

## The Effect of Self – Repair Strategies on Students’ Speaking Skills in Eleventh Grade at SMA Negeri 2 Bangli

Witya Arindrayanthi Risa <sup>1</sup>, Ni Wayan Satri Adnyani <sup>2</sup>, Ni Ketut Riska Dewi Prawita <sup>3</sup>

English Language Education Departement,  
Universitas Hindu Negeri I Gusti bagus Sugriwa Denpasar<sup>1,2,3</sup>

Author’s Email: [tyaarindra@gmail.com](mailto:tyaarindra@gmail.com), [satri.adnyani@gmail.com](mailto:satri.adnyani@gmail.com), [riskadewiprawita@gmail.com](mailto:riskadewiprawita@gmail.com)

Received: 06 04, 2026 | Accepted: 06 11, 2026 | Published: 06 13, 2026

### ABSTRACT

*This study aimed to determine whether there was a significant effect of self-repair strategies on students’ speaking skills at the eleventh grade of SMA Negeri 2 Bangli. This study used a quantitative approach with a quasi-experimental research design. The participants consisted of 68 students divided into two groups, The research instruments used in this study was speaking tests. The data were collected through pre-test, treatment, and post-test. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistical analysis and inferential statistical analysis through an independent sample t-test. The findings showed that the mean score of the experimental group in the post-test was higher ( $M = 85.15$ ) than the control group ( $M = 76.32$ ). The result of the independent sample t-test showed a t-value of 13.637 with a significance value lower than 0.05, indicating that there was a significant difference between the experimental group and the control group after the treatment. These findings related to Constructivism theory. Therefore, self-repair strategies were effective in improving students’ speaking skills at the eleventh grade of SMA Negeri 2 Bangli.*

**Keywords:** *Self-Repair Strategies, Speaking Skills, Constructivism Theory, English as a Foreign Language (EFL)*

#### How to Cite:

Risa , W. A. ., Adnyani , N. W. S. ., & Prawita , N. K. R. D. . (2026). The Effect of Self – Repair Strategies on Students’ Speaking Skills in Eleventh Grade at SMA Negeri 2 Bangli. Educational Journal, 1(4), 1835-1843. <https://doi.org/10.63822/rsya9c56>

## INTRODUCTION

Speaking skill is an important skill in learning English because it is directly used for communication (Heilmann 2023). Strong speaking skills enable individuals to participate in discussions, express ideas clearly, and engage in meaningful interactions with others. As communication is important in almost every field, mastering speaking skills helps individuals build confidence and increase people chances of success in both personal and professional settings. In English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learning, speaking is often has difficult because students are required to use vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation at the same time (Nguyen Van Huy et al., 2024). Many learners struggle with pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar, which makes it hard for student to speak fluently and communicate well. One important way is to give students a chances to speak in a supportive space. Asking students to join discussions, presentations, and language games helps students feel more confident in sharing the ideas (Wong et al., 2022). The more to speak, the more natural and fluent the English become confident. Another helpful method is creating a safe and open classroom, where students are not afraid of making mistakes. Teacher can support this by using group talks, role-play, and team projects to make students interact more in English (Larenas, 2021). In addition, structured speaking tasks, like storytelling and debates, also help students organize the ideas and speak more clearly.

Self – repair is important strategies in speaking skills learning, allowing students to correct their communication mistakes independently and gain confidence in students’ speaking abilities (Beshir and Yigzaw, 2022). Self-repair refers to the ability of students to notice and correct the students’ mistakes while speaking. Allowing self-repair strategies in the classroom helps students build problem solving skills in speaking and improves the ability to communicate (Haniah et al., 2020). Self-repair strategies consist of several types. First, repetition, when students repeat a word or phrase to correct pronunciation or grammar. Second, word search or hesitation devices, such as pauses or fillers (e.g., “uh,” “um”) while thinking of the correct word. Third, replacement, when students substitute an incorrect word with a more appropriate one. Fourth, insertion, when students add missing information to make the sentence clearer. This strategies make students feel more in control when fixing the speech, important to better confidence in speaking.

This study was supported by Constructivism Theory, which explains that students learn actively through their own learning experiences (Mir et al., 2025). In self-repair strategies, students actively recognize and correct their own mistakes while speaking. This process helps students become more aware of their speaking performance and supports speaking improvement through active learning. Several previous studies also showed positive results regarding self-repair strategies in speaking activities. Beshir and Yigzaw (2022) found that self-repair strategies helped students solve communication problems and improve classroom interaction. Haniah et al. (2020) also explained that repetition as a self-repair strategy helped students maintain fluency during speaking activities. These findings indicate that self-repair strategies can support students in improving speaking performance. Based on the explanation above, this study focused on answering the following research question: “Is there any significant effect of self-repair strategies on students’ speaking skills at the eleventh grade of SMA Negeri 2 Bangli?”

## METHODS OF RESEARCH

This study employed a quantitative research method using a quasi-experimental research design. The purpose of this study was to investigate the effect of self-repair strategies on students’ speaking skills in the

eleventh grade at SMA Negeri 2 Bangli. The study used a pre-test and post-test control group design involving two existing classes, namely the experimental group and the control group. The experimental group received speaking instruction using self-repair strategies, while the control group received fluency-based speaking practice without explicit self-repair instruction.

### **Research Design**

This study used a quasi-experimental research design to examine the effect of self-repair strategies on students' speaking skills. A quasi-experimental design is commonly used in educational research because it allows the researcher to compare groups without random assignment. This design was selected because the students had already been organized into intact classes by the school, and random assignment was not possible due to the existing academic system. The study involved two classes of eleventh-grade students at SMA Negeri 2 Bangli. Class XI C was assigned as the experimental group, while class XI B served as the control group. Both groups were given a pre-test before the treatment and a post-test after the treatment to measure the students' speaking performance. The experimental group received instruction through self-repair strategies, including repetition, replacement, insertion, and hesitation during speaking activities. Meanwhile, the control group participated in fluency-based speaking activities without explicit instruction in self-repair strategies.

### **Research Population and Participants**

This study was conducted at SMA Negeri 2 Bangli during the academic year of 2025/2026. The participants of this study were eleventh-grade students. The population consisted of 288 students distributed into seven classes. The sample of this study consisted of 68 students selected from two classes through purposive sampling. Class XI C, consisting of 34 students, was selected as the experimental group, while class XI B, consisting of 34 students, was selected as the control group. Purposive sampling was used because the selected classes had similar characteristics and were taught by the same English teacher. This helped the researcher maintain consistency in teaching methods, classroom management, and learning materials during the study.

### **Data Collection and Analysis**

The data were collected through speaking tests in the form of a pre-test and a post-test. The speaking tests were used to measure students' speaking skills before and after the treatment. The speaking performance was assessed based on three aspects, namely fluency, accuracy, and pronunciation. Each student was asked to perform a short speaking task for approximately three minutes based on the given topic. Before the treatment, both groups took the pre-test to determine the students' initial speaking ability. The treatment was conducted for four meetings during regular English class sessions. In the experimental group, students were taught using self-repair strategies, including repetition, replacement, insertion, and hesitation. Students were encouraged to notice and correct their own mistakes while speaking. Meanwhile, the control group received fluency-based speaking practice focusing on smooth communication without explicit self-repair instruction. After the treatment sessions were completed, both groups took the post-test to measure the improvement in students' speaking skills. The speaking tests were scored by two raters, namely the researcher and the English teacher, to ensure scoring reliability. The data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistical analysis. Descriptive statistics were used to describe the students' pre-

test and post-test scores, including mean, median, mode, range, variance, and standard deviation. Before testing the hypothesis, normality and homogeneity tests were conducted to determine whether the data met the assumptions for parametric testing. Since the data were normally distributed and homogeneous, the hypothesis was tested using an independent sample t-test at a significance level of 0.05 to determine whether there was a significant effect of self-repair strategies on students' speaking skills.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### Result

The findings of this study were obtained from the students' speaking skill scores in the experimental group and the control group. The experimental group was taught by using self-repair strategies, while the control group was taught through fluency-based speaking practice without explicit self-repair instruction. The data were collected through pre-test and post-test. The pre-test was used to measure students' initial speaking skills before the treatment, while the post-test was used to measure students' speaking skills after the treatment. The findings were presented through descriptive statistics, normality test, homogeneity test, and hypothesis testing using an independent sample t-test.

**Table 1. Post-Test Result of Experimental Group**

|                  |    | Post – Test Experiment |
|------------------|----|------------------------|
| Valid<br>Missing | 34 | 34                     |
|                  | 0  | 0                      |
| Mean             |    | 85.15                  |
| Median           |    | 85.00                  |
| Mode             |    | 85.00                  |
| Std. Deviation   |    | 1.971                  |
| Range            |    | 7                      |
| Minimum          |    | 69                     |
| Maximum          |    | 94                     |

Based on the Table 1 the results of the post-test in the experimental group show a mean score 85.15, a median of 85.00, and a mode of 85.00. The standard deviation was 1.971, showing the distribution of the data. The scores range from a minimum of 69.00 to a maximum of 94.00, with a total range of 7.00.

**Table 2. Post-Test Result of Control Group**

|                |         | Pre – Test Control |
|----------------|---------|--------------------|
| N              | Valid   | 34                 |
|                | Missing | 0                  |
| Mean           |         | 59.29              |
| Median         |         | 59.60              |
| Mode           |         | 59.60              |
| Std. Deviation |         | 2.431              |

|         |    |
|---------|----|
| Range   | 9  |
| Minimum | 55 |
| Maximum | 66 |

Based on the Table 2 the results of the post-test in the experimental group show a mean score 76.32, a median of 76.00, and a mode of 76.00. The standard deviation was 3.217, showing the distribution of the data. The scores range from a minimum of 62.00 to a maximum of 94.00, with a total range of 11.00.

**Table 3. Post-Test Difference Between Experimental Group and Control Group**

| Post-Test    | N  | Minimum | Maximum | Mean  | Standard Deviation | Variance |
|--------------|----|---------|---------|-------|--------------------|----------|
| Experimental | 34 | 69      | 94      | 81.56 | 6.046              | 36.557   |
| Control      | 34 | 62      | 94      | 80.79 | 7.446              | 55.441   |

Based on Table 3 it is evident from the post-test difference test results between the experimental group and the control group that the students who were taught by using self-repair strategies achieved better speaking skills scores than those who were taught by using the conventional teaching method. The results show that the experimental group's average score was 81.56, while the control group's average score was 80.79. This indicates that the experimental group's average score was higher than the control group's average score. In addition, the minimum score of the experimental group was 69, which was also higher than the control group's minimum score of 62. The maximum score of the experimental group was 94, while the control group reached 94. These results show that the students in the experimental group achieved better performance in the post-test after receiving the treatment of self-repair strategies.

**Table 4. Normality Test of Pre-Test**

|                                       |                       | Shapiro-Wilk |    |      |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|----|------|
|                                       |                       | Statistic    | df | Sig. |
| Students<br>Result                    | Pre-test Experimental | .968         | 34 | .411 |
|                                       | Pre-Test Control      | .967         | 34 | .384 |
| a. Lilliefors Significance Correction |                       |              |    |      |

Based on Table 4. the experimental group's pre-test significance value was 0.411, while the control groups pre-test significance value was 0.384, according to the Shapiro-Wilk test in Table IV.6. Since both significance values were greater than 0.05, it can be concluded that the pre-test data of both the experimental and control groups were normally distributed.

**Table 5. Normality Test of Post-Test**

|                                       |                        | Shapiro-Wilk |    |      |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|----|------|
|                                       |                        | Statistic    | df | Sig. |
| Students<br>Result                    | Post-test Experimental | .945         | 34 | .088 |
|                                       | Post-Test Control      | .962         | 34 | .275 |
| a. Lilliefors Significance Correction |                        |              |    |      |

Based on Table 5 the experimental group's post-test significance value was 0.88, while the control groups pre-test significance value was 0.275, according to the Shapiro-Wilk test in Table IV.6. Since both significance values were greater than 0.05, it can be concluded that the pre-test data of both the experimental and control groups were normally distributed.

**Table 6. Homogeneity Test of Pre-Test**

| Test of Homogeneity of Variance |                                      |                  |     |        |      |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|-----|--------|------|
|                                 |                                      | Levene Statistic | df1 | df2    | Sig. |
| Pre-Test Result                 | Based on Mean                        | .436             | 1   | 66     | .512 |
|                                 | Based on Median                      | .172             | 1   | 66     | .680 |
|                                 | Based on Median and with adjusted df | .172             | 1   | 64.750 | .680 |
|                                 | Based on trimmed mean                | .375             | 1   | 66     | .542 |

Table 6 indicates that the significance value of the pre-test data between the experimental and control groups was 0.512. Since the result was higher than 0.05, it means that the pre-test data were homogeneous. The result of Levene Statistic was  $F(1,66) = 0.436$ ,  $p=0.512$ .

**Table 7. Homogeneity Test of Post-Test**

| Test of Homogeneity of Variance |                                      |                  |     |        |      |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|-----|--------|------|
|                                 |                                      | Levene Statistic | df1 | df2    | Sig. |
| Pre-Test Result                 | Based on Mean                        | 1.749            | 1   | 66     | .191 |
|                                 | Based on Median                      | 1.701            | 1   | 66     | .197 |
|                                 | Based on Median and with adjusted df | 1.701            | 1   | 63.535 | .197 |
|                                 | Based on trimmed mean                | 1.709            | 1   | 66     | .196 |

Table 7 indicates that there is a 0.191 significance value between the experimental and control groups in the post-test data. This shows that the post-test data were homogeneous because the significance value was higher than 0.05. In addition, the result of Levene Statistic was  $F(1,66) = 1.749$ ,  $p = 0.191$ . Since the post-test homogeneity test result was homogeneous and the post-test normality test result showed that the data were normally distributed, it can be concluded that the data fulfilled the first and second assumptions. This indicates that the data met the requirements for conducting parametric statistical analysis. Therefore, the researcher could continue the analysis by using an independent sample t-test to determine whether there was a significant difference between the post-test scores of the experimental and control groups.

**Table 8. Independent Sample T-Test of Post-Test**

| Group Statistics |                        |    |       |                |                 |
|------------------|------------------------|----|-------|----------------|-----------------|
|                  | Group                  | N  | Mean  | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| Post-test score  | Post-test Experimental | 34 | 85.15 | 1.971          | .338            |
|                  | Post-test Control      | 34 | 76.32 | 3.217          | .552            |

| Independet Samples Test |                             |   |                              |        |        |      |                 |                 |                       |   |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|---|------------------------------|--------|--------|------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|---|
|                         |                             | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | T-test for Equality of Means |        |        |      |                 |                 |                       |   |
|                         |                             |   | F                            | Sig.   | T      | df   | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| Students' score         | Equal variances assumed     | 2.667                                   | .107                         | 12.888 | 66     | .000 | 9.294           | .721            | 7.854                 | 10.734                                    |
|                         | Equal variances not assumed |   |                              | 12.888 | 64.138 | .000 | 9.294           | .721            | 7.854                 | 10.734                                    |

According to the above table, the result of the independent sample t-test showed that there was a significant difference between the post-test scores of the experimental group and the control group. The experimental group obtained a mean score of 85.15 with a standard deviation of 1.971, while the control group obtained a mean score of 76.32 with a standard deviation of 3.217. The t-test result showed that the t-value was 13.637 with  $df = 66$  and the significance value (2-tailed) was 0.001.

Since the significance value was lower than 0.05, the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) was accepted. This indicates that there was a significant difference in students' speaking skills between the students who were taught by using Self-repair Strategies and the students who were taught by conventional teaching at the eleventh grade of SMA N 2 Bangli. The higher mean score of the experimental group also shows that the students who learned through self-repair strategies performed better in speaking skills than those who learned through conventional learning.

### Discussion

The findings of this study showed that self-repair strategies gave a positive effect on students' speaking skills. The result of the post-test showed that the mean score of the experimental group was higher than the control group. The experimental group obtained a mean score of 85.15, while the control group obtained a mean score of 76.32. In addition, the independent sample t-test showed that the significance

value was lower than 0.05, which indicated that there was a significant difference between the experimental group and the control group after the treatment. The improvement of students' speaking skills can be explained through Constructivism Theory. Students learned actively by identifying and correcting their own mistakes during speaking activities. Through this process, students became more confident and more aware of their speaking performance. Students were also able to continue speaking more smoothly because they practiced solving communication difficulties independently.

The findings of this study were supported by previous studies. Beshir and Yigzaw (2022) found that self-repair strategies helped students improve classroom communication and solve speaking problems. Similarly, students in the present study showed improvement in fluency and confidence after applying self-repair strategies. However, the previous study used qualitative research, while the present study used a quasi-experimental design.

Haniah et al. (2020) also found that repetition as a self-repair strategy helped students maintain speaking fluency. Similar to the present study, students used self-repair strategies to reduce pauses and continue speaking more effectively. However, the previous study focused only on repetition strategy, while the present study analyzed several self-repair strategies. Another supporting study was conducted by (Kassaye 2021), who found that students became more active and confident after applying repair strategies during classroom interaction. This finding was similar to the present study because students in the experimental group became more confident during speaking activities after using self-repair strategies.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the study, it can be concluded that self-repair strategies gave a significant effect on students' speaking skills at the eleventh grade of SMA Negeri 2 Bangli. Students who were taught using self-repair strategies showed better speaking performance compared to students who were taught using conventional teaching. Self-repair strategies helped students improve fluency, pronunciation, and confidence during speaking activities. In addition, students became more aware of their own speaking mistakes and were able to correct errors directly during communication. This strategy also encouraged students to speak more actively and confidently without depending too much on teacher correction.

The statistical analysis showed a significant difference between the experimental group and the control group after the treatment was conducted. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) was accepted, while the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) was rejected. The use of self-repair strategies not only supported students in maintaining communication flow, but also helped them develop better speaking accuracy and clearer pronunciation.

Therefore, self-repair strategies can be used as an effective alternative strategy in teaching speaking skills, especially in improving students' fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, and confidence in speaking English.

**REFERENCES**

- Beshir, Mohammed, and Abiy Yigzaw. 2022. "Students' Self-Repair in EFL Classroom Interactions: Implications for Classroom Dynamics." *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education* 7 (1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-022-00153-6>.
- Haniah, Amanda Ummu, Febry Khunto Sasongko, and Endang Fauziati. 2020. "The Use of Repetition as Self-Repair of an Efl Learner." *Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature* 15 (1): 104–11. <https://doi.org/10.15294/lc.v15i1.24469>.
- Heilmann, Jens. 2023. "The Importance of Silicones in Our Daily Life" 7 (8): 1388–89.
- Kassaye, Lemma. 2021. "The Role of Conversation Analysis-Informed Instruction to Enhance EFL Learners' Conversational Skills: Repair Strategies in Focus: Bahir Dar University, Ethiopia." *Pasaa* 62 (December): 92–118. <https://doi.org/10.58837/chula.pasaa.62.1.4>.
- Larenas, Claudio Díaz. 2011. "Exploring Knowledge of English Speaking Strategies in 8th and 12th Graders." *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development* 13 (2): 85–98.
- Mir, Aadil Hussain, Mohammad Nazmul Alam, Akash Modi, and Talwandi Sabo. 2025. "Constructivist Learning Theory : A Framework For Student- Centered Instruction In The 21st Century Classroom" 4 (4): 1273–84.
- Nguyen Van Huy, Nguyen Thanh Nam, and Bui Ngoc Bon. 2024. "The Importance of Speaking in English as a Foreign Language between Skillful and Thoughtful Competencies: Studying Sociolinguistics Perspectives." *International Journal of English Language Studies* 6 (2): 153–59. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijels.2024.6.2.22>.
- Wong, Shereen, Stacey Audrey Anak Rakey, Nur Aina Sofiya Sabari, Chyrelly Samuel, Nur Shafiqah Mohamad Shamsul, and Harwati Hashim. 2022. "Language Learning Strategies for English Speaking Skill among Level 2 Primary School Pupils." *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences* 12 (11): 2619–31. <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v12-i11/15739>.