ELITE: English and Literature Journal
Volume 9 Number 1 June 2022 Page 42-54
Print ISSN: 2355-0821, Online ISSN: 2580-5215

THE EFFECTS OF CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON FLUENCY AND ACCURACY IN 4/3/2 ACTIVITY: A CASE OF STUDENTS AT ELTO SPELL-OUT PROGRAM

Muntasir[1], Fadhlur Rahman[2], Muhammad Haekal[3]
[1]Politeknik Kutaraja, Indonesia and Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand.
[2]State Islamic Institute of Lhokseumawe, Faculty of Education, Indonesia.
[3]Monash University, Faculty of Education, Australia.
mun2017nz@gmail.com[1], fadhlur.rahman@iainlhokseumawe.ac.id[2],
muhammad.haekal@monash.edu[3]

ABSTRACT

Due to limited time in the language classroom, teachers cannot set a huge number of goals for their students in teaching-learning process. The 4/3/2 activity, which is becoming increasingly popular among ESL teachers, is the focus of this research. The corrective feedback strategy is offered in this study as a way to improve the 4/3/2 activity. There were four participants in the study, all of whom were English Language Training for Officials (ELTO) spell-out students from Southeast Asian countries. They underwent a short course at Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand. The findings suggest that fluency development is best served by 4/3/2 activity. Especially, respondents' fluency in both activities improved as a result of the time constraints. Surprisingly , there is not enough evidence to support the claim that both activities are more valuable in terms of accuracy's improvement. Despite the fact that corrective feedback has been incorporated into the activity, the results show no significant change. While adjusting the 4/3/2 activity can help, it does not take the place of adjusting the activity's priority. Correct feedback does not interfere with fluency improvement; hence this claim is disproved.

Keywords: *Corrective Feedback; Fluency; The 4/3/2 Activity*

ABSTRAK

Karena waktu yang terbatas dalam pembalajaran bahasa di kelas, guru tidak dapat menargetkan banyak hal bagi siswanya dalam proses belajar-mengajar. Kegiatan 4/3/2 yang semakin populer di kalangan guru bahasa Inggris, menjadi fokus pada penelitian ini. Strategi umpan balik korektif ditawarkan dalam penelitian ini sebagai salah satu cara untuk meningkatkan kegiatan 4/3/2. Ada empat partisipan yang menjadi objek dalam penelitian ini, semuanya adalah siswa spell-out English Language Training for Officials (ELTO) dari beberapa negara Asia Tenggara. Mereka menjalani kursus singkat di Victoria University of Wellington, Selandia Baru. Temuan dari penelitian ini menunjukkan peningkatan kefasihan berbicara, paling signifikan didapati dalam aktivitas 4/3/2. Kefasihan responden dalam kedua kegiatan tersebut meningkat tajam sebagai efek dari penekanan waktu pada aktivitas tersebut. Anehnya, tidak ada cukup bukti untuk mendukung klaim bahwa kedua aktivitas tersebut lebih bernilai dalam hal peningkatan akurasi berbicara. Terlepas dari kenyataan bahwa umpan balik korektif telah dimasukkan ke dalam aktivitas tersebut, hasilnya tidak menunjukkan perubahan yang signifikan. Meskipun menyesuaikan aktivitas 4/3/2 dapat membantu, itu tidak menggantikan penyesuaian prioritas aktivitas tersebut. Umpan balik yang benar tidak mengganggu peningkatan kelancaran, oleh karena itu klaim ini dibantah.

***Kata Kunci**: Umpan Balik; Aktivitas 4/3/2; Kefasihan Berbicara; Akurasi Berbicara..*

Received: 10 January 2022 **Revised: 22 January 2022** **Accepted: 1 February 2022**

INTRODUCTION

One of the main objectives of students learning a second language is to attain fluency in the target language. Being fluent enables the student to concentrate on the meaning of the discussion and elevates self-confidence in speaking the target language in verbal exchange (Samuel, 2020). Despite the fact that different experts have defined fluency variously, it is generally understood to be the ability to communicate the language fluently and automatically without hesitation, regardless of the context (Chambers, 1997). In recent investigations, fluency is defined as a multidimensional phenomenon that interacts with other technical specifications such as language, social-cultural and psycholinguistics on the formulation and production of speech (Syarif & Muthmainnah, 2017; De Jong, 2018; Tavakoli et al., 2020)

An additional key focus of learners when learning a language is accuracy, another crucial aspect of the process. In any language, it is unquestionably necessary to be precise when expressing compositional meaning to the listener, especially when they try to comprehend the words entirely (Lukitasari, 2020). Accuracy can be described as exerting greater control over language production to avoid making errors (Ellis, 2005). Nonetheless, accuracy and fluency in language production are two distinct components of the process. One who speaks with greater fluency does not inevitably speak with greater accuracy as well. As a result, language practitioners and scholars have devised a number of exercises to assist learners in achieving the objective of being fluent and accurate in their communication (Haliwanda, 2021). The practice of task repetition is one that practitioners and researchers frequently debate. Specifically, the 4/3/2 technique (task repetition with time pressure) is discussed in the following section of this paper, along with modifications that can be made to be accurate and fluent in the medium of instruction in language classroom.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Based on Levelt's (1989) seminal work on speech production models, it is possible to acquire fluency improvement by task repetition of similar activity. This is because task repetition encompasses the main component of speech production by formulating, establishing content materials and articulating the speech. In a more recent study, Tran (2019) discovered that aptitude simulates many advantages for language learners in such activities. Equally significant, there is a distinction in learners' growth patterns in associative memory, language analytic ability, phonemic coding, and recognition of sound sequences. In addition to that, Boers (2014) contends that verbatim repetition is the driving factor underlying fluency development in 4-3-2 activity, aside from the components identified by Nation (1989). Speaking in a series of repetitions, speakers reuse similar words and phrases from the previous talk. Verbatim repetition enables the

speaker to reuse previously used words or phrases, which gives the speaker more mental capacity to process speech's linguistic characteristics. Third-talk words become automated and easy to manufacture. Instead of helping the language creation, recycling words and phrases leads to blunders being repeated over and over again (Boers, 2014). For this reason, speakers often fail to notice that they are repeating their faults from the previous speech. Most speakers use the same utterances in all three lectures, even the errors they have made. If the speaker makes mistakes, they probably did not know it since they are busy delivering the message.

Some studies have revealed that task repetition can benefit students' fluency and accuracy (Wang, 2014; Thai & Boers, 2016). However, such elements can be changed according to the student's competency. Some students may find it challenging to fulfil a speech of four minutes with an equal range of vocabulary and ideas. Therefore, this activity can also be modified to 3/2/1. Studies show that 4-3-2 action improves fluency, accuracy, and complexity all at the same time. As an illustration, in one of the earliest and most widely recognized studies, Nation (1989) examined the relationship between fluency, accuracy, and complexity by using a limited number of participants for the 4-3-2 approach. Specifically, he looked at how many words each participant could produce in a minute to determine fluency. In comparison to the third monologue, the results show that fluency improved. Nation's fluency measurement, on the other hand, came under fire subsequently. Nation (1989) measured fluency by counting the number of words, although word length varies; some words have more than two syllables, while others only have two. Since calculating the syllables instead of words is more precise, de Jong and Perfetti (2011) recommended it.

Other significant studies have shown an increase in fluency as well. De Jong and Perfetti (2011) discovered that the fluency of the repeated monologue improved significantly with a group of twenty-four individuals. Furthermore, De Jong and Perfetti (2011) found that fluency enhanced over the long term and in the short term. The study of task repetition under time pressure by Boers (2014) also compared it to a task repetition without time pressure. Instead of counting the number of words generated by the speakers, the Boers counted the number of syllables. There was a positive correlation between the two activities and improved speaker fluency. "A startlingly high proportion of verbatim repetition in successive versions helps to account for the fluency increases," noted Boers in his study. Additionally, Thai and Boers (2016) replicated the results of Boers' original work on a bigger scale. In every case, the outcome is the same: pupils perform better when doing repeated monologues regularly.

In addition to being favorable to fluency, the 4/3/2 exercise is considered to be practical and advantageous to accuracy and complexity (Lambert et al., 2016; Tran & Saito, 2021). In the Lambert's et al (2016) study, it attempts to examine the relationship between oral monologue repetition and subsequent L2 fluency gains. Thirty-two Japanese English learners completed six oral communication

activities (instruction, narration, and opinion). Regardless of task type and proficiency level, immediate aural-oral repetition of the same task increased oral fluency. However, there is no interaction between speech rate and experiment, implying that native and non-native fluency are perceived equally.

Skehan (2009), on the other hand, asserts that a concentration on fluency is likely to come at the expense of the linguistic accuracy of a speaker's communication. When language learners want to be fluent in a foreign language, it is natural for them to make mistakes in their utterances (Nassaji, 2016). The findings of investigations on accuracy are consistent with the statements made in the studies, which is in stark contrast to a prior study. Boers (2014) discovered that accuracy and complexity did not improve in either 4/3/2 activities or constant time activities compared to baseline (3/3/3). The accuracy does not improve in Thai and Boers (2016), either, despite their efforts. Furthermore, the majority of the mistakes from the first delivery were carried over into the subsequent discussions. Thai and Boers (2016) contend that it is induced by the repetition of the exact words repeatedly. Nonetheless, only a few modifications have been made to the 4-3-2 action. Boers (2104), on the other hand, gave several recommendations to help enhance accuracy in the 4-3-2 activity. One of the proposals was to provide corrective feedback to those who made mistakes. This recommendation has consistently been seen as a mechanism of enhancing motivation and ensuring that students generate correct language (Ellis, 2009) or simply as "responses to learner utterances containing inaccuracy" (Ellis, 2006).

However, corrective feedback is not only a tool for correcting learners' errors in oral pro; it may also be used to improve the speakers' consciousness about the mistakes they have made, allowing them to make self-corrections in their delivery of the message. Since errors are relatively probable to be taken from the first talk activity in the 4/3/2 task to the following talk activity in the 4/3/2 activity (Boers, 2014), we recommend that corrective feedback be utilized during the first talk in the 4/3/2 activity.

The types of reformulation that include recasting and direct rectification are covered in reformulation. When learners receive this type of remedial feedback, they are given the target form. Prompts are focused on providing a signal that will encourage students to self-correct. Prompts include calls for clarification, metalinguistic hints, elicitation, and repetition, among other things. As a kind of corrective feedback, we used both recast and clarification requests in this investigation. The act of recasting itself has been identified as one of the most often used forms of remedial feedback by teachers in second/foreign language classrooms (Terriche, 2017; Quinn & Nakata, 2017).

In the majority of circumstances, corrective feedback has been offered as a way to lessen the likelihood of making a mistake during language output. For instance, Han (2002) conducted study in which he aimed to determine the effects of recasting on tenses consistency output in L2. According to the findings of this study, recasting has a favourable impact on enhancing students' awareness of the

consistency of tenses in spoken or written language compared to when recasting is not used. The efficiency of the recast was demonstrated in other areas as well, such as pronunciation, during the study. Saito and Lyster (2012) investigated the effect of recasting on the pronunciation of Japanese students and discovered that it had a significant impact on their ability to master the /ɹ/ sound.

One of the most difficult challenges in the language classroom is a shortage of time. In reality, teachers do not have the time to create a large number of objectives for students to achieve. In order to enhance language acquisition development as efficiently as possible, it is critical for the instructor to select activities that encourage language acquisition improvement. When it comes to language teachers, the 4/3/2 exercise has been increasingly popular. Therefore, it makes sense to enhance its use by including additional elements. As a result, it is necessary to offer a valuable improvement to the 4/3/2 activity to improve its accuracy. As a change, the corrective feedback is proposed in this study. In this study, participants receive feedback during the first delivery. A 4/3/2 activity without feedback is compared. This research aims to answer the following questions:

Does corrective feedback on the first delivery of a 4/3/2 sequence improve accuracy in subsequent deliveries? Does 4/3/2 corrective feedback affect the third delivery's fluency?

RESEARCH METHOD

The oral proficiency of participants in this descriptive study was tracked. The accuracy and fluency measurements were conducted to determine whether developmental trends could be discovered. The subjects were four students from Southeast Asian countries who joined ELTO spell-out program funded by the New Zealand government in winter 2018. The participants underwent a short course at Victoria University of Wellington on English Language Training for Officials. The participants came from different culture backgrounds, and they have been staying for three months in the capital, but none of them speaks English as their first language. Their IELTS score is between 5 and 6 or equivalent. Participants tried to speak in English as much as possible in the course settings, but they use their first language at the accommodation most of the time. When the exercise began, the researcher and two volunteers participated as observers and listeners for the participants.

The data collection procedure was split into two parts: 4/3/2 with online feedback and 4/3/2 without feedback. To begin, the activity was performed on two different days in order to prevent the contributory effects of the first activity on the second one. Individuals were summoned to different rooms one at a time as part of the initial phase of the program. Furthermore, the topic was provided to the participant before the commencement of the activity. The topic was similar for all participants, but it was delivered as they entered the room.

The first topic for the activity was participant's *"most unforgettable childhood experience"*. For the second section of the activity, the topic was participant's *"best experience during their stay in Napier/Nelson"*. The themes were chosen specifically to encourage students to talk more about their previous experiences. During the initial delivery, the feedback tends to focus solely on past tense expression problems. Before the session began, the participants admitted that they had mastered the past tense form but were still unable to use it in speech and conversation. Further, after being allocated the given topic, the participants of the study were given some time to prepare their monologue. Participants were entitled to write down what they planned to say during the rehearsal, but no specific instructions were given. With the first listener, the participants will begin the monologue. Furthermore, the participants were given only a few seconds to pause, but participants were no longer permitted to make notes.

On the next activity, the participants continued to the second delivery. Although the listener was utterly different from the previous one, the content was relatively similar. The speaker will not try to modify the topic to entertain the listener, as Nation (1989) noted. In this specific activity, three minutes were allotted for participants to speak. After completing the first task, participants quickly moved on to the third. The third delivery mechanism involved the participant speaking for two minutes to a variety of participants on somewhat identical topics. All participants must complete this activity in one day.

Secondly, the same participants were given corrective feedback while performing the 4-3-2 task. All the activity was identical to the prior one; however, the feedback component is entirely different. During the initial delivery, the participant received feedback on the second try. Due to the fact that feedback was provided at the initial delivery. The initial delivery took four minutes and one of the researchers served as the initial listener for all participants. Then, the participants instantly resumed giving the monologue with a similar talk for the second delivery. The speech lasted three minutes, while the third delivery lasted two minutes. The participants received simply a short brief for a few seconds between monologues. Each delivery had a different listener on the day one.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Fluency

Repair fluency, breakdown fluency, and speech fluency are three fluency dimensions created by Tavakoli and Skehan (2005). Speech fluency would be determined by the median number of syllables or words yielded every minute (Tavakoli and Skehan, 2005, Witton-Davies, 2010). To measure fluency, a researcher utilized word count uttered by the communicator in a minute timeframe (Nation, 1989). In consequence, to examine fluency, calculating words or syllables has been one of the most common methods instead of making use of repeated syllables, pauses, false starts, and a raw speech or speech with

hesitations, Lennon (1990) proposed that disfluency features of the speech transcription should be eliminated; thus, he referred to it as "pruned" or "trimmed" speech. Therefore, fluency is assessed in this pilot study by measuring the number of syllables generated by the speaker per minute and using trimmed speech or meaningful syllables. The initial delivery's syllable count is then compared to the third one's.

After the transcript of speech is being inscribed, any insignificant attributes for example self-correction, repeated syllables, pauses, hesitation, and false starts are eradicated to determine the speed rate. This section is sequentially divided into two parts because there are two types of activity. First and foremost, the results of this pilot study's fluency component in both activities are aligned with prior studies. In comparison to the first delivery, the data reveals that participants' fluency improves in the third delivery. Tables 1 and 2 show the results of each participant's fluency in the 4/3/2 task without feedback.

Table 1. Speed rate in 4/3/2 activity without feedback (syllables per minute)

No	Students	First delivery	Third delivery	difference
1	A	109	91	-18
2	B	110	150	40
3	C	105	129	24
4	D	137	144	7
Mean		115,5	128,5	13,25
SD		12,5	22,9	21,4

Table 2. Speed rate in 4/3/2 activity with feedback

No	Students	First delivery	Third delivery	Increase
1	A	95	83	-12
2	B	64	90	26
3	C	130	136	6
4	D	96	155	59
Mean		96,25	116	19,75
SD		23,3	30,3	28,2

The data above demonstrate that all participants in both types of activity improved their speed rate; one person did not enhance his/her speed rate. The mean speed rate in the 4/3/2 activity without feedback is 115,5 (SD 12,6) in the first delivery and in the third deliverance, it reaches 128,5 (SD 22,9). The data also shows that the rate of increase in speed spans from 7 to 40 syllables per minute, with the average number of syllables created per minute increasing by

13,25 (SD 21,4) from the first to third delivery. Furthermore, the precise state is sensed in activity with feedback. In the task with feedback, however, the average number of syllables increases considerably. In the third delivery, the mean of syllables generated increases by 19,75 (SD28,2) from the first one. The given feedback might have caused the difference in mean speed rate during the initial delivery; thus, the participants may be interrupted during the performance. In the third delivery, there was no interruption in feedback that caused participants to pause and correct their utterances.

However, claiming that the activity with feedback has a more substantial improvement in terms of speed rate than the activity without feedback is insufficient. Therefore, the sample t-test is used to compare whether one activity improves more significantly than another. The paired sample T-test is utilised in this quasi-experimental study since it is a within-participant comparison. The p-value must be less than 0.05 to establish whether or not it is statistically significant (p0.05). Nevertheless, the p-value for the paired sample T-test is 0.346, which is more than 0.05. As a result, this finding implies that there is no substantial contrast between different activities in terms of fluency improvement, and there is no evidence to indicate that one type of activity is preferred over the other. On the other hand, the upsurge in the mean number of syllables between the first to the third delivery, on the other hand, shows that the 4/3/2 activity foster students' fluency with or without feedback. This finding also demonstrates that the modification of the activity does not affect the 4/3/2 activity's primary goal in enhancing the speaker's fluency.

Accuracy

Skehan and Foster (1999) define accuracy as the ability to avoid making mistakes when speaking. Thus, this ability reflects a more effective use of words during a performance. There are a variety of methods for determining accuracy elements in speaking skills. For starters, it can be calculated by counting the number of error-free clauses per phrase or error-free units per unit (Kormos & Dénes, 2004; Robinson, 2001). Second, another way to assess accuracy is to count the number of errors per word or unit (Nation, 1989; Bygate, 2001). For instance, in his early work, Nation (1989) calculated the errors from 100 first words in the initial delivery to measure the participants' accuracy and compared them to the third delivery. In a similar vein, the number of errors in the first 150 words is calculated in this pilot study to assess accuracy. This measurement is performed because the participants have a tendency to solely focus on the topic after uttering several words or phrases. Furthermore, not all errors are counted; the pilot study is particularly conducted to monitor critical errors.

Moreover, calculating particular inaccuracies is not a novel method of evaluating accuracy; it has been utilized in a number of previous research (see Mochizuki & Ortega, 2008; Tavakoli & Foster, 2008). However, only errors in past tenses forms are counted in this pilot study, so only these specific errors receive feedback in the 4/3/2 activity. The number of errors in the first and third

deliveries is calculated to determine if the error has progressed or not. For both types of activities, Table 3 and 4 indicate the amount of failures performed by each respondent and the mean number of errors made by the rest of the group.

There is no indication that 4/3/2 activity without feedback increases participants' proficiency, as seen in the table. The participants' average number of errors during the first delivery is 12.75 (SD 2.77), and it is comparatively higher in the third delivery, at 13.5. (2.06). The speakers produced approximately the same number of mistakes in both deliveries. Even though the difference is modest, the inaccuracy is greater in the third delivery than in the first. As a result, without feedback, it is possible to conclude that accuracy does not improve during the 4/3/2 exercise. In addition to that, the data have provided synchronous results with some of the latest investigations on the topic (Boers, 2014; Thai & Boers, 2016). Even though the difference is modest, the inaccuracy is more significant in the third delivery than in the first one. As a result, it is possible to conclude that accuracy does not improve during the 4/3/2 activity without feedback.

Table 3. Number of errors in 4/3/2 without feedback.

No	Students	First delivery	Third delivery	difference
1	A	10	12	+2
2	B	15	13	-3
3	C	16	17	1
4	D	10	12	2
Mean		12,75	13,5	0,5
SD		2,77	2,06	2,06

Table. 4. Number of errors in 4/3/2 with feedback.

No	Students	First delivery	Third delivery	Increase/decrease
1	A	8	7	-1
2	B	9	8	-1
3	C	10	8	-2
4	D	15	8	-7
Mean		10,5	7,75	-2,75
SD		2,69	0,43	2,48

Moreover, the data has produced compatible results with the most recent studies on the case (Boers, 2014; Thai & Boers, 2016). Furthermore, the second activity yields slightly different results. When compared to the first delivery, the

third delivery has a somewhat lower error rate. From 10.5 (SD 2.69) in the first delivery to 7.75 (SD 0.43) in the third, the average number of errors per 150 words significantly reduced. Despite the small reduction, the drop-in errors are negligible, with some persons making only one or two fewer errors in the third delivery. It is also important to note that the delivery of some verbs (past tenses) may have contributed to the decline. As a result, for both activities, a T-test is employed to determine the relevance of accuracy.

Further, the paired sample t-test is deployed to confirm the significance of the activity. Since this particular research employed within-participant comparison, the paired t-test was utilised similarly in the fluency circumstance. According to the t-test results, the p score is 0.12, which is not less than 0.05. Therefore, there is paucity of evidence to assert that the 4/3/2 activity with feedback effectively tackles the accuracy issues when compared to the activity without feedback.

Furthermore, some errors might be carried over from the first delivery to the third one, and similar errors occur multiple times during the delivery. Even after receiving feedback, some participants used the exact verbatim from the first to the third. Most identical inaccuracies are found in the third delivery's verbatim repetitions as in the first one. For example, in the first delivery, the speaker stated, "I am scared", and despite getting feedback on the verb, the inconsistency persisted through the third delivery. Furthermore, several mistakes are echoed throughout the delivery, particularly on activities with little feedback. For example, one participant kept using the present form of the verb "have" in multiple sentences throughout each delivery, contributing to the overall number of errors. Besides, several words and phrases that were utilized to emphasize feedback in the first delivery were omitted in the third. As a result, it is challenging to follow up on the words changes. Nevertheless, the speaker/participant seemed to be more aware and alert of the past form in the third utterance, especially with high-frequency verbs and auxiliary verbs like *went* and *was* (past tense form).

CONCLUSION

The study's findings imply that 4/3/2 activity is primarily suitable for fluency development. The time constraint successfully improved speakers' fluency in both activities. However, there is not enough evidence to back up the increase in accuracy in both activities. Even though incorporating corrective feedback into the activity, the data indicates that there is no substantial improvement. Further, it is worth noting that adjusting the 4/3/2 activity does not substitute the activity's priority. Thus, the report that corrected feedback would indeed interfere with fluency improvement is rejected. As a result, if the major purpose of the 4/3/2 exercise is to increase fluency, the remodelling is permissible as long as it does not jeopardize the original goal. Another suggestion for modifying the activity is to use corrective feedback after the first activity or supported pre-task planning. Nevertheless, because the number of participants in this pilot study was relatively

modest, the results should not oversimplify the conclusion. Another weakness of this study is the narrow scope of the topic.

There were only two particular topics provided for the speaker to choose from, which may be bold and demanding. Additional alternatives should be offered to support the participants/speaker in his or her task performance. Additionally, while this study examined the effectiveness of feedback only during the third delivery, an instant uptake and impact of feedback during the second delivery should be explored in future research. Nevertheless, this study should serve as an attractive initial position for further in-depth analysis and research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Boers, F. (2014). A reappraisal of the 4/3/2 activity. *RELC Journal, 45*, 221–235.

Bygate, M., 2001. Effects of task repetition on the structure and control of language. In: Bygate, M., Skehan, P., Swain, M. (Eds.), Task-based Learning: Language Teaching, Learning, and Assessment. Longman, London, pp. 23-48.

Chambers, F. (1997). What do we mean by fluency? *System, 25*, 535–544.

De Jong, N. H. (2018). Fluency in second language testing: Insights from different disciplines. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, *15*(3), 237-254.

De Jong, N., & Perfetti, C. A. (2011). Fluency training in the ESL classroom: An experimental study of fluency development and proceduralization. *Language Learning, 61*, 533–568.

Ellis R (2005) Planning and task-based performance: theory and research. In: Ellis R (ed.) *Planning and Task Performance in Second Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 3–34.

Ellis, R. (2006). Researching the effects of form-focused instruction on L2 acquisition. *AILA review*, *19*(1), 18-41.

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, *1*(1).

Fukuta, J. (2016). Effects of task repetition on learners' attention orientation in L2 oral production. *Language Teaching Research*, *20*(3), 321-340.

Haliwanda, U. (2021). THE EFFECT OF USING THE COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING (CLT) APPROACH IN TEACHING SPEAKING. *English and Literature Journal*, *8*(2), 40-53.

Han, Z. (2002). A study of the impact of recasts on tense consistency in L2 output. *TESOL quarterly*, *36*(4), 543-572.

Hsu, H. C. (2019). The combined effect of task repetition and post-task transcribing on L2 speaking complexity, accuracy, and fluency. *The Language Learning Journal, 47*(2), 172-187.

Kormos, J., & Dénes, M. (2004). Exploring measures and perceptions of fluency in the speech of second language learners. *System*, *32*(2), 145-164.

Lambert, C., Kormos, J., & Minn, D. (2016). Task repetition and second language speech processing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 39 (1), 167–196.

Lennon, P. (1990). Investigating fluency in EFL: A quantitative approach. *Language Learning, 40*, 387–417.

Levelt, W. J. M. (1989). *Speaking: From intention to articulation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Lukitasari, D. R. (2020). POSTCOLONIAL THEORIES ON PROMOTING WORLD ENGLISH IN EFL SPEAKING CLASSES. *English and Literature Journal*, *7*(1), 13-22.

Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language teaching*, *46*(1), 1-40.

Maurice, K. (1983). The fluency workshop. *TESOL Newsletter, 17*, 429.

Mochizuki, N., & Ortega, L. (2008). Balancing communication and grammar in beginning-level foreign language classrooms: A study of guided planning and relativization. *Language Teaching Research*, *12*(1), 11-37.

Nassaji, H. (2016). Anniversary article interactional feedback in second language teaching and learning: A synthesis and analysis of current research. *Language Teaching Research*, 20 (4), 535–562.

Nation, I. S. P. (1989). Improving Speaking Fluency. *System, 17*, 377–384.

Quinn, P. G., & Nakata, T. (2017). The timing of oral corrective feedback. In *Corrective feedback in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 35-47). Routledge.

Ranta, L., & Lyster, R. (2007). A cognitive approach to improving immersion students' oral language abilities: The Awareness–Practice–Feedback sequence. In R. DeKeyser (ed.), *Practice in a second language: Perspectives from applied linguistics and cognitive psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 141–160.

Robinson, P. (2001). Task complexity, task difficulty, and task production: Exploring interactions in a componential framework. *Applied linguistics*, *22*(1), 27-57.

Saito, K., & Lyster, R. (2012). Effects of form-focused instruction and corrective feedback on L2 pronunciation development of/ɹ/by Japanese learners of English. *Language Learning*, *62*(2), 595-633.

Samuel, I. J. (2020). Teaching Effectiveness Strategies in Reducing Anxiety During English Learning and Speaking. *Psychology and Education*

Journal, *57*(8), 1312-1318.

Skehan, P. (2009). Modelling second language performance: Integrating complexity, accuracy, fluency, and lexis. *Applied Linguistics, 30*, 510–532.

Skehan, P., & Foster, P. (1999). The influence of task structure and processing conditions on narrative retellings. *Language learning*, *49*(1), 93-120.

Syarif, A., & Muthmainnah, M. (2017). THE EFFECT OF ENGLISH SPEECH ACTIVITY TOWARD THE PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECT IN SPEAKING ENGLISH FOR THE SECOND SEMESTER STUDENTS OF ENGLISH DEPARTMENT AT UNIVERSITAS SULAWESI BARAT. *English and Literature Journal*, *4*(2), 75-84.

Tavakoli, P., & Foster, P. (2008). Task design and second language performance: The effect of narrative type on learner output. *Language Learning*, *58*(2), 439-473.

Tavakoli, P., & Skehan, P. (2005). Strategic planning, task structure, and performance testing. In R. Ellis (Ed.), *Planning and task performance in a second language* (pp. 239–273). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Tavakoli, P., Nakatsuhara, F., & Hunter, A. M. (2020). Aspects of fluency across assessed levels of speaking proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal*, *104*(1), 169-191.

Terriche, A. A. (2017). Watch their language: Feedback provision via audio-visual recordings. *International E-Journal of Advances in Education*, *3*(8), 329-333.

Thai, C., & Boers, F. (2016). Repeating a monologue under increasing time pressure: Effects on fluency, complexity, and accuracy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50, 369–393.

Tran, M. N. (2019). *Scrutinizing the effects of the 4/3/2 activity: repetition, increasing time pressure, accuracy enhancement and cognitive individual differences* (Doctoral dissertation, Birkbeck, University of London).

Tran, M. N., & Saito, K. (2021). Effects of the 4/3/2 activity revisited: Extending Boers (2014) and Thai & Boers (2016). *Language Teaching Research*, 1362168821994136.

Wang, Z. (2014). *On-line time pressure manipulations* (pp. 27-62). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Witton-Davies, G. (2010). The role of repair in oral fluency and disfluency. *Disponibile in: http://www. forex. ntu. edu. tw/files/writing/2856_40576291. pdf Va*