

## THE IMPACT OF FLIPPED LEARNING 3.0 AND SELF REGULATED LEARNING TOWARD ELEVENTH GRADE STUDENTS' SPEAKING PERFORMANCE

I Gusti Agung Bayu Mahendra  
English Language Education, Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha  
e-mail: [gungbayu0@gmail.com](mailto:gungbayu0@gmail.com)

Luh Diah Surya Adnyani  
English Language Education, Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha  
e-mail: [surya.adnyani@undiksha.ac.id](mailto:surya.adnyani@undiksha.ac.id)

Luh Gd Rahayu Budiarta  
English Language Education, Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha  
e-mail: [budiartarahayu@gmail.com](mailto:budiartarahayu@gmail.com)

### Abstract

This study aimed to investigate the impact of flipped learning 3.0 and self-regulated learning on eleventh grade students' speaking performance in SMA N 1 Sukasada. This study was quasi-experimental research. Forty-seven of eleventh grade students were the sample of this study that were divided into two groups by using cluster random sampling, namely experimental and control groups. The data were collected through a survey and post-test. The data were analyzed using a two-way ANOVA. The result showed that flipped learning 3.0 gave a significant difference on students' speaking performance. Meanwhile, self-regulated learning did not give any significant differences on students' speaking performance between those who had high and low self-regulated learning. Moreover, there was no interaction effect between flipped learning 3.0 and self-regulated learning. Through the implementation of flipped learning 3.0 and self-regulated learning, the students were stimulated to learn independently. Thus, it creates their understanding and be active in the learning.

**Keywords:** flipped learning 3.0, self-regulated learning, speaking performance

### INTRODUCTION

Technology and information are easy to be accessed, since both of them are well-developed in this twenty-first century. The use of technology has become more significant in recent years as a result of the benefits which is brought to certain aspects, including the learning process (Ahmadi, 2018). Therefore, it will provide them with the latest and up-to-date knowledge as well in sophisticated learning.

Looking at the technology development which can bring a sophisticated innovation to education, it can be used to generate a brand-new way of teaching and learning (Altun, 2015). Various trusted applications and features can be used in order to support online learning activities where it can be a new experience as well. Since technology provides a variety of applications which can be used to assist teaching-learning, those applications can be effective way to support the process of teaching-learning. Additionally, technology has provided numerous resources for educational context (Gorgoretti, 2019). Moreover, the development of technology has given

valuable impact on the integration with language education, including English learning (Ahmadi, 2018)

In language education, English is essential to be learned for foreign learner, since it is an international language which is used by people worldwide. In learning English, there are four competencies that should be mastered namely reading, writing, listening, and speaking. These skills should be mastered in order to develop students' communicative competence gradually. Thus, having good performance in speaking English is essential for learners. They can easily share information to others if they have good speaking performance (Liando & Lumettu, 2017). It means speaking is an important skill to be mastered in order to establish purposeful communication, without ignoring other skills. Speaking is a complex skill to learn and to teach in foreign language education (Köro lu & Çakır 2017).

During the development of speaking performance, the success of the student's development of speaking performance also comes from their responsibility in learning. The role of students is also important for generating successful learning because one of the significant aspects to generate successful learning process is self-regulated learning (Kızıl & Savran, 2018). During the learning activity, students are required to be independent and active in finding out what they need in learning (Arianti, 2017). The students will learn how to plan, set their goals, set-time management, apply self-evaluation, learn self-motivation, and learn strategies to achieve their goals (Zelege et al., 2018).

There are some researchers investigated the role of self-regulated learning on learning or student's learning outcomes. Cheng (2011) found student's self-regulation ability played an important role in the student's learning performance. Carneiro, Lefrere, Steffens, and Underwood (2011) state that students that have good self-regulated learning are possible to achieve a better result of the study because they recognize a need to learn, make a wise choice to that need, and satisfy that need efficiently and affordably. Meanwhile, Alafgani & Purwandari (2019) found that there is no correlation between self-regulated learning and student's academic achievement.

As the importance of speaking performance, students in Indonesia still have low speaking proficiency. Swary (2014) describes that the problem of speaking for Indonesian students are fear of making mistakes, wariness, hesitation, and low confident. Additionally, the main problem is the students also do not get enough opportunity to practice the language before or during the classroom. The teacher only focuses on explaining the material during the class. As it is a well-known fact that speaking requires more practice to improve it. According to Khajloo (2013), teacher is hard to find an appropriate teaching strategy for students. With the development of technology, flipped learning is one of the English teaching reforms which is a technology teaching model that changes the role of the class and home instruction (Bergman & Sams, 2012). In the flipped learning, the students receive the knowledge before the class section and it is provided by the teacher through media, such as video or slide share. It allows the students to learn the theory of the material before the class begins. Then, the class activity focus to discuss what the students do not understand yet and the students have more time to practice about what they have learned.

As the time flies, flipped learning is developed by following the needs and situation of the teaching-learning process. Flipped learning had been evolved into the newest framework, it is flipped learning 3.0. According to Bergmann (2017) flipped learning 3.0 is not static. There is no notion that flipped learning is about video and

homework like another two current frameworks. It is all based on how this strategy is applied by the teacher. The teacher can collaborate with this strategy with the global condition and teacher's teaching style. It makes flipped learning evolving. Through the development of technology and education, flipped learning change and evolve to the better form. In addition, flipped learning also becomes meta-strategy. Meta-strategy is the main strategy that determines other strategies used in a certain situation. As a meta-strategy flipped learning becomes the foundation strategy that the teacher uses in the teaching processes. Bergman & Sams (2012) explains several applications are used in this phase, such as Schoology, YouTube, Flip grid, etc. Those applications can help the teacher to make a live online class.

As it is mentioned speaking is a productive skill, it requires practice for improvement (Köro lu & Çakır, 2017). Flipped learning creates space for students to more practice before or during the class. Some studies show a good result on the impact of using flipped learning on speaking. Study which has been conducted by Köro lu & Çakır (2017) found that the students develop their speaking in fluency, coherence, grammar, pronunciation, and accuracy during the implementation of flipped learning. The class times were spent with productive activities. Thus, the students have more chance to practice their speaking. Another study conducted by Quyen & Loi (2018) found that flipped learning gives significant development when being implemented. Besides, Sarasfiya (2018) states that applying flipped model in speaking will make the students become more active, brave, confident, and fluent during the class activity.

From the explanation above, flipped learning is one of the teaching models that can support the learning process because it can give the students a brand-new learning experience with the help of self-regulated learning concept. Flipped learning and self-regulated learning have a positive effect on student's achievement. However, the implementation of flipped learning 3.0 with self-regulated learning has never been conducted in senior high school in Buleleng, Bali, especially for eleventh grade students' speaking performance. Thus, this present study aims at investigating the effect of flipped learning 3.0, self-regulated learning and the interaction between both of them on eleventh-grade student's speaking performance in senior high school in Buleleng, Bali.

## **METHOD**

This study was conducted in SMA Negeri 1 Sukasada in the academic year of 2019/2020. The population of this study was the eleventh-grade. There were six classes in eleventh grade namely. The total numbers of student's population were 141 students. The sample was 47 students that consisted of 24 students from the experimental group and 23 students from the control group. The sample was selected by using cluster random sampling technique.

This study was a quasi-experimental with post-test only control group design. There are two groups were used in this study, namely the experimental group and the control group. The experimental and control group were given different treatments. The experimental group was taught by flipped learning 3.0 and the control group was taught by the conventional teaching strategy.

Table 1. Research Design

Self-regulated Learning (B)	Learning Model (A)	
	Flipped Learning(A1)	Conventional model (A2)
High (B1)	A1B1	A2B1
Low (B2)	A1B2	A2B2

In collecting the data, there were two kinds of methods. Those were survey and post-test. The survey was used to distribute self-regulated learning questionnaire for both experimental group and control group. Survey was used to measure the level of student's self-regulated learning. The questionnaire consisted of 30 points that has five scales. On the other hand, post-test was used to measure students's speaking performance after the treatment for both experimental and control group. The type of the test for both groups were the same which is speaking test. The difference of the group was only from the treatment given. the speaking test where students work in pairs to retell short stories in front of the class. After the data were collected, it was analyzed by descriptive and inferential analysis. In descriptive statistical analysis, the researcher analyzed the mean and standard deviation of the post-test result from both groups. Meanwhile, in inferential statistical analysis, the researcher used two-way ANOVA to analyze the effect of flipped learning 3.0 and self-reguated learning and the interaction between both of variables on students' speaking performance. Meanwhile, the effect size was calculated using eta square. The criterion of the effect size used Cohen's (1988) cited in Pallant (2011) that can be seen in the Table 2.

Table 2. The Category of Effect Size

Size	Eta Square (% Of variance explained)
Small	0.01 or 1%
Medium	0.06 or 6%
Large	0.138 or 13.8%

## FINDING

### The Finding of Students' Self-Regulated Learning

Before giving the treatment, questionnaire was distributed to each group to find out the level of student's self-regulated learning. In order to find out the level of student's self-regulated learning, the researcher used the mean of the total score. The mean was 106 which meant that the students who had 106 or higher were classified as high self-regulated learning level students, while the students who had less than 106 were classified as low self-regulated learning level students. The results of the student's self-regulated learning level can be seen in the Table 3.

Table 3. The Students' Level of Self-regulated Learning

Group	Level of SLR	Total
Experimental Group	High	15
	Low	12
	Total	27
Control Group	High	12
	Low	14
	Total	26

Table 3 shows that there are fifteen students who have high self-regulated learning level and nine students who have low self-regulated learning level in the experimental group, while thirteen students have high self-regulated learning level and ten students have low self-regulated learning level in the control group.

### The Finding of the Students' Post Test

After the data were obtained through post-test, the result of the post-test was analyzed by using descriptive and inferential statistical analysis. The results of student's speaking performance were analyzed by using SPSS 19.0. The result of descriptive statistical analysis was shown in mean and standard deviation. The result of descriptive statistical analysis can be seen on the table 4.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistical Analysis

Descriptive Statistics				
Dependent Variable: Score				
Model	SLR	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Flipped learning	Low	72,00	9,043	10
	High	76,29	9,730	14
	Total	74,50	9,496	24
Conventional	Low	64,40	5,147	10
	High	61,54	5,301	13
	Total	62,78	5,317	23
Total	Low	68,20	8,154	20
	High	69,19	10,803	27
	Total	68,77	9,678	47

From the table 4, the mean of the experimental group which was taught by flipped learning 3.0 is higher than the control group which was taught by using conventional teaching strategy. The mean of the experimental group is 74.50, while the control group is 62.78. It shows that different treatment for each group gives different results of mean. Then, the standard deviation of each group is also different. The experimental group is 9.496, while the control group who was taught is 5.317. It indicates that the standard deviation of the experimental group is higher than the control group.

Besides, the mean of student's speaking performance for those who have high self-regulated learning is 69.19 and the mean of student's speaking performance for those who have low self-regulated learning is 68.20. It shows that means score of

students who had high self-regulated learning better than students who had low self-regulated learning but the difference is however not significant. Therefore, the standard deviation of students who have high self-regulated learning is 10.803, while students who have low self-regulated learning is 8.154. It shows that the standard deviation of students who have high self-regulated learning is higher than students who have low self-regulated learning.

After descriptive was done to be conducted, the inferential statistical analysis was conducted by two-way ANOVA test. The hypothesis testing was conducted in two-way ANOVA to determine whether there was significant effect of flipped learning 3.0 and self-regulated learning on student's speaking performance or not. The result of inferential statistical analysis could be seen in the Table 5.

Table 5. The Result of ANOVA Two-Way test

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects						
Dependent Variable: Score						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	1765,938 <sup>a</sup>	3	588,646	9,956	,000	,410
Intercept	215870,655	1	215870,655	3650,927	,000	,988
Model	1433,608	1	1433,608	24,246	,000	,361
SLR	5,822	1	5,822	,098	,755	,002
Model * SLR	146,643	1	146,643	2,480	,123	,055
Error	2542,488	43	59,128			
Total	226560,000	47				
Corrected Total	4308,426	46				

a. R Squared = ,410 (Adjusted R Squared = ,369)

The conclusion can be drawn if the result of the significant value of the data is less than 0.05, it indicates that there is a significant difference result of student's speaking performance based on variable factor, but if the result of the significant value of the data is higher than 0.05, then it indicates that there is no significant difference result of student's speaking performance based on variable factor. On the other hand, the Partial eta squared was used to analyze the effect size of each variable.

From the table 5, it can be seen that the significant value model is less than 0.05. The significant value of the model is 0,000. It indicates that there is a significant difference between students who are taught by flipped learning and conventional teaching strategy. Then, the effect size is 0,361. It means that the result is higher than 0.138 and it is indicated as large effect.

On the other hand, the significant value of self-regulated learning is higher than 0.05. The significant value of self-regulated learning is 0,755. It indicates that there is no significant difference between students who have high self-regulated learning and students who have low self-regulated learning. Besides, the effect size of self-regulated

learning is shown to be 0,002 which means that the effect size of self-regulated learning is classified as small effect.

Moreover, the significant value of model\*self-regulated learning is higher than 0.05. The significant value of model\*self-regulated learning is 0,123. It indicates that there is no interaction between flipped learning 3.0 and self-regulated learning. On the other hand, the effect size for the interaction effect is 0.055. It shows that the score is lower than 0.06. which means that the effect size for the interaction effect is classified as small effect.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **The Impact of Flipped Learning 3.0 on Students' Speaking Performance**

During the process of giving treatment, the students of experimental group who were taught by flipped learning 3.0 got explanation of the material before the class activity began. In line with the concept of flipped learning, the material and online instruction were provided before the class began. In this study, Schoology platform was used on the implementation of flipped learning. It was used to provide the students with the instruction, materials, and discussion room.

On the other hand, FlipGrid platform was also used in this study. It was used for students to practice their speaking performance. When the class was dismissed, the students were asked to practice their speaking performance which was related to the material by recording a video on FlipGrid. It allowed the students to practice their speaking performance while sitting outside the classroom. The link of their video would be copied in online discussion room. In the discussion room, students and teachers would give comments on student's speaking performance. The use of FlipGrid platform was expected to help the students to get more chances to practice their speaking performance. Thus, online classroom made the students able to practice every time they wanted, got a fast feedback and formative assessment. The class activity was allocated to give more chances to practice afterward.

The class activity of the experimental group was allocated to encourage and deepen their understanding. The students were asked to work in pairs and discuss the video based on the instruction that was provided in Schoology platform. It was also used to review student's speaking performance in online session from FlipGrid. Besides, the class activity was also provided to give more practices of other topics. After watching the students' performance, teacher and other students gave comments on the student's speaking performance.

The control group was taught by using conventional teaching strategy. In the teaching process, the control group was not supported by online materials. It meant the class was started when the class was supposed to be started. Thus, it could be assumed the control group was more teacher-centered. By giving different treatments, different student's responses could be seen during the learning activity. The use of mobile phone and technology platform made the students more excited and enjoyable while following the activity. The students had a new experience in learning English, especially in speaking with technological assistance.

This is in line with Baytak et al., (2011) who stated that the use of technology could make learner's learning activity became more interesting and interactive, while increasing their motivation as well. Moreover, the online classroom which was provided by Schoology platform made the students to be well-prepared and ready for

the class activity. It was because the material was already provided by teacher. Additionally, the use of FlipGrid platform also gave a chance for students to do more practices before class began. On the other hand, the students in control group were having less challenge because the teacher was explaining the material in the class as usual without any new challenge. The students did not get any chances to do more practices which means that the learning process was teacher-centered. It was creating a boring classroom circumstance.

There were three factors which made the implementation of flipped learning 3.0 became successfully done. First, the online classroom gave a chance for students to prepare well before the class began. It meant that they had learnt knowledge before joining the class and the learning process would be more effective. Second, the use of appropriate media gave a chance for students to do more practices in speaking with the provided topics. Additionally, it made the students excited in following the learning process. Third, the teacher could maximize the time allocation for class activities. The class activities were used to discuss what students did not understand yet, student's performance on FlipGrid, and did more practices with other related material. It could be assumed that classroom time allocation would be more effective.

### **The Impact of Self-Regulated Learning on Students' Speaking Performance**

During the process of giving treatment, students who had low self-regulated learning did not make any responses during the learning process. They looked more passive when the teacher gave students opportunity to explore the material (Geduld, 2016). The students who had low self-regulated learning did small interaction in the class. It seemed like they ignored the class. They only spent small time allocation to practice and collaborate with their friends. The students who had low self-regulated learning did not use the given feedback to improve their performance. They blamed the limited time allocation as the problem.

On the other hand, the students who had high self-regulated learning were very active during the treatment. They asked and answered the question actively. They spent a lot of time to practice and collaborate with their friends. Additionally, students who had high self-regulated learning were showing high confidence during the treatment. It was because they already prepared themselves before the class activity began. This is in line with the forethought phase of the self-regulated learning cycle. The students identified the strategies to pursue and started to set their goals. It referred to the planning phase for the students. The students who had high self-regulated learning did better performance during the treatment. It also indicated that they could monitor themselves to achieve their goal. Besides, the students also did self-evaluation about their performance. It helped the students to know about their performance. Sometimes the students were assisted by other students and teacher to assess their performance. It was needed to help the students knew their weaknesses.

Based on the post-test, some students with low self-regulated learning did a good performance in speaking. They mastered the content and spoke fluently. It was because there were students who had mastered English well. There were several students who could master and speak English fluently even though they had low self-regulated learning. This is line with Kosnin (2007) who stated that there were some students who got high achievement or good performance even though they had low level of self-regulated learning because they already had the skills needed. Thus, they do not need to apply any required elements of self-regulated learning to determine their



learning outcomes. Moreover, Alafgani & Purwandari (2019) state student's academic achievement can also be influenced by self-confidence. It means the students with higher self-confidence, will become better academic achievement than students only with a good understanding and a proper learning strategy.

Self-regulated learning did not give any significant differences on student's speaking performance toward students who had high self-regulated learning and students who had low self-regulated learning. Self-regulated learning gave a good impact on those who had high self-regulated learning because they became well-prepared to join the class. It was because they tended to show more adaptive self-regulated learning patterns such as effective goal setting, goal monitoring, and approaches to study. Thus, they had studied the material before class activity began. It made them became more active to ask and answer the question in the class. However, several students who had low self-regulated learning did a good speaking performance. It was because they had mastered English well even if they had low self-regulated learning.

### **The Interaction between Flipped Learning 3.0 and Self-Regulated Learning**

During the treatment, there was no interaction between learning and students' self-regulated learning. The students who had high self-regulated learning had better attitudes and performance in the class whether they taught by flipped learning 3.0 or conventional teaching strategy. However, in the post-test, some students who had low high self-regulated learning got better performance and gained good learning outcomes even during the treatment they ignored the activity. It showed that although the students had low self-regulated learning, they could gain good learning outcome whether they taught by flipped learning 3.0 or conventional teaching strategy. It could be confirmed that whether flipped learning 3.0 and self-regulated learning 3.0 did not influence each other.

However, flipped learning 3.0 and self-regulated learning had a good impact on students. Flipped learning 3.0 encouraged students to be ready when the class began. Schoology platform was used to provide and send the material to students. Besides, students could also practice their speaking skill through FlipGrid platform. It assisted the students to improve their fluency in speaking. Thus, class activity would be more effective to provide students with spaces to practice.

On the other hand, even if it was shown that self-regulated learning did not give any significant difference on students' speaking performance, it still gave a good impact on students. It could be seen from students who had high self-regulated learning looked more active and energetic during the learning process. It was because they had prepared and set their goals before the class began. They were actively asking and answering the questions. They created a positive atmosphere during the class.

### **CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION**

There has been a great deal of emphasis on the importance of using technology in language teaching. The findings of the current study demonstrate that flipped learning is effective for developing Students' speaking performance. In addition, flipped learning creates a good atmosphere during learning aided by technology. It is clear in the mean scores of post-tests results for both groups that flipped learning was more effective than conventional teaching strategies. On the other hand, self-regulated learning does not affect students' speaking performance. Despite self-regulated learning does not affect

student's speaking performance. It gives a positive impact on the teaching-learning activity. The students who had high self-regulated learning showed good attitudes during the learning activity. Meanwhile, students who have low self-regulated learning ignore the class activities. Moreover, there was no interaction between learning and students' self-regulated learning. The students who had high self-regulated learning had better attitudes and performance in the class whether they were taught by flipped learning 3.0 or conventional teaching strategy. However, in the post-test, some students who had low high self-regulated learning got better performance and gained good learning outcomes even during the treatment they ignored the activity. It showed that although the students had low self-regulated learning, they could get good learning outcomes whether they were taught by flipped learning 3.0 or conventional teaching strategy. It could be confirmed that flipped learning 3.0 and self-regulated learning 3.0 did not influence each other. However, flipped learning 3.0 and self-regulated learning have a good impact on pupils.

In addition, this study, however, has various limitations. First, it was about the time in implementing flipped learning and self-regulated learning is needed for further research in the same field. The treatment process continued for 8 weeks, more comprehensible results can be found out after a longer treatment process. The second, it is needed for further research to find out students' perception about flipped learning 3.0 and self-regulated learning.

Based on the findings and discussion, it is suggested for the English teacher to see the possibility of the implementation of flipped learning 3.0 with the help of self-regulated learning. The implementation of flipped learning can create a modern atmosphere because it is involving technology. The digital learners feel more excited when the teaching-learning processes are aided by technology. Then, the concept of self-regulated learning can help students to manage their learning process. Moreover, it creates new experiences when learning is assisted by technology. They also can learn to manage their time management. They can learn anytime and anywhere because the material is already provided by the teacher in technology platform.

## REFERENCES

- Ahmadi, M. R. (2018). Mohammad Reza Ahmadi 1\*. *International Journal of Research in English Education (IJREE)*, 3(2), 115–125.
- Alafgani, M., & Purwandari, E. (2019). Self-efficacy, academic motivation, self-regulated learning and academic achievement. *Jurnal Psikologi Pendidikan Dan Konseling: Jurnal Kajian Psikologi Pendidikan Dan Bimbingan Konseling*, 5(2), 104. <https://doi.org/10.26858/jppk.v5i2.10930>
- Altun, M. (2015). The Integration of Technology into Foreign Language Teaching. *International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their*, 6(1), 8. [www.ijonte.org](http://www.ijonte.org)
- Arianti, N. M. S. (2017). Self-Regulated Learning Implemented By the Students of Elementary School in Buleleng Sub-District. *International Journal of Language and Literature*, 1(4), 221. <https://doi.org/10.23887/ijll.v1i4.12585>

- Baytak, A., Tarman, B., & Ayas, C. (2011). Experiencing technology integration in education: Children's perceptions. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 3(2), 139–151.
- Bergmann, J. (2017). *Flipped Learning 3.0: Flipped Learning Will Never be the Same*. [www.youtube.com](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gppL3mw8SsU). <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gppL3mw8SsU>
- Bergmann, J., & Sams, A. (2012). *Flip Your Classroom*. Jonathan Bergmann.
- Carneiro, R., Lefrere, P., Steffens, K., Underwood, J. (Eds). (2011). *Self-Regulated Learning in Technology Enhanced Learning Environments (Vol 5)*. Rotterdam/ Boston/ Taipei: Sense Publisher.
- Cheng, C. (2011). *The role of self-regulated learning in enhancing learning performance*. January 2011.
- Geduld, B. (2016). Exploring differences between self-regulated learning strategies of high and low achievers in open distance learning. *Africa Education Review*, 13(1), 164–181. <https://doi.org/10.1080/18146627.2016.1182739>
- Gorgoretti, B. (2019). The use of technology in music education in North Cyprus according to student music teachers. *South African Journal of Education*, 39(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v39n1a1436>
- Khajloo, A. I. (2013). Problems in Teaching and Learning English for Students. *International Journal of Engineering Research*, 7(3), 56. [www.ijerd.com](http://www.ijerd.com)
- Köro lu, Z. Ç., & Çakır, A. (2017). Implementation of flipped instruction in language classrooms : An alternative way to develop speaking skills of pre-service English language teachers Zeynep Çetin Köro lu Abdulvahit Çakır Gazi University , Turkey. *International Journal of Education and Development*, 13(2), 42–55.
- Kızıl, A., & Savran, Z. (2018). Assessing self-regulated learning: The case of vocabulary learning through information and communication technologies. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 31(5–6), 599–616. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2018.1428201>
- Kosnin, A. M. (2007). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement in Malaysian undergraduates. *International Education Journal*, 8(1), 221–228.
- Liando, N. V. F., & Lumettu, R. (2017). Students' Personal Initiative towards their Speaking Performance. *International Education Studies*, 10(8), 21. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v10n8p21>
- Pallant, J. (2011). *For the SPSS Survival Manual website , go to [www.allenandunwin.com/spss](http://www.allenandunwin.com/spss) This is what readers from around the world say about the SPSS Survival Manual :*
- Quyen, T. T. T., & Loi, N. V. (2018). Flipped model for improving students' English speaking performance. *Can Tho University Journal of Science*, 54(2)(January), 90. <https://doi.org/10.22144/ctu.jen.2018.012>

Sarasfiya, M. (2018). *APPLYING FLIPPED CLASSROOM MODEL TO ENHANCE STUDENTS ' SPEAKING SKILL* Mella Sarasyifa FACULTY OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES.

Swary, D. N. (2014). *a Study of Students ' Problems in Learning Speaking English At the Second Grade of Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teaching Science of Syekh Nurjati State Institute for Islamic Studies*. 1.

Zelege, W. A., Karayi it, C., & Myers-Brooks, K. (2018). Using Self-Regulated Learning Strategies to Develop Students' Multicultural Counseling Competency. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 46(1), 40–57. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmcd.12091>