposition, Auxiliary Verb, Conjunction, Interjection
Dog	And
Walk	It, have
Craze	Am
Big	But
Happy	Howzat!

Linking the notion of lexical and functional morphemes as explained by the teacher, the teacher tries to review the theory from linguistics books. Unfortunately, the three linguistics books do not convey the concept of the free morpheme category, which, as explained by the teacher, includes lexical and functional morphemes.

However, the linguists explore the notion of bound morpheme classification in their books. Bound morphemes are divided into two categories: derivational and inflectional. Derivational morphemes regularly change a word's lexical category (or part of speech). In English, derivational morphemes can be prefixes and suffixes. In contrast, inflectional morphemes never affect the root word's part of speech (Curzan & Adams, 2012; O'Grady & Archibald, 2016;

Radford et al., 2009). It is interesting since the teacher also briefly mentioned those kinds of bound morphemes, yet the teacher does not specify the term in detail. This probably caused the learners to wonder what the derivational and inflectional morphemes meant and how they functioned. Some parts may be missing in this episode, so the researcher may assume that the linguistic competence of the teacher is not really clear here. One thing that is missing from the explanation is the notion of root and non-root as parts of morphology study.

#### **Morphology Episode 4: Compound**



Morphology Episode 4 Compounds

Source: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=\\_Kvs2yMVU80](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_Kvs2yMVU80)

In this episode, the teacher talks about compounds, which is not really explained the definition well. However, the teacher briefly teaches that compound words may consist of noun + noun (e.g., football), adjective + noun (e.g., whiteboard) or preposition + noun (e.g., overcoat). Further, the teacher clarifies that a compound word may be joined with a hyphen (e.g., long-term) or not with a hyphen (apple tree). She argues that this sort of writing is ambiguous, but she explains that the reason, probably depending on how long the words are, is that they belong to the English language.

Hence, the researcher took a look at what concepts of compound words are generated by linguists. Compounding, according to O'Grady & Archibald (2016), is the merging of two already existing words,

which is another prevalent strategy for word formation in English. Compound words may be formed from nouns, verbs, or adjectives. In addition, Radford et al., (2009) stated that there is no theoretical limit to the length of compounds since the process of producing compounds may feed itself indefinitely: a compound noun is a noun in and of itself and can be compounded further. It means that what has been explored by the teacher is synchronous with the theory of the linguists. Thus, the researcher draw a line that in this episode, the teacher shows her linguistics competence in delivering the subject of compound words.

According to the findings of this research, the researcher assumes that linguistics contributes to the theory of language teaching. The language teacher should be well-versed in the linguistic knowledge that he or she will utilize to teach his or her learners. Teaching English necessitates English teachers must be fluent in the English language; therefore, to teach English effectively, teachers need a firm grounding in applied linguistics, because the primary focus of applied linguistics in language has been on fixing or at least equalizing social issues using language (Khansir, 2013). It means that, in order to be a good English language teacher, an English teacher should be competent with English linguistics.

Later on, English teachers must learn and comprehend the language system because teachers must be more skilled than learners. Furthermore, it will assist them in speaking and writing appropriately in order to make them professional because all of the linguistic system's elements will impact teachers' pedagogical competence, interpersonal skill, and personal qualities (Tahir, 2018). Learners develop communicative and linguistic ability in natural circumstances with the assistance of teacher, utilizing spoken language in suitable situations with encouragement and assistance (Gràcia et al., 2020). Schools are the roots of social connection that, through use of meaningful verbal exchanges, can promote communicative and linguistic expansion

(Hamre et al., 2014; Mashburn, 2008) and by teachers employing particular teaching methodologies (Alshurafat et al., 2020).

A number of studies have found discrepancies between learners' views about language and linguistic works and teachers' conceptions of interactions and its evaluation in classrooms (Mercer et al., 2018). This is why teachers must broaden their understanding of teaching techniques related to language and interactions throughout both initial teaching training and professional development in order to make intelligent options and adjustments (Gràcia et al., 2020). From this perspective, teacher's linguistics competence not only has to be well prepared but also has to be well assessed.

The necessity to assess linguistic competence in order to promote language development has resulted in the development of a variety of techniques. Based on a sociopragmatic and ecofunctional view on language development, (Gràcia et al., 2018) created a method for analyzing spoken language teaching and learning in the classroom. This tool is founded on the ideas of the conversational approach, which views classrooms as communicative spaces in which spoken language is remarked upon and transmitted, making it a critical tool in the learning of topics across the curriculum (Gràcia et al., 2018, 2020, 2021). The goal is to provide teachers and other professionals (such as speech therapists and educational psychologists) with a tool that allows them to assess not only the teachers' skills and strategies for nurturing communicative competence in the classroom, but also the interconnections between the teachers and the learners, as well as their linguistic perceptions.

In terms of pedagogical expertise, the language system will assist teachers in better and more appropriate lesson preparation prior to teaching in a classroom. This is due to learners being guided toward a greater grasp and use of English language. This means that teachers must integrate linguistic components into their lessons rather

of focusing just on theory. In other words, linguistic competency in terms of English phonology, grammar, and discourse is the foundation of learning English. In summary, linguistic competence must be owned by each English teacher for a successful subject delivery.

## **CONCLUSION**

Linguistics is essential for language instruction because the connection between linguistics and language teaching is comparable to that between engine comprehension and driving skill. (Akan et al., 2017). It is advisable to supply the driver with knowledge about the vehicle or engine so that he or she can operate the vehicle effectively and be prepared for any engine problems that may emerge. Likewise, teachers do not create advances in linguistics in order to apply them to language education. Instead, when faced with a dilemma in language instruction, they go to linguistic evidence for a solution. It should be nonsensical to assert that no one can be an outstanding language teacher otherwise they have a solid understanding of linguistics.

Linguistics' main contribution to language teaching is to enhance the teacher's awareness and competence. The ideal current strategy for teaching language should be to choose the greatest qualities of each method rather than to adhere to a single method. The field of linguistics, however, has been shown to have a substantial impact in language instruction. Learning linguistics may help someone become a better language teacher since it raises their linguistic sensitivity. To be sure, strategies are important, but they seldom trump the teacher's own expertise in the classroom. Therefore, a shift along a continuum is required from a direct to an indirect relationship between linguistics and language education.

## REFERENCES

- Akan, M. F., Hassan, H. M. A., Islam, A. B. M. S., & Abdelmajd, A. E. M. (2017). The Utility Extent of Linguistics to Language Teaching: An Experimental Evaluation. *Jeltl*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.21462/jeltl.v2i1.42>
- Alshurafat, H., Beattie, C., Jones, G., & Sands, J. (2020). Perceptions of the usefulness of various teaching methods in forensic accounting education. *Accounting Education*, 29(2), 177–204. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09639284.2020.1719425>
- Chathamkulam Abdulrahman, N., & Abu-Ayyash, E. A. S. (2019). Linguistic Competence, Communicative Competence and Interactional Competence. *International Journal of Computers & Technology*, 19(November), 7537–7552. <https://doi.org/10.24297/ijct.v19i0.8505>
- Curzan, A., & Adams, M. J. (2012). *How English Work, A Linguistic Introduction*. Pearson Education Inc.
- Ernest, P., Guitert Catasús, M., Hampel, R., Heiser, S., Hopkins, J., Murphy, L., & Stickler, U. (2013). Online teacher development: Collaborating in a virtual learning environment. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 26(4), 311–333. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2012.667814>
- Fillmore, L. W., & Snow, C. E. (2000). *What Teachers Need to Know About Language*. Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Finch, G. (2003). How to Study Linguistics. In *How to Study Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-230-80213-1>
- Golonka, E. M., Bowles, A. R., Frank, V. M., Richardson, D. L., & Freynik, S. (2014). Technologies for foreign language learning: A review of technology types and their effectiveness. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 27(1), 70–105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2012.700315>
- Gràcia, M., Adam, A. L., Carbó, M., Rouaz, K., & Añals, M. (2018). Communicational and oral competences in initial teacher training. *Pensamiento Educativo*, 55(2), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.7764/PEL.55.2.2018.3>
- Gràcia, M., Alvarado, J. M., & Nieva, S. (2021). Assessment of oral skills



in adolescents. *Children*, 8(12), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.3390/children8121136>

Gràcia, M., Casanovas, J., Riba, C., Sancho, M. R., Jarque, M. J., Casanovas, J., & Vega, F. (2020). Developing a digital application (EVALOE-DSS) for the professional development of teachers aiming to improve their students' linguistic competence. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 0(0), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2019.1707690>

Gruba, P. (2004). Designing tasks for online collaborative language learning. *Prospect*, 19(2), 72–81.

Hamre, B., Hatfield, B., Pianta, R., & Jamil, F. (2014). Evidence for General and Domain-Specific Elements of Teacher-Child Interactions: Associations With Preschool Children's Development. *Child Development*, 85(3), 1257–1274. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12184>

Jeong, K. O. (2017). Preparing EFL student teachers with new technologies in the Korean context. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 30(6), 488–509. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2017.1321554>

Khansir, A. A. (2013). Applied linguistics and english language teaching. *Middle East Journal of Scientific Research*, 15(8), 1140–1146. <https://doi.org/10.5829/idosi.mejsr.2013.15.8.11238>

Kharchenko, T., Semashko, T., Dolynskiy, I., Bespala, L., & Ivanova, T. (2021). Use of moodle lms-based tests for enhancing linguistic competence of students majoring in foreign language philology. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching*, 10(4), 67–81. <https://doi.org/10.5430/jct.v10n4p67>

Liu, B., & Biao, J. (2021). Strategic Evolution of Language Education Policy in the Information Age. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1744(3). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1744/3/032043>

Lucas, T., Villegas, A. M., & Freedson-Gonzalez, M. (2008). Linguistically Responsive teacher education: Preparing classroom teachers to teach english language learners. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(4), 361–373. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487108322110>

Martinez del Castillo, J. (2016). Studying Linguistic Competence The Problem. *Education and Linguistics Research*, 2(1), 85. <https://doi.org/10.5296/elr.v2i1.9157>

- Martínez del Castillo, J. (2013). Modes of Thinking , Language and Linguistics.
- Mashburn, A. J. (2008). Quality of social and physical environments in preschools and children's development of academic, language, and literacy skills. *Applied Developmental Science*, 12(3), 113–127. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888690802199392>
- Mercer, S., MacIntyre, P., Gregersen, T., & Talbot, K. (2018). Positive language education: Combining positive education and language education. *Theory and Practice of Second Language Acquisition*, 4(2), 11–31.
- O'Grady, W., & Archibald, J. (2016). *Contemporary Linguistic Analysis; an Introduction* (Eight Edit). Pearson. <http://www.pearsoned.ca/text/ogradey/>
- Quintana-Lara, M. (2014). Effect of Acoustic Spectrographic Instruction on production of English /i/ and /I/ by Spanish pre-service English teachers. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 27(3), 207–227. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2012.724424>
- Radford, A., Atkinson, M., Britain, D., Clahsen, H., & Spencer, A. (2009). *Linguistics an Introduction*. In ثبثبث (Second Edition, Issue ثق ثقثق). Cambridge University Press.
- Shaykhislamov, N. Z. ugli, & Makhmudov, K. S. ugli. (2020). Linguistics and Its Modern Types. *Academic Research in Educational Sciences*, 1(1), 9–25.
- Smythe, S., & Neufeld, P. (2010). “Podcast Time”: Negotiating Digital Literacies and Communities of Learning in a Middle Years ELL Classroom. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 53(April), 565–574. <https://doi.org/10.1598/JA>
- Syarif, H. (2016). Linguistics and the English Language Instruction. *Lingua Didaktika: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Pembelajaran Bahasa*, 10(1), 50. <https://doi.org/10.24036/ld.v10i1.6328>
- Tahir, I. (2018). Teachers ' Beliefs in Balancing Linguistic Competence and Teaching Performance in EFL Classrooms. *BRAIN. Broad Research in Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 9(1), 50–58.
- Varpe, M. G. (2013). Linguistic and Communicative Competence. *International Journal of English and Literature (IJEL)*, 3(2), 347.

19. **Jurnal Bahasa Lingua Scientia**, Vol. 15, No. 1, Juni 2023

<https://doi.org/10.2307/3585467>

**DOI:** [dx.doi.org/10.21274/lis.2023.15.1.1-19-](https://doi.org/10.21274/lis.2023.15.1.1-19-)