

Lecturer's Oral Feedback toward Sophomore College Students' Speech Errors

Lecturer's Oral Feedback toward Sophomore College Students' Speech Errors

Andreas Willyam Panjaitan

English Department, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri
Surabaya andreaspanjaitan16020084070@mhs.unesa.ac.id

Abstrak

Dosen atau guru dapat menemukan siswa yang membuat kesalahan bicara dengan mudah pada penampilan berbicara siswa. Salah satu cara untuk membantu siswa mengurangi kesalahan berbicara adalah melalui umpan balik lisan. Penelitian ini dilakukan untuk mengetahui bagaimana kuliah memberikan umpan balik lisan untuk setiap jenis kesalahan bicara yang dilakukan siswa. Peneliti menggunakan desain penelitian kualitatif. Subjek penelitian ini adalah dosen yang memberikan umpan balik lisan kepada mahasiswa tingkat dua di kelas berbicara akademik. Peneliti menggunakan observasi sebagai teknik pengumpulan data. Hasil dari penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa dosen menggunakan umpan balik deskriptif, umpan balik evaluatif dan umpan balik korektif sebagai umpan balik utama untuk tujuh jenis kesalahan bicara. Setiap jenis kesalahan bicara yang dibuat siswa mendapatkan umpan balik lisan khusus dari dosen. Setiap jenis umpan balik yang dilakukan oleh dosen memiliki tujuan mereka sendiri untuk membantu siswa mengurangi kesalahan bicara mereka.

Kata Kunci: umpan balik lisan, kesalahan bicara, penampilan berbicara

Abstract

Lecturers or teachers can find out students who made speech errors easily on the students' speaking performance. One of the ways to help the students reduce their speech errors is through oral feedback. This study was conducted to find out how the lecturer provided oral feedback to each type of speech errors that the students made. The researcher used qualitative research design. The subject of this study was the lecturer which gave oral feedback to the sophomore college students in Academic Speaking class. The researcher used observation as the data collection technique. The results of this study showed that the lecturer used descriptive feedback, evaluative feedback and corrective feedback as the main feedback for the seven types of speech errors. Each type of speech errors that the students made gets their specific oral feedback from the lecturer. Each type of feedback that the lecturer gave have their own purpose of helping the students to reduce their speech errors.

Keywords: oral feedback, speech errors, speaking performance

UNESA
Universitas Negeri Surabaya

INTRODUCTION

Teaching and learning process has a significant role in making sure that all the students realize their mistakes and errors. One of the ways to evaluate the students' misunderstandings or errors is by giving feedback. Feedback is a concept about the information that applied by some experts to assess the test or the perception from others (Hattie J & Timperley H, 2007). In general, meaning feedback has many types depends on the subject itself. In language teaching, the teacher's feedback is one of the parts of the formative assessment that gives an update about the students' understanding of the content (B. Susan, 2008). In language teaching, there are two types of feedback, the first is written feedback, and the second one is oral feedback. Written feedback is feedback provided by the teacher and usually about the word choice and also the grammar rules (B. Susan, 2008). Oral feedback is feedback delivered orally. The difference between oral feedback and written feedback is that in oral feedback, the teacher needs to be effectively and also helpful to the students' most significant problem in a speaking activity. (B. Susan, 2008). In general, there are two types of oral feedback, and they are personal and group oral feedback, however, the researcher in this research focusing on personal feedback, especially on students' speaking performance. There are three types of oral feedback suitable for students' speaking performance, and they are corrective feedback, descriptive feedback, and evaluative feedback. Corrective feedback is feedback to correct all the mistakes or errors by the students. The researcher finds out that oral feedback is essential for students' speaking performance. Although that teacher can give oral feedback directly to the student after the performance, the teacher needs something more than that. The teacher needs something that can help his/her oral feedback more precise and make sure the student knows the mistakes that the student did during the performance (K. Murphy & S. Barry, 2016). The teacher can use a camera or handy cam to record the student performance and use the recorded video for giving oral feedback to the student.

C. Rodgers, (2018) Found that students who got oral feedback about their performances felt enjoy and know what learning is all about. Oral feedback can help the students to realize their problems. They can develop their new strategies when they find the same problem that they already faced before with the help of the teacher's oral feedback.

K. Murphy & S. Barry (2016) Found that when the students can look back at their performances, it will help them to improve their presentations skill. Almost all the students mentioned the benefits when they could review their presentations instead of complaining to the teacher. The students can also do self-reflections to their performances and able to find out which part is the wrong part of their performance in presentations. Based on this research, it can be said that the students do not need the teacher's oral feedback.

Utami & Malihah (2018) found that silent pause, Filled

in pause and repetition errors as the most types of speech errors produced by the students of Islamic Boarding School Nurul Islam in the telling English story in English Tutorial Program. Based on this research, the researcher found that Students are more easily to produce speech errors, but there is no research about how does a teacher try to help the students' speech errors.

Several previous studies also tried to find out how to help students' speaking performance. In this part, the researcher wants to give some information about the three previous studies that helped him to decide that the teacher's oral feedback is the answer to improve students' speaking performance.

The first study was conducted in 2016 by Y. Haidara. The study entitled "Psychological Factor Affecting English Speaking Performance for the English Learners in Indonesia" was aimed to describe a psychological factor that affects the English speaking performance negatively for the English learners in Indonesia. The researcher was used 20 students as the participants in this study. The researcher uses an Interactive analysis technique to analyze the data. The result of this study proved that psychological factors affect negatively the students' English speaking performance.

The second study was conducted in 2017 by N. Liando and R. Lumettu. This research, entitled "Students' Personal Initiative towards their Speaking Performance," was aimed at finding out students' eagerness towards their achievement in speaking English. The researchers used the Correlation Coefficient formula to get the data. Based on the result of this research, the researchers conclude that students' personal initiative is vital as one of the factors to improve students' speaking performance.

The third study was conducted in 2017 by Y. Okada, T. Sawaumi, and T. Ito. This research, entitled "Effects of observing model video presentations on Japanese EFL learners' oral performance," was aimed to find out whether observing model videos can develop learners' speaking and oral presentation skill or not. The researchers use the T-test formula for this research. The researchers divided students into two classes. The first class was provided with more proficient model speakers in the video than the second class. The result showed that using model videos might have an impact on the improvement of students' speaking performance.

Based on those three previous studies above, three of them and in this thesis, have the same main problem, which is about students' speaking performance. The first and second studies were focusing on the students' problems and how they can affect their speaking performance. The third study also has similarities with this thesis; one of them that both are focusing on how the lecturer can help to solve the students' problems in speaking performance by using oral feedback. The big difference is that this thesis wants to know more about the type of lecturer's oral feedback for

Lecturer's Oral Feedback toward Sophomore College Students' Speech Errors

students' speaking activity used and how the lecturer does it. Furthermore, the next is how does the lecturer use oral feedback to help students' speech errors in a speaking activity?

Based on the background and previous studies above, the researcher is interested in conducting a study on the use of the lecturer's oral feedback toward sophomore college students' speaking performance in a speaking activity. To make sure that the researcher can focus on how the lecturer gives oral feedback for students speaking activity, the researcher decided to observe how does the lecturer use oral feedback for students' speech errors in speaking activity?

Based on the classification types of speech errors by Clark & Clark (1977:263) there are seven common types of speech error, and also all of the research questions are based on the most type of speech errors that the students produced based on the previous study,

1. How does the lecturer use oral feedback for students' repetition errors in speaking activity?
2. How does the lecturer use oral feedback for students' filled in pause errors in speaking activity?
3. How does the lecturer use oral feedback for students' silent pause errors in speaking activity?
4. How does the lecturer use oral feedback for students' false start errors in speaking activity?
5. How does the lecturer use oral feedback for students' correction errors in speaking activity?
6. How does the lecturer use oral feedback for students' stutters errors in speaking activity?
7. How does the lecturer use oral feedback for students' slips of tongue errors in speaking activity?

METHODS

This study aimed to find out how the lecturer applied oral feedback to reduce students' speech errors in a speaking activity. To help the researcher to answer all the research questions, the researcher used qualitative research design in this study. The main reason is that the researcher needs to observe how the lecturer gives oral feedback toward the students' speech errors. The subject of this research is the English department lecturer in one of the Universities at Surabaya. The researcher decided to choose the lecturer on Academic Speaking. The researcher chooses the English department lecturer was because the lecturer of this Academic Speaking class used oral feedback for students' speaking activities. The researcher conducted this research in two meetings. The data for answering all of the research questions are related to the learning activity provided by the lecturer and the students in the

classroom. To answer all the seven questions, the researcher needs to focus on steps that the lecturer uses to deliver oral feedback to the students' repetition errors, filled in pause errors, silent in pause errors, false start errors, correction errors, stutters errors, and slips of tongue in a speaking activity.

Data collection techniques are the techniques used by the researcher in order to collect the data for the research objective. The techniques which were used in this study is observation. The observation would be held while the teaching and learning process has occurred. It would be done for two or more weeks. The purposes of the observation were to collect the data for answering all of the research questions. While observing the students' activities, the researcher would take notes related to what was happening during the class. The observation that occurred in the class would be focused on the steps and the types of oral feedback that the lecturer gave for students' speaking activity. The instrument of this research is the researcher himself using a recorder and also notes. The researcher analyzed the data by using a qualitative analytics strategy to find out how the lecturer uses oral feedback to reduce students' speech errors. The data that had been collected would be analyzed due to finding the results of the study. Therefore, in this study, the researcher would have some stages in analyzing the collected data. Based on Johnson & Christensen (2014), there are several steps in analyzing qualitative research; segmenting and coding and interpreting.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Based on the first day and the second day of the observations by the researcher, there are nineteen students in the class. On the first day of observation, there are only nine sophomore college students who performed. On the second day of observation, there are the next ten college students who performed. The lecturer decided to give oral feedback after all of the students' performances on each day. These nineteen students were divided into two groups to present their presentation. Each student presented their own parts in the presentation. There are seven types of speech errors accumulated from these nineteen students. The researcher found out that the lecturer only used three types of feedback to cover all of the seven types of speech errors.

Each group performed their presentation. Even though it was a group presentation, but the lecturer gave personal feedback to each student one by one. Based on the observation notes from the researcher, the lecturer always gave descriptive feedback first and then the evaluative feedback. The lecturer gave corrective feedback right after the students made mistakes and then let the students continue their speech.

Descriptive Feedback

The first type of oral feedback that the lecturer used was descriptive feedback. The lecturer used descriptive feedback for the students who made filled in pause, repetition, correction, and false start errors.

First, the lecturer decided to use descriptive feedback to the student who made filled in pause errors. All of the students made “ah” sound when they forgot about their next sentences. The researcher only found students who made filled in pause error on the first day of observation.

(1)

Lecturer : If you keep looking at the air while delivering your speech, you will keep making that “ah” sound.

Student 1 : I will try my best to reduce at looking at the air so I can reduce that “ah” sound, Sir.

Lecturer : You did the same thing with one of your friend before, Stop making that “ah” sound. Just keep your focus, okay?

Student 2 : Okay, Sir.

Lecturer : One of the best way to help you to stop making “ah” sound is by looking at your cue card.

Student 3 : Sorry, Sir, I felt nervous and didn't look at my cue cards.

Lecturer : Your performance was good, but you need to reduce your habit of making “ah” sound. It was unnecessary.

Student 4 : Sorry, Sir, I will try it.

Those dialogues showed some examples of the lecturer's descriptive feedback to the students who made filled in pause errors and also the students' responses after they received that feedback personally from the lecturer.

Based on the researcher's reflective notes, the student who made filled in pause error on the first day of observation realize that their habit of making “ah” sound is not good for their presentation. On the second day of observation, there are no more students who made filled in pause error. The way the lecture gave those feedbacks straight to the main problem was the reason why all of those feedbacks are categorized as descriptive feedback. The lecturer tried to make the students understand that when the students made that “ah” sound was not allowed in academic speaking class. The researcher saw how the lecturer kept on shouting those feedback for the students who made filled in pause error to make sure the other students who will perform on the second day of observation heard those feedbacks.

Second, the lecturer used descriptive feedback for students who made repetition errors. Repetition errors might be a little hard for the students to reduce, but the lecturer decided to use descriptive feedback for the students.

(2)

Lecturer : When you forget about your next words or sentences, you can take a look at your note before you finish your last word or sentence.

Student 1 : Thank you, Sir, for your suggestion.

Lecturer : Keeping your tempo is also important, especially to help yourself to reduce repeat some words as you did before.

Student 2 : I will practice it, Sir. Thank you.

Lecturer : If you want to speed up your phase, you need to practice a lot to make it perfect.

Student 3 : all right, Sir.

Lecturer : Please stop repeating the word “that that” for your next presentation. It will reduce your score.

Those dialogues showed some examples of the lecturer's descriptive feedback to the student who made repetition errors and also the students' responses after they received that feedback personally from the lecturer.

Based on the researcher's reflective field notes, the researcher agreed with the lecturer for the decision of using descriptive feedback, because students who made repetition errors need some advice that straight to way how to reduce the repetition errors. On the second day of observation, some students also made repetition errors, but not as much as the students who did on the first day of observation.

Third, the lecturer used descriptive feedback for the correction errors. On the first day and the second day of observation, the researcher found out that only one student who made correction error.

(3)

Lecturer : It's okay to say sorry for one miserable condition, but it is uncommon to say sorry every time you make a mistake.

Student 1 : I was afraid that I let down my team, Sir.

Lecturer : If you care about your team, you need to practice more and adjust your speed. Don't rush your speech too much.

Student 1 : Okay, Sir, I will practice more than before.

The dialogue showed the lecturer's oral descriptive feedback to the student and also the student's response after he received the feedback from the lecturer.

Lecturer's Oral Feedback toward Sophomore College Students' Speech Errors

Based on the researcher's reflective notes, the researcher agreed with the lecturer decision of using descriptive feedback can help the student to realize that it is not necessary to say sorry every time he makes a mistake. The lecturer also said that the student needs to stay calm and not to rush while delivering a speech. On the second day of observation, no students made correction errors; it means that oral descriptive feedback for the correction error is effective, and other students also listened to those two descriptive feedbacks.

The last, the lecturer decided to use descriptive feedback for students who made false start errors.

(4)

Lecturer : Please pay attention to your grammar, and you used much V1 instead of V2 when you told about something that happened before.

Student 1 : Alright Sir, I will pay attention on the grammar for the performance.

Lecturer : If you start to feel anxious, you can try to take a little bit of time to calm yourself.

Student 2 : I was so nervous, Sir, sorry.

Lecturer : Taking important notes is important, but don't forget to read it in an effective way so you can avoid that kind of mistakes.

Student 3 : My fault, Sir, Okay, Sir.

Lecturer : Keep practising your fluency for your next presentation to help you to stop repeating some words.

Student 4 : Yes, Sir, Thanks for the advice.

Based on the researcher's reflective notes, the researcher believed that the lecturer did a good job when giving oral descriptive feedback for students who made false start errors. Some students did not look at their cue cards, because they scared to loose some points if they take a look at the cue cards. The lecturer also said to the students that they need to pay attention to grammatical rules, especially about verbs. On the second day of the observation, there are only three students who made false start errors. The lecturer decided to use oral descriptive feedback again for those students who made false start errors. The lecturer reminded them to keep pay attention to their speed of speech to make sure they can reduce their false start errors.

All of those decisions by the lecturer to use descriptive feedback is supported by Rodgers (2018) that descriptive feedback is effective to give the students an understanding of their mistakes or errors. The lecturer realized that not all students realize their own mistakes; because of that, descriptive feedback is one of the best

solutions for those types of speech errors. The researcher also believed that Descriptive feedback would be much better for the students to make a note of their mistakes and try to reduce it by practice. The researcher believed that the lecturer able to gave feedback effectively for the students who made filled in pause, repetition, correction and false start errors based on the result on the second-day observation.

Evaluative Feedback

The second type of feedback that the lecturer used for the students speaking performance in Academic Speaking class was evaluative feedback. The lecturer decided to use one of the types of evaluative feedback which is encouragement feedback. Based on the first day of observation, the lecturer gave evaluative encouragement feedback to the students who made silent in pause, correction and stutters errors.

First, the lecturer used evaluative encouragement feedback for the students who made silent in pause errors.

(5)

Lecturer : Believe that you can do it better than this for your next performance.

Student 1 : All right, Sir.

Lecturer : Find the problem and solve it, so you can be much better than this performance.

Student 2 : I will find it, Sir.

Lecturer : I know that you can reduce that freeze time for your next presentation.

Student 3 : Yes, Sir.

Lecturer : If you manage to reduce this one mistake, your performance will be impressive.

Student 4 : Yes, Sir, I will do it better for the next one.

Lecturer : Come on, try to reduce this kind of mistakes. I know you are better than this.

Student 5 : Yes, Sir, Sorry for let you down.

Those dialogues showed some examples of the lecturer's evaluative encouragement feedback to the students, and also the students' responses after they received that feedback personally from the lecturer.

Based on the researcher's reflective field notes, the researcher believed that this is the best type of feedback for the students who made filled in pause errors. There is no need to give descriptive feedback because the students only freeze when they forgot about the next sentence. With some encouragement from the lecturer, it can help them to be motivated to practice more than before. That point of view is supported by Clark & Clark

(1997) that silent pause error is not about how the students made some mistakes like mispronounce and others, and it is about the huge gap of silence that makes the speech a little longer than it should be. From that statement, the researcher concluded that oral evaluative encouragement feedback is the right decision to help the students to reduce filled in pause error.

Second, the lecturer decided to use evaluative encouragement feedback for the students who made correction errors. The lecturer decided to add evaluative encouragement feedback after the lecturer gave descriptive feedback for the students.

(6)

Lecturer : I know you can practice more and stop saying sorry for your next performance.

Student : All right, Sir.

Lecturer : Your performance was already good, just a little bit more.

Student : Thanks for the motivation, Sir.

The dialogue above showed the lecturer's evaluative encouragement feedback and the student's responses after receiving those feedbacks.

Based on the reflective notes from the researcher, it is not necessary for the lecturer to give evaluative encouragement feedback to the students, but the researcher believed that the lecturer probably gave that feedback because of the speech performance of that student almost excellent. The lecturer said that all the student needs is more practice on the fluency to help him reduce the correction errors. That point of view is supported by Chan & Lam (2018) who said that encouragement feedback is effective when you give it to the student who lacks of confidence or easy to feel guilty after making some mistakes. Based on that statement, the researcher concluded that the lecturer did a good job in giving oral evaluative encouragement feedback for the student who made correction errors.

Third, the lecturer decided to use evaluative encouragement feedback for the students who made stutters errors. Based on the first day and the second day of observation, there was only one student who made stutters errors. The student was not a person who always makes stutters errors when he talks to others.

(7)

Lecturer : If you feel so anxious while giving a presentation, it means that you really care about your performance. That feeling is good. All you need is believe in yourself.

Student : I don't think that I'm good enough, Sir.

Lecturer : Keep on practising, and you will find your best way to deliver your presentation.

Student : Thanks, Sir.

The dialogue above showed the lecturer's evaluative encouragement feedback and the student's responses after receiving those feedbacks.

Based on the researcher's reflective notes, the researcher believed that the student was not confident, and her eyes always look at the wall. The researcher also noticed that the lecturer knows about how shy the student was when she performed on the second day of observation. Because of that, the lecturer decided to use evaluative encouragement feedback for the student. That point of view is supported by Chan & Lam (2018), who said that evaluative encouragement feedback is the right choice for those who have high anxiety. The researcher also noted that the student's face was smiling after the lecturer gave feedback.

Based on those reasons and a statement above, the researcher concluded that the lecturer did the right thing to improve the student's speech performance and reduce stutters errors.

Corrective Feedback

The third type of feedback that the lecturer used for the students' speaking performance in the Academic Speaking classroom was corrective feedback. Clarification request is one of the types of corrective feedback. The lecturer decided to use clarification request for the students who made slips of tongue errors.

(9)

Student 1 : The researcher product this research in 6 days

Lecturer : Sorry, can you repeat what you just said?

Student 1 : The researcher conduct this research in 6 Days.

Student 2 : The researcher gave some suggestions to the other reacher.

Lecturer : Pardon me, reacher?

Student 2 : Sorry, what I mean is the researcher.

Student 3 : If we take a loop at the data we can see that.

Lecturer : Pardon me?

Student 3 : Sorry, What I mean is if we take a look.

Student 3 : The researcher suggested to the future teacher that they can focus on waiter improve the students' listening skill or speaking skill.

Lecturer : Sorry, can you repeat your last sentence please?

Student 3 : The researcher suggested to the future teacher that they can focus on whether improve the students' listening skill or speaking skill.

Lecturer's Oral Feedback toward Sophomore College Students' Speech Errors

Those dialogues showed the students who made a slip of the tongue errors, lecturer's corrective clarification request feedback, and the students' responses after receiving that feedback right at the middle of their speech.

Based on the researcher's reflective notes, the researcher surprised because of the decision of the lecturer to give clarification request feedback to the students. The researcher believed that one of the main reasons the lecturer used clarification request because the sentences that the students produced become awkward or funny. The other students who have a role as the audience were laughing out loud every time the students who performed made the slip of tongue error. The lecturer not only gave a chance for the students to repeat their sentences but also made the condition in the class become quiet. On the first day of observation, there were two students who made slips of tongue error. Both of them did the correction after the lecturer asked them to repeat their sentences. On the second day, there was only one student who made slips of tongue error. The lecturer decided to use clarification request again with an expectation that it can help the student to revise his own sentence. The decision of using clarification request was supported by Poulisse (2000), who stated that slip of tongue error could be repaired after the sentence ends or in the middle of the sentence. In the case of the first day and the second day of observation, three students made slips of tongue error, but they did not realize about their mistakes. The lecturer was a reminder to the students to revise their sentences. Based on the facts and statement from the previous researcher, the researcher concluded that the lecturer made the right decision for the students who made slips of tongue error.

Based on all of those data, the researcher found out that all of the students made more than one type of speech error. That means the lecturer gave more than one type of oral feedback to each student. The researcher believed that the decision from the lecturer consumed a lot of time, but it is effective for the students to reduce students' speech errors.

CONCLUSION & SUGESSTIONS

CONCLUSION

Based on the research findings and the discussions above, the researcher found out that the sophomore college students in one of the Academic Speaking classes did all the seven types of speech errors during the first day and the second day of the observation. The researcher's main focus was to find out how the lecturer gave feedbacks to all of those speech errors and what kind of feedback the lecturer used for each type of

speech errors. The researcher concluded that the lecturer gave specific oral feedback to every type of speech error because all of the students made more than one type of speech errors. The lecturer prefers to give descriptive feedback first and then evaluative feedback. The lecturer gave the corrective feedback only for the students who made slips of tongue error right after they made it. The lecturer's descriptive feedback had a function for the students to realize their mistakes, while the lecturer's evaluative feedback had a role to motivate the students to be better for their next performance. The lecturer gave corrective feedback for the students to correct their mistakes at the intervening of the speech.

SUGGESTIONS

Based on the results of the study, the researcher made some suggestions for English speaking lecturers or English teachers and future researchers. For the lecturers or teachers, please try to understand each type of students that belong in the class. Some of them only need some general feedback, but others need motivations and also some examples that can help them not only better at giving a speech but also able to reduce their anxiety. The researcher also believes that teachers and lecturers can explore more types of feedbacks or be creative for giving feedback to the students.

For the future researchers who want to conduct a similar study, the researcher suggested focusing on how effective oral feedback to reduce students' speech errors. They are rarely discussed because speech errors seem to be hard to collect the data and not all of lecturers or teachers give feedbacks for their students' speaking performance personally.

REFERENCES

- Bani Younes, Z. M. & Albalawi, F. S. (2017). *Investigating the Factors Leading to Speaking Difficulties: Both Perspectives of EFL Saudi Learners and Their Teachers*. SSRN Electronic Journal, (2), 268–287. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2814824>
- Corder, S. Pit. (1981). *Error Analysis and Interlingua*, New York: Oxford University.
- Creswell, John W. (2007). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and mixed methods approach*. Thousand Oaks, California. SAGE Publications.
- Dermody, F., & Sutherland, A. (2013). *Human-Computer Interaction – Interact* 2013, 8119, 369–370. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-40498-6>
- Johnson, R., & Christensen, L. (2014). *Educational Research Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Approaches*. 5th Edition, SAGE.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). *Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake: Negotiation of Form in Communicative Classrooms*. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37-66.

- Murphy, K., & Barry, S. (2016). *Feed-forward: students gaining more from assessment via deeper engagement in video-recorded presentations. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 41(2), 213–227.
- Okada, Y., Sawaumi, T., & Ito, T. (2017). *Effects of observing model video presentations on Japanese EFL learners' oral performance. Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 14(2), 129–144.
- P.Ida, & M.Ahmad. (2017). *Error Repetition after Direct Written Corrective Feedback in Students' Writing*.
- Poulisse, N. (2000). *Slips of the Tongue in First and Second Language Production*, 54(1986), 136–149.
- Ramaprasad, A. (1983). *On the definition of feedback. Behavioral Science*, 28(1), 4–13.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/bs.3830280103>
- Rodgers, C. (2018). *Descriptive feedback: student voice in K-5 classrooms. Australian Educational Researcher*, 45(1), 87–102.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-018-0263-1>
- Sato, K. (2003). *Improving Our Students' Speaking Skills : Using Selective Error Correction and Group Work*.
- Susan, B. (2008). *Effective feedback skills*,
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2009.04.219>
- Sutarsyah, C. (2017). *An Analysis of Student ' s Speaking Anxiety and its Effect on Speaking Performance*, 1(2), 143–152.
- Utami, A. R., & Malihah, N. (2018). *Speech Errors Produced by EFL Learners of Islamic Boarding School in Telling English Story, OKARA: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 12(2), 191.

