



## Exploring Oral Personalized Feedback Affects the Improvement of English-Speaking Proficiency

Ferninda Rachmadheani<sup>1</sup>, Kristi Nuraini<sup>1</sup>, Anita Fatimatul Laeli<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Muhammadiyah University of Jember

\*Corresponding Author: Ferninda Rachmadheani

E-mail: [ferninda.rd@gmail.com](mailto:ferninda.rd@gmail.com)



### Article Info

#### Article history:

Received 17 October 2024

Received in revised form 22

January 2025

Accepted 3 March 2025

#### Keywords:

Oral Personalized Feedback

Small Class

English-Speaking

### Abstract

*This study delves into the crucial role of oral personalized feedback in enhancing spoken English proficiency. It explores the profound connection between individualized feedback and the journey towards mastering English as a spoken language. This research highlights the multifaceted benefits of personalized feedback, not only offering visible benefits but also highlighting aspects that may often be overlooked. In doing so, this article aims to provide a holistic perspective on the complex relationship between oral personalized feedback and spoken language proficiency. The researcher used classroom observation and student rhetorical analysis methods. Classroom observations reveal that the teacher actively engaged students in honing their speaking abilities through a structured approach involving two distinct speaking performances. In the first performance, the teacher offers personalized feedback to each student, intending to foster improvements in their speaking skills for the subsequent week's performance. In the study, it was found that this personalized feedback was able to improve several aspects of speaking skills, including refining pronunciation, and aiding students in speaking more fluently.*

## Introduction

Speaking plays a pivotal role in acquiring a foreign or second language (Rao, 2018). Attaining fluency places a significant responsibility on teachers to guide students in incorporating English into their daily lives. Small classes, distinguished by a constrained number of students, lack a universally defined numerical threshold. However, in common practice, a class is often considered small when it consists of fewer than 30 students. In addition, in the classroom at a tutoring centre in the research location, each class only has a small number of students. This size distinction emphasizes the potential for more personalized attention and interactive engagement within the learning environment. It promotes a more intimate and collaborative educational experience for both students and educators. Additionally, meaningful interaction between teachers and students is vital, with teachers focusing on monitoring students' development in English speaking proficiency within the classroom. Furthermore, handling larger classes poses more significant challenges compared to smaller ones (Whisenhunt et al., 2019). The approach of providing feedback is particularly effective in small class settings, where each student can receive individualized, detailed attention. In larger classes, however, the sheer number of students poses significant challenges, limiting opportunities for sufficient practice and meaningful improvement. Previous research from Bhutto et al. (2023) identified four categories of problems in teaching speaking skills in large classes: 1) Large classes hinder skill development due to the need for individual attention; 2) A public university respondent noted that late arrivals disrupt classes and require material repetition; 3) There are insufficient teachers and classrooms for all students; 4) Time constraints limit the provision of individual attention.

Another study also highlighted that The teacher often express frustration with teaching speaking skills in large classes (Hayes, 1997). The large number of students complicates organizing activities and encouraging participation. Additionally, immediate feedback is necessary for improving students' oral communication skills.

Personalized feedback is most effective when delivered personally. Oral feedback involves verbal interactions between the teacher and students, either in a group or individually. It provides detailed comments on a student's performance and progress. A small class is essential for optimizing this process, allowing teachers to engage with each student individually and monitor their development more efficiently. “The positive effects of smaller class sizes on students' academic performance have been extensively recorded in the United States and other Western nations” (Finn, 2019). Oral personalized feedback in a small class facilitates the development of English-speaking skills. Teachers can have students speak individually, offering immediate feedback after each students’ presentation in their initial performances. In subsequent sessions, students are given the opportunity to speak on related topics, enabling teachers to monitor progress. This feedback serves to guide student preparation, highlighting both strengths and areas for improvement, while encouraging enhanced performance in future sessions. Oral personalized feedback gives specific suggestions, aiding students' speaking development. In small classes, it is especially effective, offering more focused and efficient feedback. Oral personalized feedback differs from peer feedback which peer feedback offering feedback to one another, often with less expertise. According to the findings of a previous study by Muamaroh & Pratiwi (2022) Students lacked confidence in giving feedback to their peers. They were unsure if their feedback was correct or acceptable, and didn’t know what comments to make because they didn’t fully understand the material. As a result, they couldn’t give helpful feedback on their peers' work.

Shen & Chiu (2019) states that Students find speaking English the most challenging, facing psychological issues (nervousness, fear of mistakes, lack of confidence), linguistic obstacles (limited vocabulary, grammar issues, difficulty organizing sentences), and environmental factors (unsupportive settings for conversation). The fear of making mistakes and shyness in the classroom often impede fluency, resulting in hesitation and pauses. Achieving proficiency in English speaking requires addressing anxiety and enhancing speaking skills. Even though it's normal for students to make speaking errors as they learn, minimizing these mistakes is a challenge for teachers. One way to tackle this challenge is by offering feedback. The learning process involves the teacher handling students' mistakes and feedback (Harmer, 2007). This underscores the significant role of feedback in the teaching-learning process, especially for the students. The purpose of providing feedback is to encourage active learning among students. To encourage student participation in the classroom, both teachers and students must be willing to engage in interaction (Zaim et al., 2019). Feedback motivates student participation and informs their progress. Teachers are responsible for providing feedback, crucial for improving English speaking skills. In small classes, feedback is regularly given during speaking exercises, focusing on areas such as vocabulary, fluency, and pronunciation. This helps track student development and guides improvement. Both positive and constructive feedback are essential for recognizing strengths and weaknesses, enabling students to enhance their performance. For non-native speakers, accepting and applying feedback is vital to overcoming challenges and advancing their language proficiency. The focus of feedback is to help learners identify and amend errors (Yang et al., 2021). Providing valuable feedback is a challenging task, as the interplay among its format, timing, and effectiveness is intricate and subject to variation, as noted by (Price et al., 2010).

Expanding on this idea, feedback plays a crucial role in helping students improve their speaking skills. It's not just about fixing mistakes; it's a tool for continuous improvement in their future performances. Feedback is like information about how you're doing now that you can use to do better in the future (Gnepp et al., 2020). This means it's not just looking back at what went wrong; it's about shaping what comes next. Students have the capacity to provide feedback in three forms: oral feedback, written feedback, and corrective feedback (Pirhonen, 2016). Wang et al., (2022) found that personalized feedback significantly improved students' learning performance. It helps enhance English-speaking skills by providing clear, targeted guidance. Hattie & Timperley (2007) note that feedback outlining next steps highlights areas for improvement. Students who interpret feedback positively usually demonstrate high self-efficacy, showing confidence in handling similar tasks once they have experienced success (Caffarella & Barnett, 2000). When the teacher provides feedback effectively, tailored to the student's individual characteristics, it gradually contributes to the student's proficiency in spoken English. Studies found that if students don't take feedback seriously, it doesn't work as well (Narciss et al., 2014). The impact of feedback varies based on individual student traits, such as motivational goal orientation or prior knowledge (Narciss & Huth, 2004). Most of the oral personalized feedback discussed happens on a big scale, especially in higher education online courses and learning systems.

Previous research highlights the significance of students taking feedback seriously to enhance their English-speaking proficiency. Active engagement with feedback is crucial for improving English-speaking proficiency. However, written feedback is easier to retain, while verbal feedback risks being forgotten without writing it down. Previous studies have also shown that students prefer written feedback to oral feedback (Prastya, 2018). Consequently, actively delivering personalized feedback through interaction is recommended for optimal impact. Speaking English involves direct interaction, emphasizing the interactive nature of spoken language for social relationships (Brown & Yule, 1983). Modern teaching is defined by interaction, communication, and active engagement (Khan et al., 2013). In addition to the essential requirement for interaction between students and the teacher, this study has a research questions, "does oral personalized feedback lead to significant improvements in students' speaking performance?"

This study aims to determine whether there is a significant change in students' performance after receiving oral personalized feedback, focusing on fluency, pronunciation, content, and organization.

## **Methods**

This was a case study. This research was conducted at one of the private English courses in Jember from September to December 2023. The study involved twenty students from high school. To collect data on students' speaking proficiency, the researcher recorded videos of their performances both before and after they received feedback. There are four aspects to be assessed: fluency, pronunciation, content and organization. The students participated in two speaking performances as part of the study. In the initial presentation, each student took turns speaking in front of the class, promoting a skincare topic they had prepared. The teacher then granted them an opportunity to improve their speaking skills in the subsequent session, using the same topic and the identical skincare product.

During the subsequent session, they had the opportunity to revisit and re-present the material covered in the previous meeting. The researcher noticed some differences in how they spoke before and after getting oral personalized feedback from the teacher. In the first performance, the students were still hesitant and made many mispronunciations. However, in the subsequent

performance, most of them showed improvement, reducing fillers, correcting their pronunciation and they seemed to be more self-assured. Furthermore, self-assurance, involves acting wisely or foolishly and interacting with others in alignment with societal and environmental expectations (Utama et al., 2013). As students become more self-assured, their confidence will manifest in future performances, leading to a gradual decrease in their anxiety and reluctance to speak English.

## Results and Discussion

### Classroom Observation

The researcher observed two teaching approaches: direct, with explicit explanations, and indirect, where teachers guide without detailed instructions. The study found that the teacher primarily used an indirect, student-centered approach, allowing students to explore independently. Observations indicated that indirect instruction was more common than direct guidance in teaching learning processes and strategies. Following the classroom observation, the researcher noted that in this small class, the teacher actively engages with students, either before or after they receive feedback. This size distinction emphasizes the potential for more personalized attention and interactive engagement within the learning environment. Prior to the lesson, the teacher discusses the content covered in the previous meeting. Following this, the teacher informs the speaking performance schedule, focusing on the "skincare review" topic. Clear guidelines are provided on elements to include in the review. Additionally, the teacher shares references to skincare review videos. Students are given a 15-minute window to find references and write sentences for their presentations. The teacher asks the students to organize their performance by informing the name of the product, the ingredients of the product, how to use it, the texture of the product, where to buy the product and the rate of the product. Students are given a 15-minute window to find references and write sentences for their presentations. Before the first performance, the teacher inquiries about each student's chosen product and their experiences with it. Emphasizing that the day is a practice, the teacher reminds students that the actual performance will take place the following week.

### Analysing Student's Speaking Performance

Numerous papers are presently accessible on the evaluation of speaking skills. These include overarching reviews of speaking assessment developments by authors like (Ginther, 2012), (Sullivan et al., 2014). Additionally, specific aspects of speaking assessment are pronunciation, rating spoken performance and interactional competence (Isaacs, 2017), (Winke, 2012), (Galaczi & Taylor, 2018). To collect data on students' speaking proficiency, the researcher recorded and made transcription of their video performances before and after they received oral personalized feedback. To analyse the students' speaking performance, the researcher has provided a table containing the students' speaking assessment for before and after they have given oral personalized feedback from the teacher and the teacher's feedback.

Table 1. Before the Students Receive Oral Personalized Feedback

Respondent (R)	Fluency	Pronunciation	Content	Organization
Respondent 1,4,7,12,14,18	R1 spoke slowly, used only one filler word, and often read from notes. R4 spoke fluently	R1 mispronounced some words like: - "acid" as "/etʃɪt/" instead of "/æɪsɪd/", - "salicylic acid" as "/sælɪsɪlɪt etʃɪt/" instead of "/sælɪ'sɪlɪk 'æɪsɪd/", and - "even though" as "/i:vən tək/" instead of "/i:vən 'ðuʊ/".	The student mentioned the name of the product, the ingredients ingredients, how to use, where to buy and the rate of the product. But they	The students not mention the texture of the product before telling where to buy it.

	<p>without any fillers. R7 and R12 spoke fluently but used many fillers like "aaa...". R14 and R18 spoke hesitantly and use many fillers.</p>	<p>R4 There is no mispronunciation, but the teacher gave the feedback about the form of the rate of the feedback "the correct form is "four out of five", not "four out a five". R7 mispronounced how to use the product " 2-3 drops of serum on the hands and then apply it evenly to the clean face and neck, gently pat your face.". She pronounced "/ ɛpli it/", instead of "/ə'plai it/". R12 mispronounced some of ingredients of the product; "...Hydroxyethylcellulose, Daucus Carota Leaf Extract...". She pronounced "/hɪ, drɒksɪ' ɛθɪl' sɛljʊ:lous/, /' du:kəs sɪ' rʊtə li:f ' ɛkstrækt/", instead of "/haɪ' drɒksɪ, ɛθɪl' sɛljʊləʊz/, /' dɔ:kəs kə' rʊtə li:f ' ɛkstrækt/". R14 mispronounced some words; "...licorice, retinol...", she pronounced "/' lɪkərəɪs/, /rɪ' tɛɪnəl/", instead of "/' lɪkəriʃ/, /' rɛtɪnəl/". "...apply a toner if desired...", she pronounced "/dɪ' zɪrd/", instead of "/dɪ' zɑɪərd/". "...take a small amount of the serum...", she pronounced "/ə' mɒnt/", instead of "/ə' maʊnt/". R18 mispronounced some of the ingredients of the product; "...Hydroxyethyl Cellulose, Phenoxyethanol...", She pronounced it "/' hɪ' drɒksɪtɪl' sɛljʊ:lɒs, fɪ' nɒksɪ, ætænəl/", instead of /haɪ' drɒksɪ, ɛθɪl' sɛljʊ:lous, fɪ' nɒksɪ, ɛθænəl/".</p>	<p>missed the texture of the product.</p>	
<p>Respondent 2,3,5,6,9</p>	<p>R2 and R5 spoke fluently without any fillers. R3 didn't speak clearly, so the teacher didn't give any feedback about her pronunciation. R6 spoke fluently but used many like "aaa..." and "umm...". The student hesitates frequently, affecting the flow.</p>	<p>R2 mispronounced a word "smooth" as "/' smu:tsɪ/" instead of "/smu:ð/". R3 and R5 there is no mispronunciation. R6 mispronounced the ingredient like "Hyaluronic Acid," He pronounced it "/, haɪə' lɔ:rənɪs ' æsɪd/", instead of "/, haɪə' lɔ:rənɪk ' æsɪd/". R9 mispronounced some ingredients of the product; "...Hydroxyethyl Urea, Niacinamiae, Bis-Ethoxydiglycol Cyclohexane". She pronounced "/haɪ' drɒksɪθɪf ' jʊə, riə, ,nɑɪəsɪ' neɪd, bɪ' sɛtɒksɪ, dɪgɪkɒl sɪk' fəʊhɪksem/", instead of "/haɪ' drɒksɪ, ɛθɪl' jʊə, riə, ,nɑɪəsɪ' næmaɪd, bɪ' sɛθɒksɪ, dɪglɪkɒl ' sɑɪkləʊhɛksem/".</p>	<p>The students mentioned the name of the product, the ingredients, where to buy and the rate of the product. But they missed to mention how to use it and the texture of the products.</p>	<p>The students missed the procedures of how to use it and the texture of the products.</p>

Respondent 8,11,15,17	R8, R11, R15 spoke fluently without any filler. R17 spoke fluently without any fillers, but there are many pauses.	R8, there is no mispronunciation. R11 mispronounced a word like. "... smooth and fluid", She pronounced "/flʊɪd/", instead of "/flu:ɪd/" R15 mispronounced the word "Salicylic Acid", she pronounced "/sæɪlɪsɪk 'æɪsɪd/" instead of "/sæɪlɪ'sɪlɪk 'æɪsɪd/". R17, there is no mispronunciation.	The students mentioned the name of the product, ingredients, how to use, the texture of the product, where to buy and the rate of the product.	The students presented the promotion in the correct order without any items missing.
Respondent 10	The student spoke hesitantly and made many fillers "aaa..".	The student mispronounced some of ingredients, some words of how to use the product, and the texture. - --- "Decyl Glucoside, Hydrated Silica", he pronounced"/dekɪl glu:'kəʊsɪt, 'heɪdrɪtɪd 'sɪlɪkə/" instead of "Decyl Glucoside, Hydrated Silica". - "... massage gently...", he pronounced "/mæsɪdʒ 'dʒentli/" instead of "/mə'sɑ:ʒ 'dʒentli/". - "Non-greasy, he pronounced it "/nɒn 'greɪzi/" instead of "/nɒn 'gri:zi/".	The student talked about Pond's Men Lightning Oil Clear Facial Scrub. He mentioned the name of the product, how to use, the texture and rating of the product. ingredients, but he missed where to buy the product.	He missed to mention where to buy the product.
Respondent 13	She used many fillers like "aaa" and pause.	She mispronounced some of the ingredients of the product "...Melaleuca Alternifolia Leaf Water, Artemisia Argyi...". She pronounced "/mələ'lu:sə ,æltər'nɪfə ,leɪə li:f 'wɔ:tər/", instead of "/mələ'lu:sə ,æltər'nɪfə ,leɪə li:f 'wɔ:tər, ɑ:l'tər'mɪzɪə 'ɑ:rdʒɪə/".	She talked about Sea Makeup Micellar Water. She mentioned the name of the product, the ingredients, how to use, the texture, and where to buy. But she skipped the rating of the product.	She missed the procedures of the rate of the product after explaining where to buy the product.
Respondent 16	He spoke fluently, but there are still some fillers like "emm...".	He mispronounced the texture of the product "...absorbs quickly...", he pronounced it "/ɛb'zɔ:rb/" instead of "/əb'zɔ:rbz/".	He talked about acne serum by Scarlett. He begins by mentioning the name of the product, the ingredients, the texture of the product, where to buy and the rate of the product. But he missed a part of how to use the product.	He missed the procedures of how to use the product.
Respondent 19	He spoke hesitantly, there are many pauses.	He mispronounced in a part of how to use the product "...apply an even layer to your face...". She pronounced "/i'vents/", instead of "/i:vən/". "...absorbed...", she pronounced it "/ɪb'zɔ:ɪd/" instead of "/əb'zɔ:ɪbd/".	He talked about Azarine sunscreen gel. She begins by mentioning the name of the product, the ingredients, the texture of the product, how to use, where to buy	The organization of the student is complete, but the sections on how to use and the texture of the product are reversed. The "how to

			and the rate of the product.	use” section should be mentioned before the “texture of the product” section.
Respondent 20	She spoke fluently, but use a few fillers.	She mispronunciation a word from ingredients “Octenylsuccinate”, she pronounced it “/ɒk'tɛnɪlsʌsɪnɛt/” instead of “/ɒk'tɛnɪl'sʌksɪnɛɪt/”.	She talked about Erha AcneAct Pore minimizer & oil control gel cream. She begins by mentioning the name of the product, the ingredients, how to use, the texture of the product, the rate of the product and where to buy.	The organization of the student is complete, but the sections on where to buy and the rate of the product are reversed. The “where to buy” section should be mentioned before the “rate of the product” section.

Table 2. After the Students Receive Oral Personalized Feedback

Respondent	Fluency	Pronunciation	Content	Organization
Respondent 1 and 3.	R1 and R3 spoke more fluently, used a few fillers.	R1 improved the mispronunciation some words like: - “acid”. Before, he pronounced it “/ɛtʃɪt/” and improved to “/ˈæsɪd/”, - “salicylic acid”. Before, he pronounced it “/sælɪsɪlɪt ɛtʃɪt/” and improved to “/sælɪ'sɪlɪk 'æsɪd/”, and - “even though”. Before, he pronounced it “/i:vən tʊk/” and improved to “/i:vən 'ðuː/”. R3 there is no mispronunciation.	The students mentioned the name of the product, some ingredients, how to use, where to buy and the rating of the product. But, they missed the texture of the product.	The students still missed the procedures of the texture before explaining where to buy the product.
Respondent 2,5,14	R2 spoke more clearly and fluently. R5 spoke fluently without any fillers. R14 spoke more fluently, reducing fillers and hesitations.	R2 improved the mispronunciation a word “smooth” from “/ˈsmu:tsɪ/” to “/smu:ð/”. R5 there is no mispronunciation. R14 improved the mispronunciation of the ingredients - --“...licorice, retinol...”. Before, she pronounced “/ˈlɪkərɪs/, /rɪ'teɪnəl/”, and improved to “/ˈlɪkərɪs/, /rɪ'teɪnəl/”. Before, she also mispronounced some words of how to use the product “...apply a toner if desired...”, she pronounced “/dɪ'zɪrd/”, and improved to “/dɪ'zərɔrd/”. Before, she pronounced “...take a small amount of the serum...”, and improved to “/ə'məʊnt/”, instead of “/ə'maʊnt/”.	The student mentioned the name of the product, some ingredients, how to use, where to buy and the rating of the product. But, they missed the texture of the product.	The students still missed not to tell the procedures of how to use the product and also the texture of the product before explaining where to buy the product.
Respondent 4,6,7,8	R4 and R8, spoke fluently	R4 there is no mispronunciation, but the student improved the form of the rate product. Before, she said “the correct	The student mentioned the name of the	She presented the promotion in the correct order

	without any fillers. R6, R7 spoke more fluently and reduced fillers like 'aaa...' and 'umm...'. R6 improved the mispronunciation of the ingredient "Hyaluronic Acid", "/,haɪə'lɔ:rənɪs 'æsaɪd/" to the correct pronunciation "/,haɪə'lɔ:rənɪk 'æsaɪd/". R7 improved the mispronunciation how to use the product. She improved "apply it", from "/ 'ɛplɪ ɪt/" to "/ə'plɑɪ ɪt/". R8, there is no mispronunciation.	product, some ingredients, how to use, the texture, where to buy and the rating of the product.	without any items missing.	
Respondent 9	She spoke with no hesitations, improving the flow.	The student improved the mispronunciation some ingredients of the product "...Hydroxyethyl Urea, Niacinamide, Bis-Ethoxydiglycol Cyclohexane". She improved from "/haɪ'drɒksɪθɪf 'jʊə,riə, ,naɪəsɪ'neɪd, bɪ'setɒksɪ,dɪgɪkɒl sɪk'fəʊhɪksem/", to the correct pronunciation "/haɪ'drɒksɪ,ɛθɪl 'jʊə,riə, ,naɪəsɪ'næmaɪd, bɪ'setɒksɪ,dɪglɑɪkɒl 'sɑɪkləʊheksem/".	The student talked about Illuminating Serum Y.O.U radiance glow. She mentioned the name of the product, the ingredients, the texture, where to buy and the rating of the product. But she missed how to use it.	She initially missed to explain how to use the product and the texture of the product. However, she improved after receiving feedback. At first, she missed mentioning two things: how to use it and the product's texture. After the feedback, she only forgot to mention one item; how to use the product.
Respondent 8,10,11,12,13, 15,16,18,19 and 20.	R10 spoke more fluently, reducing fillers like 'aaa...'. R8, R11, R12, R15, R19, and R20 spoke fluently without any fillers. R13 spoke with fewer pauses and fillers like 'aaa'. R16 spoke fluently, but there are still some fillers like "emm...". R17 spoke fluently without any fillers and reduced pauses. R18 used a few fillers, but there is no pause.	R10 improved the mispronunciation some of ingredients, some words of how to use the product, and the texture. - "Decyl Glucoside, Hydrated Silica", he improved from"/'dekɪl glu:'kəʊsaɪt, 'heɪdreɪtɪd 'sɪlkə/" to "Decyl Glucoside, Hydrated Silica". For - "... massage gently...", he improved from "/'mæsɪdʒ 'dʒentli/" to "/mə'sɑ:ʒ 'dʒentli/". - "Non-greasy, he improved from "/nɒn 'greɪzi/" to "/nɒn 'grɪ:zi/". R11 improved the mispronunciation a word of the texture of the product. "... smooth and fluid", She improved from "/'flɔɪd/", to "/'flu:ɪd/". R12 improved mispronunciation some of ingredients of the product "...Hydroxyethylcellulose, Daucus Carota Leaf Extract...". She improved from "/hɪ,drɒksɪ'ɛθɪl'sɛljʊ:lʊʊs/, /'du:kəs sɪ'ruʊtə li:f'ɛkstrækt/", to "/haɪ'drɒksɪ,ɛθɪl'sɛljʊ:lʊʊz/, /'dɔ:kəs kə'ruʊtə li:f'ɛkstrækt/". R13 improved mispronunciation some of the ingredients of the product "...Melaleuca Alternifolia Leaf Water, Artemisia Argyi...". Before, he pronounced "/,mɛlə'lu:sə ,æltər'nɪfə,leə li:f'wɔ:tər/", but he improved to "/,mɛlə'lu:sə ,æltər'nɪfə,leə li:f'wɔ:tər, ɑ:l'tər'mɪzɪə 'ɑ:rdʒaɪ/".	The students mentioned the name of the product, how to use, the texture and rating of the product. ingredients, but skipped where to buy the product.	The students presented the promotion in the correct order without any items missing.

		<p>R15 improved the mispronunciation the word “Salicylic Acid”. Before, she pronounced “/ˈsælɪsɪk ˈæsɪd/” and improved to “/ˌsæliˈsɪlik ˈæsɪd/”.</p> <p>R16 improved the mispronunciation the texture of the product “...absorbs quickly...”. Before, he pronounced it “/ɛbˈzɔ:rb/” and improved to “/əbˈzɔ:rbz/”.</p> <p>R1, there is no mispronunciation.</p> <p>R18 improved mispronunciation some of the ingredients of the product “...Hydroxyethyl Cellulose, Phenoxyethanol...” Before, she pronounced it “/ˈbu:tɪlɪn ˈɡlɪkəl, hɪˈdrɒksɪtɪl ˈselju:lɒs, fiˈnɒksɪ, ætænəl/”, and improved to “/ˈbjʊ:tɪli:n ˈɡlaɪkəl, haɪˈdrɒksɪ, ɛθɪl ˈselju:lɒs, fiˈnɒksɪ, ɛθænəl/”.</p> <p>R19 mispronounced in a part of how to use the product “...apply an even layer to your face...”. She pronounced “/iˈvents/”, instead of “/i:vən/”. “...until it is fully absorbed...”, she pronounced it “/ɪbˈzɔ:riɪd/” instead of “/əbˈzɔ:riɪd/”.</p> <p>R20 improved the mispronunciation a word from ingredients “Octenylsuccinate”. Before, she pronounced it “/ɒkˈtɛnɪlsʌsɪnɛt/” and improved to “/ɒkˈtɛnɪlˈsʌksɪnɛt/”.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

### **Analysis of Students’ Performance Before Receiving Oral Personalized Feedback**

#### ***Respondents: 1, 2, 3, 5 (Omission of the Texture of the Product)***

Prior to feedback, these respondents consistently omitted the description of the product’s texture. Although they included other content elements, the absence of this detail made their presentations incomplete. Fluency varied among the group, with some relying on fillers and hesitations, which disrupted their speech. Pronunciation errors, especially for technical terms, were also observed.

#### ***Respondents: 6, 9, 14, 18 (Omission of Both “How to Use” and “Texture”)***

These respondents omitted two critical sections: ‘how to use’ and the texture of the product. This led to significantly incomplete presentations. Hesitations, fillers, and frequent mispronunciations further detracted from their overall delivery, making their presentations less effective.

#### ***Respondent: 10 (Omission of “Where to Buy”)***

The respondent failed to include the ‘where to buy’ section in their presentation. Additionally, their delivery was marked by frequent fillers, hesitations, and mispronunciations, which affected clarity and coherence.

#### ***Respondent: 13 (Omission of “Products’ rate”)***

In the initial presentation, this respondent omitted the product’s rating. The delivery was further impacted by pauses, fillers, and mispronunciations, reducing the overall quality and completeness of the presentation.

***Respondents: 4, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20 (Complete Presentation Achieved Before Feedback)***

These respondents presented more complete content and their organization is orderly compared to the other groups, covering most required sections. However, issues such as minor mispronunciations, hesitations, and the use of fillers were observed, affecting the fluency and delivery of their presentations. Particularly for respondents 19 and 20, who exhibited similar mistakes, namely a reversed organizational structure.

**Analysis of Students' Performance After Receiving Oral Personalized Feedback**

***Respondents: 1, 2, 3, 5 (Omission of the Texture of the Product)***

Following feedback, these respondents improved in terms of fluency and pronunciation, with a reduction in fillers and hesitations. However, the omission of the product's texture persisted, indicating the need for more targeted feedback focusing on this specific content area.

***Respondents: 6, 9, 14, 18 (Omission of Both "How to Use" and "Texture")***

Despite noticeable progress in fluency and pronunciation, these respondents continued to omit one or both of the critical sections, 'how to use' and the texture of the product. This indicates that further corrective instruction is required to address these recurring omissions effectively.

***Respondent: 10 (Omission of "Where to Buy")***

After feedback, the respondent displayed significant improvements in fluency and pronunciation. However, the 'where to buy' section remained absent, highlighting the need for specific guidance to ensure all required elements are included in future presentations.

***Respondent: 13 (Omission of "Products' Rating")***

Following feedback, this respondent successfully included the product's rating in their presentation, addressing the earlier omission. Fluency and pronunciation also improved significantly, reflecting the effectiveness of the feedback in enhancing content and delivery.

***Respondents: 4, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20 (Complete Organization Achieved After Feedback)***

These respondents demonstrated marked improvement after feedback, delivering presentations that included all required elements in the correct sequence. Pronunciation errors were corrected, fluency improved, and hesitations were minimized. The feedback effectively addressed their initial challenges, resulting in well-organized and confident presentations.

The analysis highlights significant improvements in fluency, pronunciation, and content organization across all groups after oral personalized feedback. However, persistent omissions in specific content areas—such as 'how to use,' 'texture,' and 'where to buy'—among certain respondents suggest the need for further targeted feedback to ensure complete and accurate presentations.

The researcher aims to analyze students' speaking proficiency in terms of fluency, pronunciation, content and organization. Language (L2) oral fluency has been more important for assessing communication competence and learner proficiency in recent decades. The concept of fluency refers to the ability to produce language at an appropriate pace, with greater ease and minimal hesitation (Tavakoli et al., 2020). Most students displayed hesitation during their first performance but showed noticeable improvement in subsequent performance. However, many overlooked minor details from the teacher's instructions, such as evaluating the texture of skincare products. This highlights both the strengths and limitations of personalized feedback in small class settings. The frequent omission of the product's texture

was primarily due to hesitation and a lack of confidence, as evidenced by some students' repeated mistakes despite receiving feedback. The factors that impacted students' English speaking performance were shown through fear of making mistakes, shyness, hesitation, and low confidence (Haidara, 2016). Proper pronunciation improves clarity and fluency, allowing individuals to express themselves more effectively (Pennington, 2021). When student pronounces words correctly, their message is more understandable, and they can speak with greater confidence and ease, leading to better speaking overall. Previous study from Lyster et al. (2013) has shown that attention to pronunciation, particularly through instruction on articulation as a preparatory activity combined with corrective feedback during communicative practice, can enhance both segmental and suprasegmental pronunciation. Speech content was defined as content elaboration/development, reflecting the extent to which the test-taker conveys relevant and well-elaborated/developed ideas on specific topics (Sato, 2012). The table data generally aligns with the expectations of "speech content," which involves relevance, clarity, and elaboration. The respondents mentioned key elements such as the name of the product, its ingredients, how to use it, the texture, where to buy it, and its rating. However, some respondents missed specific aspects, such as the texture or usage procedures, which slightly affects the completeness of the content. This definition was created using the concept of topic development from the TOEFL iBT speaking rubrics (Educational Testing Service, 2019). The organization of discourse is important for making second language speakers' performances clear and easy to follow. Research shows that coherence, which means arranging ideas logically and using connecting words, is linked to better understanding in academic speaking tasks (Yusuf & Mabagits, 2020). With proper organization, students can present their ideas in a structured manner and have a clear sense of what to address in their speaking performance.

## Conclusion

Personalized feedback is essential for improving students' speaking skills, as it helps identify both strengths and weaknesses, guiding students toward better proficiency. By understanding these areas, students can focus on what needs improvement, leading to overall progress in their language skills. This type of feedback is particularly effective in smaller class settings, where teachers can give more detailed, one-on-one attention to each student. In such environments, feedback can be delivered more thoroughly, ensuring students do not repeat the same mistakes in future performances. For subsequent research, it is highly recommended to conduct the study in a larger classroom environment to ensure more definitive, reliable, and broadly applicable findings.

## References

- Bhutto, A. A., Jokhio, A. A., & Ahmad, A. (2023). A Case Study of Teaching Speaking Skills in Large Classes: Problems and Solutions. *Pakistan Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 11(2), 2006–2014. <https://doi.org/10.52131/pjhss.2023.1102.0496>
- Brown, G. A., & Yule, G. (1983). Enhancing Students' Fluency in Writing: Learning to Use Transition Words. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 2.
- Caffarella, R. S., & Barnett, B. G. (2000). Teaching Doctoral Students to Become Scholarly Writers: The importance of giving and receiving critiques. *Studies in Higher Education*, 25(1), 39–52. <https://doi.org/10.1080/030750700116000>
- Educational Testing Service. (2019). *The TOEFL iBT Test Prep Planner*. 1–71.

- Finn, J. D. (2019). Academic and non-cognitive effects of small classes. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 96(January), 125–135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2019.05.006>
- Ginther, A. (2012). Oller, John W., Jr. *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, November 2013. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0882>
- Gnepp, J., Klayman, J., Williamson, I. O., & Barlas, S. (2020). The future of feedback: Motivating performance improvement through future-focused feedback. *PLoS ONE*, 15(6), 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0234444>
- Haidara, Y. (2016). Psychological Factor Affecting English Speaking Performance for the English Learners in Indonesia. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 4(7), 1501–1505. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2016.040701>
- Harmer. (2007). *The Practice of English La.pdf*.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
- Hayes, D. (1997). Helping teachers to cope with large classes. *ELT Journal*, 51(2), 106–116. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/51.2.106>
- Isaacs, T. (2016). Assessing speaking. *Handbook of second language assessment*, 12, 131-146. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781614513827-011>
- Khan, M. J., Altaf, S., & Kausar, H. (2013). Effect of perceived academic stress on students' performance. *FWU Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(2).
- Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 46(1), 1–40. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000365>
- Muamaroh, M., & Pratiwi, U. S. (2022). Advantages and Disadvantages of Peer Feedback on EFL Students Essay Writing at Tertiary Level. *Proceedings of the International Conference of Learning on Advance Education (ICOLAE 2021)*, 662(Icolae 2021), 1122–1128. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.220503.124>
- Narciss, S., & Huth, K. (2004). *How to design informative tutoring feedback for multi-media learning*. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:18399234>
- Narciss, S., Sosnovsky, S., Schnaubert, L., Andrès, E., Eichelmann, A., Gogvadze, G., & Melis, E. (2014). Exploring feedback and student characteristics relevant for personalizing feedback strategies. *Computers and Education*, 71, 56–76. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2013.09.011>
- Pennington, M. C. (2021). Teaching Pronunciation: The State of the Art 2021. *RELC Journal*, 52(1), 3–21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882211002283>
- Pirhonen, N. (2016). *Students' perceptions about the use of oral feedback in EFL classrooms*. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:148147470>
- Prastya, R. L. (2018). Students' Reaction and Preferences to Teachers' Feedback on Weekly Journal Activity at English Education Department of Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta. *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Learning*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.18196/ftl.3229>

- Price, M., Handley, K., Millar, J., & O'Donovan, B. (2010). Feedback: All that effort, but what is the effect? *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(3), 277–289. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930903541007>
- Rao, P. (2018). *DEVELOPING SPEAKING SKILLS IN ESL OR EFL SETTINGS*. <https://doi.org/10.33329/ijelr.52.286>
- Sato, T. (2012). The contribution of test-takers' speech content to scores on an english oral proficiency test. *Language Testing*, 29(2), 223–241. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532211421162>
- Shen, M., & Chiu, T. (2019). EFL Learners' English Speaking Difficulties and Strategy Use. *Education and Linguistics Research*, 5(2), 88. <https://doi.org/10.5296/elr.v5i2.15333>
- Sullivan, A. M., Johnson, B., Owens, L., & Conway, R. (2014). Punish them or engage them? Teachers' views of unproductive student behaviours in the classroom. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(6), 43–56. <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2014v39n6.6>
- Tavakoli, P., Nakatsuhara, F., & Hunter, A. –M. (2020). Aspects of Fluency Across Assessed Levels of Speaking Proficiency. *Modern Language Journal*, 104(1), 169–191. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12620>
- Utama, I. M. P., Marhaeni, A. A. I. N., & Jaya, I. N. A. (2013). The Effect Of Think Pair Share Teaching Strategy To Students' self-Confidence And Speaking Competency Of The Second Grade Students Of Smpn 6 Singaraja. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Indonesia*, 1. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jpbi.v1i0.740>
- Wang, X., Zhang, L., & He, T. (2022). Learning Performance Prediction-Based Personalized Feedback in Online Learning via Machine Learning. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 14(13). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14137654>
- Whisenhunt, B. L., Cathey, C., Visio, M. E., Hudson, D. L., Shoptaugh, C. F., & Rost, A. D. (2019). Strategies to address challenges with large classes: Can we exceed student expectations for large class experiences? *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology*, 5(2), 121–127. <https://doi.org/10.1037/stl0000135>
- Winke, P. (2012). Rating oral language. *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*, 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0993>
- Yang, L., Chiu, M. M., & Yan, Z. (2021). The power of teacher feedback in affecting student learning and achievement: insights from students' perspective. *Educational Psychology*, 41(7), 821–824. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2021.1964855>
- Zaim, M., Refnaldi, R., & Rahmiyanti, R. (2019). Students' Perceptions on Teachers' Teaching Strategy and Their Effects towards Students' Achievement. *International Journal of Research in Counseling and Education*, 4(1), 28. <https://doi.org/10.24036/00207za0002>