

THE EFFECT OF PEER FEEDBACKS ON STUDENTS' SPEECH

Susie Kusumayanthi

Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, STKIP Pasundan, Cimahi, Indonesia

Corresponding author: Susie Kusumayanthi, STKIP Pasundan, Cimahi, Indonesia

E-mail: susiekusuma7@gmail.com

Volume 7

Number 1

September 2022

Page 603-611

Abstract:

In speaking English, students still find many difficulties especially when students make speeches, and unfortunately in giving speeches students are rarely given feedback so they don't know where their mistakes are. Feedback can be given by teachers or their peer. In fact, transactional peer feedback is believed to be able to foster students' participation as well as communicative competence in compared with the feedback from the teacher (Liu & Carless, 2006). In this paper, the researcher intends to find out how peer feedback is implemented, the focus especially discusses the types of feedback used by the participants in this study, and the effect of conducting peer feedback on students' speech. This study makes use of descriptive qualitative method. Involving 6 participants. The data sources of this research are observations, student speech scores, and interviews. Observations were conducted in 3 weeks, the students' speech scores from the assessments of their peers before and after peer feedback, and interviews. From the observation, the researchers identified the types of feedback that were often used by participants, namely corrective feedback, reinforcing feedback, and didactic feedback. From the interview, the researcher perceived that the students found it beneficial from given feedback. In addition, peer-feedback techniques also have a positive effect on participants. Peer feedback can improve student speech, student confidence, and fun learning activities. Even though it was revealed that peer feedback has a lot of benefits, but most of participants agree that peer feedback activities should be followed by feedback from the teacher. Because they believe the feedback from their teacher is more reliable.

Keyword:

Peer Feedback; Students' Speech; Students' Participation



Cite this as: Kusumayanthi, Susie. (2022). The Effect of Peer Feedbacks on Students' Speech
English Journal Literacy Utama,
<https://doi.org/10.33197/ejlitama.vol7.iss1.2021.2655.4585>

Article History:

Received: 30 June 2022; Revised: 24 July 2022; Accepted: 31 August 2022

INTRODUCTION

The objectives of providing English lessons for high school students are including developing communication competence in both spoken and written form, increasing students' understanding of the importance of English. As a result, students must learn all aspects of English, particularly speaking (Oktavian, 2013). According to (Harmer, 1998), speaking ability is defined as the ability to accomplish some type of spoken task utilizing any of the languages available to the learner. Therefore, this is one of the skills that plays a large role in communication. The most notable component of learning a second or foreign language is mastering speaking abilities. The capacity in keeping on a talk in the language is a measure of success.

A lot of activities that the teacher may use in English class, such as discussion, role-playing, games, problem-solving, music, presentations, or giving speeches. One of the activities that are often used by teachers in English class is by given the task of giving speeches. Often students are asked to speak in class. However, comments are rarely given so that students do not know where the error is. In giving a speech normally students will be making some mistakes. They face

challenges such as pronunciation, grammar, restricted vocabulary, and fluency. Therefore, feedback is needed to help students to improve their speech.

Feedback is an important part of language learning that affects students' learning and achievement. Feedback helps teachers and students to find the goals of learning. According to (Hattie & Timperley, 2007) feedback has an important role in learning. (Hattie & Timperley, 2007) define feedback as an information provided by an agent with respect to one's performance or understanding.

Feedback can be from various sources, one of which is peer feedback. (Liu & Carless, 2006) defined peer feedback as a communication process through which learners enter into dialogues related to performance and standards. Peer feedback encourages students' participation and fosters communicative competence through two-way interactions. The peer feedback process involves students participate actively in the learning process, helps develop self-management and assessment, strengthens self-assessment capacity, helps develop subject knowledge, allows students to receive feedback more quickly and encourages social interaction (Liu & Carless, 2006). However, (Gielen et al., 2010) says some students even reported being unsure of their strength. It was because they were not confident in their own ability to assess their peers. This can be shown from the study by (Liu & Carless, 2006) which showed that the researchers face refusal and indifference from the students and school workers in Hong Kong when a survey was made about peer feedback that is included in the assessment.

Many studies have investigated peer feedback can affect language learning; therefore, it can allow peer feedbacks to affect students' speech delivery. (Hattie & Timperley, 2007) states that Peer feedback in speaking is formative and has different potentials to encourage further learning. Moreover, (Kerr, 2017) states that giving feedback has many advantages for both the giver and receiver. One of the benefits is to foster students' confidence in public speaking. Therefore, to foster students' speech delivery, the teacher must give some assignments to their students, one of which is by giving speech delivery assignments. Giving speeches can also be done based on the text / speech script which has been prepared in advance (Iskandar, 2008). By doing speeches in front of large audience, learners will participate in extended speaking, using their various linguistic resources and experiment with new languages.

Although previous researchers have highlighted the potential value of peer feedback for students' language learning. The possibilities for more detailed potential scores such as the effect of online peer feedback on improving students' speech delivery through speech assignments are in the form of a speech performance have not been explored.

Based on the explanation above, in this paper the researcher will investigate the types of peer feedback that the students mostly used in giving comments, and the effects of peer feedback on students' speech.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review will talk about speech and feedback. (Sellnow, 2005) states that speech is a sustained formal presentation to inform persuade, or entertain made by a speaker to an audience.

Moreover, based on (Mulgrave, 2004), speech is the ability to pronounce articulation sounds or words to express an idea. Speech can be said as a system of audible and visible sign utilized for communicating ideas. Speech provides an opportunity for the speaker to be able to express ideas. As a one-way communication, there is no turn-taking in the speech in contrast to casual conversation. (Ghasani & Sofwan, 2017) in their journal about Appraisal and Speech Structure of Contestants' Speeches in Speech Contest of ESA WEEK Competition, they stated that the speaker has to prepare the speech properly to make the target market understand what the speaker says because the listeners are not allowed to ask what the speaker says. The diction or the arrangement of the words becomes one of the keys to recognizing the speakers' meaning due to the fact that means is the core of the speech itself. According to Beebe (1993), the following are the major elements of a speech: (1) Introduction.

Based on Pfeiffer (2002), The Introduction is how speaker starts the speech or presentation, it is to give listeners a structure for capturing information, (2) Body. Lucas (2009), mentions that the body is the longest and most important part. Body provides supporting material (for an occasional speech), descriptive details (for an informative speech), or compose speaker strongest arguments (for a persuasive speech), (3) Conclusion. According to Pfeiffer (2002), the conclusion is the summary of speech or presentation. Reminds the audience what you have just talked about. This speech element will be used in this paper and included in the assessment rubric for participants.

Above is the discussion about speech, while the following discussion will discuss feedback. Many experts define feedback in a different way based totally on their perception and reasons. Susan Askew in her book, based on Gipps and Stobart (1997) argues that Feedback is a critical function of educating and learning processes and one component in a repertoire of linked strategies to assist learning.

According to Vollmeyer (2005), sourced Kulhavy and Wager (1993), the historic overview of feedback in the first half of the 20th century, feedback used to be viewed in three ways: (1) as a motivation or incentive to enhance performance, and (2) as verification of records that freshmen can use or exchange the preceding response; (3) As a satisfactory state. These feedback features are still applicable today. Feedback as motivation is based on the faith that letting humans comprehend how they function their duties will be the motivation for increased efforts in the future. Together with its data function, learners should think more about the shape of the task. Therefore, they need to come up with more high-quality but harder strategies than in the case of no feedback. The third function is in reality phase of what we understand as motivational (for example, having extra fun in the gaining knowledge of process).

Also, other experts define Feedback as facts furnished by way of an agent (e.g., teacher, peer, book, parent, self, experience) related to components of one's performance or understanding. An instructor or mum or dad can grant corrective information, a peer can furnish a choice strategy, a book can furnish records to make clear ideas, a father or mother can provide encouragement, and a learner can appear up the answer to evaluate the correctness of a response. Feedback for this reason is a "consequence" of performance (Hattie & Timperley, 2007).

According to Hadzic (2016) Feedback is divided into two forms, there are written and oral feedback: (1) Written Feedback. Written feedback is a natural part of a classroom setting that conveys feedback in written form that involves student participation in providing feedback. Written feedback is normally given once the assignment has been completed. Because of that, teachers and students have more time to consider how to provide feedback on the assignments they have been assigned, (2) Oral Feedback. Oral feedback is in contrast to written feedback. If written feedback is a natural part of the classroom setting that is delivered through writing, written feedback needs to be in written form. Oral feedback, on the other hand, is a spoken exchange between teachers and students or students and other students. When students receive oral feedback, there is a lot of discussion that helps them enhance their learning.

Both oral feedback and written feedback will be used in this study. First, participants will use written feedback. Both participants will also provide their feedback in oral form to explain the written feedback that has been given.

Furthermore, the literature review talks about peer feedback and its types. According to (Liu & Carless, 2006), Peer Feedback is a communication process through which learners enter into dialogues related to performance and standards.

On the other hand, Van der Pol, Van den Berg, Admiraal, & Simmons (2008, p. 1805) define Peer feedback can be part of peer assessment in which students engage in reflective criticism of the products of other students and provide them with feedback, using previously defined criteria.

(Gielen et al., 2010) states that Peer Feedback can be a solution to fulfill students' needs of receiving feedback to help them improve their learning process. According to Van der Pol et al. (2008), feedback is important to give students good ideas and develop self-confidence. Receiving feedback serves to improve their performance.

Based on Chi (1996), Feedback has categorized into four types of feedback, there are: Corrective, Reinforcing, Didactic and Suggestive. The writer used the same framework to categorizing the peer feedback that will be used in this study: (1) Corrective Feedback. Corrective Feedback is effective to reduce students' incorrect design or information in their projects. This kind of feedback is used if students' design or information is incorrect, then peer gives feedback to point it out or correct it, (2) Reinforcing Feedback. Reinforcing Feedback sometimes students are encouraged or stimulated without knowing the reason explicitly, and this feedback is given when what students does is correct. E.g., "Your presentation was great. You made good eye contact and were well prepared. You were a little hard to hear at the back of the room, but with some practice, you can overcome this. Keep up the good work!" Instead of: "You didn't speak loudly enough. However, the presentation went well.", (3) Didactic Feedback. In Reinforcing Feedback peer can provide lengthy explanations when a student makes a mistake or provides inaccurate information. A lengthy explanation in this type of feedback is needed to direct students to on the right side. E.g., "I do think you need to support each activity with enough evidence; especially, when you are talking about the time when you are buying things. I also think it is not the right decision to visit that place again. Your work also needs to be made more inspiring. Furthermore, the plan is not

really feasible; for example, it would be too hot to cook meal outdoor in the daylight.”, (4) Suggestive Feedback. Suggestive Feedback is also considered a kind of scaffolding. In Suggestive Feedback, peer reminds students that there is a problem without saying what the problem is. This can be a hint, pauses, or rising intonation. This type of feedback is used when the students' design is incomplete, then peers provide indirect feedback. E.g., “I do think it is better for you to explore more about the detail of the plan” and “My suggestion is for you to explore the plan in more detailed”. This research makes use of all of the types of the feedbacks mentioned above.

Other research has been done to see how online peer feedback affects students' speech. Another research was undertaken, the first of which was conducted by Indira N. Z. Day, Nadira Saab, and Wilfried Admiraal (2021). They are investigated online peer feedback on video presentations: type of feedback and improvement of presentation skills. The findings of their research revealed that students' presenting abilities had increase in quality significantly. The second is a study conducted by Susan (2012), she is an article about “Enhancing Peer Feedback and Speech Preparation: The Speech Video Activity”. In her article, she used speech video activity to improve students' speech, the result showed that the speech video activity has an improvement in students' speech.

METHODS

This study 'aims to fill the gaps in the literature by measuring the effect of peer feedback on students' speech delivery. To achieve this research aim, the study will use a descriptive design with qualitative approach. The descriptive research approach is a basic research method that examines the situation as it is in its current state (Gay, 1992). Descriptive research involves identifying the attributes of a particular phenomenon on the basis of observation or exploring the correlation between two or more phenomena.

Qualitative research was adopted in this study. According to Mack et al (2005) Qualitative research is effective in obtaining culturally specific information about the values, opinions, behaviors, and social contexts of a particular population. In other words, qualitative research is used to obtain information from a specific population. The data is obtained to find the social context and certain people. Qualitative do not use the procedure of statistical analysis or other quantification (Moleong, 2007). While descriptive qualitative is research that effort to say existing problem solving now based on data, so he also presents the data, analyzes the data, and interprets the data (Narbuko and Abu Achmadi, 1997). In this study, the researcher will focus on applying peer feedback in speech assignments in the form of speech delivery in the class.

In this paper, the researcher involved 6 students in one senior high school in Jampang Kulon. All participants do not use English as a second language. In addition, in the Jampang Kulon area, it is quite rare for students to speak fluent English.

The students who participated in this study were eleventh graders in one of the senior high schools in Jampang Kulon. Students involved in this study were selected using convenience sampling. A convenient sample is a group of individuals who are (comfortably) willing to be studied (Fraenkel, 2009). There are two reasons why convenience sampling was used in this study. The first reason is that convenience sampling is easier to implement, the second reason is because of the limited time of the researcher. Previously, researcher would search for participants based on the standards made by the researcher. Participants were divided into 3 categories, there are high, medium and low. The standard value for each category is 89 for high, 84 for medium and 78 for low. The standard value is based on their English scores when they were in tenth grade. Then the researcher will ask and convince the required participants (according to the required categories) to be willing to participated, both in terms of time and willingness to be involved in this research.

The data collection technique used is doing observation, using students' speech grade and interview. The data will be gathered and analysed.

In analysing the data. The researcher transcribes, transforms, and interprets the data that has been collected from the observation sheet and finds out the kind of peer feedback that is frequently used by participants. Then, the researcher analyses the students' speech grades. The researcher will analyse and compare the grade and find out the effect of online peer feedback on students' speech. Finally, after conducting the interview, the researcher will get more information about the effect of online peer feedback on students' speech.

In this study, the researcher uses a rubric adapted from (Brown, 2004); to be in line with the situation of this study, the rubric went through several modifications. According to (Brown, 2004) Rubric for assessing speaking performance was adopted from the oral presentation

checklist. For assess speech from the delivery category, the researcher uses a rubric adapted from Brown (2004) and focuses on pronunciation and fluency. Meanwhile, to assess speech from the content category, researcher uses the rubric was adapted from Rooney (2004) to assess the completeness of a speech (introduction, body, and conclusion). The two rubrics are combined and modified to make it easier for participants when using this rubric. The score for each item ranges from 1 (bad) to 4 (very good) for a range of 16 to 80 total points. The rubric as follows:

Table 1: Rubric for Assessing Speaking Performance (Brown, 2004)

CRITERION		1	2	3	4
Comprehension	Introduction	Three of the criteria are not met.	Two of the four criteria are not met.	One of the four criteria is not met.	Attention getter is applied; The topic is stated comprehensibly; Credibility is established; The main points are previewed
	Body	Main points are not comprehensible with no support and no evidence.	Main points need to be explored, lack of evidences.	Main points are somewhat comprehensible, some support, and some evidences are provided	Main points are comprehensible and are supported, relatable evidences are provided.
	Closing	The audience is left hanging, no signposting of closure	Closure is put forward.	Main points are summarized, and closure is put forward.	- Main points are summarized. - Closure is put forward - Unforgettable
Pronunciation		Speaking words with incomprehensibly (>5 error)	Speaking with incorrect pronunciation but still understandable (1-4 error)	Speaking with several incorrect pronunciation (1-2 error)	Speaking with correct pronunciation (no error)
Fluency		Speaking with some break offs.	Speaking at a quite slow pace	Overall, speaking is at normal speed	Speaking is delivered smoothly with no errors.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Result of the Observation

According to Chi (1996), Feedback has categorized into four types of feedback, there are: Corrective, Reinforcing, Didactic and Suggestive. In this sub chapter the researcher made observations during the peer feedback activity to obtain data on the types of peer feedback that were often used by participants in this study.

After the students complete the task of making a speech script and making a speech video, they are asked to give an assessment of the speech script and video. Then give feedback alternately with their partner, the students in this study provide feedback using English. The result is that the majority of the students are primarily using corrective feedback. The example of corrective peer feedbacks are presented below:

"The opening is actually too simple, so maybe it can be added like an introduction or a prayer so that the opening is better."

"Though your fluency in speaking was lacking, it was still a good performance. I believe that you can make it better."

These feedbacks are considered to be a good representation of corrective feedback for not only do they appreciate one's work, they also give a correction to make their friend's speech even better.

Didactic feedback came second as the type of feedback commonly utilized by the students in giving comments, for example:

"Your speech is too fast and some sentences are incorrect but for the nature and vocabulary it's pretty good and for the materials it's not too much but it is ok".

"You are speaking too fast when giving examples. Some sentences had a bad sentence structure. When it came to vocabulary, you have a good mastery of vocabulary. Overall, it was a good performance but the material was just okay."

In the above examples, the students provided a long-detailed explanation on what mistakes in speaking that their partner was doing. They were also giving a comment on the material that their friends used.

Reinforcing feedbacks came the third in this research. In this type of feedbacks, the students are encouraged or stimulated without knowing the reason explicitly, and this feedback is given when what students does is correct, for example:

"Her performance was already good. Her pronunciation, for example, was good and correct. However, some words were not pronounced clearly."

In this example, the student was trying to help her partner to achieve better speaking performance by giving feedback on her pronunciation.

The last type of peer feedback used in this research is suggestive feedback. This appears to be the most unpopular feedbacks found in the students' commentaries. Suggestive Feedback is also considered a kind of scaffolding. In Suggestive Feedback, peer reminds students that there is a problem without saying what the problem is. This can be a hint, pauses, or rising intonation. This type of feedback is used when the students' design is incomplete, then peers provide indirect feedback.

In the analysis, suggestive feedback was not found. This might happen because the participant thought that they might feel the need to make a clear and direct explanation whenever they give a comment on one's work.

Based on the findings of Widyaningrum (2017), the use of suggestive feedback is possible only for students with high English proficiency.

The Result of the Interview

To answer the second research question, the researcher uses data that are gained from the students' interview.

Six participants were employed to conduct a peer feedback based on their peer's speech performance. They were giving a comment in which areas that their peer can improve in terms of speaking. After the feedbacks were given, another performance was conducted. First speech and second speech were scored based on their performance. Only the first performance was given feedbacks by their peer. The feedbacks were in form of qualitative feedback.

Leki (1990) explained that qualitative feedback provided more detailed information about one's strengths and weaknesses in terms of feedback processes. He also stated that it is more beneficial and richer in information in contrast to numerical feedbacks given by teachers. However, everything comes with consequences. Qualitative feedbacks might take longer than numerical feedbacks.

Based on the findings of the Interview, data collected from all of the participants showed that there are two types of students; one who likes to give the peer feedbacks and another one who dislikes to give the peer feedbacks. The students give a positive response towards giving feedback to their peer meaning that they do give feedback to their peer when they are paired to speak within the classroom.

Meanwhile, other participants give negative response towards giving feedback to their peer. They dislike giving comments on one's performance either because they give less attention to others while another one felt that they did not like the talking activity itself. This shows that even if the activity of giving feedback was told by the teachers. There is a possibility that the students do not give any feedbacks to their peers. This can happen possibly because of one's characteristics or one's feelings during the activity. Some students found it hard to give a comment towards their peer's performance because they felt that they were not confidence enough to let their peer knew about the performance and this occurs when the participant is unsure of their English level because differences in the level of English skills may affect their feedback towards their peers.

When the participants were asked if there were any difficulties when doing peer feedback, most of them answered that they have no difficulties when doing peer feedback, but still there are some of them who have difficulties when doing peer feedback. Like they find it difficult to get a partner who is less experienced when giving a speech, there are also participants who have difficulty giving feedback for fear of making the wrong judgment.

However, all participants agree that the rubric used to evaluate their partners is very helpful. A participant stated that he felt confused if there was no rubric because he didn't know what to assess and correct.

All participants also think that peer feedback has benefits for them and they can learn from the feedback activity. As stated by some participants that they feel more confident to speak English, know each other's shortcomings and get motivated to learn.

This study also reveals that all participants are satisfied with the feedback given by their partners. Some said that the feedback given to them was very clear and detailed, because one of the factors is that they use the speech rubric.

After being given the peer feedback, several students feel that there is an improvement especially in pronunciation after doing peer feedback but the others feel that there is no change even though they are becoming more confident now when speaking in English.

Furthermore, the students reveal that they really like being given feedback especially if their partner is a close friend, besides that they also like to be given feedback if the feedback is constructive, if not then they will feel hurt and less confident.

Even though peer feedback has a lot of benefits but most of participants agree that peer feedback activities should be followed by feedback from the teacher. Because they believe the feedback from their teacher is more reliable. This is in accordance with (Mamoon-Al-Bashir, Md., Kabir Rezaul, Md., Rahman, 2016) who mentioned that teachers' feedback can provide quality information to ensure learning as they are usually more effective in detecting mistakes in students' work.

The discussion will now move to the students' speech grades.

The Students' Speech Grades

The data was collected from the participants, comparing the students' speech grades before and after the participants conduct peer feedback.

Table 2: The Comparison of Students' Speech Grades

Participant	Score 1	Score 2
Participant 1	60	65
Participant 2	65	65
Participant 3	75	80
Participant 4	70	75
Participant 5	60	65
Participant 6	65	65

Table 2 above shows participants' scores before (score 1) and after (score 2) applying the Peer Feedback. There are some scores that increased by five points and others remained the same. As seen in Participant 1, Participant 3, Participant 4, and Participant 5, their scores were increased from 60 to 65, 75 to 80, 70 to 75, and 60 to 65. Meanwhile, Participant 2 and Participant 6's scores remained the same. To conclude, most participants' speech grade in this study increases insignificantly after conducting peer feedback.

CONCLUSION

Referring to the findings and discussion of the research, the conclusions of this study are as follows: (1) from the 4 types of feedback, corrective feedback is the most widely used by participants, followed by Didactic Feedback, Reinforcing Feedback, and lastly Suggestive Feedback, (2) most participants' speech grade increases but not significant in which they increased only 5 points. Some other participants' speech grade remained the same, (3) most of the students gave positive responses to the questions given during the interview. As when asked about the use of the speech rubric, the level of satisfaction with the feedback given, and the benefits of the feedback itself, all participants gave a positive response. They said that the rubric

provided was very helpful, they were also satisfied with the feedback given by their respective partners, and that the feedback activity gave benefits to all of them. As they are more confident in speaking English, get motivated to learn, they also know where their mistakes are if they are given feedback. However, there were also some students who gave negative responses, especially because they feel that they have difficulty in giving feedback due to their lack of English. Some peer feedbacks are found to be not constructive leaving their peers hurt and become insecure. The students also reveal that teacher's feedback is still needed.

REFERENCES

- Astuti, N. K. (2011). *Jurus kilat jago: public speaking! : secara otodidak*. Laskar Aksara. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=-YLajgEACAAJ>
- Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practice*. Pearson Education, Inc.
- Cambridge Press, U. (2008). *Cambridge Advanced Learners Dictionary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Demirbilek, M. (2015). Social media and peer feedback: What do students really think about using Wiki and Facebook as platforms for peer feedback? *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 16(3), 211–224. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787415589530>
- DiGiovanni, E., & Nagaswami, G. (2001). Online peer review: An alternative to face-to-face? *ELT Journal*, 55(3), 263–272. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/55.3.263>
- Fraenkel, J. R. (2009). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*. New York. McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Ghasani, & Sofwan. (2017). Appraisal And Speech Structure Of Contestants' Speeches In Speech Contest Of ESA WEEK Competition. *English Education Journal*, 7(2).
- Gielen, Peeters, Dochy, Onghena, & Struyven. (2010). Improving the effectiveness of peer feedback for learning. *Lerning and Instruction*, 20(4).
- Harmer. (1998). *How to Teach English*. Longman.
- Hattie, & Timperley. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*.
- Kerr. (2017). Giving feedback on speaking. *Cambridge Papers on ELT Series*. http://www.cambridge.org/elt/blog/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/Cambridge-Press_Whitepaper_Feedback_Speaking_2018.pdf
- Liu, & Carless. (2006). Peer Feedback: the learning element of peer assessment. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 11(3). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510600680582>
- Mamoon-Al-Bashir, Md., Kabir Rezaul, Md., Rahman, I. (2016). The Value and Effectiveness of Feedback in Improving Students' Learning and Professionalizing Teaching in Higher Education. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(16), 38.
- Mulgrave. (2004). *Speech: A Handbook of Voice Training Diction and Public Speaking*.
- Oktavian. (2013). *An Analysis of Corrective Feedback in Students' Speaking Activity at Senior High School*. University of Muhammadiyah, Gresik.
- Sellnow. (2005). *Confident Public Speaking 2nd Edition*.
- Situmorang, R. N. (2016). The Effect of Public Speaking by using Manuscript Speech on Students' Speaking Achievement of Twelveth grade at SMA N 11 Medan. Repository UHN.
- Slagell, A. (2009). Public Speaking. 21st Century Communication: A Reference Handbook. Notes and Queries, s8-III(64), 218.
- Steele, J. (2010). The Definition of Public Speaking. www.Speechmastery.Com. <https://www.speechmastery.com/definition-of-public-speaking.html>
- Sukini, I. (2008). NoSD/MI, Bahasa Indonesia untuk kelas 6 Title. Jakarta: Bookkeeping Center of the Ministry of National Education.
- Tuzi, F. (2004). The impact of e-feedback on the revisions of L2 writers in an academic writing course. *Computers and Composition*, 21(2), 217–235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2004.02.003>
- van der Pol, J., van den Berg, B. A. M., Admiraal, W. F., & Simons, P. R. J. (2008). The nature, reception, and use of online peer feedback in higher education. *Computers and Education*, 51(4), 1804–1817. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2008.06.001>
- Warschauer, M., & Ware, P. (2006). Automated writing evaluation: Defining the classroom research agenda. *Language Teaching Research*, 10(2), 157–180. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168806lr190oa>

