School Practices to Cultivate LGBT-Steady Climate:Associations with Young adult Harassing Inclusion

M Zaid Raditia Rahman[1]
Dion Tira Erlangga[2]
English Education

zaidraditia7@gmail.com
diontiraerlangga@gmail.com

Abstract

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) youth experience unbalanced degrees of harassing contrasted with their hetero peers. Schools are strategically set up to address these distinctions by establishing a steady school environment for LGBT youth, yet further exploration is expected to inspect the different expert improvement practices and open doors executed for this reason. The ongoing review looks at how school rehearses for establishing a steady LGBT understudy environment connect with understudy reports of harassing. Understudy level information come from the 2013 Minnesota Understudy Study, a statewide overview of chance and defensive variables. The 10th and eleventh graders (N = 31.183) detailed the recurrence of casualties and culprits of physical and social tormenting and sexual direction based badgering. School chairmen detailed six practices connected with establishing a strong LGBT school environment (N = 103 schools): having asset people on issues of LGBT understudies, showing sexual direction explicit substance, having gay-straight collusions, examining tormenting in light of sexual direction, and giving proficient improvement around LGBT consideration and issues of LGBT understudies. A list was made to show the number of practices that each school utilized (M = 2.45; SD = 1.76). Staggered calculated relapse shows that understudies go to class more obligingly. LGBT environments report lower chances of being casualties of social harassing, demonstrations of actual tormenting, and sexual direction based badgering contrasted with understudies in schools with a less steady LGBT environment. Sexual direction didn't direct this relationship, proposing that rehearses that help LGBT might be defensive for all understudies, no matter what their sexual direction. The discoveries support extensive endeavors to establish a steady environment for LGBTQ youth as a component of a bigger harassing counteraction methodology.

Key words: Lesbian, gay, bisexual youth . School climate . Bullying . School practices

INTRODUCTION

The enlarging and well-duplicating abberations in wellbeing and wellbeing risk ways of behaving among lesbian, gay, sexually open, and transsexual (LGBT) youth have prompted calls for projects (Fithratullah, 2019) and approaches that make schools more secure for this populace (Aguss et al., 2021). While a few schools have answered this call, more observational examination is expected to report the practices utilized and research how these endeavors to establish a LGBT-steady environment connect with the prosperity of LGBT youth (F. M. Sari & Oktaviani, 2021). A few strong practices in schools stand out enough to be noticed, like the presence of gay-straight partnerships (GSAs) in schools or the utilization of expressed enemy of harassing strategies (for instance, those that incorporate sexual direction and orientation personality/articulation among the most weak gatherings of youth) (Al Falaq et al., 2021). Helpless against harassing; However generally little is had some significant awareness of how much understudy (Sartika & Pranoto, 2021) and educator centered endeavors is explicitly intended to make schools more steady of

LGBT youth according to understudies' encounters of harassing (Aminatun & Oktaviani, 2019).

Harassing inclusion, as a culprit or potentially casualty, is related with horde social, scholastic, and medical conditions (Mandasari & Aminatun, 2020). Harassing can take various structures including physical (hitting, battling) or social (talk spreading, exclusion), (Kuswoyo & Indonesia, 2021) and these various structures have both covering and special predecessors and sequelae (Pranoto & Suprayogi, 2020). Some proof recommends there are contrasts in the ways the school setting is connected with these types of tormenting (F. M. Sari & Wahyudin, 2019). As (Oktaviani, 2018) stated that for test ple, school advocates rate social harassing vignettes as less serious, report less compassion for focuses of social harassing, and intercede less unequivocally (e.g., with less extreme consequences for the culprit) for social harassing contrasted with actual tormenting (F. M. Sari, 2019). Besides, understudies going to schools with a higher propor-tion of understudies engaged with disciplinary activities are more similar to ly to report actual exploitation and execution (S. N. Sari & Aminatun, 2021), however not social exploitation or execution, than understudies in schools with lower extents of discipline-involved youth (Puspita et al., 2021). Similitudes additionally exist in connects of these types of harassing, and more examination is expected to un-derstand how school environment improvement endeavors are connected with types of tormenting association (Purwaningsih & Gulö, 2021).

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer/questioning (LGBQ) stu- dents in particular report rates of bullying victimization and perpetration significantly higher than their heterosexual peers, a gap that appears to be widening (Oktavia & Suprayogi, 2021). Furthermore, LGBT youth are often the targets of prejudice- based harassment, a form of bullying that is focused on per- sonal characteristics of the victim (e.g., sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, gender identity) (Puspita & Pranoto, 2021), and emerging research indi- cates that this type of harassment is at least as harmful as traditional bullying (Suprayogi & Eko, 2020). As schools attempt to reduce bullying among students, improving school climate has been a key focus of these efforts, but the ways in which schools work to improve school climate specifically for LGBQ students require more study (F. M. Sari, 2020).

School environment, or the "quality and character of school life" has been related with an assortment of understudy ways of behaving, paying little mind to sexual ori-entation or orientation personality (Sinaga & Oktaviani, 2020). For test ple, understudies going to schools where they feel more secure report less brutality, tormenting, non-attendance, and bias based ha-rassment than understudies who have a solid sense of reassurance (Febriantini et al., 2021). Be that as it may, far less LGBT understudies have a solid sense of security at school, which restricts their capacity to profit from these defensive impacts. In a 2015 report, over portion of LGBT understudies revealed feeling un-protected at school in light of their sexual direction, further highlighting the pertinence of school environment for LGBT youth. According to (Samanik & Lianasari, 2018) different parts of school environment might be exceptionally significant for LGBT youth yet are less habitually test ined in the field and seldom as for sexual direction or orientation variety. More worldwide proportions of understudies' view of by and large school environment show comparable defensive impacts for LGBTyouth, incorporating relationship with less discouragement, suicidality, delinquency, and liquor and marijua-na use (Samanik, 2021). Critically, when school environment discernments were particularly sure, center school LGBQ youth didn't show raised paces of these ways of behaving com-pared to their hetero peers (Putri & Sari, 2020). Together, these outcomes sug-gest that schools can work as

strong defensive environ-ments for LGBT youth, yet more work is expected to explain how school environment improvement endeavors intended for LGBT youth are connected with prosperity.

Research indicates that combatting homophobic or aggres- sive school climates requires engagement of multiple constit- uencies within the school through coordinated efforts. For LGBT youth in particular, whole-school approaches to create supportive climates necessitate specific and intentional efforts to address inequities experienced, with over 80% of LGBT youth reporting discriminatory school policies and almost 30% reporting being disciplined for be- haviors not routinely sanctioned for heterosexual peers, such as public displays of affection. A variety of other school-based discriminatory practices have been re- ported, such as limitations or prohibitions on specific types/ styles of clothing, discussion of LGBT topics in school assign- ments, and GSA formation or promotion (Yulianti & Sulistiyawati, 2020). When schools treat LGBT youth differently and/or fail to provide a safe learning environment, students in the school may receive explicit or implicit messages that bullying LGBTyouth may be tolerated (Kardiansyah, 2019).

In any case, a few steady school rehearses have been recognized in the writing as being defensive elements for LGBT youth (Mandasari & Wahyudin, 2019). Of these, gay-straight collusions have gotten the greater part of the consideration. Proof recommends understudies who go to schools with GSAs report more noteworthy convictions that all is well with the world, better grades and school belongingness, and less tormenting/provocation inclusion, substance use, and psychological wellness issues (Yudha & Mandasari, 2021). Besides, starter research shows that these defensive impacts reach out to straight understudies as well as LGBT understudies (Suprayogi & Pranoto, 2020). The components that underlie these affiliations appear to fixate on giving a feeling of safety and having a place, as well as a way to connect youth to other strong assets in the everyday schedule. Significantly, these variables, like security and association, are key bits of school environment, highlighting the pertinence of school environment improvement endeavors (Septiyana & Aminatun, 2021). An extensive rundown of proposals for best practices that encourage steady environments exist, at further developing the school climate for and supporting the prosperity of LGBT youth.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Suggested rehearses remember consolidating LGBT figures or characters for educational program, proficient improvement for educators, great enemy of tormenting/provocation strategies that plainly determine sexual direction (Suprayogi, 2019) and orientation personality, ensur-ing value in attire/clothing regulation approaches and at occasions like prom , having an impartial washroom, and educator support (Pranoto & Afrilita, 2019). Every one of these practices has hypothetical significance to prosperity for LGBT youth (Fithratullah, 2021). For instance, information by instructors and school staff about normal stressors LGBT understudies might face could further develop relations between LGBT understudies and educators. However restricted huge scope observational examinations look at these elements, and, surprisingly, less research schools' utilization of different practices together (K. Sari & Pranoto, 2021), to some extent since concentrates seldom have adequate quantities of schools and LGBT youth to analyze these inquiries (Nuraziza et al., 2021). Since utilizing various practices frequently includes numerous supporters inside the school (e.g., understudies, educators, staff, organization), understanding how the quantity of practices at further developing school environment for LGBT youth are

connected with tormenting association ought to illuminate anticipation endeavors in schools (Aminatun et al., 2021). At the point when information are free, more broad school upholds are regularly examined (e.g., consultant/advisee framework; hostile to harassing strategy) close by or instead of procedures intended for LGBT youth had the option to resolve this inquiry, explicitly analyzing the jobs of GSA, safe school strategies, comprehensive educational plan, and strong educators on LGBT youth's scholastic accomplishment and confidence. Critically, (Rido et al., 2021) found that these backings cushioned risk; in any case, that review depended on understudies' reports of school upholds/rehearses. While understudies' view of supports give a significant focal point on this issue, reports of LGBT-steady practices according to school heads' points of view can add to this image (Suprayogi et al., 2021). (Setri & Setiawan, 2020) asserted that executive reports both enlighten how directors think they are helping understudies, and incorporate practices that might be more subtle to understudies (e.g., educator proficient turn of events) yet that can impact school environment By the by (Amelia, 2021).

The current study combines data from a large sample of adolescents with a school-level survey of LGBT-supportive practices to examine how the number of these practices a school implements is related to student reports of a variety of forms of bullying involvement (relational and physical bull- lying perpetration and victimization and sexual orientation- based bullying victimization). The presence of six best practices to create supportive climates for LGBT youth was assessed: (1) point person for LGBT student issues, (2) displaying LGBT content where students could see it, (3) GSA, (4) professional development about LGBT student issues, (5) professional development around LGBT inclusion in curriculum and school climate, and (6) discussed bullying based on sexual orientation with students. The sum of best practices in each school was used as an indicator of the supportiveness of the climate of each school for LGBQ students. We anticipated that students attending schools with a greater number of supportive practices would report less frequent bullying involvement than students in schools with fewer. Given past research indicating that GSAs are protective for heterosexual students as well as LGBT for some outcomes, we investigated whether sexual orientation moderated associations between LGBT-supportive climate and bullying involvement

METHOD

Data Sources

Student-level data come from the 2013 Minnesota Student Survey (MSS), a population-based survey of risk and protective factors among 5th, 8th, 9th, and 11th graders in Minnesota. Every 3 years, the MSS is offered to all public and charter schools in the state, and in 2013, 84% of districts had at least one grade level participate. In accordance with state law, data is collected anonymously under passive consent procedures.

School-level data were collected as part of a larger study examining school programs, policies, and practices related to bullying, school climate, and student support. As a result, secondary schools were sampled with the broader goal of adequate representation of 8th, 9th, and 11th graders. Fifth graders were not included in the sample because the policies and programs in question were less relevant to elementary schools. Although schools serving 8th graders were included in the sample, only 9th and 11th graders provided information about their sexual orientation. Numerous schools serving 8th graders also served 9th and/or 11th graders (e.g., 7th–12th grade secondary schools; 7th–9th grade

middle schools), so a complete sample selection description is provided below. However, due to the importance of sexual orientation for this paper, only data from 9th and 11th graders were included here. A stratified random sample of schools was selected from the 325 schools with students in at least one of 8th, 9th, or 11th grade completing the 2013 MSS. To ensure adequate representation of students in all three grades, a stratified sampling approach was applied with the goal of approximately 120 schools for each grade level. First, schools with 8th graders (and any other participating grades) were randomly selected, then schools with 9th and 11th graders, and finally, schools with only participating 9th graders were randomly selected. This About in approximately equal numbers of schools with participating 8th (n = 121), 9th (n = 121), and 11th (n = 119) graders (n = 176 schools in total; note that schools may be multiply counted if they had , for example, 8th and 9th graders participate in the MSS).

To ensure an adequate number of schools with 20 or more LGBQ students, which supports more robust multilevel analyses, all schools (n = 27) with at least 400 students in 9th and/or 11th grades that were not already randomly selected were added to the pool of schools to contact, assuming a 5% LGBQ rate. These procedures are in 206 schools eligible to participate in school data collection. The resulting schools were similar in grade configuration (e.g., 7th–12th grades, 6th–8th grades) to the distribution of these school configurations in the state, though with a slight over-representation of schools in- cluding 9th and 11th graders, given the intentional oversampling strategy to ensure adequate numbers of LGBQ students. The Institutional Review Board at the University of Minnesota determined that these data were exempt from IRB review.

Measures

Student Level Students reported on their involvement in five types of bullying behavior with questions primarily derived from the California Healthy Kids Survey. For each question, the five response options ranged from never to every day with bullying involvement dichotomized as never versus ever being involved in each type of bullying in the past 30 days. Because even infrequent involvement in bullying is associated with a variety of health-risk behaviors and the distribution of the bullying variables was highly skewed in this sample, numerous investigations using the MSS have dichotomized bully-ing in this way. Relational bullying victimization was assessed with two items asking how often other students had "spread mean rumors or lies about you" or "exclud- ed you from friends, other students or activities" in the past 30 days. Two parallel items assessed relational bullying perpetration. Physical bullying victimization was assessed with two questions: "pushed, shoved, slapped, hit or kicked you when they weren't kidding around" and "threatened to beat you up." Parallel items assessed physical bullying perpetration. Finally, one item examined sexual orientation-based harassment: How often have other students harassed or bullied you… "because you are gay or lesbian or because someone thought you were?"

Students indicated their sexual orientation as heterosexual (straight), gay/lesbian, bisexual, or not sure (questioning), and for the purposes of this analysis, youth were grouped into one of two categories: straight and lesbian/gay, bisexual, or questioning (LGBQ). Students also provided information about sociodemographic covariates, including grade, sex, and participation in the free/reduced price lunch program. Race/ethnicity was obtained through two questions, one asking whether the student identified as Hispanic or Latino/a and one question that asked youth to check all that applied of five race categories. Due to small

sample sizes at the school level, these questions were combined into one variable dichotomized as non-Hispanic white or students of color (i.e., Hispanic, non-Hispanic American Indian/Alaskan Native, non-Hispanic Asian, Native Hawaiian , non-Hispanic Black, or other Pacific Islander, multiple races).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Descriptive statistics and chi-square analyzes examining demographic differences among LGBQ and straight youth are presented in Table 1. Students were approximately equally split by sex and grade. Nearly one quarter of participants identified as students of color and 6.29% identified as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or questioning. Relational bullying victimization (31.56%) was the most common form of bullying involvement with sexual orientation-based bullying the least common (6.06%). Significant differences were noted in all variables except grade for straight compared to LGBQ students. On average, LGBQ students were more likely to be female, students of color, received free/reduced price lunch, and report all five forms of bullying involvement than their straight peers.

The LGBT-supportive climate indicators varied in prevalence, with the two most frequent practices being the presence of a point person in the school for LGBT student issues (61.17%) and discussing sexual orientation-based bullying (59.22%). The remaining four indicators were present in less than half the schools: displaying content specific to sexual orientation where students can see it (40.78%), GSA or similar club (38.83%), professional development about LGBT student issues (25.24%) , and professional development around LGBT inclusion in curriculum and school climate (19.42%). The LGBT-supportive climate index was normally distributed, with a range of 0 to 6 and a mean of 2.45.

Discussion

Utilizing a huge example of ninth and eleventh graders, the ongoing review inspected relationship between schools' utilization of LGBT-steady practices and understudies' tormenting contribution. Schools announced utilizing the full range of practices, from none to each of the six, showing critical variety in the take-up of these accepted procedures. Schools were probably going to report having a go-to person for LGBT understudy issues and examined harassing in view of sexual direction with understudies. Similarly, less schools gave proficient improvement to educators zeroed in on incorporating LGBT figures in educational plan, a critical technique for combatting heteronormativity (e.g., suspicions that heterosexuality is "typical") and further developing impressions of security for orientation non-adjusting understudies. GSAs, a deeply grounded defensive element, were available in less than 40% of center and secondary schools in this example.

Despite the rarity of some of these measures, we demonstrated that students in schools using more supportive practices experienced significantly lower odds of relational bullying- ing victimization, physical bullying perpetration, and sexual orientation-based bullying victimization than those in schools using fewer practices. A non-significant trend also suggested lower odds of relational bullying perpetration in schools with more supportive practices compared to fewer. Importantly, these associations were not moderated by sexual orientation. That is, both heterosexual and LGBQ students engaged in less bullying when their schools used more supportive practices, bolstering the argument

that efforts to improve school climate and safety for LGBQ youth benefit the whole student body.

CONCLUSION

Not with standing these limits, this review gives prom-ising proof that school endeavors to advance safe and backing ive environments for LGBQ youth through different practices are related with lower chances of understudy harassing association. Future examination is expected to analyze the subtleties of these practices (e.g., explicit subjects of expert turn of events) to decide if explicit substance might affect understudy prosperity as well as longitudinal examinations to decide causality. Schools ought to think about current endeavors in contrast to best practices and figure out what extra advances can be added. The way that these endeavors were related with less tormenting for all understudies paying little heed to sexual direction ought to reinforce heads' thinking for carrying out them, paying little mind to bigger local area perspectives about sexual direction or orientation personality. To put it plainly, more strong environments benefit all understudies.

REFERENCES

Aguss, R. M., Amelia, D., Abidin, Z., & Permata, P. (2021). Pelatihan Pembuatan Perangkat Ajar Silabus Dan Rpp Smk Pgri 1 Limau. *Journal of Social Sciences and Technology for Community Service (JSSTCS)*, *2*(2), 48. https://doi.org/10.33365/jsstcs.v2i2.1315

Al Falaq, J. S., Suprayogi, S., Susanto, F. N., & Husna, A. U. (2021). Exploring The Potentials of Wattpad For Literature Class. *Indonesian Journal of Learning Studies*, *1*(2), 12–19.

Amelia, D. (2021). Antigone's Phallus Envy and Its Comparison to Indonesian Dramas' Characters: A Freudian Perspective. *Vivid: Journal of Language and Literature*, *10*(1), 23–30.

Aminatun, D., Muliyah, P., & Haryanti, H. (2021). the Effect of Using Dictogloss on Students' Listening Comprehension Achievement. *JURNAL PAJAR (Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran)*, *5*(2), 262–269. https://doi.org/10.33578/pjr.v5i2.8246

Aminatun, D., & Oktaviani, L. (2019). Memrise: Promoting students' autonomous learning skill through language learning application. *Metathesis: Journal of English Language, Literature, and Teaching*, *3*(2), 214–223.

Febriantini, W. A., Fitriati, R., & Oktaviani, L. (2021). AN ANALYSIS OF VERBAL AND NON-VERBAL COMMUNICATION IN AUTISTIC CHILDREN. *Journal of Research on Language Education*, *2*(1), 53–56.

Fithratullah, M. (2019). Globalization and Culture Hybridity; The Commodification on Korean Music and its Successful World Expansion. *Digital Press Social Sciences and Humanities*, *2*(2018), 00013. https://doi.org/10.29037/digitalpress.42264

Fithratullah, M. (2021). Representation of Korean Values Sustainability in American Remake Movies. *Teknosastik*, *19*(1), 60. https://doi.org/10.33365/ts.v19i1.874

Kardiansyah, M. Y. (2019). Wattpad as a Story Sharing Website; Is it a field of literary production? *ELLiC Proceedings*, *3*, 419–426.

Kuswoyo, H., & Indonesia, U. T. (2021). *TRANSITIVITY ANALYSIS OF PRESIDENTIAL DEBATE BETWEEN TRUMP AND TRANSITIVITY ANALYSIS OF PRESIDENTIAL DEBATE BETWEEN TRUMP AND BIDEN IN 2020*. *December*. https://doi.org/10.33365/llj.v2i2

Mandasari, B., & Aminatun, D. (2020). IMPROVING STUDENTS'SPEAKING

PERFORMANCE THROUGH VLOG. *English Education: Journal of English Teaching and Research*, *5*(2), 136–142.

Mandasari, B., & Wahyudin, A. Y. (2019). Flipped Classroom Learning Model: Implementation and Its Impact on EFL Learners' Satisfaction on Grammar Class Corresponding Email Article's History Flipped Classroom Learning Model: Implementation and Its Impact on EFL Learners' Satisfaction on Grammar C. *Ethical Lingua*, *8*(1), 2021.

Nuraziza, N., Oktaviani, L., & Sari, F. M. (2021). EFL Learners' Perceptions on ZOOM Application in the Online Classes. *Jambura Journal of English Teaching and Literature*, *2*(1), 41–51. https://doi.org/10.37905/jetl.v2i1.7318

Oktavia, W. R., & Suprayogi, S. (2021). GRAMMATICAL COHESION IN BORIS JOHNSON'S SPEECH ENTITLED CORONAVIRUS SPREAD IN UK. *Linguistics and Literature Journal*, *2*(1), 8–16.

Oktaviani, L. (2018). ETHNIC SNAKE GAME: A STUDY ON THE USE OF MULTIMEDIA IN SPEAKING CLASS FOR ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING STUDENTS. *Section Editors*.

Pranoto, B. E., & Afrilita, L. K. (2019). The organization of words in mental lexicon: evidence from word association test. *Teknosastik*, *16*(1), 26–33.

Pranoto, B. E., & Suprayogi, S. (2020). Incorporating 9GAG memes to develop EFL learners' speaking ability and willingness to communicate. *IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education)*, *7*(2), 130–144.

Purwaningsih, N., & Gulö, I. (2021). Representation of Reynhard Sinaga in Bbc News and the Jakarta Post. *Linguistics and Literature Journal*, *2*(1), 50–61.

Puspita, D., Nuansa, S., & Mentari, A. T. (2021). Students' Perception toward the Use of Google Site as English Academic Diary. *Community Development Journal : Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat*, *2*(2), 494–498. https://doi.org/10.31004/cdj.v2i2.1980

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, E., & Sari, F. M. (2020). INDONESIAN EFL STUDENTS'PERSPECTIVES TOWARDS LEARNING MANAGEMENT SYSTEM SOFTWARE. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, *1*(1), 20–24.

Rido, A., Kuswoyo, H., Suryaningsih, A. S., Nuansa, S., Ayu, R., & Arivia, R. P. (2021). Repair Strategies in English Literature Lectures in a University in Indonesia. *TEKNOSASTIK*, *19*(1), 14–23.

Samanik, S. (2021). Imagery Analysis In Matsuoka's Cloud Of Sparrows. *Linguistics and Literature Journal*, *2*(1), 17–24.

Samanik, S., & Lianasari, F. (2018). Antimatter Technology: The Bridge between Science and Religion toward Universe Creation Theory Illustrated in Dan Brown's Angels and Demons. *Teknosastik*, *14*(2), 18. https://doi.org/10.33365/ts.v14i2.58

Sari, F. M. (2019). Patterns of teaching-learning interaction in the EFL classroom. *Teknosastik*, *16*(2), 41–48.

Sari, F. M. (2020). UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS'VIEWS ON THE USE OF ONLINE LEARNING PLATFORM. *THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON ENGLISH EDUCATION*.

Sari, F. M., & Oktaviani, L. (2021). Undergraduate Students' Views on the Use of Online Learning Platform during COVID-19 Pandemic. *Teknosastik*, *19*(1), 41. https://doi.org/10.33365/ts.v19i1.896

Sari, F. M., & Wahyudin, A. Y. (2019). Blended-Learning: The responses from non-

English students in the Indonesian tertiary context. *Teknosastik*, *17*(1), 23–28.

Sari, K., & Pranoto, B. E. (2021). *Representation of Government Concerning the Draft of Criminal Code in The Jakarta Post : A Critical Discourse Analysis*. *11*(2), 98–113.

Sari, S. N., & Aminatun, D. (2021). STUDENTS'PERCEPTION ON THE USE OF ENGLISH MOVIES TO IMPROVE VOCABULARY MASTERY. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, *2*(1), 16–22.

Sartika, L. A., & Pranoto, B. E. (2021). *Analysis of Humor in the Big Bang Theory By Using Relevance Theory : a Pragmatic Study*. *2*(1), 1–7.

Septiyana, L., & Aminatun, D. (2021). the Correlation Between Efl Learners'Cohesion and Their Reading Comprehension. *Journal of Research on Language Education*, *2*(2), 68–74.

Setri, T. I., & Setiawan, D. B. (2020). Matriarchal Society in The Secret Life of Bees by Sue Monk Kidd. *Linguistics and Literature Journal*, *1*(1), 28–33. https://doi.org/10.33365/llj.v1i1.223

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.

Suprayogi, S. (2019). Javanese Varieties in Pringsewu Regency and Their Origins. *Teknosastik*, *17*(1), 7–14.

Suprayogi, S., & Eko, P. B. (2020). The Implementation of Virtual Exhibition Project in English for Tourism Class for University Students. *Academic Journal Perspective: Education, Language, and Literature*, *8*(2), 87–97.

Suprayogi, S., & Pranoto, B. E. (2020). VIRTUAL TOURISM EXHIBITION ACTIVITY IN ENGLISH FOR TOURISM CLASS: STUDENTS'PERSPECTIVES. *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*, *7*(2), 199–207.

Suprayogi, S., Samanik, S.-, Novanti, E. A., & Ardesis, Y.-. (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), 2. http://journal.unika.ac.id/index.php/celt/article/view/2871

Yudha, H. T., & Mandasari, B. (2021). *THE ANALYSIS OF GAME USAGE FOR SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL*. *2*(2), 74–79.

Yulianti, T., & Sulistiyawati, A. (2020). The Blended Learning for Student's Character Building. *International Conference on Progressive Education (ICOPE 2019)*, 56–60.