

## **CHAPTER II**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **A. Peer Direct Feedback**

Feedback, basically information, more or less, is about reactions to a product, a person performance of a task, skills, etc., which are used as a basis for improvement. However, feedback itself is only as effective as the students' engagement with it (Price, et al., 2011), and such engagement is only possible if students and tutors share a common understanding of the role of feedback in the learning process. Rather than the intrinsic quality of a tutor's feedback, it is the extent to which such feedback is aligned with the students' needs and expectations that will determine its effectiveness (Orsmond & Merry, 2011). Feedback is a very broad term involving many different ways of providing information to students. The effectiveness of feedback has been largely debated throughout history (Wahlström, 2014). The distinction of the effectiveness of feedback occurs when it is conveyed, considering the types of feedback, how the feedback is delivered, and who gives and is given the feedback (Eslami, 2014). There are types of written feedback, direct and indirect feedback (Ferris, 2006). The direct feedback is used in this current research.

Direct feedback is a strategy of correcting students' errors by providing the correct linguistic form of linguistic structure of the target language (Ferris, 2006). Cited in Wahlström (2014, p. 6) "Ferris &

Roberts (2001), in their study of 72 ESL students ability to self-edit their written work, found that there were no significant differences between students who received direct and indirect feedback. The direct feedback group had all their errors underlined and coded, while the indirect feedback group had their errors underlined but without codes". As far as I do with my interlocutor, the feedback is legitimately clear, described by points. I perceive the strengths and weaknesses easily from the direct feedback my interlocutor gives. From recognition, I realise my limits and I adjust to what is wrong. It is not be all thumbs when my handledare is the same age as mine, a peer to me. Casually, we take and give the feedback, we address and receive.

To connect to the last core in previous paragraph, I assert that peer direct feedback provides a dialogue. Nicol (2010) emphasised that surely peer direct feedback needs to be understood in terms of dialogue. Between two persons, likely one becomes an assessor, and the other one submits his piece of work. There is dialogue round, the assessor forms opinions and asks materials on the work and generating feedback, so does the worker present his work, describes what he has made, its process, and answers questions asked to him (Hamer, et al., 2014). Peer feedback gives students more vigour. Huisman, et al. (2018) added that peer feedback processes drive students criticizing over materials and integrating new knowledge which can be comprehensibly pertained to as reflective knowledge strengthening. The act of providing peer feedback triggers students to

absorb into peer discussion to get a revealing towards any kinds of problem they face, then later contemplate the problem solving itself and propose adjustments afterwards for a refinement (Chen, 2014).

## **B. Oral Fluency**

Utilizing a light concept from the research background, fluency refers to one's ability of accuracy, appropriateness or speed, and proper expression or intonation. These are the key elements to evaluate one's ability and fluency in any kinds of English skills (Fuchs, 2005).

(1) *Accuracy* refers to the ability to recognize and decode words correctly, and to understand the relationship between letters and sounds (Hudson, et al., 2005),

(2) *Flow* is made possible by clarity of expression, the acceptable ordering of ideas, use of vocabulary and syntax appropriate to the context (Samuels, et al., 2005),

(3) *Expression / intonation* describe the rhythmic and tonal aspects of speech, including pitch, stress patterns, and duration (Hudson, et al., 2005),

(4) *Speed* is an indicator of one's ability and how fast one can talk to decode and recognize words, not only on the individual word level, but also from sentence to sentence, and throughout the text (Samuels, et al., 2005).

The elements must be encouraged with exercises and repetitive practices. Therefore, I have to comprehend the steps and all the insights I acknowledge about the limits I bear, make it greater for some improvement record. For that matter, Gatbonton & Segalowitz (2005) affirmed, we do not claim a teaching classroom, for example specified communicative language teaching (CLT) classrooms as a substantial cause to promote general fluency, for they do not provide the repetition necessary to achieve automatic fluency:

Although one component of fluency is automatic, smooth, and rapid language use, there are no provisions in current CLT methodologies to promote language use to a high level of mastery through repetitive practice. In fact, focused practice continues to be seen as inimical to the inherently open and unpredictable nature of communicative activities. Thus, when teachers believe that learning has reached the point where reinforcement of new forms through practice is necessary, they tend to revert to non-communicative means for attaining this end (such as pattern practice). (p. 327)

Oral fluency is often noticed as one of the most prominent markers, refers to proficiency in second language. The term ‘fluency’ has various meanings, the most common of which is allied to ‘high proficiency,’ that is, an excellent grasp of a language vocabulary and grammar (Friesen, et al., 2014). Riggensbach (2000) in her book, specified fluency as a performance phenomenon related to ‘flow, continuity, automaticity, or smoothness of speech’. Oral fluency is a prodigious prominence that second language (L2) learners have to be cognizant with in order to be

able to partake in academic, occupational, and social contexts. Several efforts are needed to acquire speaking fluency (Daly, et al., 1995). Learners take time as phase is requisite, and in some cases, considerable financial resources are taken too to acquire fluency (Demie, 2013). They are expected that they will eventually be able to speak the language fluently after every efforts cultivated (He, 2015). Somehow, learners still discourage towards the outcome of oral fluency after all those commitments and uphill struggles, even being instructed for one or two full years in ESL practicing, they are not guaranteed yet to achieve ‘high proficiency’ (Derwing, Munro, & Thomson, 2007).

Aside from the former elements of term ‘fluency’, some researchers delineate that there are activities to reach out to fluency development (free production, rehearsal/repetition, consciousness-raising, and use of formulaic sequences and fillers). Rossiter, et al. (2010), in their article, restricted analysis to books that were available in Edmonton, Alberta, and that were used frequently. The learner textbooks (designed for low to high intermediate proficiency learners) and teacher resource books selected for analysis included: (a) 14 student textbooks that explicitly claimed to promote the development of oral fluency (according to publisher advertisement, synopses, tables of contents, and titles, e.g., *Bridge to Fluency: Speaking*; *World Links: Developing English Fluency*); (b) 14 general texts that were widely used in local Edmonton ESL programs (e.g., *Touchstone*; *Canadian Snapshots*); and (c) 14 teacher

resource books that addressed the teaching of oral fluency (e.g., *Fluency and its Teaching; Discussions that Work: Task-Centred Fluency Practice*). Two textbooks from the Canadian Snapshots series were surveyed, but there were no other multiples of a given series. They assume each book included oral fluency activities that were determined.

a) *consciousness-raising tasks* (i.e., to raise awareness of fluency features) (Boers, Eyckmans, Kappel, Stengers, & Demecheleer, 2006);

b) *rehearsal or repetition tasks* (Bygate, 2002; Gatbonton & Segalowitz, 2005; Lynch & Maclean, 2001; Nation, 1989);

c) *the use of formulaic sequences* (Boers, Eyckmans, Kappel, Stengers, & Demecheleer, 2006; Ejzenberg, 2000; Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992; Towell, Hawkins, & Bazergui, 1996; Wood, 2006, 2009; Wray, 2002);

d) *the use of discourse markers* (lexical fillers such as so; you know) (Guillot, 1999; Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992); and

e) *communicative free-production activities* (e.g., general speaking tasks without a specific focus, traditionally seen as fluency builders in L2 classrooms).

Rossiter, et al., 2010 (p. 586-587)

Considering the elements and the activities to expand oral fluency, I conclude those all must be comprehended all well one another. As it is mentioned 'repetitive practice', I guess to whatever activities I use to cultivate my speaking to be exceedingly fluent, comprehension is necessary. Previous studies flesh out that fluency intertwines with comprehension (Pey, et al., 2014). Some researchers attentive of the fact most studies that reported gains in comprehension as a function of fluency improvement assessed comprehension by means of either standardized multiple-choice tests or on the basis of literal retellings (Applegate, et al., 2009). From researcher's situation, it is not contrast with the idea. The researcher does not suddenly speak with an accurate fluency; it runs together with comprehension producing an oral fluency that is strengthened. Oral fluency means accuracy, also manner of how people deliver ideas, 'clearly and accurately' in speech, pronouncing of individual sounds and words with ease, for the listeners to be able to catch the words said (Fysh, 2008).