The Effectiveness Of Public Speaking Assessment Model With Sandwich Feedback Method Through Web-Based Technology

Pipit Rahayu[1], Yenni Rozimela[2], Jufrizal[3]

[1](corresponding author) English Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Pasir Pengaraian University, 28557, Indonesia, email: darariau2010@gmail.com
[2]Language Pedagogy Doctoral Program, Faculty of Language and Art, Padang State University, 25000, Indonesia, email: yenni.rozimela@fbs.unp.ac.id
[3]Language Pedagogy Doctoral Program, Faculty of Language and Art, Padang State University, 25000, Indonesia, email: jufeli@yahoo.com

Abstract

The purpose of this research was to determine the effectiveness of PIPA Model in the form of a Speaking Test at fourth-semester students of the English Department, University of Pasir Pengaraian. The method used in this study is an experimental method involving two groups, namely the experimental group and the control group. The population of this research were the fourth-semester student of the English Department, Pasir Pengaraian University. The sample was obtained by using total sampling. So, the total sample of this research were twenty-four students, with a sample size of 13 people for the experimental group and 11 people for the control group. Therefore, it can be stated that the PIPA Model has the value of effectiveness in improving students' Public Speaking skills. According to the experts' team, the test indicated that the PIPA Model development was valid. Furthermore, both lecturers and students agreed that the PIPA Model was practical. Some issues arose throughout the implementation of the PIPA Model. Yet, the whole development process of the PIPA Model could run practically based on Web Equal 4.0.

Keywords: Public Speaking, Assessment Model, Sandwich Feedback, Web-Based Technology.

INTRODUCTION

In higher education, public speaking skill is an important thing. Public speaking remains one of the most desirable and necessary skills for college students (Morreale & Pearson, 2008). Furthermore, Templeton & Fitzgerald (1999) state that public speaking has a speaker stand before the audience to deliver a speech structured to persuade, inform, or entertain the audience. In other words, Public Speaking is a process of designing and delivering a message from a speaker to a specific audience. Public speaking is quite similar to the presentation, where the difference is usually meant for a commercial or academic environment. A Commercial environment means that public speaking is used to promote or advertise something.

In contrast, the academic environment is used to media in teaching and learning. There are various purposes for speakers to explore their ideas in front of the Public, such as telling a story, sharing an experience, informing about a message, and persuading others to do an action. In addition, Public speaking is a skill that can be used by leadership/personal development, business, customer service, effective group communication, and mass communication.

In line with this, Wrench, Goding, Johnson, & Attias (2012) state that Public speaking is a process of designing and delivering a message to the audience. Planning and organizing the topic or material are needed to be an excellent public speaker. Furthermore, he states that three types of public speaking are

based on the intended purpose: informative, persuasive, and entertainment. The most common types of public speaking are informative and persuasive. The purpose of the informative speech is to share knowledge with others. In the classroom, the lecturers share their knowledge with the students. Persuasive speaking is how the speakers try to persuade others. The speaker must convince, motivate, and invite the audience to change or move to be better. Then entertainment speaking involves organizing some events such as presenting and accepting awards, introducing wedding toasts, delivering eulogies at funerals and memorizing services to after-dinner speeches. At the same time, students who have public speaking classes hold some benefits. These benefits include developing critical thinking, fine-tuning verbal and non-verbal skills, and overcoming a fear of public speaking.

Due to the importance of public speaking skills, assessing students' learning outcomes is also essential. It remains a necessary process in higher education and helps ensure students successfully achieve course competencies Backlund & Morreale (1994). More importantly, the primary goal of assessment is to provide evidence that the instruction received will increase students' knowledge, improve students' behaviors, and change students' attitudes toward course content" (LeBlanc et al., 2011). Thus, assessment enables lecturers to witness students' transition to achieve learning outcomes (such as presentational competency) during a semester and know if the lecturers are doing what they intend to do in the classroom and the educational program (Backlund & Arneson, 2000).

There is a distinction between two main types of assessment in language teaching, summative and formative. According to Brown & Abeywickrama (2010), summative assessment is employed to verify how well students have reached the objectives at the end of a course or unit of instruction. However, it does not provide any suggestions for improvement. In contrast, through formative assessment (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2010;

Maturana, 2015), teachers assess students' final results of each topic and focus on the students' learning process by delivering appropriate feedback.

Like assessment, on the other hand, feedback was considered one of the fundamental pedagogical practices from educational perspectives. Studies conducted in different periods provided testimony of the importance of feedback in the teaching-learning process. Ovanda (1992) states that feedback emerged in the literature to facilitate both the learning process and teaching performance. The context of constructive, systematic feedback included evaluation as an essential element in decision-making for teaching. Assessment and feedback help lecturers check the current status of their student's language ability through which they will know what the students know and do not know. It also gives chances to students to participate in modifying or re-planning the upcoming classes (Bachman & Palmer, 1996). Later on, Hattie & Timperley (2007) argue that feedback was one of the most powerful influences on learning and achievement.

The feedback sandwich method is a popular method of giving constructive criticism. It is often used in Toastmasters and the corporate environment. It can also be referred to as PIP or 3C, which stands for Positive-Improvement-Positive or Compliment-Criticism-compliment (Bergen et al., 2014). This feedback process is broken down into three segments: first, focus on performance strength. The feedback can be given through positive statements or giving compliments. The second is providing criticism or offering suggestions to improve the presentation; the last is rounding the feedback with a positive comment. It is called the "sandwich feedback" because it wedges criticism between an opening and an ending – like a patty wedged between two buns (Walter, 2001). In addition, the sandwich feedback method can be given to the students' public speaking presentations to improve skills and know the students' strengths and weaknesses in each performance.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Nature of Speaking

Speaking is defined as an interactive process of constructing meaning that involves producing, receiving, and processing information. Its form and meaning are dependent on the context in which it occurs, the participants, and the purposes of speaking (Burns & Joyce, 1997). Speaking is a skill that is very important to be mastered by students to be good communicators. Accordingly, it is the ability to express oneself orally, coherently, fluently, and appropriately in a given meaningful context using correct pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary and adopting the pragmatic and discourse rules of the spoken language. In this respect, (McDonough & Shaw (2003) state that speaking is not the oral production of written language but involves learners in the mastery of a wide range of sub-skills, which constitute an overall competence in the spoken language.

Besides, Florez (1999) defines speaking as an interactive process of constructing meaning that involves producing, receiving, and processing information. Speaking, therefore, is part of reciprocal exchange in which both reception and production play a part. In the same line, Mead & Rubin (1995) assume that speaking is an interactive process in which an individual alternately takes the roles of a speaker and a listener, including both verbal and nonverbal components.

In addition, Byrne (1984) defines speaking as two-way communication between a speaker and a listener; it involves the productive and receptive skill of understanding. It can be inferred that in the speaking process, one tries to communicate with and send out their message to others. A speaker produces a message in communication, and a listener receives the message. Tarigan (2008) states speaking is a skill in conveying a message through oral speech. Furthermore, speaking is also defined as the ability to speak fluently, presupposes knowledge of language features and the ability to process information and language on the spot (Harmer, 2001).

From all statements above, speaking seems to be an activity to share information, ideas, and feelings by sound production that has significance in making communication possible. No matter how great the idea is, it cannot be effective if it is not communicated correctly. Therefore, speaking is essential for communicating as it shapes, modifies, extends, and organizes thoughts. Furthermore, through good communication, learners can communicate with others to achieve certain goals or express their opinions, intentions, hopes, and viewpoints in the public area.

Public Speaking

Public speaking is considered to be of paramount importance to students. It provides them with practical speaking skills that can magnificently handle their interpersonal communication problems during their working life. Students of today are leaders of tomorrow. As future leaders, they would find themselves in a situation where they would have to persuade their subordinates impressively during their interpersonal communications. Generally, people judge and assess a speaker by the way they speak. The first impression would usually be a lasting impression that would be registered in the minds of the people who come into contact with the speaker. A good public speaking skill would enhance employment opportunities and marketability. Consequently, there is an urgent need for students to improve their public speaking skills.

Meanwhile, Public speaking is defined as speaking in front of an audience in a limited time on a certain topic (Fukazawa & Kobayashi, 2012). In the globalized world, opportunities to disseminate one's opinions in English on various occasions have been increasing; online meetings and face-to-face communication with people from various backgrounds, including both English-speaking countries and ESL/EFL countries, are common nowadays (Fuyuno, 2015). Furthermore, Public speaking is a process of designing and delivering a message to the audience (Wrench et al., 2012). In

addition, to be a good public speaker, planning and organizing the topic or material are needed.

Public speaking is quite similar to presentation, where the difference is the latter is usually meant for the commercial or academic environment. Furthermore, according to Templeton & Fitzgerald (1999), public speaking has a speaker to stand before the audience to deliver a speech in a structured manner, with the purpose of either persuading, informing or entertaining the audience. This definition is in line with Lucas (2015); public speaking is one of the communication skills for persuading, informing, and entertaining in front of many people. In Short, public speaking is a vital means for human beings. It is a way to express ideas and impact issues that matter in society. Besides, it is important to share and influence or convince others.

In short, it can be stated from many scholars definitions that public speaking generally has many functions, it is whether intended to inform, influence, or entertain the audience. At least, at the end of the speech, the audience should be able to bring back a message that they can learn from the speech. In addition, to be a good public speaker, planning and organizing the topic or material are needed. In Short, public speaking is a vital means in human beings. It is a way to express ideas and impact issues that matter in society. Besides, it is important to share and influence or convince others.

Assessment Model

The English Language is treated as a skill-based subject but not a content-based one (NCTB, 1995). Language learning is concerned with developing certain skills which are developed and perfected through practice. Communicative language teaching aims to develop the four skills- listening, speaking, reading and writing (Foster, 2009). The English curriculum prescribes different aspects of the English Language teaching-learning process. Assessment is one of the important aspects that is being treated as a teaching-learning process (Stiggins, 1991). Assessing students is a very

important part of lecturer's teaching (Nitko, 2001). It is an integrated process for determining the nature and extent of student's learning and achievement (Linn & Gronlund, 2000).

There are two general types of assessment: formative and summative (Ahsan, 2009). Current English curriculum (NCTB, 1995) especially focuses on summative assessment through terminal examinations. Less importance has been given to formative assessment. From 2007 a new dimension in assessment, namely School Base Assessment (SBA), has been introduced in national assessment procedures (Begum & Farooqui, 2008). Students' achievement can be measured from different perspectives of educational approaches. According to the taxonomy of educational objectives (Bloom, 1956), lecturers can assess students skills from various levels of competencies. Sometimes those skills are from the lower level of competencies, and sometimes, those are from the higher levels.

Furthermore, Formative assessment is concerned with how judgments about the quality of student responses (performances, pieces, or works) can be used to shape and improve the student's competence by short-circuiting the randomness and inefficiency of trial-and-error learning (Sadler, 1989). Summative contrasts with formative assessment in that it is concerned with summing up or summarizing the achievement status of a student and is geared towards reporting at the end of a course of study, especially for certification purposes. It is essentially passive and does not normally have an immediate impact on learning, although it often influences decisions that may have profound educational and personal consequences for the student. The primary distinction between formative and summative assessment relates to purpose and effect, not to timing. It is argued below that many of the principles appropriate to summative assessment are not necessarily transferable to formative assessment; the latter requires a distinctive conceptualization and technology.

On the other hand, feedback is a key element in formative assessment (Sadler, 1989) and is usually defined in terms of information about how successfully something has been or is being done. Few physical, intellectual or social skills can be acquired satisfactorily simply by being told about them. Most require practice in a supportive environment which incorporates feedback loops. This usually includes a lecturer who knows which skills are to be learned, and who can recognize and describe a fine performance, demonstrate a fine performance, and indicate how poor performance can be improved. Feedback can also be defined in terms of its effect rather than its informational content: "Feedback is information about the gap between the actual level and the reference level of a system parameter which is used to alter the gap in some way" (Ramaprasad, 1983). This alternative definition emphasizes the system-control function. Broadly speaking, feedback provides for two main audiences, the lecturer and the student. Lecturers use feedback to make programmatic decisions with respect to readiness, diagnosis and remediation. Students use it to monitor the strengths and weaknesses of their performances so that aspects associated with success or high quality can be recognized and reinforced, and unsatisfactory aspects modified or improved.

Sandwich Feedback Method for Public Speaking Assessment Model

In assessing students' skills, lecturers' feedback is the most important thing to know the strength and weaknesses during the teaching and learning process. Feedback is an integral part of the formative assessment and helps determine what has been achieved and the next goal in terms of learning. According to Utha (2015), feedback is the information from the lecturer to students on the correctness of their work and how to further improve the work.

According to Hattie & Timperley (2007), feedback is conceptualized as information provided by an agent (e.g., teacher,

peer, book, parent, self, experience) regarding aspects of one's performance or understanding. A teacher or parent can provide corrective information, a peer can provide an alternative strategy, a book can provide information to clarify ideas, a parent can provide encouragement, and a learner can look up the answer to evaluate the correctness of a response. Feedback thus is a "consequence" of performance.

There are some findings found dealing with Sandwich feedback method. One of them was in the business and behavioral studies area. Like Bergen et al. (2014), they used this Sandwich feedback method in correcting employee behaviour and performance in a company. When employees do unsafe, unhealthy, unfair, or destructive to the organization, such misconduct cannot be ignored or allowed to continue. According to Treviño (1992), misconduct can be defined from the manager's perspective as any behavior that does not meet work standards according to the prescribed moral or technical requirements. Under this definition," employee theft, drug or alcohol abuse, tardiness, excessive absenteeism or sick leave use, insubordination, and sub-standard work performance may all qualify as misconduct and must be corrected" (Redeker, 1984).

In this case, the researcher chose the sandwich feedback method with the same protocol as the expert mentioned before by giving (3C) compliments, criticism and compliment or (PIP) positive, improvement and positive to students performance in public speaking. This feedback hopefully will be better improve students' skills through the public speaking assessment model that the researcher designed since the assessment function itself is not only about measuring students' progress while the teaching and learning process occurred but also seeing the improvement on future performance by giving feedback.

Web-Based Technology for Public Speaking Assessment Model

Nowadays, technology plays an increasingly important role in language classrooms and it is commonplace for teachers, to a certain extent, to apply technology-assisted language teaching (Sun & Yang, 2015). The advent of the internet has allowed people worldwide to stay connected, sharing and contributing to the world knowledge. If in the age of Web 1.0 technology, people surf on the internet mainly as readers, today, web 2.0 enables the Internet users to be part of the world's knowledge contributors (Faizi, 2018). Instead of passively reading web content as in the former, online readers today can comment, provide feedback and contribute their knowledge, e.g. blogging. Web 2.0 also revolutionizes the way people contact and communicate with each other (Qarajeh & Abdolmanafi-Rokni, 2015). For instance, instead of reaching friends via their phone or email, nowadays, people can keep in touch by making friends on Facebook, a popular social networking site, and message or call each other via this free platform.

Web-Based has been pointed as a central term in language education. It has been an increasing number of teaching applications, especially in long-distance learning that address the employment of web-based tools in language classrooms. Web-based technology has enabled language instructors to extend their teaching practice beyond the physical constraint of their language classroom (Lai & Gu, 2011). It can be seen in blended learning practically like the combination of conventional and web strategies in learning and teaching processes. In addition, the role of the language instructor in web-based technology implementation was also found to be crucial, e.g. monitoring L2 learners' learning progress and providing feedback (Chong, 2018).

Web-based assessment should fit in with and help achieve the course aims. The development web-based assessment will result good assessment instrument, it will provide benefits for lecturer and student, for example it can determine the level of students' achievement in learning of actual information. Web-based gives the chance to open the interaction between lecturers and students. An effort should be made to motivate students to follow the learning process. Only when students are willing to practice learning and do not feel at a loss when faced with a web assignment can we get them out of the familiar scenario at conventional learning tutorials where students usually feel they have nothing to do even when they are forced to (Xiao et al., 2005).

Web-based performance assessment is appropriate assessment technique of skill aspect. Ramesh & Patel (2013) stated that web-based performance assessment is conducted to obtain data on students' ability to finishing tasks related to lecturing material. Web-based performance assessment requires students to demonstrate their knowledge, understanding, and skill. Students will demonstrate knowledge, understanding, and skills when the experimental method is applied in the lecture. Therefore, the experimental method is suitable with the web-based performance assessment and both are necessary in the process of integrated science lecture.

The development of web-based performance assessment will result in a good assessment instrument, it will provide benefits for lecturers and student, for example it can determine the level of students' achievement in learning of actual information. Therefore, research on the development of Web-Based Performance Assessment needs to be conducted. This model is able to provide students to learn actively so there will be interaction between the students (Slunt & Giancarlo, 2004).

In this research, web-based technology for assessment can create different learning and assessment contexts and produce flexible approaches to instruction and evaluation. Assessment provided on web-based technology allows students to have more control over their practice and receive reinforcement that can help them build at least intrinsic motivation and improve their confidence. So, that is why the researcher is interested in using web-based technology for the public speaking assessment model with the sandwich feedback method in

this research.

Web-Based Technology for Public Speaking Assessment Model

The effectiveness is assessing whether research is effective simply means finding out if it produced any outputs, outcomes and/or societal benefits or impact. The main unit of analysis required is simply a measure of outputs (or outcomes and/or impact). In addition, Nieveen (1999) states that the model is said to be effective if the model can give the outcomes or impact. The effectiveness of PIPA model was measured by giving pre-test and post-test to the subject of the research.

RESEARCH METHOD

In this case, the purpose of this research was to determine the effectiveness of PIPA Model in the form of Speaking Test at fourth semester students of English Department, University of Pasir Pengaraian. The PIPA refers to the Persuasive Informative Presentation Assessment (PIPA) developed in this study. This research aimed to see the effect of the research variable and measure the hypothesis. The population of this research were the fourth-semester student of English Department, Pasir Pengaraian University. The sample was obtained by using total sampling. So, the total sample of this research were twenty-four students.

The method used in this study is an experimental method involving two groups, namely the experimental group and the control group, with a sample size of 13 people for the experimental group and 11 people for the control group. In this group, pretest data was taken before being given treatment and posttest after being given treatment. The instrument of this study was test. The type of the test was the speaking test. All instruments were designed and tested for validation by experts. The public speaking assessment model was developed by considering the components proposed by Public Speaking Competence Rubric,

formative assessment, sandwich feedback method, and technology as the media. From the data that has been collected, then proceed with the prerequisite test, namely the normality test and homogeneity test.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Based on the normality test and homogeneity test. The normality test got the results, namely the sig. value was 0.047 < 0.05 (Not Normal) for the Pretest Experiment, and sig. value was 0.501 > 0.05 (Normal). For the Posttest Experiment, sig. value was 0.001 < 0.05 (Not Normal) for the Pretest Control and sig. value was 0.437 > 0.05 (Normal) for the Control Posttest. So it can be concluded that the data in this study are not normally distributed. While the homogeneity test got the results, namely sig 0.453 > 0.05. So it can be concluded if the data in this study has a homogeneous variance. These results state that the hypothesis test in this study uses a non-parametric test.

Hypothesis testing in this study obtained the results: (1) The sig for the experimental group based on the Wilcoxon test results. value was 0.001 < 0.05. So it can be concluded if there is an effect / an increase in the experimental group. (2) For the control group, based on the results of the Wilcoxon test, the sig value was 0.028 < 0.05 was obtained. So it can be concluded if there is an effect / an increase in the control group.

Furthermore, suppose it is said to have a significant effect on each group in the experimental and control groups. In that case, the analysis of the different test will be carried out using the Mann-Whitney test to find out whether there is a difference in improvement between the experimental group and the control group with the sig value was 0.000 < 0.05. So it can be concluded that there is a difference in the value of the experimental and control groups.

Then, a descriptive statistical analysis test was conducted, which aims to determine which group's average difference has the better improvement, with the result that the difference

in the average score in the experimental group is 20.3562 greater than the difference in the average score, in the control group that is 6.2755. So it can be concluded that the PIPA Model applied to the experimental group has a better effect than the method applied to the control group. Furthermore, the percentage effectiveness test was carried out, which aims to determine how effective the method is given in the form of per cent with the result that if the experimental class the effectiveness value is 46.77% better than the control class, the effectiveness value is 21.65%.

The research proved that the PIPA model significantly affects the experimental group. It can be seen from the result of the effectivity test from control and experimental class. It can be concluded that the PIPA Model applied in the experimental group has a better effect than the conventional assessment applied in the control class. Furthermore, the percentage effectiveness test was carried out, which aims to determine how effective the model is given in the form of per cent with the result that if the experimental class the effectiveness(Azwar, 2007). It meant that the PIPA model solved the problem of the experimental group.

In addition, the use of Web-Based technology in PIPA model takes an important role in identifying the effectiveness of the assessment model. The public speaking assessment model has been more effective with web-based technology as the media for supporting the process than the conventional model. The conventional assessment was conducted manually in the classroom without any supporting media or technology. It took more time and it was not efficient. In line with this, there was research done by (Prochazka et al., 2020); the web-based technology affected the participant or the students in the learning process. This finding was supported by Chollet et al. (2015) which states that the Web or Technology Learning Management System is better than other conventional learning.

Moreover, Macendo-Rouet, Ney, Chaeles, & Lallich-Boidin (2009) conducted a study to investigate the impact of web-based technology and paper-based assessment delivery on students' performance and perceived satisfaction. They found that students who assessed with web-based technology were superior to the students who assessed with printed documents. Although the students preferred the paper materials and paper-based quizzes, they appreciated the course website's availability. As authors suggested, while integrating web technologies into the assessment phase of the instruction, ease of use and legibility of the tests should be considered. Besides, accessibility of the online content and test of the courses are important factors to support students anytime, anywhere access to the instruction. (Seppala & Alamaki, 2003) conducted a study on comparing the effectiveness of face-to-face, internet and mobile-based instruction. As a result of their study, they suggested that innovative internet and mobile solutions can be useful for academic teaching because of providing possibilities for open teaching. Besides, Broeckelman-Post, Hawkins, Katherine, Arciero, & Malterud (2019) state that there was a difference in public speaking performance between the face-to-face and online public speaking courses, there was a difference significance score in introduction, body, conclusion, overall impression,and delivery. In line with this, (2020) state that web-based language learning can improve student speaking ability.

On the other hand, the effectiveness of PIPA model also improved the sudents' anthuasim in the teaching and learning process. This result linked to the study who had been done by Endahati & Purwanto (2016) ; learning public speaking using IT-based media is more effective for improving students' enthusiasm than using non-IT-based media. It was also supported by the other study, Erenchinova & Prouschenko (2017) state that a certain complexity characterized Web resources inspired by genuine collaborative learning in terms of multimodality and technology, or professional knowledge combining academic and practical experience. It meant that the main advantage of using Web resources in the

learning process was creating a comfortable learning environment**.**

CONCLUSION

Public Speaking assessment model with Sandwich feedback method through web-based technology (PIPA Model) which has been developed at English Department of the University of Pasir Pengaraian. This model was needed by the lecturers and the students in teaching and learning speaking. It was also suitable with the curriculum demand of the English Department, Pasir Pengaraian University. The Research result shows that the students and the lecturers need a specific model for assessing public speaking skills, especially for Persuasive and Informative speech, which provide detailed feedback and media supporting the assessment process.

PIPA Model, a Public Speaking assessment model with sandwich feedback method through web-based technology, have been judged as valid, practical, and effective by expert judgment through focus group discussion and test of validity, practicality, and effectivity. Therefore, the PIPA Model can be used as an assessment model for public speaking at the English Department in the University of Pasir Pengaraian.

REFERENCES

1. Ahsan, S. (2009). Classroom assessment culture in secondary schools of Dhaka City. Teacher's World, 2009, 231–244.
2. Azwar, S. (2007). Metode penelitian. Pustaka Pelajar.
3. Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). Language testing in practice. Oxford University Press.
4. Backlund, P., & Arneson, P. (2000). Educational assessment grows up: Looking toward the future. Journal of the Association for Communication Administration, 29, 88–102.
5. Backlund, P., & Morreale, S. . P. (1994). History of the speech communication association's assessment efforts and present role of the committee on assessment and testing. In & C. C. S. Morreale, M. Books, R. Berko (Ed.), SCA summer conference proceedings and prepared remarks (p. 9016). Speech Communication Association Publications.
6. Bashori, M., Hout, R. van, Strik, H., & Cucchiarini, C. (2020). Web-based language learning and speaking anxiety. Computer Assisted Language Learning, 1–32.
7. Begum, M., & Farooqui, S. (2008). School based assessment: Will it really change the education scenario in Bangladesh? International Education Studies, 1(2), 45–53.
8. Bergen, C. W. V., Bressler Martin, S., & Kitty, C. (2014). The sandwich feedback method: No very tasty. Journal of Bahavioral Stuides in Business, 7, 1–13.
9. Bloom, B. S. (1956). Taxonomy of educational objectives : The classification of educational goals, handbook I cognitive domain. Longmans, Green and Co.
10. Broeckelman-Post, M. A., Hawkins, H., Katherine, E., Arciero, A. R., & Malterud, A. s. (2019). Online versus face-to-face public speaking outcomes: A comprehensive assessment. Basic Communication Course Annual, 31(10).
11. Brown, H. D., & Abeywickrama, P. (2010). Language assessment: principles and classroom practice (2nd ed.). Pearson Education Inc.
12. Burns, A., & Joyce, H. (1997). Focus on speaking. National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research.
13. Byrne. (1984). Teaching oral english. Longman Group Lid.
14. Chollet, M., Wörtwein, T., Morency, L. P., Shapiro, A., & Scherer, S. (2015). Exploring feedback strategies to improve public speaking: An interactive virtual audience framework. Proceedings of UbiComp, 1143–1154.
15. Chong, S. C. (2018). Internet-based ICT

adoption: evidence from Malaysian SMEs Article in Industrial Management & Data Systems.

16. Endahati, N., & Purwanto, E. (2016). Analysis of the effectiveness of public speaking subject module information-technology (IT) based. Ahmad Dahlan Journal of English Studies, 3(1).

17. Erenchinova, E., & Prouschenko, E. (2017). Advantages of WEB resources use in learning process. Proceedings of the 7th International Scientific and Practical Conference "Current Issue of Linguistics and Didactics: The Interdiciplinary Approach in Humanities" (CILDIAH 2017), 103–108.

18. Faizi, R. (2018). Teachers' perceptions towards using Web 2.0 in language learning and teaching. Education and Information Technologies, 23(3), 1219–1230.

19. Florez, M. A. (1999). Improving adult english language learners' speaking skills. ERIC Digest, 98.

20. Fukazawa, N., & Kobayashi, H. (2012). Components and development patterns of Japanese Shikiji speeches: Characteristics of one genre in Japanese public speaking. Journal of Technical Japanese Education, 14, 27–34.

21. Fuyuno, M. (2015). Needs analysis of practical english skills in global business; tpward the development oj japanese global human resource. Studies in Englisg Teaching and Learning in East Asia, 5, 13–27.

22. Harmer, J. (2001). How to teach english. Longman Group Ltd.

23. Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. Review of Educational Research, 77, 81–112.

24. Lai, C., & Gu, M. (2011). Self-regulated out-of-class language learning with technology. Computer Assisted Language Learning, 24(4), 317–335.

25. LeBlanc, K., Vela, L., & Houser, M. L. (2011). Improving the basic communication course: Assessing the core components. Basic Communication Course Annual, 23, 61–92.

26. Linn, R. L., & Gronlund, N. E. (2000). Measurement and assessment in teaching (8th ed.). Prentice Hall.

27. Lucas, S. E. (2015). The art of public speaking (12thEd.). McGraw Hill.

28. Macendo-Rouet, M., Ney, M., Chaeles, S., & Lallich-Boidin, G. (2009). Student's performance and satisfaction with web vs paper-based practice quizzes an lecture notes. Computer & Education, 53(2), 375–384.

29. Maturana, L. M. (2015). Learning evaluation within the context of other languages. Fondo Editorial Funlam.

30. McDonough, J., & Shaw, C. (2003). Materials and methods in ELT. Oxford University Press.

31. Mead, N. A., & Rubin, D. L. (1995). Assessing listening and speaking skill. ERIC DIGEST.

32. Morreale, S. P., & Pearson, J. C. (2008). Why communication education is important: The centrality of the discipline in the 21st century. Communication Education, 57, 227–240.

33. NCTB. (1995). Curriculum and syllabus, junior secondary level. First Part.

34. Nieveen, N. (1999). Prototyping to reach product quality. In Design approaches and tools in education nad training. Kluwer Academic Publisher.

35. Nitko, J. A. (2001). Educational assessment of students. Prentice Hall.

36. Ovanda, M. N. (1992). Constructive feedback: A key to successful teaching and learning.

37. Prochazka, J., Fedosseva, Y., & Houdek, P. (2020). A field experiment on dishonesty: A registered replication on Azar et al. (2008). Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics, 90, 1–6.

38. Qarajeh, M., & Abdolmanafi-Rokni, S. J. (2015). The impact of social

networking on the oral performance of EFL learners. Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 6(2), 51–56.

39. Ramaprasad, A. (1983). On the definition of feedback. Behavioral Science, 28, 4–13.

40. Ramesh, M., & Patel, R. C. (2013). Critical pedagofy for constructing knowledge and process skills in science. Journal Education Confab, 2(1), 98–105.

41. Redeker, J. R. (1984). Discipline: Policies and procedures. Bureau of National Affairs.

42. Sadler, D. R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. Instructional Science, 18(2), 119–144.

43. Seppala, P., & Alamaki, H. (2003). Mobile learning in teacher training. Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 19(3), 330–335.

44. Slunt, K., & Giancarlo, L. C. (2004). Student-centered learning: A comparison of two different method of instruction. Journal of Chemical Education, 81(7).

45. Stiggins, R. J. (1991). elevant classroom assessment training for teachers. Educational Measurement: Issues and Practices, 10(1), 7–12.

46. Sun, Y. C., & Yang, F. Y. (2015). I help, therefore, I learn: service learning on Web 2.0 in an EFL speaking class. Computer Assisted Language Learning, 28(3), 202–219.

47. Tarigan, H. G. (2008). Membaca sebagai suatu keterampilan berbahasa. Angkasa.

48. Templeton, M., & Fitzgerald, S. S. (1999). Schaum's quick guide to great presentations. McGraw-Hill.

49. Treviño, L. K. (1992). Moral reasoning and business ethics: Implications for research, education, and management. Journal of Business Ethics, 11, 445–459.

50. Utha, K. (2015). Formative assessment practices in Bhutanese secondary schools and its impact on quality of education. Aalborg University Press.

51. Wrench, J. S., Goding, A., Johnson, D. I., & Attias, B. A. (2012). Public speaking: Practice and ethics.

52. Xiao, J., Wang, Z., & He, L. (2005). Exploring an integrated approach to web based course assessment. Asian Association of Open Universities Journal, 1(1), 38–44.