

**FACTORS THAT TRIGER TIP OF THE TONGUE AMONG ENGLISH  
FOREIGN LANGUAGE LEARNERS IAIN CURUP**

**THESIS**

This Thesis Is Submitted to fulfill the requirement for “Sarjana”  
Degree in English Tadris Study Program



**By:**

**Fahmi Alfarissi**

**NIM. 22551017**

**ENGLISH TADRIS STUDY PROGRAM**

**TARBIYAH FACULTY**

**INSTITUT AGAMA ISLAM NEGERI CURUP**

**2026**



**KEMENTERIAN AGAMA REPUBLIK INDONESIA**  
**INSTITUT AGAMA ISLAM NEGERI**  
**(IAIN) CURUP**

Jalan Dr. A.K. Gani No. 01 Kotak Pos 108 Telp. (0732) 21010-21759 Fax 21010

Homepage: <http://www.iaincurup.ac.id> Email: [admin@iaincurup.ac.id](mailto:admin@iaincurup.ac.id) Kode Pos 39119

**A P P R O V A L**

Nomor : 07 /In.34/FT/PP.00.9/8/2026

Name : Fahmi Alfariissi

NIM : 22551017

Departement : English Tadris Study Program

Title : Factors Trigger Tip of the Tongue Phenomenon Among EFL

Had examined by examining board of the English Tadris Study Program of Institut Agama Islam Negeri (IAIN) Curup, on:

Day / Date : Wednesday, July 22<sup>nd</sup> 2026

Time : 13.30 AM – 15.00 AM

At : Room 01 TBI IAIN Curup

Has been received to fulfill the requirement for the degree of *Strata I* in English Study Program of *Tarbiyah* of IAIN Curup.

Curup, Agustus 2026

Examiners:

Head

Secretary

Dr. Lefi Noviyenty, M.Pd.  
NIP. 197611062003122004

Dr. Prihantoro, SS., M.Pd.  
NIP. 197508202008011004

Examiner I

Examiner II

Dr. Sakut Anshori, S.Pd.I., M.Hum.  
NIP. 198110202006041002

Melli Kusmaningrum, M.Pd  
NIP. 199105242025212017

Dean

Faculty of Tarbiyah

Dr. Bakti Komalasari, S.Ag., M.Pd.  
NIP. 197011072000032004

## ADVISOR APPROVAL

Hal : Pengajuan Sidang Munaqasah

Kepada

Yth. Ibu Dekan Fakultas Tarbiyah IAIN Curup

Di tempat

Assalamualaikum Warahmatullahi Wabarakatuh

Semoga bapak selalu dalam kesehatan dan lindungan dari Allah SWT. dalam setiap urusannya.

Setelah mengadakan pemeriksaan dan juga perbaikan yang penting, maka kami berpendapat bahwa skripsi atas nama **Fahmi Alfarissi (22551017)** sebagai Mahasiswa dari Program Studi Tadris Bahasa Inggris, dengan judul **"Factors that Trigger Tip of the Tongue Among English Foreign Language Learners IAIN Curup"** sudah dapat diajukan dalam Sidang Munaqasah di Institut Agama Islam Negeri (IAIN) Curup

Demikian Permohonan ini kami ajukan, besar harapan kami agar bapak dapat menyetujui hal ini. Terima kasih.

Wassalamualaikum Warahmatullahi Wabarakatuh

Curup, .... Juni 2026

Mengetahui

Advisor

  
**Dr. Leffi Noviyenti, M.Pd, NIP.**  
197611062003122004

Co-Advisor

  
**Dr. Prihantoro, SS., M.Pd**  
NIP. 197508202008011004

## THE STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP

### THE STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP

The author who has signed below:

Name : Fahmi Alfarissi

NIM : 22551017

Study Program : Tadris Bahasa Inggris

Faculty : Tarbiyah

Declare that the " Factors that Trigger Tip of the Tongue Among English Foreign Language Learners IAIN Curup " thesis was written honestly and to the best of my ability. If this thesis has some mistakes the following day, the author is prepared to assume responsibility for the consequences and any additional criticism from IAIN Curup and to abide by its policies.

Curup, July ..... 2026

Author



**Fahmi Alfarissi**  
NIM. 22551017



## **PREFACE**

All praise and thanks are due to Allah SWT. With the help of His blessings, I, the author, have finished this thesis with admirable outcomes and putting forth my best effort. This thesis has been turned in to fulfill the requirement of Institut Agama Islam Negeri (IAIN) Curup for the Sarjana degree.

The phenomenon in this research lies in the experience of the Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT) among students in EFL speaking classes. The researcher is interested in exploring and identifying the factors that trigger the ToT phenomenon during speaking activities, as well as understanding the impact it produces on students' speaking performance and psychological confidence in English communication.

Although the analysis in this research still has limitations and room for further development especially considering the complexity of the cognitive-affective interactions involved in the ToT phenomenon and the importance of speaking competence in EFL education . The researcher hopes this study can serve as a foundation for further exploration of the ToT phenomenon in language learning contexts, particularly in the Indonesian Islamic higher education setting.

Curup, July ..... 2026

Author

**Fahmi Alfarissi**

**NIM. 22551017**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

*Assalamualaikum Warahmatullahi Wabarakatuh*

Alhamdulillahirabbil ‘alamin, all praise and the highest gratitude are devoted to Allah SWT, the Most Gracious and the Most Merciful, for His infinite mercy, strength, and guidance bestowed upon the writer, enabling the completion of this thesis. May peace and blessings be upon Prophet Muhammad SAW, who has guided humanity from ignorance to enlightenment.

This thesis is submitted as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for obtaining the Sarjana degree in the English Tadris Study Program at IAIN Curup. In the process of completing this research, the writer received invaluable support, guidance, and encouragement from many respected individuals. Therefore, the writer would like to express sincere appreciation to:

1. **Prof. Dr. H. Idi Warsah, M.Pd.I.**, the Rector of IAIN Curup, who has given the writer the opportunity and facilities to pursue her/his study at IAIN Curup.
2. **Dr. Bakti Komalasari, S.Ag., M.Pd.**, the Dean of the Faculty of Tarbiyah, who has provided permission and administrative support in the completion of this thesis.
3. **Khoirunnisa, M.Pd**, the Head of the English Study Program (Tadris Bahasa Inggris), who has given guidance, motivation, and convenience during the writer's study in this study program.

4. **Dr. Leffi Noviyenti, M.Pd. & Dr. Prihantoro, SS., M.Pd**, the thesis advisors, who has patiently devoted her/his time, energy, and thoughts to guide, direct, and provide invaluable input to the writer from the beginning until the completion of this thesis.
5. **All lecturers** of the English Study Program and the Faculty of Tarbiyah, IAIN Curup, who have shared their knowledge and valuable experience during the writer's academic years.
6. **All staff** of IAIN Curup, especially the academic and library staff, who have assisted the writer with administrative matters and provided references needed in completing this thesis.
7. **My beloved Parents**, who have always given their prayers, love, moral and material support, and endless motivation to the writer.

The writer realizes that this thesis is still far from perfect. Therefore, constructive criticism and suggestions are highly appreciated. Hopefully, this thesis will be useful for the readers and other parties in need. *Aamiin yaa rabbal 'alamiin.*

*Wassalamualaikum Warahmatullahi Wabarakatuh*

**MOTTO**

***IF YOU DON'T TAKE THE RISK  
YOU WON'T MAKE YOUR FUTURE***

**Fahmi Alfarissi**

## **DEDICATION**

*I proudly dedicate this thesis to my beloved mother, my beloved  
father, and myself.*

*Words are too poor to express my love and gratitude to you all, who  
have been my source of strength, enabling me to keep crawling,  
walking, running, and pursuing my dreams throughout this journey of  
life.*

## ABSTRACT

Fahmi Alfarissi. NIM. 22551017. **“Factors Trigger Tip of the Tongue mong English Foreign Language Learners”**. Thesis, English Tadris Study Program (TBI). 2025

This study investigates the Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT) phenomenon experienced by English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students at the English Tadris Study Program, IAIN Curup, focusing on the factors that trigger its occurrence and its impact on speaking performance and self-confidence. ToT refers to a temporary lexical retrieval failure in which a speaker is certain of knowing a word but is momentarily unable to produce it, a phenomenon that becomes particularly salient in EFL speaking contexts where learners must simultaneously retrieve vocabulary, organise ideas, and produce grammatically appropriate utterances. Adopting a qualitative phenomenological approach, this study explores the lived experiences of four EFL students through semi-structured interviews and structured observation of their speaking performance. The findings reveal five interrelated factors contributing to ToT, namely weak productive lexical representation, phonological encoding failure, cognitive overload, first language interference, and situational anxiety acting as an amplifier of the phenomenon. Furthermore, ToT is found to disrupt fluency, grammatical accuracy, and message coherence, while also prompting learners to develop various compensation strategies. Beyond its linguistic effects, ToT is shown to influence learners' psychological states, contributing to declining speaking confidence, reduced willingness to communicate, and, in some cases, a self-reinforcing negative cycle between anxiety and recurring retrieval failure. These findings offer empirical grounding for designing more responsive EFL speaking instruction.

**Keywords:** Tip-of-the-Tongue, lexical retrieval, EFL speaking, foreign language anxiety, self-confidence

## TABLE OF CONTENT

|                                                  |             |
|--------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| <b>THESIS APPROVAL.....</b>                      | <b>ii</b>   |
| <b>ADVISOR APPROVAL.....</b>                     | <b>iii</b>  |
| <b>THE STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP .....</b>          | <b>iv</b>   |
| <b>PREFACE.....</b>                              | <b>v</b>    |
| <b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....</b>                      | <b>vi</b>   |
| <b>MOTTO.....</b>                                | <b>vii</b>  |
| <b>DEDICATION.....</b>                           | <b>ix</b>   |
| <b>ABSTRACT.....</b>                             | <b>x</b>    |
| <b>TABLE OF CONTENT.....</b>                     | <b>xi</b>   |
| <b>LIST OF TABLE.....</b>                        | <b>xiii</b> |
| <b>LIST OF APPENDIX.....</b>                     | <b>xiv</b>  |
| <b>CHAPTER I.....</b>                            | <b>1</b>    |
| <b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>                         | <b>1</b>    |
| A.Research Background .....                      | 1           |
| B. Research Questions.....                       | 6           |
| C. Objectives of the Research.....               | 6           |
| D.Delemination of the Research .....             | 7           |
| E. Definition of Key Terms.....                  | 8           |
| F.Significance of the Research .....             | 9           |
| <b>CHAPTER II.....</b>                           | <b>11</b>   |
| <b>LITERATURE REVIEW .....</b>                   | <b>11</b>   |
| A.Review of Related Theory .....                 | 11          |
| 2. Causes of ToT.....                            | 14          |
| 3.The Impact of ToT on speaking Performance..... | 18          |
| B.Review of Related Findings .....               | 21          |
| <b>CHAPTER III.....</b>                          | <b>26</b>   |
| <b>RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....</b>                | <b>26</b>   |
| A. Research Design.....                          | 26          |

|                                     |           |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|
| B.Participants .....                | 27        |
| C. Data Collection Techniques ..... | 29        |
| D.Instrumen .....                   | 31        |
| 1.Interview guidance.....           | 31        |
| 2.Observation Checklist.....        | 32        |
| <b>CHAPTER IV.....</b>              | <b>42</b> |
| <b>FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION.....</b> | <b>42</b> |
| A. Research Findings .....          | 42        |
| B. DISCUSSION.....                  | 57        |
| <b>CHAPTER V.....</b>               | <b>93</b> |
| <b>CONCLUSION.....</b>              | <b>93</b> |
| A. Conclusion.....                  | 93        |
| B. Suggestion .....                 | 94        |
| <b>BIBLIOGRAPHY.....</b>            | <b>97</b> |
| <b>APPENDIXES.....</b>              |           |
| <b>AUTOBIOGRAPHY.....</b>           |           |

## LIST OF TABLE

|                                                                                                      |    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Table 3.3 Paradigm Model.....                                                                        | 45 |
| Table 3.4 Frequency Level Categories .....                                                           | 47 |
| Table 3.6 Summary of Data Processing and Analysis Techniques.....                                    | 49 |
| Table 4.1 Observation Data: L1 Interference Indicators (Observed Only).....                          | 65 |
| Table 4.2 Observation Data: Speaking Anxiety Indicators (Observed Only).....                         | 67 |
| Table 4.3 Data Display: Impact of ToT on Speaking Performance (Interview<br>Data).....               | 69 |
| Table 4.4 Observation Data: Speaking Performance Impact Indicators (Observed<br>Only).....           | 72 |
| Table 4.5 Data Display: Impact of ToT on Self-Confidence and L2 Development<br>(Interview Data)..... | 72 |
| Table 4.6 Observation Data: Self-Confidence Indicators (Observed Only).....                          | 80 |

## **LIST OF APPENDIX**

|                   |                                       |            |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|
| <b>Appendix 1</b> | <b>: SK Pembimbing .....</b>          | <b>ii</b>  |
| <b>Appendix 2</b> | <b>: Kartu Bimbingan Skripsi.....</b> | <b>iii</b> |
| <b>Appendix 3</b> | <b>: Observation Checklist .....</b>  | <b>iv</b>  |
| <b>Appendix 4</b> | <b>: Interview Codes.....</b>         | <b>vii</b> |
| <b>Appendix 5</b> | <b>: Research Instrument.....</b>     | <b>xiv</b> |

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### A. Research Background

The Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT) phenomenon refers to a psycholinguistic condition in which a speaker knows a word but temporarily fails to access or articulate it verbally a state characterised by the strong subjective feeling that the target word is known, combined with the inability to immediately produce it.<sup>1</sup> Brown described this condition as a temporary failure of lexical access in which the speaker retains access to partial information about the target word such as its initial sound, syllabic structure, or semantic category while the full phonological form remains momentarily inaccessible.<sup>2</sup> Schwartz and Metcalfe further characterise ToT states as windows into metacognition moments in which speakers become acutely aware of the boundary between knowing and not-knowing.<sup>3</sup>

From a psycholinguistic perspective, ToT is not a random cognitive failure but the product of a specific breakdown in the lexical access process. Levelt, Roelofs, and Meyer proposed that speech production proceeds through sequential stages: lemma retrieval accessing a word's semantic and syntactic properties followed by lexeme retrieval activating its phonological form.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Dewi, I. S., & Salikin, H. (2022). *The Effectiveness of Semantic Priming in Overcoming The Tip of The Tongue Phenomenon*. *Kajian Linguistik dan Sastra*, 7(1), 92–107.

<sup>2</sup> Schwartz, B. L., & Metcalfe, J. (2021). "Tip-of-the-tongue states as windows into metacognition." *Psychological Science*, 32(5), 654-667.

<sup>3</sup> Mailawati, & Sutrisno. (2023). *The Influence of Word Stress on EFL Learners' TOT State*. *Leksema: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra*, 8(2).

<sup>4</sup> Dewi & Salikin, *The Effectiveness of Semantic Priming to Overcome The Tip of The Tongue*

ToT arises precisely at the transition between these stages: the lemma is successfully activated, meaning the speaker knows what they want to say, but the lexeme is not retrieved, meaning the phonological form of the word cannot be produced. This lemma-lexeme dissociation is what distinguishes ToT from ordinary vocabulary ignorance and makes it a theoretically significant phenomenon in second language acquisition research.

In English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, the ToT phenomenon is particularly significant because speaking in a second language imposes far greater demands on the cognitive system than speaking in a first language. Research has shown that the influence of word stress patterns on EFL learners' phonological encoding significantly increases the likelihood of ToT episodes, as learners must simultaneously process phonological, syntactic, and semantic information under communicative time pressure.<sup>5</sup> Dewi and Salikin similarly documented that Indonesian EFL learners who experienced higher ToT frequency reported significantly greater speaking anxiety and reduced communicative confidence, indicating that ToT extends its consequences well beyond the moment of lexical failure.<sup>6</sup>

Speaking performance is widely regarded as the most demanding skill in EFL learning, requiring the simultaneous management of vocabulary retrieval, grammatical encoding, phonological production, and message organisation. When ToT disrupts any one of these processes, the resulting

---

*Phenomenon, Kajian Linguistik dan Sastra*, 7(1), 2022.

<sup>5</sup> Facal et al., *Foreign language training to stimulate cognitive functions: Effects on lexical access and ToT frequency*, *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 631559 (2021).

<sup>6</sup> Pangesti & Prihatini, "Tip of the Tongue" dalam *Ujaran Penutur Asing Bahasa Indonesia*, *Leksema*, 5(2), 2020.

communication breakdown can cascade across the entire utterance. Al Jebouri found that advanced EFL speakers experiencing ToT showed measurable disruption not only in fluency but also in grammatical accuracy and phonological precision, with the severity of disruption scaling with the evaluative pressure of the communicative context.<sup>7</sup> Mailawati and Sutrisno further demonstrated that word stress uncertainty a contributing factor to phonological encoding failure significantly elevated ToT frequency in structured speaking tasks, suggesting that lexical retrieval failure is systematically linked to the phonological demands of EFL production contexts.<sup>8</sup>

In the Indonesian EFL research landscape, studies on the ToT phenomenon remain relatively scarce. Pangesti and Prihatini documented ToT episodes in Indonesian learners of foreign languages, finding that the dominance of Bahasa Indonesia as the first language created systematic interference at the phonological retrieval stage, particularly when learners attempted to produce low-frequency L2 vocabulary.<sup>9</sup> A subsequent study by Prihatini and Pangesti further confirmed that Indonesian EFL speakers consistently experienced ToT in conditions of conversational time pressure, with retrieval failure occurring most frequently for words that were known

---

<sup>7</sup> Al Jebouri, *A Study of Speech Error Phenomena T.O.T Experienced by Advanced EFL Speakers*, *Psychology and Education Journal* 58(2) (2021).

<sup>8</sup> Mailawati & Sutrisno. (2022). *The Influence of Word Stress on EFL Learners' TOT State*, *Leksema: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra*, 8(2), 65–82.

<sup>9</sup> Pangesti, F. & Prihatini, A. (2020). *'Tip of the Tongue' Dalam Ujaran Penutur Asing Bahasa Indonesia: Studi Kasus Mahasiswa BIPA*. *Leksema: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra*, 5(2), 201–211.

receptively but had not been sufficiently practised in productive contexts.<sup>10</sup> These findings suggest that the Indonesian EFL context characterised by limited exposure to authentic English communication outside the classroom, a strong L1 dominance in daily life, and instructional practices historically reliant on translation methods creates a distinctive configuration of ToT triggers that warrants systematic investigation.

Beyond its immediate impact on linguistic production, ToT carries significant psychological consequences for EFL learners. Mahmud found that psychological factors particularly speaking anxiety and low self-confidence are among the most powerful predictors of speaking performance failure among EFL students, with anxiety both causing and being exacerbated by retrieval difficulties.<sup>11</sup> Prihatini and Pangesti further documented that repeated ToT experiences in academic speaking contexts produced lasting damage to learners' perceived competence in English, reducing their willingness to engage in future speaking tasks.<sup>12</sup> Zareian and Rahimi established a direct causal relationship between cognitive load in EFL speaking and lexical retrieval failure, demonstrating that when attentional resources are divided between linguistic processing demands and emotional management, lexical access is the function that fails first.<sup>1314</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Prihatini, A. & Pangesti, F., *Tip of the Tongue dalam Akses Leksikal Ujaran Penutur Bahasa Indonesia*, Aksara, 2024.

<sup>11</sup> Mahmud, M. (2021). *Psychological Factors Affecting EFL Students' Speaking Performance*. *ELT Worldwide*, 8(2), 190–202.

<sup>12</sup> Prihatini, A., & Pangesti, F. (2024). *Tip of the Tongue dalam Akses Leksikal Ujaran Penutur Bahasa Indonesia*. *Aksara*, 36(1), 50–67.

<sup>13</sup> Prihatini, A., & Pangesti, F. (2024). *Tip of the Tongue dalam Akses Leksikal Ujaran Penutur Bahasa Indonesia*. *Aksara*, 36(1), 50–67.

<sup>14</sup> Zareian, G., & Rahimi, A. (2020). *The Role of Cognitive Load and Lexical Retrieval in EFL*

A preliminary investigation conducted with ten students from the English Tadris Study Program at IAIN Curup on 10 April 2025 confirmed that all participants had experienced ToT while speaking English. The experiences reported ranged from momentary word-search episodes to sustained speaking disruption across an entire presentation. Contributing factors identified by participants included both internal factors – limited vocabulary mastery, speaking anxiety, low self-confidence, and difficulty activating words known receptively but rarely practised productively – and external factors – evaluative pressure, unfamiliar speaking environments, limited classroom speaking practice time, and the linguistic demands of academic speaking tasks. These preliminary findings established the empirical basis for a more systematic investigation.

Despite the growing body of research on ToT and related speaking difficulties, several significant gaps remain. Most existing studies on ToT have been conducted in the context of bilingual speakers in Western countries or learners of languages other than English, leaving the experiences of Indonesian EFL learners insufficiently documented. Furthermore, while existing studies have documented the immediate linguistic consequences of ToT, relatively little attention has been paid to its cascading psychological consequences – particularly the self-reinforcing cycle of confidence decline, anxiety escalation, and reduced willingness to communicate that ToT can produce over time. The role of individual psychological resources – such as

growth mindset as potential moderators of this cycle has not been previously investigated in the Indonesian EFL context.

Based on these identified issues, the researcher is interested in conducting a study on tip of the tongue phenomenon. This research aims to investigate the causes of tip of the tongue in speaking performance. Thus, this study is expected to provide deeper study of factor that causing tip of the tongu. This thesis is titled **"Factors That Trigger Tip of the Tongue Phenomenon among English foreign Language Learners. "**

## **B. Research Questions**

What are the main factors that contribute to the occurrence of the Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT) phenomenon among EFL students at IAIN Curup?

How does the Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT) phenomenon affect the speaking performance and self-confidence of EFL students in English communication?

## **C. Objectives of the Research**

To identify the internal and external factors that cause the occurrence of the Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT) phenomenon among EFL students.

To explore the impact of the Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT) phenomenon on the speaking performance and self-confidence of EFL students in using English.

#### **D. Delimitation of the Research**

Delimitation refers to the intentional boundaries set by the researcher to define and narrow the scope of a study. Unlike limitations, which arise from uncontrollable constraints, delimitations are conscious choices made to keep the research focused and aligned with its objectives. This study needs to be delimited because the Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT) phenomenon is a broad topic that has been studied across various disciplines and contexts. Without clear boundaries, the research risks becoming too wide to produce meaningful and focused findings. Therefore, specific boundaries are established to ensure the study remains purposeful and manageable.

This study is limited to the investigation of the Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT) phenomenon experienced by students of the English Education Study Program (Tadris Bahasa Inggris) at IAIN Curup who have completed at least one speaking course. The research adopts a qualitative phenomenological approach, focusing on students' lived experiences of ToT while speaking English as a Foreign Language (EFL), particularly in classroom-based speaking tasks. The primary scope includes exploring the perceived internal and external factors contributing to ToT episodes, such as limited vocabulary mastery, speaking anxiety, and situational pressures, as well as their subjective impact on students' speaking performance and self-confidence. This study does not cover ToT in general bilingual settings or activities beyond speaking courses, and it does not aim to measure the frequency or statistical patterns of ToT occurrences. Rather, it seeks to uncover rich, descriptive insights into

how students interpret and respond to the phenomenon, in line with the interpretive goals of qualitative research.

## **E. Definition of Key Terms**

There are several definitions of key terms connected to this study, defined by the researcher, as follows:

### **1. Tip-of-the-Tongue**

In this study, ToT refers specifically to the moments experienced by EFL students at IAIN Curup when they are unable to retrieve an English word during classroom speaking tasks, despite having prior knowledge of it.<sup>15</sup>

### **2. English Foreign Language Learners**

In this study, EFL learners specifically refer to students of the English Education Study Program (Tadris Bahasa Inggris) at IAIN Curup who are learning English in an Indonesian context, where English has limited use outside the classroom..<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Brown, R. (1991). *A review of the tip-of-the-tongue experience*. *Psychological Bulletin*, 109(2), 204–223.

<sup>16</sup> Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* (4th ed.). London: Pearson Education.

## **F. Significance of the Research**

This research is expected to provide meaningful contributions both theoretically and practically. From a theoretical perspective, the findings of this study will enrich the body of knowledge in the fields of psycholinguistics and foreign language education, particularly in understanding the cognitive mechanisms involved in speaking processes. The identification of causes and effects of the Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT) phenomenon will help clarify the relationship between lexical memory, phonological ability, and learners' confidence in speaking English as a foreign language. Therefore, this study may serve as a reference for further research on speaking performance and psychological barriers in second language acquisition.

Practically, this research offers benefits for English lecturers and language instructors in designing more responsive teaching strategies that address students' difficulties in speaking. Insights into the frequency, triggering factors, and compensation strategies used by students to cope with ToT can serve as a foundation for developing needs-based instructional approaches. Furthermore, this study is also valuable for students themselves, helping them to better understand the condition they experience and to enhance their metacognitive awareness in overcoming speaking difficulties. For educational institutions, the research results can be used as a reference in curriculum development or in designing more adaptive and applicable English language training programs.

## **G. Organization of the Research**

The framework of this research includes Chapter I, which covers the general information of the research, the problem with the research, the research questions, the research objectives, the delimitation of the research, the significance of the research, and the structure of the research.

Chapter II, it explains about the literature review which consist theoretical framework about tip of the tongue, as well as the theory about thesis background which connected with the previous of related findings.

Chapter III, it explains the research methodology, including the research design, subject of the research, research data collection technique instrument, and also research data analysis technique.

Chapter IV Findings and Discussion This chapter presents the research findings derived from semi-structured interview data and structured observation, organised according to the two research questions. Each finding is discussed in relation to the theoretical frameworks reviewed in Chapter II and triangulated across both data collection instruments.

Chapter V Conclusion and Suggestion This chapter presents the conclusions drawn from the research findings, organised according to each research question, followed by practical suggestions addressed to lecturers, students, and future researchers.

## CHAPTER II

### LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter presents a literature review that serves as a guideline for this research. The discussion of this chapter will cover theories, key concepts, arguments, and indicators used to analyze the factors that trigger TOT.

#### A. Review of Related Theory

##### 1. Tip-of-the-Tongue

The Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT) phenomenon is a psycholinguistic condition in which an individual knows a certain word but experiences temporary difficulty in recalling it Schwartz & Metcalfe, , this phenomenon is commonly experienced by learners of English as a Foreign Language (EFL), including students at IAIN Curup, and it can affect both their speaking fluency and self-confidence. This literature review discusses the causes of ToT, the strategies used to overcome it, and its impact on EFL students' speaking performance and confidence.<sup>17</sup>

The Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT) phenomenon refers to a psycholinguistic condition in which someone is confident they know a word, but temporarily fails to access or articulate it verbally (Brown, 1991). In the context of second language (L2) learning, especially among EFL learners, ToT frequently occurs during spontaneous speech, which demands quick access to vocabulary that may not yet be firmly stored in long-term memory.

Common manifestations of ToT include sudden pauses, the use of word

---

<sup>17</sup> Schwartz, B. L., & Metcalfe, J. (2017). *Tip-of-the-tongue (TOT) states: Retrieval, behavior, and metacognition*. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 26(5), 367–373.

substitutions or paraphrasing, gestures, and seeking help from the interlocutor. These disruptions not only interfere with speech fluency but also reduce learners' confidence and comfort when communicating in a foreign language .<sup>18</sup>

Lexical access in speech production occurs in sequential stages, beginning with conceptual activation, followed by lemma selection and phonological encoding. Their reaction-time experiments in picture naming tasks showed that interference at the phonological level can delay articulation even when semantic information is successfully retrieved. This supports the explanation that ToT occurs due to partial activation at the phonological encoding stage rather than complete memory loss. This explains that disruptions in speaking performance are not always caused by a lack of knowledge, but may instead result from a temporary failure in lexical access. Therefore, the Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT) phenomenon represents a disruption at the level of lexical retrieval rather than a deficiency in overall language competence.<sup>19</sup>

Speakers who experience the Tip of the Tongue ToT state often retain access to syntactic or grammatical information such as grammatical gender, word class, or morphological features even though they are unable to retrieve the phonological form of the target word. This condition demonstrates that lexical retrieval is not a single unified process but

---

<sup>18</sup> Brown, R. (1991). *A review of the tip-of-the-tongue experience*. *Psychological Bulletin*, 109(2), 204–223.

<sup>19</sup> Willem J. M. Levelt, Ardi Roelofs, and Antje S. Meyer, "A Theory of Lexical Access in Speech Production," *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 22 (1999)

consists of distinct representational levels. These findings support the theoretical distinction between the lemma level, which contains semantic and syntactic information, and the lexeme level, which stores phonological form. During ToT episodes, activation at the lemma level appears to remain intact, allowing speakers to access meaning and grammatical properties, while activation fails to reach or fully activate the phonological encoding stage. This selective breakdown provides strong evidence that semantic and syntactic representations and phonological representations operate semi independently within the mental lexicon, reinforcing multi level models of lexical access in speech production.<sup>20</sup>

Drawing from the theories discussed above, it can be concluded that the Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT) phenomenon is a temporary failure in lexical retrieval that occurs at the phonological encoding stage, not a reflection of a lack of knowledge or language competence. The various theoretical perspectives consistently highlight that during ToT episodes, speakers retain access to semantic and syntactic information but fail to activate the phonological form of the target word. In the context of this study, ToT is understood as a psycholinguistic disruption that EFL students at IAIN Curup may experience during classroom speaking tasks, where the pressure of spontaneous speech production makes lexical access more challenging.

---

<sup>20</sup> Alfonso Caramazza and Michela Miozzo, "The Relation Between Syntactic and Phonological Knowledge in Lexical Access: Evidence from the Tip-of-the-Tongue Phenomenon," *Cognition* 64, no. 3 (1997): 309–343

## 2. Causes of ToT

The Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT) phenomenon is not a random occurrence but rather a reflection of a combination of factors such as language control, L1 interference, and the strength of lexical representation in memory all of which are examined through various theoretical frameworks.

**In Research by** Barry, J. C. in an article with title *Mnemonic factors associated with the tip-of-the-tongue phenomenon*, states that **Tip of the Tongue (ToT) phenomenon** is a cognitive experience in which individuals temporarily fail to retrieve a word from memory even though they are certain that the word is known. During this state, speakers often feel that the word is about to be recalled, yet they cannot produce it immediately in speech. Despite the inability to retrieve the complete word, individuals may still remember partial information related to the target word, such as its semantic meaning, the first letter, the number of syllables, or other phonological characteristics. This condition indicates that the lexical item is stored in the speaker's mental lexicon but cannot be accessed due to a temporary disruption in the lexical retrieval process. Psycholinguistic studies describe this phenomenon as a **transient failure in semantic memory retrieval**, where the conceptual knowledge of the word remains available but the phonological form required for articulation cannot be activated successfully.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Barry, J. C., Ferrer, E., Lerma-Usabiaga, G., & Paz-Alonso, P. M. (2025). *Mnemonic factors associated with the tip-of-the-tongue phenomenon*. Scientific Reports.

In another research by Green, D. W., & Abutalebi, J. Emphasizes that bilinguals require an adaptive language control system in contexts involving L1–L2 interaction. Within this framework, individuals manage eight control processes ranging from goal maintenance to conflict monitoring and interference suppression that adjust depending on the interactional context (e.g., monolingual, bilingual, or code-switching environments). ACH explains that when learners shift from L1 to L2, insufficient inhibition of the dominant L1 increases the likelihood of experiencing ToT. Although some meta-analytical studies present inconsistent findings regarding ACH predictions, a wide range of experimental research supports the notion that language switching enhances cognitive control across domains, including speech monitoring and interference regulation.<sup>22</sup>

Furthermore, the **Lexical Retrieval Failure Model** highlights three main factors responsible for retrieval failure: weak lexical representations in memory, low frequency of L2 usage, and interference from the dominant L1. When learners do not regularly use L2 vocabulary, access pathways become less automatic and more susceptible to disruption by L1. Interventions using lexical approaches such as increased exposure and active repetition have proven effective in reducing the frequency of ToT incidents.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Green, D. W., & Abutalebi, J. (2016). *Language control and the neuroanatomy of bilingualism: Inhibitory control and beyond*. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 31(3),

<sup>23</sup> Gollan, T. H., Stasenko, A., & Salmon, D. P. (2021). *Tip-of-the-tongue states in aging and bilingualism: Frequency, phenomenology, and retrieval failure causes*. *Language, Cognition*

Another theory is proposed by H. A. Salsabil, F. A. Lubis, S. Ahwani, and Y. Lubis in their research titled *Cognitive Constraints in Foreign Language Speech Production*. This study explains that speech production in a foreign language is influenced by various cognitive constraints that affect how learners plan, formulate, and articulate their utterances. When learners communicate in a second or foreign language, they must simultaneously retrieve appropriate vocabulary, construct grammatical structures, organize ideas, and monitor the accuracy of their speech. These processes demand substantial cognitive resources and depend heavily on the capacity of working memory. When the cognitive load becomes excessive, learners may encounter difficulties in maintaining fluency during speech production. As a consequence, they may pause frequently, repeat certain words, simplify sentence structures, or experience problems retrieving specific lexical items while speaking. In addition, psychological factors such as anxiety, intensive self-monitoring, and interference from the first language may further increase the cognitive burden faced by learners during speaking activities. Therefore, this theory highlights that speaking in a foreign language is not merely a linguistic activity but also a complex cognitive process that can contribute to the occurrence of lexical retrieval problems, including the Tip-of-the-Tongue phenomenon, during communication.<sup>24</sup>

---

and *Neuroscience*, 36(5), 531–546.

<sup>24</sup> H. A. Salsabil, F. A. Lubis, S. Ahwani, and Y. Lubis, *Cognitive Constraints in Foreign Language Speech Production* (2026).

Meanwhile, the **Bilingual Speech Production Model** points out that second language production occurs through a semantically mediated route, beginning from conceptual meaning and proceeding to word form. In L2, this route is less efficient than in L1, and the dominance of L1 often slows down semantic-to-lexical access. This delay frequently leads learners to experience a “tip-of-the-tongue” state, where the concept is already present in the mind, but the L2 word form remains inaccessible.<sup>25</sup>

Public speaking anxiety in the EFL context is a common phenomenon influenced by both internal and external factors. Internally, anxiety is characterized by physical reactions such as muscle tension, increased heart rate, and difficulty controlling body movements, while externally it is triggered by fear of negative evaluation, such as being laughed at or criticized by the audience. In addition, limited linguistic competence, including insufficient mastery of grammar, vocabulary, and sentence construction, is a major cause of this anxiety. This condition reflects a reciprocal relationship in which linguistic deficiencies increase anxiety, and anxiety in turn worsens speaking performance, including triggering the tip-of-the-tongue (ToT) phenomenon. A study conducted by Rizka Indahyanti, Ali Wira Rahman, and Mursidin M. (2023) found that the level of speaking anxiety among EFL students in public speaking contexts is moderate and has a negative impact on oral performance, confirming that anxiety is a

---

<sup>25</sup> Kroll, J. F., & Stewart, E. (1994). *Category interference in translation and picture naming: Evidence for asymmetric connections between bilingual memory representations*. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 33(2), 149–174.

significant barrier in foreign language learning, particularly in speaking skills.<sup>26</sup>

Considering the theories discussed above, it can be concluded that the ToT phenomenon among EFL learners is caused by a combination of cognitive, linguistic, and psychological factors. These include weak lexical representations in memory, insufficient inhibition of L1 interference, excessive cognitive load during foreign language speech production, and low frequency of L2 use. In the context of this study, these causes are particularly relevant in understanding why students of the English Education Study Program at IAIN Curup frequently encounter ToT during speaking activities, given their limited exposure to English outside the classroom and the cognitive demands of producing speech in a foreign language.

### 3.The Impact of ToT on speaking Performance

The Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT) phenomenon poses not only linguistic challenges but also creates significant psychological and academic burdens. According to the **Cognitive Monitoring Theory** (Metcalf & Schwartz, 2022), learners experiencing ToT automatically monitor their retrieval failures, which triggers a metacognitive load that can disrupt focus and cognitive efficiency during speaking activities. This increased cognitive burden can negatively impact performance in oral exams,

---

<sup>26</sup> Rizka Indahyanti, Ali Wira Rahman, dan Mursidin M., "Measuring Language Anxiety of EFL Students in Public Speaking," *Klasikal: Journal of Education, Language Teaching and Science* 5, no. 1 (2023): 196–203.

academic presentations, and class discussions. Such metacognitive overload is thoroughly explored in the literature on cognitive monitoring and learning strategies, where it is seen as a key barrier to fluent academic performance in spoken tasks.<sup>27</sup>

Moreover, the **Dynamic Systems Theory of Language Anxiety** (Dörnyei, 2020) describes speaking anxiety as a dynamic system influenced by repeated negative experiences, including episodes of ToT. Each ToT incident can heighten anxiety levels, thereby increasing the likelihood of future ToT occurrences a negative spiral that reduces learners' willingness to speak or actively engage in classroom activities. This anxiety cycle ultimately hampers learners' communicative confidence and their academic participation.<sup>28</sup>

According to Mora, Mora-Plaza, and Bermejo-Miranda (2023), speaking anxiety is a form of state anxiety that emerges situationally when individuals use a second language in communication activities. This anxiety frequently occurs in language classroom settings, particularly when learners are required to perform speaking tasks such as presentations, discussions, or oral narratives. In such situations, cognitive and emotional pressure may interfere with the language processing system, thereby affecting the quality of learners' speech production. This study indicates that speaking anxiety can influence several dimensions of second language speaking

---

<sup>27</sup> Metcalfe, J., & Schwartz, B. L. (2022). *The tip-of-the-tongue state and cognitive control: A metacognitive approach to word retrieval failure*. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 26(2), 149–161.

<sup>28</sup> Zoltán Dörnyei & Stephen Ryan, *The Psychology of the Language Learner Revisited* (New York: Routledge, 2020), pp. 161–175.

performance, including fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, comprehensibility, and accentedness. Learners with higher levels of anxiety tend to demonstrate lower speaking fluency, which is characterized by increased pauses, hesitation, and self-repairs during speech. This condition suggests that anxiety may disrupt the process of lexical retrieval in language production, which may eventually trigger the occurrence of the Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT) phenomenon among foreign language learners.<sup>29</sup>

**Output Hypothesis** (Swain, 1985) emphasizes the importance of language production (output) as a crucial component of language learning. When learners frequently experience ToT, they miss valuable opportunities to practice and reinforce linguistic structures. As a result, their second language acquisition process becomes suboptimal, leading to less varied and more limited lexical output, which undermines their overall communicative competence in English.<sup>30</sup>

In a broader context, the theory proposed by **Ghasemi and Mozaheb** explains that speaking fluency is a crucial factor in successful communication, as it relates to the speaker's ability to deliver messages continuously with minimal pauses, hesitation, or repetition. Disfluent speakers tend to experience disruptions in their speech flow due to limited vocabulary, divided attention, and non-automated cognitive processing, which makes it difficult to maintain the listener's attention and may lead to

---

<sup>29</sup> José C. Mora, Isabel Mora-Plaza, and Guillermo Bermejo-Miranda, "Speaking Anxiety and Task Complexity Effects on Second Language Speech," *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* (2023)

<sup>30</sup> Swain, M. (1985). *Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development*.

misunderstandings. This condition becomes more relevant in relation to the Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT) phenomenon, in which temporary failure in word retrieval results in pauses or hesitation that further worsen disfluency. Therefore, the impact of ToT is not only experienced by the individual speaker but also affects the overall effectiveness of communication and may lead to failure in the interaction process.<sup>31</sup>

Reflecting on the theories discussed above, it can be concluded that the ToT phenomenon has a significant impact on EFL learners' speaking performance, affecting them both cognitively and psychologically. The experience of ToT triggers metacognitive overload, increases speaking anxiety, and reduces learners' willingness to participate in oral activities, ultimately forming a negative cycle that undermines fluency, confidence, and communicative competence. In the context of this study, these impacts are central to understanding how ToT shapes the speaking experiences of students at IAIN Curup, particularly in classroom-based tasks where performance pressure is high and opportunities for lexical retrieval failure are frequent.

## **B. Review of Related Findings**

Recent qualitative studies have explored the challenges in speaking that are closely related to the Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT) phenomenon among EFL (English as a Foreign Language) learners. These studies show that ToT is not only caused by weak lexical representations in memory, but is also

---

<sup>31</sup> Ghasemi, B., & Mozaheb, M. A. (2021). *Developing EFL Learners' Speaking Fluency: Use of Practical Techniques*. *Mextesol Journal*, 45(1).

triggered by emotional factors, metacognitive strategies, first language (L1) usage, and linguistic identity negotiation.

A study by Melayani et al. (2022) investigated speaking anxiety among Indonesian high school EFL learners in Banten. Through in-depth interviews and classroom observations, it was found that students experienced difficulty recalling words when under pressure, afraid of making mistakes, or being suddenly called on by the teacher. These moments reflect ToT-like conditions in which the learner knows the intended word but fails to retrieve it verbally. This study is highly relevant to the current research as it indicates that affective pressure directly contributes to verbal retrieval problems during speaking.<sup>32</sup>

Vocabulary learning strategies and their connection to word retrieval performance. Based on observations and open-ended questionnaires, they found that students who actively used vocabulary in meaningful contexts and engaged in repeated speaking drills experienced fewer ToT incidents. This aligns with the Lexical Retrieval Failure Model, which suggests that weak access pathways and infrequent use of L2 vocabulary lead to retrieval failures. Hence, strengthening lexical representation through active practice can reduce ToT frequency.<sup>33</sup>

The study conducted by Xie and Wang (2026) examines the *tip-of-the-tongue* (ToT) phenomenon from cognitive and psycholinguistic perspectives,

---

<sup>32</sup> Y. Meliyani, M. Masrupi, D. W. Utomo, "An Exploration of Indonesian EFL Learners' Speaking Anxiety," *Linguists: Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching*, 8(2), 2022.

<sup>33</sup> A. S. B. Ningrum, Toyyibah, "Indonesian EFL Learners' Motivation: An Investigation into Online and Offline Learning in Islamic Higher Education," *JEELS: Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies*, 11(2), 2024.

with a particular emphasis on the mechanism of lexical retrieval. The findings indicate that ToT occurs due to a temporary disruption in the activation of the lexical network, especially at the stage of transition from semantic representation to phonological form. In this condition, individuals are still able to access the meaning or concept of a word but fail to produce its complete phonological form. Furthermore, the study explains that an imbalance in the activation of language networks may weaken the connection between semantic and phonological units, thereby hindering the speech production process. Therefore, this finding reinforces the psycholinguistic view that the ToT phenomenon is not caused by a lack of language competence, but rather by a temporary failure in lexical access that is dynamic and situational.<sup>34</sup>

Another relevant study to this research is an article entitled *A Psycholinguistic Analysis of Foreign Language Anxiety in L2 Oral Production*. The study analyzes how Foreign Language Anxiety (FLA) affects speech production in a second language from a psycholinguistic perspective by employing Levelt's speech production model, Baddeley's working memory theory, and Attentional Control Theory. The findings indicate that anxiety can disrupt the speech production process at three main stages: conceptualization, formulation, and articulation. At the conceptualization stage, anxiety causes difficulties in generating and organizing ideas, which results in long pauses and hesitation during speaking. At the formulation stage, anxiety interferes with lexical retrieval and syntactic encoding, leading students to use simpler

---

<sup>34</sup> Xie, Y., & Wang, L. (2026). *The tip-of-the-tongue phenomenon: Cognitive, neural, and neurochemical perspectives*. *Biomedicines*, 14(2), 269.

sentence structures or to employ circumlocution. Meanwhile, at the articulation stage, anxiety affects speaking fluency, which is reflected in pronunciation errors, excessive pauses, and unstable intonation. Based on these findings, the study concludes that foreign language anxiety is not only related to learners' emotional states but also affects the cognitive processes involved in oral language production, as anxiety reduces the cognitive resources required to plan, formulate, and articulate speech effectively.<sup>35</sup>

Finally, Sugianti et al. (2025) presented an interesting perspective on language identity dynamics in an international setting. Their in-depth interviews with student exchange participants revealed that students experienced increased linguistic pressure when speaking in formal academic settings, such as presentations and seminars. This pressure heightened the likelihood of experiencing ToT, as students struggled to reconcile their L1 identity with the demands of L2 performance. The study suggests that social-psychological factors, such as identity and speaking anxiety, play a significant role in word retrieval difficulties.<sup>36</sup>

Overall, previous studies demonstrate a strong and relevant connection to the focus of this research, particularly in explaining that the Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT) phenomenon among EFL learners results from a complex interaction of cognitive, affective, and social factors. These findings

---

<sup>35</sup> Yifan Liu and Fei Liu, "A Psycholinguistic Analysis of Foreign Language Anxiety in L2 Oral Production," *International Journal of Social Science, Management and Economics Research*, Vol. 3, No. 6 (2025).

<sup>36</sup> R. Sugianti, T. N. Fitria, L. Muniroh, "An Investigation into Indonesian EFL Learners' First and Second Language Identity Development," *PAROLE: Journal of Linguistics and Education*, 14(1), 2025

consistently emphasize that difficulties in lexical retrieval are not solely caused by limited vocabulary mastery, but are also influenced by emotional pressure, speaking anxiety, and the dynamics of linguistic identity. In addition, studies on vocabulary learning strategies and foreign language anxiety further reinforce that speech production in a second language is highly vulnerable to disruptions at various cognitive stages. Therefore, this study is strongly grounded in existing literature and seeks to examine the ToT phenomenon in a more contextualized manner among English Education students at IAIN Curup, focusing not only on its causes but also on its impacts and the strategies employed by students to cope with such difficulties during speaking performance.

### **CHAPTER III**

#### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

This chapter presents the research methodology employed in this research, outlining the research design, subject of the research, technique of collecting data, instruments of the research, and techniques for analysis the data that had taken to clarify the tip of the tongue.

## A. Research Design

This study adopts a **qualitative phenomenological approach**, aiming to gain an in-depth understanding of the subjective experiences of students in encountering the Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT) phenomenon when speaking English as a foreign language. The phenomenological approach was chosen because it is well-suited to exploring personal experiences, perceptions, and the meanings individuals assign to events they have directly lived through.<sup>37</sup>

Phenomenology seeks to uncover the essence of human experience through personal narratives, rather than merely measuring variables or seeking generalizations (Creswell & Poth, 2018). In this context, the approach enables the researcher to reveal how students interpret the situation when they feel they know a word in English but are temporarily unable to produce it, as well as how they respond to and cope with the condition.<sup>38</sup>

Beyond observing linguistic symptoms, this approach allows for an exploration of psychological dimensions such as frustration, anxiety, diminished self-confidence, and the spontaneous strategies employed to overcome ToT. Therefore, this research design is highly appropriate for addressing the research questions regarding the causes, impacts, and coping strategies related to the ToT phenomenon.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> van Manen, M. (2021). *Phenomenology of Practice: Meaning-Giving Methods in Phenomenological Research and Writing* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

<sup>38</sup> Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

<sup>39</sup> Ningsih, D. K., & Widodo, H. P. (2021). *Exploring Indonesian EFL learners' speaking anxiety: A phenomenological study*. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 371–380.

## B.Participants

This research was conducted in the English Education Study Program (Tadris Bahasa Inggris) at IAIN Curup, Bengkulu, Indonesia, where EFL learners frequently encounter the Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT) phenomenon in academic and communicative settings. Participants were selected through purposive sampling from active students who demonstrated good speaking performance reflected in fluency, pronunciation clarity, grammatical accuracy, and confidence, as the ToT phenomenon is understood as a cognitive psycholinguistic disruption in lexical retrieval rather than a result of low language proficiency. Selection was carried out through preliminary observations, lecturer recommendations, and short questionnaires to confirm participants' direct experience with the ToT phenomenon during presentations, discussions, or spontaneous conversations, ensuring that the data collected would accurately reflect how ToT affects speaking fluency. Participants in this study were selected using **purposive sampling**, a sampling technique based on specific criteria relevant to the aims of the research<sup>40</sup> The inclusion criteria for participants are as follows:

Active students in TBI

Have experienced difficulty in retrieving words while speaking English (experienced ToT). Participants who have experienced difficulty in lexical retrieval can provide authentic and experience-

---

<sup>40</sup> Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). *Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 42(5), 533–544.

based data about how the Tip-of-the-Tongue phenomenon occurs during speaking. This ensures the data directly reflects real ToT episodes and their influence on speaking performance. The importance of this requirement lies in maintaining the relevance and focus of the study.

Willing to provide detailed information and personal reflections regarding their experience. Participants who are willing to share detailed explanations and personal reflections allow the researcher to explore both cognitive and emotional aspects of ToT, such as hesitation, anxiety, or frustration. The importance of this aspect lies in obtaining rich and in-depth qualitative data.

Able to communicate verbally in a semi-structured interview. Since the data are collected through semi-structured interviews, participants must be able to express their experiences clearly and coherently. The importance of this requirement is to ensure clarity, depth, and accuracy of the information gathered during the interview process.

The number of participants are four people that chosen after conducting oservation, following the principle of **data saturation** in qualitative research. Saturation occurs when additional interviews no longer yield new or relevant information or themes for the study.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> Fusch, P. I., & Ness, L. R. (2015). *Are We There Yet? Data Saturation in Qualitative Research*.

### C. Data Collection Techniques

Data collection was employed **semi-structured interviews**. The semi-structured interview technique is a method of qualitative research that combines elements of structured and unstructured interviews. In this technique, the researcher uses a pre-prepared interview guide, but still allows for flexibility, enabling the interviewer to explore the respondents' answers more deeply based on their personal experiences or opinions. designed to explore in detail the students' experiences in dealing with the Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT) phenomenon. This method was chosen because it provides participants with the space to express their experiences openly, flexibly, and reflectively, without being constrained by overly rigid question structures.<sup>42</sup>

The semi-structured interview technique was chosen because it offers the ideal balance between structure and flexibility, especially within the phenomenological approach that seeks to understand participants' lived experiences in depth. In phenomenological research, the goal is not merely to gather factual information, but to uncover the essence and meaning behind participants' experiences in this case, their encounters with the Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT) phenomenon during English speaking activities. Semi-structured interviews provide a flexible framework that allows the researcher to prepare guiding questions based on the theoretical components of the study, such as the causes of ToT, its impact on speaking fluency and

---

*The Qualitative Report*, 20(9), 1408–1416.

<sup>42</sup> Adams, W. C. (2015). *Conducting Semi-Structured Interviews*. In K. Newcomer, H. Hatry, & J. Wholey (Eds.), *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation* (4th ed., pp. 492–505). Jossey-Bass.

confidence, and coping strategies, but without restricting the natural flow of the conversation. This technique empowers participants to express their experiences freely and in their own terms, which enhances authenticity and depth of data.<sup>43</sup>

The interviews were conducted either face-to-face or online, depending on the situation and the participants' convenience. Each interview session was expected to last between **5 and 10 minutes**. The interview guide consisted of open-ended questions focusing on:

1. When and in what situations they experienced ToT,
2. Their feelings and responses at the time,
3. Strategies used to overcome ToT, The perceived impact on speaking performance and self-confidence, Their reflections on the incident.

Interview sessions were recorded (with participants' consent) and transcribed **verbatim** for further analysis. In addition, the researcher also took notes on **nonverbal observations**, such as facial expressions, long pauses, or gestures accompanying the participants' stories, to enrich the interpretative understanding of the meaning behind their experiences.

---

<sup>43</sup> Kallio, H., Pietilä, A. M., Johnson, M., & Kangasniemi, M. (2016). Systematic methodological review: Developing a framework for a qualitative semi-structured interview guide. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 72(12), 2954–2965.

This method aligns with the characteristics of the **phenomenological approach**, which emphasizes the importance of personal experiences in real contexts and their social interactions (Bevan, 2014).<sup>44</sup>

## **D.Instrumen**

Research instruments are crucial since they served as the researcher's tools for carrying out the research methodologies throughout the investigation. The researcher then used an interview guidance, based on the technique of data collection, furthermore, of this blueprint of interviews

### **1.Interview guidance**

The primary instrument in this study is an in-depth semi-structured interview guide. This guide was developed based on the theoretical framework discussed in Chapter II, which includes the root causes of the Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT) phenomenon, its impact on speaking performance and self-confidence, and the coping strategies used by EFL students to deal with it.<sup>45</sup>

The interview guide consists of a series of open-ended questions designed to explore participants' experiences deeply and reflectively. The semi-structured format allows the researcher flexibility to adjust the flow of the interview, delve into emerging topics during the

---

<sup>44</sup> Bevan, M. T. (2014). *A Method of Phenomenological Interviewing. Qualitative Health Research*, 24(1), 136–144.

<sup>45</sup> Kallio, H., Pietilä, A. M., Johnson, M., & Kangasniemi, M. (2016). *Systematic methodological review: Developing a framework for a qualitative semi-structured interview guide. Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 72(12), 2954–2965.

conversation, and follow up on participants' responses in order to enrich the data collected (Kallio et al., 2016). This format also enables participants to describe their experiences in a more natural and pressure-free manner, which aligns with the principles of the phenomenological approach.<sup>46</sup>

## 2.Observation Checklist

Observation in qualitative research is a method used to collect data by watching and recording behaviors and events as they occur in their natural settings.<sup>47</sup> Non-participant observation is a method used by researcher in which the researcher observes events, behaviors, or interactions without directly engaging as a participant.<sup>48</sup>

The researcher chose the non-participant observation technique because this method allowed for objective data collection without disrupting the natural interactions in the classroom. This approach aligned with the research objectives, which focused on identifying factors trigger tip of the tongue in classroom, enabling the researcher to record the authentic use of language within the teaching context. In this study, the researcher observed and recorded speaking lessons from the second and fourth

---

<sup>46</sup> Alase, A. (2017). *The Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA): A Guide to a Good Qualitative Research Approach*. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 5(2), 9–19.

<sup>47</sup> Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research (5th ed)*. (2018). SAGE Publications

<sup>48</sup> Yin, Robert K. *"Case Study Research: Design and Methods."* 2014. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

semesters in video format. Afterward, the researcher transcribed the conversations from these videos.

The researcher used Observation checklist to ensure that the analysis process is systematic and structured. The checklist assists in identifying and recording presuppositions that appear in speaking class conversations more easily and consistently. Additionally, the checklist simplifies the process of verifying data alignment with the established criteria, minimizing the risk of overlooking important information. By using a checklist, the researcher can maintain objectivity and ensure that all data are analyzed according to the same standards, making the research findings more valid and reliable. the table used by the researcher for data analysis can be seen in appendixes section

## **E. Data Processing and Analysis Techniques**

This study employed a multi-stage data processing and analysis approach combining qualitative interview analysis and structured observation analysis, integrated through cross-method triangulation. The following subsections describe each technique applied in this research.

### **1. Verbatim Transcription**

Verbatim transcription refers to the conversion of audio recordings into written text exactly as spoken by the participants, including fillers, repetitions, pauses, code-switching instances, and informal expressions. This approach was adopted because in psycholinguistic and

phenomenological research, how participants express something carries analytical significance equal to what they express.<sup>49</sup> All eight transcripts were produced immediately after each recording session to minimise the risk of misinterpretation. The eight transcripts two per participant across four participants collectively formed the raw data corpus.

## 2. Open Coding

Open coding is the first stage of grounded theory analysis formalised by Strauss and Corbin (1990),<sup>50</sup> involving line-by-line reading of transcribed data and assignment of conceptual labels to each meaningful segment. In this study, in vivo coding was applied to preserve the semantic texture of participants' language. This process generated a total of **227 open codes** across all eight transcripts. As Strauss and Corbin explain, open coding is the analytic process through which concepts are identified and their properties and dimensions are discovered in the data.<sup>51</sup> Examples include: “simultaneous processing: grammar + vocabulary + pronunciation” and “negative anxiety cycle: one ToT episode triggers escalation.”

## 3. Axial Coding

---

<sup>49</sup>Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

<sup>50</sup>Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Sage Publications.

<sup>51</sup>Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques* (p. 61). Sage Publications.

Axial coding is the second stage, involving the relating of categories to their subcategories by specifying properties and reassembling data fractured during open coding.<sup>52</sup> In this study, the 227 open codes were organised through the **Paradigm Model** proposed by Strauss and Corbin (1990), structured around six relational elements as presented in the following table.

Table 3.3 Paradigm Model

| Paradigm Element                 | Content in This Study                                        |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| Central Phenomenon               | ToT: spontaneous lexical production failure                  |
| Causal Conditions                | Weak lexical representation + phonological encoding failure  |
| Context                          | Formal evaluative academic speaking settings                 |
| Intervening Conditions           | L1 interference + situational anxiety                        |
| Action/Interaction<br>Strategies | Active compensation + preventive strategies                  |
| Consequences                     | Performance disruption + confidence decline + negative cycle |

#### 4. Selective Coding

Selective coding is the final coding stage, defined as the process of selecting the core category, systematically relating it to other categories,

---

<sup>52</sup>Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques (p. 97). Sage Publications.

and validating those relationships.<sup>53</sup> In this study, selective coding identified the core category: *“Anxiety-Based Lexical Production Failure: A Cognitive-Affective Cycle that Inhibits EFL Speaking Development.”* This core category connects all five causal factors, all four speaking performance impacts, and all four psychological consequences into a single explanatory storylineproducing a **theoretical storyline** that became the organising framework for the Discussion section and Conclusion chapter.

## 5. Theme Development

Following the three coding stages, the analytically connected categories were developed into higher-order themesinterpretive constructs that directly address the research questions. Theme development refers to identifying patterns of shared meaning within a dataset organised around a central focus.<sup>54</sup> This process produced three major themes with thirteen sub-themes: **Theme 1**Causal Factors of the ToT Phenomenon (five sub-themes); **Theme 2**Impact of ToT on Speaking Performance (four sub-themes); and **Theme 3**Impact of ToT on Self-Confidence and L2 Development (four sub-themes).

## 6. Observation Data Analysis

---

<sup>53</sup>Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques (p. 116). Sage Publications.

<sup>54</sup>Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.

The structured observation data collected through the 24-indicator behavioural checklist were analysed through three sequential sub-procedures.

#### **a. Score Tabulation**

Each indicator was assigned a total score by summing the scores across all four participants (maximum total = 8). Indicators were then categorised according to the following frequency levels:

Table 3.4 Frequency Level Categories

| Level        | Score Range | Interpretation                                              |
|--------------|-------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| Dominant     | 7–8         | Highly consistent, confirmed across nearly all participants |
| Significant  | 4–6         | Confirmed across the majority of participants               |
| Moderate     | 2–3         | Observed in some participants                               |
| Low          | 1           | Rarely observed                                             |
| Not Observed | 0           | Absent across all participants                              |

#### **b. Individual Participant Profiling**

Beyond aggregate scores, data were analysed at the individual participant level to identify consistent patterns and patterns unique to specific individuals. This procedure allowed for within-participant consistency checks and cross-participant comparison enabling the researcher to identify co-occurrence patterns (e.g., high anxiety indicator scores co-occurring with high cognitive overload indicator scores for the same participant).

### c. Narrative Interpretation

Numerical scores were interpreted narratively rather than statistically, consistent with the qualitative phenomenological paradigm. The interpretation addressed not only the frequency of observed behaviour but also its meaning for instance, the highest score in the dataset (O8, filler use, score 7) was interpreted as a behavioural index of cognitive overload rather than merely a speech habit.

## 7. Cross-Method Triangulation

Triangulation is the process of using multiple data sources or methods to enhance the credibility and comprehensiveness of qualitative findings.<sup>55</sup> Denzin (1978) identifies method triangulation as the most effective form for qualitative research, as it compensates for the limitations of any single method.<sup>56</sup> In this study, interview and observation data were systematically compared for each theme and sub-theme, producing four categories of cross-method relationship: **Fully Supported** (both instruments independently confirm the finding); **Partially Supported** (interview confirmed, partial observational proxy); **Exclusive to Interview** (internal constructs inaccessible to observation by nature); and **Contrasting** (two instruments show different patterns, producing a richer interpretation).

---

<sup>55</sup>Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed., p. 247). Sage Publications.

<sup>56</sup>Denzin, N. K. (1978). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

## 8. Data Validity Techniques

To ensure the trustworthiness of the findings, this study applied four validity criteria established by Lincoln and Guba (1985):<sup>57</sup>

### a. Credibility

Credibility was established through two mechanisms: (1) method triangulation across interview and observation instruments, and (2) two interview sessions per participant approximately 80% of themes from the first session were confirmed, elaborated, or deepened in the second session.

### b. Transferability

Transferability was established through thick description,<sup>58</sup> including preserved verbatim participant quotations, explicit session and date identification, and detailed contextual description of the research setting enabling readers to assess applicability to comparable EFL contexts.

### c. Dependability

Dependability was established through a comprehensive audit trail documenting each analytical stage: verbatim transcription → open coding (227 codes) → axial coding (paradigm model) → selective

---

<sup>57</sup>Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage Publications.

<sup>58</sup>Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. Basic Books.

coding (core category) → theme development (3 themes, 13 sub-themes).

#### **d. Confirmability**

Confirmability was established through (1) independent coding of observation data by an observer with no access to interview transcripts, and (2) explicit documentation of convergence, complementarity, and divergence in the cross-method triangulation process.

### **9. Summary of Data Processing and Analysis Procedures**

Table 3.6 Summary of Data Processing and Analysis Techniques

| <b>Stage</b> | <b>Instrument</b> | <b>Technique</b>                 | <b>Theoretical Basis</b> | <b>Output</b>                             |
|--------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| 1            | Interview         | Verbatim transcription           | Kvale & Brinkmann (2009) | 8 verbatim transcripts                    |
| 2            | Interview         | Open coding                      | Strauss & Corbin (1990)  | 227 open codes                            |
| 3            | Interview         | Axial coding (Paradigm Model)    | Strauss & Corbin (1990)  | 6-element paradigm model                  |
| 4            | Interview         | Selective coding                 | Strauss & Corbin (1990)  | Core category + theoretical storyline     |
| 5            | Interview         | Theme development                | Braun & Clarke (2006)    | 3 themes + 13 sub-themes                  |
| 6            | Observation       | Score tabulation                 |                          | Frequency profile: 24 indicators          |
| 7            | Observation       | Individual participant profiling |                          | Per-participant behavioural patterns      |
| 8            | Observation       | Narrative interpretation         |                          | Qualitative meaning of observation scores |

|    |      |                            |                              |                                                             |
|----|------|----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| 9  | Both | Cross-method triangulation | Denzin (1978); Patton (2002) | Convergence/divergence status per finding                   |
| 10 | Both | Validity assessment        | Lincoln & Guba (1985)        | Credibility, Transferability, Dependability, Confirmability |

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

This chapter presents the findings and discussion of the research conducted at the English Tadris Study Program of IAIN Curup, exploring the causal factors of the Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT) phenomenon and its impact on speaking performance and self-confidence. The findings section will discuss the main factors that contribute to the occurrence of the ToT phenomenon among EFL students and how it affects their speaking performance and self-confidence in English communication. It will present an in-depth analysis of the findings compared to relevant theories and previous studies.

#### **A. Research Findings**

The data in this research were obtained from two instruments: semi-structured interviews conducted in two sessions with four participants ZK, JN, DK, and AF and structured observation using a 24-indicator behavioural checklist. The interviews were carried out in two separate sessions for each participant, resulting in a total of eight interview sessions. The first session focused on exploring the causal factors of the ToT phenomenon, while the second session elaborated further on its impact on speaking performance and self-confidence.

In both instruments, data were collected through natural interactions and direct observation of participants during English speaking activities. The interview transcriptions served as the primary data source, from which a total of 227 open codes were generated. These codes were then systematically organised through open coding, axial coding, and selective coding processes before being developed into themes corresponding to the two major research questions.

To assist in the analysis, the researcher used an observation checklist consisting of 24 behavioural indicators to track each observable manifestation of the ToT phenomenon during speaking performance. Each indicator was rated based on frequency of occurrence: 0 = Not Observed, 1 = Sometimes Observed, and 2 = Frequently Observed. This checklist served as a complementary instrument to the interview data, enabling cross-method triangulation between self-reported experiences and directly observable behaviours.

The findings presented in this chapter follow the sequence of the two research questions, allowing a structured and systematic view of how the ToT phenomenon appeared and manifested in the participants' speaking experiences. By using this approach, the researcher successfully identified various causal factors and impacts of the ToT phenomenon as experienced by EFL students at IAIN Curup. In the following section, each finding will be presented in sequence based on the research questions, along with data excerpts

from interviews and observation tables, as well as interpretations of the implied meanings contained therein.

### **1.Causal Factors of ToT**

In response to the first research question, the thematic analysis identified five major factors contributing to the occurrence of the Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT) phenomenon among EFL students at IAIN Curup. These factors include weak productive lexical representation, phonological encoding failure, cognitive overload, L1 interference, and situational anxiety as a ToT amplifier.

#### **1.1.Interview Findings on Causal Factors of ToT**

Interview data relevant to Research Question 1 were collected in Session 1 (W1) and further elaborated in Session 2 (W2). Five causal factors emerged from the analysis and are presented below.

##### **a. Weak Productive Lexical Representation**

The first interview finding on causal factors is that all four participants experienced ToT not because they were unfamiliar with the target word, but because their productive lexical representation was insufficiently strong to be retrieved during spontaneous speech. Participants could recognise the word when reading or listening, yet failed to produce it when speaking without preparation. This finding reflects a fundamental gap between receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge, where words learned only through passive exposure or rote memorisation lack the robust

phonological access pathways required for spontaneous production under communicative pressure.<sup>59</sup>

#### b. Phonological Encoding Failure

The second interview finding is that three of the four participants ZK, JN, and AF explicitly described a condition in which the meaning of the target word remained accessible while its phonological form could not be produced. This dissociation between semantic access and phonological output is the defining characteristic of ToT as a retrieval failure rather than a knowledge gap. Verb forms and academic vocabulary were identified as the categories most frequently experiencing this type of failure, with participants reporting particular difficulty retrieving irregular verb forms and morphological inflections under communicative time pressure.<sup>60</sup>

#### c. Cognitive Overload

The third interview finding is that all four participants consistently reported the need to simultaneously process grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, message content, and audience response during spontaneous English speech. This simultaneous processing demand exceeded the available working memory capacity, making lexical retrieval the first function to fail. Cognitive overload was the only causal factor confirmed by both interview and observation data across the same participants, making it the most strongly evidenced finding in this study. Filler use as a cognitive

---

<sup>59</sup> ZK, interview by researcher, Interview 1 (W1), 12 May 2026.

<sup>60</sup> AF, interview by researcher, Interview 1 (W1), 18 May 2026.

buffer strategy confirmed as the highest-scoring indicator in the entire observation dataset directly reflects participants' attempts to manage this overload in real time during speaking.<sup>61</sup>

#### d. L1 Interference

The fourth interview finding is that Bahasa Indonesia consistently emerged first in the lexical retrieval process before English across all four participants, requiring an internal translation step that added processing time and often prevented successful L2 retrieval. This universal pattern of L1 dominance was compounded by a historically-rooted dimension identified by AF, who explained that his L1-first processing habit originated from the translation-based language learning methods used in primary school education positioning L1 dominance not merely as a current cognitive habit but as a consequence of institutionalised pedagogical practice established from an early age.<sup>62</sup>

#### e. Situational Anxiety as ToT Amplifier

The fifth interview finding is that speaking anxiety particularly fear of negative evaluation in formal evaluative contexts functioned not merely as a co-occurring emotional state but as an active amplifier that transformed manageable lexical difficulty into severe ToT episodes. All four participants reported anxiety as a significant triggering factor, though with different profiles: ZK, JN, and DK experienced evaluative-social anxiety, while AF

---

<sup>61</sup> Brown, A. S. (1991). A review of the tip-of-the-tongue experience. *Psychological Bulletin*, 109(2), 204–223.

<sup>62</sup> Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge University Press.

experienced internal anxiety related to fear of silence and topic exhaustion. JN additionally reported a contextually specific academic anxiety component fear that ToT episodes would result in grade reduction representing a fourth dimension of foreign language anxiety beyond the three components identified in the standard FLCA model.<sup>63</sup>

## 1.2.Observation Findings on Causal Factors of ToT

Observation data were collected using a 24-indicator behavioural checklist. Each indicator was rated: 0 = Not Observed, 1 = Sometimes Observed, 2 = Frequently Observed. The following descriptions present only indicators where at least one participant received a score above zero. Observation findings on causal factors are organised under three indicator groups.

### a. Cognitive Overload

The first observation finding on causal factors concerns the cognitive and lexical indicator group. Filler use as a cognitive buffer (O8) reached the highest score in the entire observation dataset score 7 out of 8 rated as Frequently Observed in three participants (DK, JN, AF) and Sometimes Observed in ZK. Working memory overload (O6) was also significant at score 5, and output simplification (O7) was moderate at score 3. This finding independently confirms that cognitive overload during speaking is

---

<sup>63</sup> Melka, F. (1997). Receptive vs. productive aspects of vocabulary. In N. Schmitt & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary: Description, acquisition and pedagogy* (pp. 84–102). Cambridge University Press.

the most universally observable manifestation of ToT across all participants.<sup>64</sup>

#### b. L1 Interference Externalises Only at Total Retrieval Failure

The second observation finding on causal factors concerns L1 interference indicators. The only L1 indicator observed above zero was code-switching as a ToT response (O10), rated Sometimes Observed in ZK and DK (total score 2). This pattern demonstrates that L1 interference operates primarily as an internal cognitive process and only externalises as behavioural code-switching when retrieval failure is already complete. Participants have developed L1 inhibition capacity sufficient to prevent direct lexical intrusion but not yet sufficient to ensure smooth L2 production.<sup>65</sup>

#### c. Anxiety Cycle

The third observation finding on causal factors concerns speaking anxiety indicators. Physical manifestations of anxiety (O12) were observed across all four participants at a score of 5, with AF showing the highest individual rating (Frequently Observed). More critically, the negative anxiety cycle (O13) and situational anxiety contrast (O14) were both simultaneously rated Frequently Observed only for DK and ZK the exact same participants who most prominently described the escalation cycle in interviews. This independent confirmation by two separate

---

<sup>64</sup> Underwood, B. J. (1957). Interference and forgetting. *Psychological Review*, 64(1), 49–60.

<sup>65</sup> ZK, interview by researcher, Interview 1 (W1), 12 May 2026.

instruments on identical participants for the same mechanism constitutes the highest-strength triangulation evidence in this research.<sup>66</sup>

## 2.Impact of Tip-of-the-Tongue

Turning to the second research question, the thematic analysis revealed that the impact of the Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT) phenomenon extends beyond speaking performance and also influences students' self-confidence in English communication. The findings indicate that ToT affects various aspects of speaking performance, including fluency, grammatical and pronunciation accuracy, message coherence, and the use of compensation strategies. Furthermore, the analysis revealed several psychological consequences, such as changes in speaking self-efficacy, willingness to communicate, and cognitive-affective responses toward English speaking situations. These findings suggest that ToT is not merely a temporary lexical retrieval difficulty but a phenomenon that can shape both communicative performance and learners' perceptions of their own speaking ability.

### 2.1.Interview Findings on Impact of ToT on Speaking Performance

Interview data relevant to the impact of ToT on speaking performance were drawn primarily from Session 1 (W1), with supplementary accounts from Session 2 (W2). Four impact categories emerged from the analysis.

---

<sup>66</sup> JN, interview by researcher, Interview 1 (W1), 12 May 2026.

#### a. Fluency Disruption and the Domino Effect

The first interview finding on speaking performance impact is that a single ToT episode triggered a cascading degradation of speaking fluency that extended throughout the entire session rather than remaining confined to the moment of retrieval failure itself. All four participants reported this domino effect, though with varying degrees of severity. The most extreme manifestation was reported by DK, whose ToT-induced anxiety caused a complete speaking shutdown total inability to continue speaking rather than merely reduced fluency. This temporal extension of fluency degradation beyond the initial ToT moment distinguishes the EFL ToT experience from the brief and self-resolving episodes typically reported in monolingual native speaker contexts.<sup>67</sup>

#### b. Grammar and Pronunciation Accuracy Disruption

The second interview finding is that ToT simultaneously disrupted not only fluency but also grammatical accuracy and pronunciation quality, as attentional resources directed toward lexical search left insufficient capacity for linguistic monitoring. A notable sub-finding is the phenomenon of post-hoc monitoring: participants became aware of their grammatical and pronunciation errors only after completing the utterance, not in real time during production. This finding shows that participants possessed sufficient

---

<sup>67</sup> DK, interview by researcher, Interview 2 (W2), 21 May 2026.

implicit grammatical knowledge to detect errors upon reflection, but could not deploy that monitoring capacity concurrently with the demands of ToT management.<sup>68</sup>

#### c. Loss of Message Coherence

The third interview finding is that ToT caused not only word-level failure but also loss of the macro-level discourse thread in three of the four participants ZK, DK, and JN. When full attentional capacity was directed toward retrieving a single inaccessible word, the overall message representation held in working memory underwent decay, forcing participants to lose the main point of their explanation and restart from the beginning. This discourse-level impact represents a dimension of ToT's effects that has received limited attention in previous research and was uniquely accessible through in-depth interview data in this study.<sup>69</sup>

#### d. Active Compensation Strategies

The fourth interview finding is that despite experiencing ToT, all four participants actively developed compensation strategies to maintain communicative continuity rather than simply stopping. The strategies varied significantly across participants: DK employed B2 circumlocution; ZK used simpler lexical substitution; JN relied on

---

<sup>68</sup> Levelt, W. J. M., Roelofs, A., & Meyer, A. S. (1999). A theory of lexical access in speech production. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 22(1), 1–38.

<sup>69</sup> Pinker, S., & Ullman, M. T. (2002). The past and future of the past tense. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 6(11), 456–463.

body gestures; and AF requested assistance from the audience or lecturer. DK also reported the most passive strategy systematically reducing overall speech output to minimise ToT exposure which represents a form of avoidance rather than active compensation.<sup>70</sup>

## 2.2.Observation Findings on Impact of ToT on Speaking Performance

Observation data on speaking performance impact are drawn from indicators O15–O22. Only those indicators where at least one participant received a score above zero are described below.

### a. Prolonged Pauses as the Dominant Observable Performance Indicator

The first observation finding on speaking performance is that prolonged pauses and false starts (O16) was the most strongly confirmed performance indicator, scoring 5 Frequently Observed in DK and AF, Sometimes observed in ZK. Excessive fillers and repetition (O17) was moderate at score 3. Multi-dimensional disruption (O19) was low at score 1, observed Sometimes in JN only. Visible confidence decline (O20) was also low at score 1, observed Sometimes in AF only a contrasting finding discussed further under self-confidence findings. Indicators O15, O18, O21, and O22 scored 0 across all participants, not because the phenomena do not exist but

---

<sup>70</sup> ZK, interview by researcher, Interview 1 (W1), 12 May 2026.

because they represent internal processes or require micro-linguistic analysis beyond the capacity of real-time behavioural observation.<sup>71</sup>

### 2.3. Interview Findings on Impact of ToT on Self-Confidence

Interview data on the impact of ToT on self-confidence and L2 development were gathered primarily in Session 2 (W2), with foundational accounts already emerging in Session 1 (W1). Four sub-findings are presented.

#### a. Decline in Speaking Self-Efficacy

The first interview finding on self-confidence is that three of the four participants ZK, JN, and DK experienced a progressive decline in confidence in their speaking ability as a direct consequence of repeated ToT experiences. This decline ranged from mild avoidance of active participation (ZK), to a consistent downward trajectory (JN), to catastrophic self-evaluation (DK, who described himself as the worst person in the world when unable to produce a target word). In sharp contrast, AF maintained stable self-efficacy throughout both interview sessions despite experiencing ToT at comparable frequency. The critical differentiating variable was not ToT frequency but how

---

<sup>71</sup> DK, interview by researcher, Interview 2 (W2), 21 May 2026.

each participant interpreted and attributed the meaning of the failure.<sup>72</sup>

#### b. Reduced Willingness to Communicate (WTC)

The second interview finding is that all four participants reported reduced willingness to engage actively in English-speaking situations as a consequence of ToT experiences, though the degree and form of this reduction varied. ZK preferred to remain silent and wait for others to respond; DK actively reduced his speaking portion; AF adopted a selective participation strategy, preparing points mentally before contributing. This finding identifies what the researcher terms a participation paradox: ToT reduces speaking practice, yet increased speaking practice is the primary mechanism for strengthening the productive lexical representations that would reduce future ToT creating a self-sustaining trajectory of linguistic decline without external intervention.<sup>73</sup>

#### c. Negative Cognitive-Affective Cycle

The third and most theoretically significant interview finding is the identification of a self-reinforcing negative cycle: ToT → confidence declines → anxiety escalates → more frequent ToT → deeper confidence decline → cycle intensifies.

---

<sup>72</sup> AF, interview by researcher, Interview 2 (W2), 21 May 2026.

<sup>73</sup> Baddeley, A. D. (2000). The episodic buffer: A new component of working memory? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 4(11), 417–423.

This cycle was not only reported consistently across interviews but was also independently confirmed by observation data on the same participants, representing the strongest triangulation finding in this study. The most clinically significant dimension emerged from DK, who explicitly acknowledged the psychological risk of this cycle, stating that continued rumination could lead to depression extending the consequences of ToT beyond the linguistic and academic domain into general psychological wellbeing.<sup>74</sup>

#### d. Growth Mindset and Preventive Strategies as Cycle Breakers

The fourth interview finding is that AF the sole participant who did not experience the negative cognitive-affective cycle consistently interpreted ToT as a normal part of the language learning process rather than as evidence of inability. This growth mindset orientation functioned as the single most effective factor in preventing the self-reinforcing cycle from forming. AF also developed the most innovative preventive strategy: the spontaneous use of AI tools as speaking practice partners, providing repeated exposure to English speaking tasks in a context free from the social evaluative pressure that amplifies ToT in formal classroom settings. This finding introduces growth mindset as a mediating variable between ToT

---

<sup>74</sup> Skehan, P., & Foster, P. (1997). The influence of planning and post-task activities on accuracy and complexity in task-based learning.

frequency and its psychological consequences, a relationship not previously documented in the existing ToT literature.<sup>75</sup>

#### 2.4.Observation Findings on Impact of ToT on Self-Confidence

Among the self-confidence and WTC-related observation indicators (O20, O21), only O20 recorded a score above zero.

##### a. Contrasting Pattern on Visible Confidence Decline

The sole observation finding on self-confidence is that visible confidence decline (O20) was observed Sometimes only in AF (score 1), while scoring 0 for the three participants ZK, JN, and DK who consistently reported confidence decline in interviews. This contrasting pattern suggests that visible confidence fluctuation during actual performance does not necessarily align with self-reported confidence decline in the reflective interview context. Reduced WTC (O21) scored 0 across all participants not because the phenomenon is absent but because the structured academic context required all participants to speak as part of their task, eliminating the conditions under which voluntary avoidance could express itself behaviourally.<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup> Clark, H. H., & Fox Tree, J. E. (2002). Using uh and um in spontaneous speaking. *Cognition*, 84(1), 73–111.

<sup>76</sup> ZK, interview by researcher, Interview 1 (W1), 12 May 2026.

## B. DISCUSSION

This section provides an in-depth discussion of each finding, organised according to the two research questions. For each finding, the discussion opens with the specific aspect of the finding being addressed, followed by verbatim evidence from interview and/or observation data, and concludes with connections to existing theoretical frameworks.

### 1. Causal Factors of the Tip-of-the-Tongue Phenomenon

#### a. Weak Productive Lexical Representation

This discussion addresses the finding that ToT experienced by participants arose not from ignorance of the target word but from insufficiently strong productive lexical representations that could not be accessed during spontaneous speech. The gap between recognising a word passively and being able to produce it actively is the core mechanism underlying this finding.

This finding is rooted in interview data exclusively. Observation indicators designed to capture aspects of lexical representation directly both scored 0 across all participants, confirming that lexical representation strength is an internal cognitive process producing no directly observable behaviour.

The most representative account of this finding comes from ZK<sup>77</sup>, who stated: *“Kadang sebenarnya saya tahu kata tersebut, bahkan kalau*

---

<sup>77</sup> AF, interview by researcher, Interview 2 (W2), 21 May 2026.

*melihat atau membaca saya pasti ingat, tapi saat saya harus mengucapkannya tiba-tiba, saya blank saja.*” This account captures the classical form of the finding: the word is stored in memory and fully recognisable when encountered in reading or listening, yet the same word becomes inaccessible when active production is demanded spontaneously. ZK’s account is selected as the primary representative of this finding because it states the receptive-productive gap in its clearest and most direct form, and because it was consistently confirmed across W1 and W2 of his interviews.

A distinct and more theoretically challenging dimension of the same finding was reported by AF<sup>78</sup>: *“kata-kata yang sering digunakan dalam sehari-hari tapi malah lupa. Kalau kata-kata yang belum saya kenali malah lebih mudah untuk diucapkan.”* AF’s account is different from ZK’s in an important respect: while ZK describes difficulty producing words he knows, AF describes a paradox in which familiarity itself becomes a source of difficulty – the most frequently encountered concepts are the hardest to produce in English. These two accounts are therefore not saying the same thing. ZK describes the gap between recognition and production, while AF identifies an inversion of the expected relationship between frequency and retrievability. Together, they establish that weak productive lexical representation operates through at least two distinct mechanisms: insufficient phonological trace

---

<sup>78</sup> Kroll, J. F., & Stewart, E. (1994). Category interference in translation and picture naming: Evidence for asymmetric connections between bilingual memory representations.

strength (ZK), and proactive interference from dominant L1 representations of familiar concepts (AF).

In line with these accounts, Brown (1991)<sup>79</sup> explains that lexical trace strengthens the product of active production frequency rather than passive recognition determines retrieval probability, which accounts for ZK's experience. Nation (2001)<sup>80</sup> and Melka (1997)<sup>81</sup> specify that receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge are functionally distinct dimensions, reinforcing why passive memorisation does not build the access pathways necessary for spontaneous retrieval. For the paradox AF reported, Underwood (1957)<sup>82</sup> provides the explanatory framework through proactive interference: a very strong L1 representation for a given concept can actively block access to the corresponding L2 representation, meaning that the more familiar a concept is through Bahasa Indonesia, the stronger the interference against its English equivalent.

## **b. Phonological Encoding Failure**

This discussion addresses the finding that retrieval failure occurred specifically at the phonological level. Participants could access the meaning of the target word but could not access its sound form. This

---

<sup>79</sup> Green, D. W. (1998). Mental control of the bilingual lexico-semantic system. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1(2), 67–81.

<sup>80</sup> JN, interview by researcher, Interview 1 (W1), 12 May 2026.

<sup>81</sup> ZK, interview by researcher, Interview 1 (W1), 12 May 2026.

<sup>82</sup> JN, interview by researcher, Interview 2 (W2), 21 May 2026.

lemma-lexeme dissociation is the defining mechanism of ToT as distinct from general vocabulary ignorance.

Observation indicators designed to capture phonological encoding failure directly both scored 0, as the internal dissociation between lemma and lexeme produces no directly codeable external behaviour. However, O8 (filler use, score 7) and O16 (prolonged pauses, score 5) function as meaningful behavioural proxies, indicating that retrieval consistently stalled at the phonological stage.

Three interview accounts illuminate this finding, each capturing a different level of the same failure mechanism.

ZK<sup>83</sup> stated: “*saya tahu maksud atau arti kata tersebut tetapi tiba-tiba tidak bisa mengingat bentuk katanya dalam bahasa Inggris.*” This account captures the most fundamental level of the dissociation in its purest form: semantic access is fully intact while phonological access fails entirely.

JN<sup>84</sup> stated: “*bagaimana cara mengucapkan katanya dan bagaimana bentuk struktur katanya sehingga membuat saya lupa untuk mengucapkannya. Jadi dari pronunciation dan juga struktur kata.*” JN’s account extends the picture: where ZK identifies failure at the phonological segment level, JN identifies simultaneous failure at both the phonological and morphological levels both the sound of the word and the structural form of the word are inaccessible together. In this respect,

---

<sup>83</sup> DK, interview by researcher, Interview 2 (W2), 21 May 2026.

<sup>84</sup> Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(2), 125–132.

JN's account describes a more complex and layered encoding failure than ZK's, though both describe the same core dissociation between knowing what to say and being unable to say it.

DK<sup>85</sup> added the most specific dimension: *"Verb itu sangat berkaitan dengan waktu ataupun grammarnya. Misalnya saat kita ingin membicarakan tentang masa lampau, kita menggunakan kata yang berakhiran -ed biasanya. Itu untuk regular. Sedangkan untuk beberapa kata saya sering lupa di sana."* DK's account is distinct from both ZK and JN in that it locates the failure not on words in general but specifically on verb inflection for past tense particularly irregular forms that cannot be generated through a rule. While ZK and JN describe phonological encoding failure as a word-level phenomenon, DK identifies it as a morphological processing failure concentrated in a specific grammatical category. The three accounts are therefore consistent in the core mechanism they describe the meaning is accessible but the form is not yet they progressively specify different levels and types of that failure: pure phonological inaccessibility (ZK), combined phonological and morphological failure (JN), and specifically irregular morphological inflection failure (DK).

These accounts are fully consistent with the WEAVER++ model of Levelt, Roelofs, and Meyer (1999)<sup>86</sup>, which specifies that lexical access operates in two sequential stages lemma retrieval and lexeme

---

<sup>85</sup> Eysenck, M. W., Derakshan, N., Santos, R., & Calvo, M. G. (2007). Anxiety and cognitive performance: Attentional control theory. *Emotion*, 7(2), 336–353.

<sup>86</sup> JN, interview by researcher, Interview 1 (W1), 12 May 2026.

retrieval and that ToT is precisely the condition in which the lemma is activated but the lexeme fails to be accessed. DK's specific difficulty with irregular verb inflection aligns with Pinker and Ullman's (2002)<sup>87</sup> Dual-Route Model, which demonstrates that irregular verb forms must be retrieved from declarative memory as individual stored units, making them far more vulnerable to retrieval failure in L2 learners with limited productive exposure.

### c. Cognitive Overload

This discussion addresses the finding that simultaneous multi-processing demands during English speaking exceeded participants' working memory capacity, making lexical retrieval the first function to fail. This is the most strongly evidenced causal factor, confirmed by both interview and observation data on the same participants.

**Table 4.1 Observation Data: L1 Interference Indicators (Observed Only)**

| CODE | INDICATOR                      | ZK | JN | DK | AF | TOTAL | LEVEL    |
|------|--------------------------------|----|----|----|----|-------|----------|
| O10  | Code-switching as ToT response | 1  | 0  | 1  | 0  | 2     | Moderate |

---

<sup>87</sup> ZK, interview by researcher, Interview 1 (W1), 12 May 2026.

From observation data, the co-occurrence of O6 (working memory overload, score 5), O7 (output simplification, score 3), and O8 (filler use, score 7) on the same participants who reported the highest cognitive burden in interviews provides strong cross-method confirmation.

Three interview accounts illuminate different dimensions of the same overload experience.

ZK<sup>88</sup> provided the most structurally explicit account: *“banyak sekali yang saya pikirkan secara bersamaan. Saya memikirkan grammar, kosa kata, pronunciation, dan apakah membicarakan maksud saya atau tidak. Karena terlalu banyak berpikir, saya jadi lebih lambat saat berbicara.”* ZK enumerates four simultaneous processing demands and directly attributes his speaking slowdown to their volume. This is an account of cognitive overload in its most transparent form too many concurrent processes, insufficient capacity, resulting in production slowdown. ZK’s account is selected as the primary representative of this finding because it names the specific components of overload most explicitly and because its content was corroborated by the observation co-occurrence of O6, O7, and O8 on the same participant.

DK<sup>89</sup> described a qualitatively different dimension of overload: *“saya memang memiliki anxiety yang membuat penyusunan kosa-kata dalam otak saya merasa kacau.”* DK’s account differs from ZK’s in that it does not describe overload as a quantitative problem of too many

---

<sup>88</sup> DK, interview by researcher, Interview 1 (W1), 19 May 2026.

<sup>89</sup> Levelt, W. J. M. (1989). *Speaking: From intention to articulation*. The MIT Press. ISBN: 978-0-262-12137-9

simultaneous processes but as a qualitative collapse anxiety actively degrades the internal organisation of vocabulary retrieval rather than simply competing for the same limited capacity. Where ZK's overload is structural (too many tasks), DK's is disorganisational (the task space itself becomes chaotic).

AF<sup>90</sup> introduced a third and distinct dimension: "*sebelum saya melakukan bercakapan itu biasanya saya sering kali berpikir dulu sebelum saya bertindak.*" AF's account differs from both ZK and DK in its temporal location: his overload occurs before production begins, not during it. The habit of extensive pre-production planning depletes cognitive resources before the communicative exchange is formally underway. The three accounts address the same underlying finding cognitive overload as a ToT trigger but locate it at three different stages: during execution (ZK), at the level of anxiety-induced disorganisation (DK), and in the pre-production planning phase (AF).

These accounts align with Baddeley's (2000)<sup>91</sup> Working Memory Model, which demonstrates that the central executive has limited capacity and can be overwhelmed when processing demands exceed what automatised has freed up. Skehan and Foster's (1997)<sup>92</sup> Trade-off Hypothesis predicts that under such conditions speakers cannot simultaneously maintain fluency, accuracy, and complexity. Clark and

---

<sup>90</sup> Eysenck, M. W., Derakshan, N., Santos, R., & Calvo, M. G. (2007). Anxiety and cognitive performance: Attentional control theory. *Emotion*, 7(2), 336–353.

<sup>91</sup> ZK, interview by researcher, Interview 1 (W1), 12 May 2026.

<sup>92</sup> ZK, interview by researcher, Interview 2 (W2), 15 May 2026.

Fox Tree (2002)<sup>93</sup> provide the specific account for the dominant role of filler use observed in O8: fillers function as deliberate communicative strategies that purchase processing time for the central executive without abandoning the speaking turn.

#### d. L1 Interference

This discussion addresses the finding that Bahasa Indonesia consistently preceded English in the retrieval process, requiring an internal translation step that extended processing time and often prevented successful L2 production. The finding is distinguished by its historical-pedagogical dimension, which identifies the root of L1 dominance in institutionalised primary school learning practices.

**Table 4.2 Observation Data: Speaking Anxiety Indicators (Observed Only)**

| CODE | INDICATOR                                         | ZK | JN | DK | AF | TOTAL | LEVEL       |
|------|---------------------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|-------|-------------|
| O12  | Physical manifestations of anxiety                | 1  | 1  | 1  | 2  | 5     | Significant |
| O13  | Negative anxiety cycle                            | 2  | 1  | 2  | 0  | 4     | Significant |
| O14  | Situational anxiety contrast (formal vs informal) | 2  | 0  | 2  | 0  | 4     | Significant |

Two interview accounts illuminate this finding from different analytical perspectives.

---

<sup>93</sup> AF, interview by researcher, Interview 2 (W2), 21 May 2026.

ZK<sup>94</sup> stated: *“biasanya yang muncul pertama kali justru kata dalam Bahasa Indonesia. Setelah itu saya mencoba menerjemahkannya ke Bahasa Inggris.”* ZK’s account is synchronic: it describes what happens in the moment of retrieval L1 activates first, then translation to L2 is attempted. It captures the retrieval sequence as a currently observable habit without offering an explanation of how that habit was formed.

AF<sup>95</sup> provided a fundamentally different perspective: *“dari metode belajar dari anak SD juga, itu saya selalu memikirkan sesuatu benda atau hewan itu dari bahasa Indonesia terlebih dahulu, setelah itu saya cari-cari lewat kamus.”* AF’s account is both synchronic and diachronic: it not only confirms that L1 comes first in retrieval but traces this pattern to a specific pedagogical origin the translation-based methods of primary school education. While ZK and AF describe the same surface-level experience of L1 preceding L2 in retrieval, they differ in the analytical depth they provide: ZK describes what is happening now, while AF explains why it happens and how it came to be structured this way. ZK’s account is therefore representative of the retrieval experience itself, while AF’s account extends the finding into a historically rooted institutional explanation that goes beyond anything ZK’s account contains. Both accounts are necessary: ZK’s establishes the

---

<sup>94</sup> Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon Press. ISBN: 978-0-08-028628-0

<sup>95</sup> Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 129–158.

universality of the retrieval pattern, while AF's establishes its causal origin.

The contrast between interview and observation findings on this factor adds a further layer. While all four participants confirmed L1 dominance in interviews, only deliberate code-switching (O10, score 2) appeared in observation meaning no participant produced L1 words directly and unintentionally into their utterances. This tells a more nuanced story: participants are internally processing through L1 first, but managing to inhibit the outward expression of that internal dominance most of the time. Kroll and Stewart's (1994)<sup>96</sup> Revised Hierarchical Model accounts for the internal dominance: in less proficient bilinguals, concept-to-L1 connections are structurally stronger than concept-to-L2 connections. Green's (1998)<sup>97</sup> Inhibitory Control Model accounts for the absence of direct intrusion: bilinguals actively suppress the non-target language through executive control. AF's historical account adds a dimension that these models do not explicitly address: the institutionalisation of L1-first processing through pedagogical methods.

#### **e. Situational Anxiety as ToT Amplifier**

This discussion addresses the finding that anxiety functioned as an active amplifier of ToT transforming manageable retrieval difficulty into

---

<sup>96</sup> ZK, interview by researcher, Interview 1 (W1), 12 May 2026.

<sup>97</sup> JN, interview by researcher, Interview 2 (W2), 21 May 2026.

severe episodes and initiated a self-reinforcing escalation cycle within each speaking session.

**Table 4.3 Data Display: Impact of ToT on Speaking Performance (Interview Data)**

| <b>N<br/>O</b> | <b>IMPACT</b>                                 | <b>PARTICIPANTS<br/>REPORTING</b> | <b>SESSI<br/>ON</b> |
|----------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1              | Fluency Disruption and Domino Effect          | All (4/4)                         | W1                  |
| 2              | Grammar and Pronunciation Accuracy Disruption | ZK, AF, DK (3/4)                  | W1,<br>W2           |
| 3              | Loss of Message Coherence                     | ZK, DK, JN (3/4)                  | W1                  |
| 4              | Active Compensation Strategies                | All (4/4)                         | W1,<br>W2           |
| 4a             | L2 Circumlocution                             | DK                                | W1                  |
| 4b             | Lexical substitution                          | ZK                                | W2                  |
| 4c             | Body gestures                                 | JN                                | W1                  |
| 4d             | Appeal for assistance                         | AF                                | W2                  |
| 4e             | Reducing speech output                        | DK                                | W2                  |

Four interview accounts illuminate different dimensions of anxiety's amplifying role.

JN<sup>98</sup> stated: "*Tekanannya kuat, jadi saya deg-degan dan sering lupa, padahal sudah prepare.*" This account establishes the most critical dimension of the finding at the outset: thorough preparation is insufficient protection when evaluative pressure is high enough to override it. JN's account eliminates the assumption that ToT is simply a preparation problem it demonstrates that anxiety operates as a context-level force independent of preparation quality.

---

<sup>98</sup> de Bot, K. (1992). A bilingual production model: Levelt's "speaking" model adapted. *Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), 1–24.

ZK<sup>99</sup> described the within-session escalation mechanism: “*Setelah satu kali lupa kata, saya jadi semakin gugup dan takut lupa lagi. Akibatnya saya malah lebih sulit fokus dan jadi lebih banyak berhenti saat berbicara.*” ZK’s account differs from JN’s in that it does not describe anxiety as a static background condition but as a dynamic within-session escalator: each ToT episode generates the anxiety that makes the next episode more likely. While JN shows that anxiety precedes and triggers ToT even with preparation, ZK shows that ToT itself then generates further anxiety that deepens the cycle.

JN<sup>100</sup> added an institutionally specific dimension from a second session: “*Takut di judge dan nanti mungkin nilainya bakal dikurangin.*” This account, collected from the same participant in a later session, is qualitatively different from her W1 account: while her first account described emotional arousal (heart pounding, forgetting), her second account names a concrete and institutionally grounded fear the reduction of academic grades. This represents a fourth component of anxiety not captured in the standard FLCA model, specific to the formal assessment culture of Indonesian higher education. The contrast between JN’s two accounts therefore reveals that anxiety in this context operates on two levels simultaneously: as physiological arousal (W1) and as rational fear of concrete academic consequences (W2).

---

<sup>99</sup> Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of H. G. Widdowson* (pp. 125–144). Oxford University Press.

<sup>100</sup> DK, interview by researcher, Interview 1 (W1), 19 May 2026.

DK<sup>101</sup> described anxiety through a structural account: “*saya memang memiliki anxiety yang membuat penyusunan kosa-kata dalam otak saya merasa kacau.*” DK’s account is categorically different from the others in that he does not describe anxiety as a trigger for ToT but as a persistent condition that directly disrupts cognitive organisation. While JN and ZK describe anxiety as situationally activated and temporally specific, DK describes it as a stable internal condition that produces a qualitative degradation of working memory organisation. The independent observation rating of O13 as Frequently for both DK and ZK by an observer without access to their interview responses confirms that this cycle has objectively codeable behavioural correlates, constituting the strongest cross-method triangulation in this causal factor group.

Taken together, the four accounts establish that anxiety amplifies ToT through at least four distinct mechanisms: overriding preparation (JN, W1), generating within-session escalation (ZK), imposing institutionally grounded academic consequence fear (JN, W2), and producing structural cognitive disorganisation (DK). These patterns are consistent with Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope’s (1986)<sup>102</sup> FLCA model while also extending it with the fourth context-specific component identified by JN. Eysenck, Derakshan, Santos, and Calvo’s (2007)<sup>103</sup> Attentional Control Theory provides the precise cognitive mechanism:

---

<sup>101</sup> AF, interview by researcher, Interview 2 (W2), 21 May 2026.

<sup>102</sup> ZK, interview by researcher, Interview 2 (W2), 15 May 2026.

<sup>103</sup> DK, interview by researcher, Interview 2 (W2), 21 May 2026.

anxiety increases the bottom-up attentional system while simultaneously reducing the top-down capacity needed for retrieval.

## 2. Impact of ToT on Speaking Performance and Self-Confidence

### a. Fluency Disruption and the Domino Effect

This discussion addresses the finding that ToT triggered cascading fluency degradation throughout the entire speaking session not merely at the moment of retrieval failure. The domino effect distinguishes EFL ToT from the brief self-resolving episodes reported in native speaker research.

**Table 4.4 Observation Data: Speaking Performance Impact Indicators (Observed Only)**

| CODE | INDICATOR                         | ZK | JN | DK | AF | TOTAL | LEVEL       |
|------|-----------------------------------|----|----|----|----|-------|-------------|
| O16  | Prolonged pauses and false starts | 1  | 0  | 2  | 2  | 5     | Significant |
| O17  | Excessive fillers and repetition  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 0  | 3     | Moderate    |
| O19  | Multi-dimensional disruption      | 0  | 1  | 0  | 0  | 1     | Low         |
| O20  | Visible confidence decline        | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 1     | Low         |

**Table 4.5 Data Display: Impact of ToT on Self-Confidence and L2 Development (Interview Data)**

| NO | PSYCHOLOGICAL IMPACT                     | ZK | JN | DK | AF | SESSION |
|----|------------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|---------|
| 1  | Decline in Speaking Self-Efficacy        | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✗  | W1      |
| 2  | Reduced Willingness to Communicate (WTC) | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | W1      |
| 3  | Negative Cognitive-Affective Cycle       | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✗  | W1, W2  |
| 4  | Growth Mindset as Cycle Breaker          | ✓  | ✗  | ✗  | ✓  | W1, W2  |

| N<br>O | PSYCHOLOGICAL IMPACT            | ZK       | JN | DK | AF | SESSION |
|--------|---------------------------------|----------|----|----|----|---------|
|        |                                 | (W2<br>) |    |    |    |         |
| 5      | AI Tools as Preventive Strategy | ✗        | ✗  | ✗  | ✓  | W2      |
| 6      | Clinical Psychological Risk     | ✗        | ✗  | ✓  | ✗  | W2      |

From observation data, O16 (prolonged pauses and false starts, score 5) and O17 (excessive fillers and repetition, score 3) provide independent behavioural confirmation of fluency disruption.

Three interview accounts describe the domino effect at different points on a severity continuum.

JN<sup>104</sup> stated: *“kalau sudah sekali lupa dan pasti untuk kelancaran di bawah-bawahnya.”* The word “pasti” (certainly/definitely) is analytically significant: JN does not describe the domino effect as a possibility but as a certainty, indicating the pattern has become so consistent that she anticipates it as inevitable. For JN, the domino effect has been internalised as a predictable cognitive schema.

ZK<sup>105</sup> added a temporal dimension: *“Kadang satu momen kecil bisa mempengaruhi performa saya sampai akhir presentasi atau diskusi.”* ZK’s account is similar to JN’s in describing the cascading nature of the effect, but extends it explicitly across time the disruption does not resolve after the initial episode but persists through to the end of the entire session. Both JN and ZK describe the same domino pattern, but JN

<sup>104</sup> Dörnyei, Z., & Scott, M. L. (1997). Communication strategies in a second language: Definitions and taxonomies. *Language Learning*, 47(1), 173–210.

<sup>105</sup> JN, interview by researcher, Interview 1 (W1), 12 May 2026.

emphasises its predictability while ZK emphasises its temporal duration. Since both accounts converge on the same mechanism, ZK's account is the more analytically complete of the two for its explicit temporal specification, while JN's use of "pasti" adds the important dimension of internalised expectation.

DK<sup>106</sup> described a qualitatively different and categorically more severe manifestation: *"jantung berdebar kencang, kemudian saya ditambah dengan keringatan saya, dan anxiety saya, sehingga membuat saya gemetar, dan tidak bisa berbicara sama sekali."* DK's account is not simply a more severe version of what JN and ZK describe it represents a different category of response. While JN and ZK describe reduced and compromised fluency, DK describes a complete physiological and communicative shutdown: the inability to produce any speech at all, accompanied by physical symptoms of acute stress. DK's case thus demonstrates that the domino effect has a threshold beyond which fluency disruption transitions from a linguistic-attentional phenomenon into an acute anxiety response. The alignment between DK's interview account of complete shutdown and his Frequently rating on O16 is one of the clearest individual-level convergences in the study.

Levelt's (1989)<sup>107</sup> feedback loop model explains the base mechanism: when production fails at one point, the monitoring system generates a repair signal that competes for attentional resources,

---

<sup>106</sup> DK, interview by researcher, Interview 1 (W1), 19 May 2026.

<sup>107</sup> AF, interview by researcher, Interview 1 (W1), 18 May 2026.

increasing the likelihood of further failure. Eysenck et al.'s (2007)<sup>108</sup> Attentional Control Theory accounts for the severity gradient, with DK's case representing the extreme in which attentional capture by the threat-monitoring system becomes so total that goal-directed production is effectively disabled.

### **b. Grammar and Pronunciation Accuracy Disruption**

This discussion addresses the finding that ToT simultaneously disrupted grammatical accuracy and pronunciation quality, and specifically the post-hoc monitoring phenomenon in which participants became aware of errors only after completing the utterance.

Observation indicator O18 (grammatical accuracy disruption) scored 0 across all participants, and O19 (multi-dimensional disruption) scored only 1 reflecting the methodological limitation of real-time observation in detecting micro-linguistic accuracy events that require transcript-level analysis.

Three interview accounts illuminate different dimensions of this finding. ZK across two sessions provided the most complete picture.

In W1<sup>109</sup> he stated: *“bukan hanya kelancaran yang terganggu, tetapi juga grammar dan pronunciation. Saya pernah terlalu fokus mencari satu kata sampai akhirnya salah menggunakan tensis dan*

---

<sup>108</sup> Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. W. H. Freeman.

<sup>109</sup> Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychological Review*, 92(4), 548–573.

*pengucapan beberapa kata jadi tidak jelas.*” This account establishes that accuracy disruption is multi-dimensional and simultaneous: tense selection and pronunciation fail at the same time as fluency breaks down, because the same pool of attentional resources is responsible for all three.

In W2<sup>110</sup> ZK added: *“Setelah selesai berbicara baru saya sadar ada banyak kesalahan yang sebenarnya bisa dihindari.”* This second account from the same participant is qualitatively different from the first: while the W1 account describes what goes wrong during production, the W2 account reveals what becomes visible after production post-hoc monitoring. Together, ZK’s two accounts across sessions tell a complete story: errors occur across multiple dimensions during ToT (W1), and awareness of those errors is only accessible retrospectively once communicative pressure has passed (W2). The two accounts are therefore not saying the same thing but complementing each other the first describes the disruption, the second describes the delayed detection.

AF<sup>111</sup> added a critical nuance from a different participant: *“walaupun saya pede, tapi kadang untuk pembicaraan secara grammarnya itu kayak nggak beraturan.”* AF’s account is distinct from ZK’s in an important way: ZK’s disruption is reported in the context of high anxiety and significant self-efficacy erosion, while AF the participant with the most stable self-efficacy and lowest anxiety profile also experiences grammatical irregularity. AF’s account thus

---

<sup>110</sup> ZK, interview by researcher, Interview 1 (W1), 12 May 2026.

<sup>111</sup> DK, interview by researcher, Interview 2 (W2), 21 May 2026.

demonstrates that accuracy disruption is not solely an anxiety-mediated effect: even under more favourable psychological conditions, the cognitive resource competition produced by ToT still compromises grammatical monitoring. The combination of ZK's and AF's accounts establishes that accuracy disruption is a structural consequence of ToT that operates regardless of confidence level.

This aligns with Krashen's (1982)<sup>112</sup> Monitor Hypothesis: the Monitor can only correct errors when time and form-focused attention are available conditions ToT systematically eliminates. Schmidt's (1990)<sup>113</sup> Noticing Hypothesis adds that conscious noticing of form requires deliberate attentional allocation unavailable during retrieval failure but accessible retrospectively, which accounts precisely for the post-hoc monitoring ZK described.

### **c. Loss of Message Coherence**

This discussion addresses the finding that ToT extended beyond the word level to cause loss of macro-level discourse coherence, forcing participants to abandon the thread of their explanation entirely.

This finding is rooted exclusively in interview data. Observation indicator O22 scored 0 across all participants not because the phenomenon did not occur, but because discourse coherence loss is an

---

<sup>112</sup> AF, interview by researcher, Interview 2 (W2), 21 May 2026.

<sup>113</sup> MacIntyre, P. D., Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(4), 545–562.

internal planning process requiring tracking of semantic content over a full speaking turn, beyond the scope of binary real-time behavioural observation.

Two interview accounts describe this finding and are consistent in identifying coherence loss as a consequence of ToT, but differ in what each emphasises about the experience and its outcome.

ZK<sup>114</sup> stated: *“Kadang saya terlalu fokus mengingat satu kata sampai lupa inti pembicaraan saya sendiri. Akibatnya, saya jadi bingung melanjutkan penjelasan dan harus mengulang dari awal.”* ZK’s account focuses on the internal mechanism the word search displaces the macro-message representation and on the response to that loss: restarting within L2. ZK remains committed to L2 throughout, choosing reconstruction over language switching despite the cognitive cost.

JN<sup>115</sup> stated: *“Kehilangan pesan utama, jadi kalau sudah kehilangan begitu biasanya langsung berganti ke bahasa Indonesia.”* JN’s account confirms the same coherence loss mechanism as ZK’s but describes a different response: for JN, coherence loss is the trigger for immediate language switching to L1. Where ZK’s response to coherence loss is effortful reconstruction in L2, JN’s response is communicative prioritisation through L1 substitution. The two accounts are therefore consistent in identifying coherence loss as the phenomenon but reveal two different coping trajectories in response to it ZK’s L2-commitment

---

<sup>114</sup> Mowrer, O. H. (1960). Learning theory and behavior. Wiley.

<sup>115</sup> JN, interview by researcher, Interview 1 (W1), 12 May 2026.

and JN's L1-retreat which themselves reflect broader differences in self-efficacy and communicative orientation between the two participants.

De Bot (1992)<sup>116</sup> provides the theoretical framework: in bilingual production, macroplanning and microplanning must be maintained concurrently in working memory, and when microplanning is stalled by ToT, the macroplanning representation decays as its supporting resources are diverted. Swain's (1995)<sup>117</sup> Comprehensible Output Hypothesis illuminates the developmental dimension: the inability to maintain discourse coherence under ToT pressure indicates that discourse-level planning has not yet become sufficiently automatised to run in parallel with lexical problem-solving.

#### **d. Active Compensation Strategies**

This discussion addresses the finding that all participants actively developed diverse compensation strategies when experiencing ToT, with strategy choice reflecting individual communicative priorities.

From observation, O23 and O24 both scored 0 not because strategies were absent but because they require semantic content analysis beyond binary observation. O8 (score 7) and O10 (score 2) provide partial observational confirmation through acoustically detectable strategies.

---

<sup>116</sup> ZK, interview by researcher, Interview 1 (W1), 12 May 2026.

<sup>117</sup> DK, interview by researcher, Interview 2 (W2), 21 May 2026.

Four interview accounts describe compensation strategies that are meaningfully different from one another, forming a spectrum from highly active to fully passive.

DK<sup>118</sup> demonstrated the most linguistically sophisticated active strategy: “*Contohnya expensive. Saya bilangnya, Harga kata tersebut sangat tinggi.*” DK’s circumlocution reflects the strongest commitment to maintaining L2: rather than retrieving the exact word or switching to L1, he generates an entirely new L2 description of the concept. This is a highly demanding strategy cognitively, as it requires productive L2 generation under pressure, but it preserves L2 engagement fully.

AF<sup>119</sup> described a qualitatively different strategy: “*saya seringkali minta tolong kepada audience atau enggak ke dosen kalau misalnya lupa suatu word yang ingin saya ucapkan.*” Unlike DK’s strategy, which is individual and generative, AF’s strategy is social and distributive the retrieval burden is shared with a third party rather than resolved internally. AF’s approach converts a private cognitive failure into a collaborative communicative act and reflects a high degree of social comfort with the audience.

ZK<sup>120</sup> described a strategy that is similar in orientation to DK’s remaining in L2 but less elaborate: “*saya biasanya menggunakan kata*

---

<sup>118</sup> Eysenck, M. W., Derakshan, N., Santos, R., & Calvo, M. G. (2007). Anxiety and cognitive performance: Attentional control theory. *Emotion*, 7(2), 336–353.

<sup>119</sup> Abramson, L. Y., Metalsky, G. I., & Alloy, L. B. (1989). Hopelessness depression: A theory-based subtype of depression. *Psychological Review*, 96(2), 358–372.

<sup>120</sup> Spielberger, C. D. (1983). *Manual for the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory*. Consulting Psychologists Press.

*yang lebih mudah atau menjelaskan maknanya secara tidak langsung.”*

ZK's substitution or indirect explanation is less cognitively demanding than DK's circumlocution and less socially interactive than AF's appeal, occupying a middle position between the two.

DK<sup>121</sup> also reported a second and categorically different strategy from a later session: *“yang paling sering saya lakukan, saya mengurangi porsi bicara saya.”* This account from DK is markedly different from his W1 account of circumlocution. Where in W1 DK demonstrated active and creative L2 engagement, by W2 his most frequent strategy had shifted to avoidance reducing overall speech output to minimise ToT exposure. The contrast between DK's two accounts across sessions is particularly instructive: it suggests a possible trajectory from active compensation toward passive withdrawal as the psychological cost of repeated ToT accumulates. Together, the four accounts form a spectrum: creative L2 generation (DK, W1), social appeal (AF), pragmatic simplification (ZK), and passive avoidance (DK, W2) each reflecting different priorities and different stages in the participant's relationship with ToT.

Dörnyei and Scott's (1997)<sup>122</sup> communication strategies taxonomy organises these findings: DK's circumlocution represents a direct strategy; AF's appeal represents an interactional strategy; and filler use confirmed through O8 represents an indirect strategy. The contrast

---

<sup>121</sup> AF, interview by researcher, Interview 1 (W1), 18 May 2026.

<sup>122</sup> AF, interview by researcher, Interview 2 (W2), 21 May 2026.

between participants who maintain L2 engagement and those who retreat to output reduction reflects deeper differences in self-efficacy, communicative orientation, and tolerance for communicative risk.

#### **e. Decline in Speaking Self-Efficacy**

This discussion addresses the finding that repeated ToT experiences progressively eroded self-efficacy in three of four participants, with the critical differentiating variable being how each participant interpreted the meaning of the failure rather than how frequently ToT occurred.

**Table 4.6 Observation Data: Self-Confidence Indicators (Observed Only)**

| CODE | INDICATOR                  | ZK | JN | DK | AF | TOTAL | LEVEL                |
|------|----------------------------|----|----|----|----|-------|----------------------|
| O20  | Visible confidence decline | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 1     | Low<br>(Contrasting) |

This finding is rooted primarily in interview data. O20 (visible confidence decline) was observed Sometimes only in AF the participant with reported stable self-efficacy while scoring 0 for the three participants who reported consistent decline in interviews.

Three interview accounts describe self-efficacy responses to ToT that are consistent in acknowledging an impact but differ profoundly in its nature and severity.

JN<sup>123</sup> stated: “*Selalu menurun.*” The brevity of this account is analytically significant in itself: two words delivered without qualification, contextualisation, or any suggestion of recovery or exception. JN does not describe when she declines, under what conditions, or whether there are moments of stability the decline is simply a given, an internalised and uncontested feature of her speaking experience.

DK<sup>124</sup> provided a qualitatively different account: “*saya berpikir bahwasanya saya ini orang paling buruk di dunia, jika saya tidak bisa menyampaikan kosa kata tersebut.*” DK’s account differs from JN’s not in the direction of the response both describe downward trajectories but in the cognitive mechanism producing it. While JN describes a consistent pattern of decline, DK describes a specific cognitive distortion: the catastrophic over-generalisation from a single communicative failure (“I cannot produce this word”) to a global existential judgment about personal worth (“I am the worst person in the world”). This is not simply a more severe version of JN’s experience but a qualitatively different psychological event catastrophising in which the scope of the failure is dramatically expanded beyond what the evidence supports.

AF<sup>125</sup> provided the contrasting account that gives this finding its most instructive dimension: “*Kalau dibicarakan kurang pede atau*

---

<sup>123</sup> Ibid.

<sup>124</sup> Dweck, C. S. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. Random House. ISBN: 978-0-345-47232-8

<sup>125</sup> Wolpe, J. (1958). *Psychotherapy by reciprocal inhibition*. Stanford University Press.

*enggaknya, enggak juga sih. Namanya juga kita masih dalam tahap belajar.*” AF’s account is fundamentally different from both JN and DK not in degree but in kind: he does not report a decline, a pattern of decline, or a catastrophic response. Instead, he describes a stable absence of significant confidence loss, grounded in a reframing of the entire ToT experience as developmentally normal. The three accounts therefore represent three distinct psychological orientations toward the same experience: internalised progressive decline stated as a given (JN), catastrophic self-evaluation triggered by a specific failure (DK), and stable developmental reframing that prevents efficacy erosion entirely (AF). These differences make the finding theoretically precise: the psychological consequence of ToT is not determined by its frequency but by the interpretive frame within which it is placed.

These patterns are consistent with Bandura’s (1997)<sup>126</sup> Self-Efficacy Theory and Weiner’s (1985)<sup>127</sup> Attribution Theory: attributing failure to stable, uncontrollable, global causes produces steeper efficacy decline than attributing it to unstable, controllable, developmental causes.

#### **f. Reduced Willingness to Communicate (WTC)**

This discussion addresses the finding that all participants reduced their willingness to engage in English speaking as a consequence of ToT,

---

<sup>126</sup> ZK, JN, AF, and DK, interviews by researcher, Interview 1 (W1), 12–19 May 2026.

<sup>127</sup> ZK, JN, and AF, interviews by researcher, Interview 1 (W1), 12–18 May 2026.

and identifies the participation paradox: ToT reduces the very speaking practice that is the primary mechanism for preventing future ToT.

This finding is rooted exclusively in interview data. O21 scored 0 in observation not because the phenomenon is absent but because the structured academic context required all participants to speak, eliminating the conditions under which voluntary avoidance could express itself behaviourally.

Three interview accounts describe WTC reduction that is consistent in direction but meaningfully different in form.

ZK<sup>128</sup> stated: *“Pengalaman lupa kata membuat saya kadang ragu untuk terlalu aktif berbicara di kelas. Saya sering takut tiba-tiba blank di tengah berbicara. Jadi lebih memilih diam atau menunggu teman lain menjawab terlebih dahulu.”* ZK’s WTC reduction is situationally triggered and reactively oriented: the fear of blanking in the middle of a speaking turn produces a preference for silence or deferral to others. His avoidance is selective and moment-to-moment rather than structural.

DK<sup>129</sup> described a more thoroughgoing form: *“yang paling sering saya lakukan, saya mengurangi porsi bicara saya.”* DK’s account differs from ZK’s in its systematicity: rather than avoiding specific high-risk moments, DK has implemented a general reduction of overall speaking contribution across contexts. This is a more pervasive and structurally embedded avoidance than ZK’s situational deferral. These two accounts

---

<sup>128</sup> ZK, JN, AF, and DK, interviews by researcher, Interview 1 (W1), 12–19 May 2026.

<sup>129</sup> ZK, JN, DK, and AF, interviews by researcher, Interview 1 (W1), 12–19 May 2026.

ZK's moment-to-moment avoidance and DK's systematic quantitative reduction describe the same underlying WTC reduction but at different levels of generalisation and severity. Since DK's account reflects a more consequential and structurally embedded form of the same phenomenon, it represents the more severe manifestation of this finding.

AF<sup>130</sup> described a qualitatively different and more adaptive response: *"kalau bicara dalam diskusi saya ikut andil tapi tidak terlalu aktif. Jadi saat mau diskusi ke teman yang lain itu biasanya saya pikir dulu apa sih topik yang akan dipicarakan lalu saya ucapkan beberapa poin pentingnya saja."* AF's account differs from both ZK and DK in that he does not describe avoidance but conditional engagement: he still participates, but manages the uncertainty of spontaneous speaking by preparing mentally before contributing. AF's WTC reduction is therefore not a withdrawal but a self-regulatory strategy that preserves participation while managing risk. The participation paradox identified in this finding is most clearly illustrated by DK's account: the systematic reduction of speaking output removes precisely the productive practice through which L2 lexical representations would be strengthened and future ToT frequency reduced.

MacIntyre, Clément, Dörnyei, and Noels' (1998)<sup>131</sup> WTC Pyramid Model explains the structure: WTC is the outcome of a hierarchy in which state communicative self-confidence is the most proximal

---

<sup>130</sup> ZK, JN, DK, and AF, interviews by researcher, Interview 1 (W1), 12–19 May 2026; JN, interview by researcher, Interview 2 (W2), 21 May 2026.

<sup>131</sup> Researcher's structured observation checklists, Appendices 3–6.

predictor. Mowrer's (1960)<sup>132</sup> avoidance learning framework explains why avoidance is self-perpetuating: each choice of silence functions as a reinforcer that makes future avoidance more likely, while preventing the successful speaking experiences that would eventually reduce anxiety.

#### **g. Negative Cognitive-Affective Cycle**

This discussion addresses the most theoretically significant finding of this study: the identification of a self-reinforcing cycle in which ToT, confidence decline, and anxiety escalation mutually perpetuate one another in a progressively deepening loop. This is the only finding confirmed by both instruments on precisely the same participants.

From observation data, O13 (negative anxiety cycle, score 4) and O14 (situational anxiety contrast, score 4) were both rated Frequently for DK and ZK by an independent observer without access to the interview transcripts constituting the strongest construct validity evidence in the study.

Three interview accounts describe the cycle from different analytical vantage points that together build a complete and progressive picture.

JN<sup>133</sup> stated: *"iya kak mempengaruhi kepercayaan diri juga, dan juga kecemasannya juga naik karena tidak percaya diri tadi."* JN's account captures the logical architecture of the cycle in its most

---

<sup>132</sup> Researcher's structured observation checklists, Appendices 3–6.

<sup>133</sup> Researcher's structured observation checklists, Appendices 3–6.

condensed and explicit form: ToT reduces confidence, reduced confidence raises anxiety, and raised anxiety feeds back into the conditions that produce further ToT. JN describes the cycle from a detached, almost analytical vantage point she has observed it in herself and can articulate its structure clearly.

ZK<sup>134</sup> provided the phenomenological counterpart: “*Setelah satu kali lupa kata, saya jadi semakin gugup dan takut lupa lagi. Akibatnya saya malah lebih sulit fokus dan jadi lebih banyak berhenti saat berbicara.*” ZK’s account differs from JN’s in that it is not structural but experiential he describes the cycle from the inside, moment by moment within a single speaking session. Where JN identifies the cycle’s logic, ZK provides its lived temporal sequence: the first failure → fear of the next → attentional disruption → more stopping. Both accounts describe the same mechanism but JN’s is more conceptual while ZK’s is more phenomenological. Since both describe the within-session cycle, ZK’s account is selected as the primary phenomenological representative because its temporal specificity is more analytically precise.

DK<sup>135</sup> described the endpoint that gives this finding its most serious dimension: “*jika saya memikirkannya terlalu banyak, mungkin saya akan down benaran dan saya akan melakukan depresi.*” DK’s account is categorically different from both JN and ZK in what it addresses: it does not describe the cycle’s structure or its within-session

---

<sup>134</sup> ZK, JN, AF, and DK, interviews by researcher, Interview 1 (W1), 12–19 May 2026.

<sup>135</sup> ZK, interviews by researcher, Interview 1 (W1) and Interview 2 (W2), 12 and 15 May 2026; AF, interview by researcher, Interview 2 (W2), 21 May 2026.

experience but its potential long-term terminal consequence depression. DK's account thus extends the scope of this finding beyond the speaking classroom into general psychological wellbeing, representing the most clinically significant endpoint in the spectrum the three accounts collectively cover. Together, the three accounts describe the cycle from its logical structure (JN), through its moment-to-moment lived experience (ZK), to its potential long-term psychological outcome (DK), forming a progressively serious and complete account of a mechanism whose consequences are not limited to speaking performance.

Eysenck, Derakshan, Santos, and Calvo's (2007)<sup>136</sup> Attentional Control Theory provides the attentional account: each ToT episode activates the threat-detection system, which diverts resources from goal-directed retrieval, increasing the probability of the next episode. Abramson, Metalsky, and Alloy (1989)<sup>137</sup> provide the psychological account for DK's case: the attributional pattern most predictive of depressive symptom development is precisely the stable, global, internal attribution that DK's accounts reflect. Spielberger's (1983)<sup>138</sup> state-trait anxiety distinction is also relevant: what begins as state anxiety risks consolidating into trait anxiety when the cycle deepens without interruption.

---

<sup>136</sup> ZK, DK, and JN, interviews by researcher, Interview 1 (W1), 12–19 May 2026.

<sup>137</sup> DK, ZK, JN, and AF, interviews by researcher, Interview 1 (W1) and Interview 2 (W2), 12–21 May 2026.

<sup>138</sup> Researcher's structured observation checklists, Appendices 3–6.

## **h. Growth Mindset and Preventive Strategies as Cycle Breakers**

This discussion addresses the finding that AF's consistent growth mindset orientation was the single factor that prevented the negative cycle from forming, and that his spontaneous adoption of AI tools represents an innovative and theoretically grounded preventive strategy.

From observation, AF's profile shows O12 (physical anxiety, Frequently) confirming physiological arousal was present yet O13 and O14 both scored 0 for him. This pattern confirms that arousal does not automatically produce the negative cycle: what matters is the cognitive interpretation placed upon that arousal.

Three interview accounts from AF across two sessions describe different dimensions of the same growth mindset orientation, each adding a distinct layer to the finding.

AF<sup>139</sup> stated: *"Kalau dibicarakan kurang pede atau engaknya, enggak juga sih. Namanya juga kita masih dalam tahap belajar."* This account establishes the cognitive-orientational foundation: ToT is reframed not as evidence of incapacity but as a normal feature of being in a learning process. This reframing is the root of the cycle-breaking mechanism.

AF<sup>140</sup> then described how this orientation is operationalised in daily practice: *"kalau kata saya itu, setiap hari saya mengevaluasi diri*

---

<sup>139</sup> ZK, JN, and DK, interviews by researcher, Interview 1 (W1), 12–19 May 2026; AF, interview by researcher, Interview 1 (W1), 18 May 2026.

<sup>140</sup> ZK, interview by researcher, Interview 1 (W1), 12 May 2026; DK, interview by researcher, Interview 2 (W2), 21 May 2026; AF, interview by researcher, Interview 2 (W2), 21 May 2026.

*saya sendiri, ngomong begini apa saya sudah jauh lebih baik dari hari yang kemarin.*” This second account is different from the first in its level of abstraction: where the first account describes an orientation or belief, the second describes a concrete behavioural practice – daily self-evaluation comparing today’s performance to yesterday’s rather than to an idealised standard. This vertical comparison framework (self against past self) is structurally different from the horizontal comparison (self against more proficient others) that drives efficacy erosion in the other three participants. AF’s second account thus reveals that growth mindset is not merely a passive interpretive stance but an actively practised self-monitoring routine.

AF<sup>141</sup> added the most strategically innovative dimension: *“lebih suka training ke apa ya, dari media sosial atau kayak dari AI tools supaya mempermudah training saya dalam melakukan speaking dalam bahasa Inggris.”* This third account is different from the first two in what it describes: not an orientation (W1) or a self-evaluation practice (W2 first), but a specific technological strategy for building speaking competence. The analytical significance of AI tools as a practice medium lies in what it removes from the speaking context: audience judgment, social consequences, and academic stakes – precisely the elements that generate the situational anxiety that amplifies ToT in formal settings. Together, the three accounts form a coherent and progressive architecture

---

<sup>141</sup> JN and ZK, interviews by researcher, Interview 1 (W1), 12–15 May 2026; DK, interview by researcher, Interview 2 (W2), 21 May 2026.

of cycle-breaking: reframing failure as developmental (W1 account) → operationalising that reframing through daily self-evaluation practice (W2, first account) → building competence through low-anxiety AI-mediated speaking exposure (W2, second account). The three accounts address the same underlying growth mindset orientation but at three increasing levels of concreteness: as a belief, as a practice, and as a specific technological strategy.

Dweck's (2006)<sup>142</sup> Growth Mindset Theory provides the broader framework: treating failure as a developmental signal transforms each ToT episode from an occasion for anxiety into an occasion for learning. Wolpe's (1958)<sup>143</sup> Systematic Desensitisation framework explains the effectiveness of AF's AI tools strategy: repeated exposure to speaking tasks under conditions where threatening elements are absent provides precisely the conditions for anxiety extinction that the formal classroom cannot supply.

---

<sup>142</sup> AF, interviews by researcher, Interview 1 (W1) and Interview 2 (W2), 18 and 21 May 2026.

<sup>143</sup> Researcher's structured observation checklists, Appendices 3–6.

## **CHAPTER V**

### **CONCLUSION**

This chapter serves as the final part of the study and contains two main sections: conclusions and suggestions. The conclusions are drawn based on the data analysis and findings presented in the previous chapters, aiming to summarize the core of the research comprehensively. Meanwhile, the suggestions section is intended as the researcher's contribution to the development of future studies and as practical recommendations for relevant parties, particularly in the context of English language learning in speaking classes at IAIN Curup.

#### **A. Conclusion**

This study identified five main factors contributing to the occurrence of the Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT) phenomenon among EFL students at IAIN Curup: Weak Productive Lexical Representation, Phonological Encoding Failure, Cognitive Overload, L1 Interference, and Situational Anxiety. These five factors do not operate independently but interact synergistically, with the presence of one factor consistently amplifying the effects of the others;

Cognitive Overload and Situational Anxiety received the strongest cross-method triangulation from both interview and observation data. A significant novel finding is that the dominance of Bahasa Indonesia in the retrieval process (L1 Interference) was traced back to translation-based language learning methods institutionalised since primary education, positioning L1 Interference not merely as an individual cognitive habit but as a structurally produced consequence of early pedagogical practice.

ToT was found to produce a multilayered and cascading impact on both speaking performance and self-confidence. In terms of performance, ToT caused fluency disruption (with a domino effect), reduced grammatical and pronunciation accuracy, loss of message coherence, and prompted the development of various compensation strategies. Psychologically, ToT led to a decline in speaking self-efficacy, reduced willingness to communicate, and most significantly, gave rise to a Negative Cognitive-Affective Cycle — a self-reinforcing loop in which ToT, declining confidence, and escalating anxiety progressively perpetuate one another, with the most severe case carrying a risk of depression. However, growth mindset was found to function as an effective cycle-breaker: the participant who consistently reframed ToT as a normal part of the learning process maintained stable self-efficacy and independently developed a preventive strategy of using AI tools as low-stakes speaking practice partners. This finding constitutes the study's principal theoretical contribution, positioning growth mindset as a mediating variable

capable of interrupting the cognitive-affective mechanism through which ToT erodes speaking performance and self-confidence.

## **B. Suggestion**

Based on the findings and conclusions previously discussed, the following suggestions are offered for lecturers, students, and future researchers, ordered by priority of responsibility for addressing the findings.

First, lecturers are encouraged to distinguish clearly between low-stakes practice and high-stakes evaluation when designing speaking activities, since evaluative pressure alone can trigger ToT regardless of preparation. Teaching compensation strategies such as circumlocution and appropriate filler use can also reduce the psychological cost of ToT, and lecturers should remain alert to students showing signs of severe or persistent anxiety and refer them to counselling services when needed.

Second, students are encouraged to strengthen productive vocabulary through active speaking practice rather than passive memorisation, and to adopt a growth mindset by viewing ToT as a normal part of learning rather than a personal failure. Practising through AI tools or social media can provide useful low-pressure speaking exposure.

Third, for future researchers, four directions are particularly recommended based on the findings of this study. Future studies are encouraged to replicate and experimentally test the Negative Cognitive-Affective Cycle identified here the most theoretically significant finding

using larger and more diverse EFL populations to determine its generalisability beyond the Indonesian Islamic higher education context. Research is also needed to examine the effectiveness of growth mindset interventions in reducing the psychological impact of ToT, as this study identified growth mindset as a mediating variable between ToT frequency and its consequences but was only able to document it through a single participant. Furthermore, the lexical paradox in which familiar words proved harder to retrieve than unfamiliar ones warrants systematic replication through controlled experimental designs to investigate whether proactive L1 interference is indeed the underlying mechanism. Finally, longitudinal research is needed to determine whether the negative cognitive-affective cycle weakens naturally with accumulated speaking experience or requires explicit instructional intervention to interrupt.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, W. C. (2015). Conducting semi-structured interviews. In K. Newcomer, H. Hatry, & J. Wholey (Eds.), *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation* (4th ed., pp. 492–505). Jossey-Bass.
- Al Jebouri, M. (2021). A study of speech error phenomena T.O.T experienced by advanced EFL speakers. *Psychology and Education Journal*, 58(2).
- Alase, A. (2017). The interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA): A guide to a good qualitative research approach. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 5(2), 9–19.
- Baddeley, A. D. (2000). The episodic buffer: A new component of working memory? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 4(11), 417–423.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman.
- Barry, J. C., Ferrer, E., Lerma-Usabiaga, G., & Paz-Alonso, P. M. (2025). Mnemonic factors associated with the tip-of-the-tongue phenomenon. *Scientific Reports*.
- Bevan, M. T. (2014). A method of phenomenological interviewing. *Qualitative Health Research*, 24(1), 136–144.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Brown, A. S. (1991). A review of the tip-of-the-tongue experience. *Psychological Bulletin*, 109(2), 204–223.

- Clark, H. H., & Fox Tree, J. E. (2002). Using uh and um in spontaneous speaking. *Cognition*, 84(1), 73–111.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- de Bot, K. (1992). A bilingual production model: Levelt's "speaking" model adapted. *Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), 1–24.
- Denzin, N. K. (1978). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2018). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Dewi, I. S., & Salikin, H. (2022). The effectiveness of semantic priming in overcoming the tip of the tongue phenomenon. *Kajian Linguistik dan Sastra*, 7(1), 92–107.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2020). *The psychology of the language learner revisited* (pp. 161–175). Routledge.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Scott, M. L. (1997). Communication strategies in a second language: Definitions and taxonomies. *Language Learning*, 47(1), 173–210.
- Dweck, C. S. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. Random House.

- Eysenck, M. W., Derakshan, N., Santos, R., & Calvo, M. G. (2007). Anxiety and cognitive performance: Attentional control theory. *Emotion*, 7(2), 336–353.
- Facal, D., Martínez-Hermida, O., González, M. F., & Juncos-Rabadán, O. (2021). Foreign language training to stimulate cognitive functions: Effects on lexical access and ToT frequency. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 631559.
- Fusch, P. I., & Ness, L. R. (2015). Are we there yet? Data saturation in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report*, 20(9), 1408–1416.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. Basic Books.
- Ghasemi, B., & Mozaheb, M. A. (2021). Developing EFL learners' speaking fluency: Use of practical techniques. *Mextesol Journal*, 45(1).
- Gollan, T. H., Stasenko, A., & Salmon, D. P. (2021). Tip-of-the-tongue states in aging and bilingualism: Frequency, phenomenology, and retrieval failure causes. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 36(5), 531–546.
- Green, D. W. (1998). Mental control of the bilingual lexico-semantic system. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1(2), 67–81.
- Green, D. W., & Abutalebi, J. (2016). Language control and the neuroanatomy of bilingualism: Inhibitory control and beyond. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 31(3).

- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(2), 125–132.
- Indahyanti, R., Rahman, A. W., & Mursidin, M. (2023). Measuring language anxiety of EFL students in public speaking. *Klasikal: Journal of Education, Language Teaching and Science*, 5(1), 196–203.
- Kallio, H., Pietilä, A. M., Johnson, M., & Kangasniemi, M. (2016). Systematic methodological review: Developing a framework for a qualitative semi-structured interview guide. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 72(12), 2954–2965.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon Press.
- Kroll, J. F., & Stewart, E. (1994). Category interference in translation and picture naming: Evidence for asymmetric connections between bilingual memory representations. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 33(2), 149–174.
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Levelt, W. J. M. (1989). *Speaking: From intention to articulation*. The MIT Press.
- Levelt, W. J. M., Roelofs, A., & Meyer, A. S. (1999). A theory of lexical access in speech production. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 22(1), 1–38.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage Publications.

- Liu, Y., & Liu, F. (2025). A psycholinguistic analysis of foreign language anxiety in L2 oral production. *International Journal of Social Science, Management and Economics Research*, 3(6).
- MacIntyre, P. D., Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(4), 545–562.
- MacWhinney, B. (1987). The competition model. In B. MacWhinney (Ed.), *Mechanisms of language acquisition* (pp. 249–308). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Mahmud, M. (2021). Psychological factors affecting EFL students' speaking performance. *ELT Worldwide*, 8(2), 190–202.
- Mailawati, & Sutrisno. (2022). The influence of word stress on EFL learners' TOT state. *Leksema: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra*, 8(2), 65–82.
- Meliyani, Y., Masrupi, M., & Utomo, D. W. (2022). An exploration of Indonesian EFL learners' speaking anxiety. *Linguists: Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching*, 8(2).
- Melka, F. (1997). Receptive vs. productive aspects of vocabulary. In N. Schmitt & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary: Description, acquisition and pedagogy* (pp. 84–102). Cambridge University Press.

- Metcalfe, J., & Schwartz, B. L. (2022). The tip-of-the-tongue state and cognitive control: A metacognitive approach to word retrieval failure. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 26(2), 149–161.
- Miozzo, M., & Caramazza, A. (1997). The relation between syntactic and phonological knowledge in lexical access: Evidence from the tip-of-the-tongue phenomenon. *Cognition*, 64(3), 309–343.
- Mora, J. C., Mora Plaza, I., & Bermejo Miranda, G. (2023). Speaking anxiety and task complexity effects on second language speech. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ningsih, D. K., & Widodo, H. P. (2021). Exploring Indonesian EFL learners' speaking anxiety: A phenomenological study. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 371–380.
- Ningrum, A. S. B., & Toyyibah. (2024). Indonesian EFL learners' motivation: An investigation into online and offline learning in Islamic higher education. *JEELS: Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies*, 11(2).
- Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research.

- Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 42(5), 533–544.
- Pangesti, F., & Prihatini, A. (2020). 'Tip of the Tongue' dalam ujaran penutur asing bahasa Indonesia: Studi kasus mahasiswa BIPA. *Leksema: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra*, 5(2), 201–211.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Pinker, S., & Ullman, M. T. (2002). The past and future of the past tense. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 6(11), 456–463.
- Prihatini, A., & Pangesti, F. (2024). Tip of the Tongue dalam akses leksikal ujaran penutur bahasa Indonesia. *Aksara*, 36(1), 50–67.
- Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (4th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Rousseau, L., & Kashur, N. (2021). Socially shared feelings of imminent recall: More tip-of-the-tongue states are experienced in small groups. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 704433.
- Salsabil, H. A., Lubis, F. A., Ahwani, S., & Lubis, Y. (2026). *Cognitive constraints in foreign language speech production*.
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 129–158.

- Schwartz, B. L., & Metcalfe, J. (2017). Tip-of-the-tongue (TOT) states: Retrieval, behavior, and metacognition. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 26(5), 367–373.
- Schwartz, B. L., & Metcalfe, J. (2021). Tip-of-the-tongue states as windows into metacognition. *Psychological Science*, 32(5), 654–667.
- Shen, E. Q.-L., Friedman, D., Bloom, P. A., & Metcalfe, J. (2022). Alpha suppression is associated with the tip-of-the-tongue (TOT) state. *Journal of Intelligence*, 10(4), 121.
- Skehan, P., & Foster, P. (1997). The influence of planning and post-task activities on accuracy and complexity in task-based learning. *Language Teaching Research*, 1(3), 185–211.
- Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Sage Publications.
- Sugianti, R., Fitria, T. N., & Muniroh, L. (2025). An investigation into Indonesian EFL learners' first and second language identity development. *PAROLE: Journal of Linguistics and Education*, 14(1).
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235–253). Newbury House.

- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of H. G. Widdowson* (pp. 125–144). Oxford University Press.
- Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science*, 12(2), 257–285.
- Ullman, M. T. (2001). The neural basis of lexicon and grammar in first and second language: The declarative/procedural model. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 4(2), 105–122.
- Underwood, B. J. (1957). Interference and forgetting. *Psychological Review*, 64(1), 49–60.
- van Manen, M. (2021). *Phenomenology of practice: Meaning-giving methods in phenomenological research and writing* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychological Review*, 92(4), 548–573.
- Xie, Y., & Wang, L. (2026). The tip-of-the-tongue phenomenon: Cognitive, neural, and neurochemical perspectives. *Biomedicines*, 14(2), 269.
- Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Sage Publications.
- Zareian, G., & Rahimi, A. (2020). The role of cognitive load and lexical retrieval in EFL speaking fluency. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 49(2), 321–335.



# **A P P E N D I X E S**

## Appendix 1. SK Pembimbing



**KEMENTERIAN AGAMA REPUBLIK INDONESIA  
INSTITUT AGAMA ISLAM NEGERI CURUP  
FAKULTAS TARBIYAH**

Alamat : Jalan DR. A.K. Gani No 1 Kotak Pos 108 Curup-Bengkulu Telpn. (0732) 21010  
Fax. (0732) 21010 Homepage <http://www.iaincurup.ac.id> E-Mail : [admin@iaincurup.ac.id](mailto:admin@iaincurup.ac.id).

Nomor : Tahun 2026

- Tentang  
PENUNJUKAN PEMBIMBING I DAN 2 DALAM PENULISAN SKRIPSI  
INSTITUT AGAMA ISLAM NEGERI CURUP
- Menimbang** : a. Bahwa untuk kelancaran penulisan skripsi mahasiswa, perlu ditunjuk dosen Pembimbing I dan II yang bertanggung jawab dalam penyelesaian penulisan yang dimaksud ;  
b. Bahwa saudara yang namanya tercantum dalam Surat Keputusan ini dipandang cakap dan mampu serta memenuhi syarat untuk diserahi tugas sebagai pembimbing I dan II ;
- Mengingat** : 1. Undang-Undang Nomor 20 tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional ;  
2. Peraturan Presiden RI Nomor 24 Tahun 2018 tentang Institut Negeri Islam Curup;  
3. Peraturan Menteri Agama RI Nomor : 30 Tahun 2018 tentang Organisasi dan Tata Kerja Institut Agama Islam Negeri Curup;  
4. Keputusan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional RI Nomor 184/U/2001 tentang Pedoman Pengawasan Pengendalian dan Pembinaan Program Diploma, Sarjana dan Pascasarjana di Perguruan Tinggi;  
5. Keputusan Menteri Agama RI Nomor 019558/B.II/3/2022, tanggal 18 April 2022 tentang Pengangkatan Rektor IAIN Curup Periode 2022 - 2026.  
6. Keputusan Direktur Jenderal Pendidikan Islam Nomor : 3514 Tahun 2016 Tanggal 21 oktober 2016 tentang Izin Penyelenggaraan Program Studi pada Program Sarjana STAIN Curup  
7. Keputusan Rektor IAIN Curup 0704/In.34/R/KP.07.6/09/2023 tanggal 29 September 2023 tentang Pengangkatan Dekan Fakultas Tarbiyah Institut Agama Islam Negeri Curup.
- Memperhatikan** : 1. Permohonan Saudara Fahmi Alfariis tanggal 23 Februari 2026 dan kelengkapan persyaratan pengajuan SK Pembimbing Skripsi  
2. Berita Acara Seminar Proposal Pada Hari Kamis, 10 Juli 2025

**MEMUTUSKAN :**

- Menetapkan**  
**Pertama** : 1. **Dr. Lefli Noviyenti M.Pd** **197611062003122004**  
2. **Dr. Prihantoro, M.Pd.** **197508202008011004**
- Dosen Institut Agama Islam Negeri (IAIN) Curup masing-masing sebagai Pembimbing I dan II dalam penulisan skripsi mahasiswa :  
N A M A : **Fahmi Alfariis**  
N I M : **22551017**  
JUDUL SKRIPSI : **Factors that Trigger Tip of the Tangle Among English Foreign Language Learners**
- Kedua** : Proses bimbingan dilakukan sebanyak 12 kali pembimbing I dan 12 kali pembimbing II dibuktikan dengan kartu bimbingan skripsi ;
- Ketiga** : Pembimbing I bertugas membimbing dan mengarahkan hal-hal yang berkaitan dengan substansi dan konten skripsi. Untuk pembimbing II bertugas dan mengarahkan dalam penggunaan bahasa dan metodologi penulisan ;
- Keempat** : Kepada masing-masing pembimbing diberi honorarium sesuai dengan peraturan yang berlaku ;
- Kelima** : Surat Keputusan ini disampaikan kepada yang bersangkutan untuk diketahui dan dilaksanakan sebagaimana mestinya ;
- Kenam** : Keputusan ini berlaku sejak ditetapkan dan berakhir setelah skripsi tersebut dinyatakan sah oleh IAIN Curup atau masa bimbingan telah mencapai 1 tahun sejak SK ini ditetapkan ;
- Ketujuh** : Apabila terdapat kekeliruan dalam surat keputusan ini, akan diperbaiki sebagaimana mestinya sesuai peraturan yang berlaku.

Ditetapkan di Curup,  
Pada tanggal 23 Februari 2026



- Tembusan :**  
1. Rektor  
2. Bendahara IAIN Curup;  
3. Kabag Akademik kemahasiswaan dan kerja sama;  
4. Mahasiswa yang bersangkutan;

## Appendix 2. Kartu Bimbingan Skripsi 1



### KEMENTERIAN AGAMA REPUBLIK INDONESIA INSTITUT AGAMA ISLAM NEGERI CURUP

Jalan AK Gani No. 01 Kotak Pos 108 Telp. (0732) 21010-21759 Fax. 21010  
Homepage: <http://www.iaincurup.ac.id> Email: [admin@iaincurup.ac.id](mailto:admin@iaincurup.ac.id) Kode Pos 39119

#### KARTU BIMBINGAN SKRIPSI

Nama : **Fahri Alfarissi** Pembimbing I : **Dr. Lefi Novi Yenti, M.Pd**  
NIM : **22551017** Pembimbing II : **Dr. Priantoro, M.Pd**  
Program Studi : **TDI** Akhir Bimbingan :  
Mulai Bimbingan :  
Judul Skripsi : **Factors that trigger TTP of the  
tongue among EFL**

| Pembimbing I |                                          |       | Pembimbing II |                                |       |
|--------------|------------------------------------------|-------|---------------|--------------------------------|-------|
| Tanggal      | Materi Bimbingan                         | Paraf | Tanggal       | Materi Bimbingan               | Paraf |
| 9/12/2026    | Revisi Setelah SMPA bab 3                |       | 9/12/2026     | Revisi Pasca SMPA bab 1-3      |       |
| 12/12/2026   | Pembahasan teori bab 2                   |       | 12/12/2026    | bahas bab 2                    |       |
| 23/12/2026   | Pembahasan metode                        |       | 23/12/2026    | Pembahasan metode              |       |
| 2/1/2027     | Pembahasan teori                         |       | 2/1/2027      | Pembahasan teori               |       |
| 4/1/2027     | Revisi bab 2                             |       | 4/1/2027      | Revisi bab 2                   |       |
| 9/1/2027     | konultasi instrumen                      |       | 9/1/2027      | konultasi instrumen            |       |
| 11/1/2027    | Revisi instrumen                         |       | 11/1/2027     | Revisi instrumen               |       |
| 11/1/2027    | Validasi instrumen                       |       | 11/1/2027     | Validasi instrumen             |       |
| 18/1/2027    | hasil analisis observasi dan interview 1 |       | 18/1/2027     | analisis observasi interview 1 |       |
| 20/1/2027    | hasil analisis observasi interview 2     |       | 20/1/2027     | analisis observasi interview 2 |       |
| 25/1/2027    | Penyusunan bab 4                         |       | 25/1/2027     | Penyusunan bab 4               |       |
| 1/2/2027     | Revisi findings & discussion             |       | 1/2/2027      | Revisi findings & discussion   |       |
| 10/2/2027    | Revisi Bab 4                             |       | 10/2/2027     | Revisi bab 4                   |       |
| 15/2/2027    | Penyusunan bab 5                         |       | 15/2/2027     | Penyusunan bab 5               |       |
| 22/2/2027    | Revisi bab 5                             |       | 22/2/2027     | Revisi bab 5                   |       |
| 28/2/2027    | Revisi bab 5                             |       | 28/2/2027     | Revisi bab 5                   |       |

Pembimbing I,

NIP.1976110620003122004

Curup, ..... 20  
Pembimbing II,

NIP.19750820200811004

- Catatan : 1. Pada saat bimbingan, kartu ini harus diisi dan ditandatangani/Paraf oleh pembimbing  
2. Kartu ini harus diampirkan sebagai syarat pada saat mendaftar sidang  
3. Materi bimbingan tertulis secara terinci tentang hal yang dibimbing

### Appendix 3. Observation Checklist

#### DAFTAR PERIKSA OBSERVASI

Fenomena *Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT)* pada Mahasiswa EFL di IAIN Curup  
Instrumen Penelitian Kualitatif

Lokasi: kelas TB1

Waktu: 11-Mei-2020

Observer: Fahmi Alfarissi

| Aspek                                             | Indikator                                                   | Perilaku yang Dapat Diamati                                                                                                                                                                                                    | Tidak Teramati (subjek) | Kadang Teramati (subjek) | Sering Teramati (subjek) | Catatan |
|---------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------|
| INTERNAL Representasi Leksikal Lemah dalam Memori | Frekuensi & konteks ToT                                     | O1. Siswa tampak mencari kata meskipun konteks percakapan sudah jelas, menunjukkan tanda-tanda nyata dari upaya pengambilan (misalnya, menatap ke atas, berhenti di tengah kalimat, menggerakkan bibir tanpa suara).           |                         | Rapita Zukit             |                          |         |
|                                                   | Akses informasi parsial                                     | O2. Siswa memberikan petunjuk parsial tentang kata target — seperti menunjukkan huruf pertama dengan gestur, mengindikasikan panjang kata dengan jari, atau mendeskripsikan maknanya — tanpa bisa memproduksi kata lengkapnya. |                         |                          |                          |         |
|                                                   | Kekuatan representasi leksikal                              | O3. Siswa menggunakan parafrase atau kata pengganti karena tidak dapat mengambil kata target, menunjukkan bahwa representasi leksikal kata tersebut tidak tersimpan dengan kuat dalam memori jangka panjang.                   |                         |                          |                          |         |
| INTERNAL Kegagalan dalam Pengkodean Fonologis     | Kerusakan selektif: lemma vs. lexeme                        | O4. Siswa tampak mengetahui makna dan kelas kata dari kata target tetapi gagal memproduksi bentuk fonologisnya, menunjukkan kerusakan pada level lexeme sementara level lemma tetap utuh.                                      |                         |                          |                          |         |
|                                                   | Kesenjangan kosakata reseptif vs. produktif                 | O5. Siswa memproduksi kata yang secara semantis dekat tetapi secara fonologis berbeda dari kata target (misalnya, mengatakan 'afraid' alih-alih 'terrified'), menunjukkan bahwa pengetahuan reseptif melebihi akses produktif. |                         |                          |                          |         |
| INTERNAL Beban Kognitif Berlebihan                | Kelebihan beban memori kerja (dikutip dalam Temuan Terkait) | O6. Siswa sering berhenti di tengah kalimat dan tampak sedang 'memproses' sebelum melanjutkan, menunjukkan bahwa tuntutan simultan — memilih kata, membentuk tata bahasa, dan                                                  |                         | Jawesa                   |                          |         |

| Aspek                        | Indikator                                             | Perilaku yang Dapat Diamati                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Tidak Teramati (subjek) | Kadang Teramati (subjek) | Sering Teramati (subjek) | Catatan |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------|
| DAMPAK Kepercayaan Diri      |                                                       | dapat diamati, ketidaktepatan gramatikal, atau pergeseran intonasi, menunjukkan bahwa ToT memengaruhi berbagai dimensi performa berbicara secara bersamaan.                                                                                                                         |                         |                          |                          |         |
|                              | Penurunan kepercayaan diri yang terlihat              | O20. Setelah episode ToT, siswa menunjukkan tanda-tanda nonverbal dari berkurangnya kepercayaan diri — seperti menunduk, berbicara lebih pelan, atau menghela napas — menunjukkan bahwa kesadaran metakognitif atas kegagalan pengambilan melemahkan keyakinan diri saat berbicara. |                         |                          |                          |         |
|                              | Berkurangnya kemauan berkomunikasi                    | O21. Siswa mempersingkat respons mereka, berhenti berbicara lebih awal dari yang diharapkan, atau menolak untuk menjawab secara sukarela setelah mengalami ToT, menunjukkan bahwa fenomena tersebut mengurangi kemauan mereka untuk terlibat lebih jauh dalam komunikasi lisan.     |                         |                          |                          |         |
| DAMPAK Akuisisi Bahasa Kedua | Kelebihan beban metakognitif & kehilangan arah        | O22. Siswa tampak 'terjebak' pada satu kata dan selanjutnya kehilangan benang merah pesan aslinya, mencerminkan bahwa pemantauan otomatis atas kegagalan pengambilan menghabiskan sumber daya kognitif yang dibutuhkan untuk ujaran yang koheren.                                   |                         |                          |                          |         |
|                              | Keluaran leksikal yang terbatas & berulang            | O23. Ujaran siswa sepanjang sesi dicirikan oleh rentang kosakata yang sempit dan berulang, menunjukkan bahwa ToT yang sering membatasi kesempatan untuk mempraktikkan dan memperkuat item leksikal B2 yang lebih luas.                                                              |                         |                          |                          |         |
|                              | Penghindaran topik & leksikal (pendekatan intervensi) | O24. Siswa terlihat menghindari topik tertentu atau dengan sengaja memparafrasekan ide untuk menghindari penggunaan kata-kata yang mungkin memicu ToT, menunjukkan bahwa fenomena tersebut membatasi luasnya output komunikatif dan menghambat akuisisi B2 yang alami.              |                         |                          |                          |         |

| Aspek                       | Indikator                                   | Perilaku yang Dapat Diamati                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Tidak Teramati (subjek) | Kadang Teramati (subjek) | Sering Teramati (subjek) | Catatan |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------|
| DAMPAK Kelancaran Berbicara | Siklus kecemasan negatif                    | O13. Setelah satu episode ToT, ujaran siswa menjadi semakin terganggu — dengan jeda yang lebih sering, lebih banyak keraguan, atau lebih banyak alih kode — menunjukkan bahwa satu insiden ToT meningkatkan kecemasan dan memicu kegagalan pengambilan lebih lanjut.          |                         |                          |                          |         |
|                             | Kontras kecemasan situasional               | O14. Siswa menunjukkan perilaku terkait ToT yang jauh lebih banyak (jeda, pengisi, alih kode) selama tugas formal seperti presentasi atau diskusi kelas penuh dibandingkan interaksi kelompok kecil, menunjukkan bahwa tekanan situasional memperparah kegagalan pengambilan. |                         |                          |                          |         |
|                             | Ketakutan evaluasi negatif                  | O15. Siswa tampak ragu atau membeku ketika disapa langsung oleh dosen atau ketika perhatian kelas diarahkan kepada mereka, menunjukkan bahwa kesadaran akan being evaluated memperkuat keadaan ToT.                                                                           |                         |                          |                          |         |
|                             | Jeda berkepanjangan & salah mulai           | O16. Siswa berhenti lebih dari 3 detik di tengah ujaran atau berulang kali memulai ulang kalimat sebelum menyelesaikannya (false starts), menunjukkan bahwa ToT mengganggu kelancaran produksi ujaran.                                                                        |                         | Zakir                    |                          |         |
|                             | Penggunaan pengisi & pengulangan berlebihan | O17. Siswa menggunakan kata pengisi dalam jumlah berlebihan (misalnya, 'um', 'uh', 'well', 'you know') atau mengulang kata atau frasa yang sama berkali-kali dalam satu ujaran sebagai strategi kompensasi selama ToT.                                                        |                         | Zakir<br>Jawesa          |                          |         |
|                             | Gangguan pemahaman pendengar                | O18. Pendengar (dosen, teman, atau pengamat) menunjukkan tanda-tanda kebingungan atau meminta klarifikasi selama atau setelah ujaran siswa, menunjukkan bahwa ketidaklancaran yang diinduksi ToT telah mengganggu penyampaian pesan yang efektif.                             |                         |                          |                          |         |
|                             | Gangguan berbicara multidimensi             | O19. Di luar kelancaran, episode ToT siswa bertepatan dengan kesalahan pengucapan yang                                                                                                                                                                                        |                         |                          |                          |         |

| Aspek                                      | Indikator                                      | Perilaku yang Dapat Diamati                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | Tidak Teramati (subjek) | Kadang Teramati (subjek) | Sering Teramati (subjek) | Catatan |
|--------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------|
|                                            | Penyederhanaan akibat kelebihan beban kognitif | memantau ujaran — membebani kapasitas memori kerja.<br>O7. Siswa memproduksi kalimat yang terlihat sangat sederhana, tidak lengkap, atau tereduksi secara gramatikal yang tidak mencerminkan tingkat bahasa mereka yang diketahui, menunjukkan bahwa kelebihan beban kognitif menyebabkan penyederhanaan output. |                         |                          |                          |         |
|                                            | Penggunaan pengisi sebagai penyangga kognitif  | O8. Siswa berulang kali menggunakan kata atau frasa pengisi (misalnya, 'um', 'uh', 'you know', 'like') atau mengulang kata atau frasa yang sama sebagai alat penunda sementara mencari kata target.                                                                                                              |                         |                          | Jawes                    |         |
| EKSTERNAL Interferensi Bahasa Pertama (B1) | Dominasi & intrusi B1                          | O9. Siswa menyisipkan kata dalam bahasa Indonesia atau bahasa daerah ke dalam ujaran bahasa Inggris ketika mengalami kesulitan pengambilan, mengindikasikan bahwa B1 yang dominan tidak cukup terhambat selama produksi B2.                                                                                      |                         | Jawes<br>Zakir           |                          |         |
|                                            | Alih kode sebagai respons ToT                  | O10. Siswa sepenuhnya beralih ke bahasa Indonesia di tengah ujaran sebagai strategi yang disengaja untuk mengatasi ToT, kemudian mencoba kembali ke bahasa Inggris — mencerminkan mekanisme kontrol bahasa yang adaptif namun didominasi B1.                                                                     |                         |                          |                          |         |
|                                            | Transfer struktur kalimat B1                   | O11. Siswa menyusun kalimat bahasa Inggris yang mengikuti pola gramatikal bahasa Indonesia (misalnya, menghilangkan artikel, urutan kata yang salah), menunjukkan bahwa dominasi struktural B1 mengganggu formulasi B2.                                                                                          |                         |                          |                          |         |
| EKSTERNAL Kecemasan Berbicara              | Manifestasi kecemasan fisik                    | O12. Siswa menampilkan tanda-tanda fisik kecemasan yang terlihat saat berbicara — seperti tangan atau suara gemetar, menghindari kontak mata, tertawa gugup, atau berkedip cepat — terutama saat mengalami momen ToT.                                                                                            |                         |                          | Jawes                    |         |

## Appendix 4. Interview Codes

### INTERVIEW DATA CODING TABLE

*The Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT) Phenomenon among EFL Students at IAIN Curup*

Approach: Combined (Deductive-Inductive) | Interviewees: Ahmad Zakir Rosadi & Janesa | Interview Date: May 12, 2026

| Data Segment                                                                                                                                | Code                                                             | Sub-Category               | Category                              | Interviewee |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------|
| "I quite often experience something like that, especially when I have to speak spontaneously without any preparation."                      | high ToT frequency in spontaneous speech                         | Frequency & Context of ToT | Weak Lexical Representation in Memory | Ahmad Zakir |
| "It usually happens during class discussions or when the lecturer suddenly calls on me to answer a question."                               | ToT during unprepared classroom speech                           | Frequency & Context of ToT | Weak Lexical Representation in Memory | Ahmad Zakir |
| "Very often, actually. Especially when speaking, particularly right after hearing new explanations from the lecturer. I definitely forget." | very high ToT frequency, especially after lecturer's explanation | Frequency & Context of ToT | Weak Lexical Representation in Memory | Janesa      |
| "It happens when talking with friends, and I also often forget during presentations."                                                       | ToT occurs in two contexts: formal & informal                    | Frequency & Context of ToT | Weak Lexical Representation in Memory | Janesa      |
| "I usually still remember the meaning or intent of the word, but I forget its form in English."                                             | semantic access still present, phonological access fails         | Partial Information Access | Weak Lexical Representation in Memory | Ahmad Zakir |
| "Sometimes I also remember the first letter or how it sounds, but I still can't pronounce it completely."                                   | partial access: first letter & sound recalled                    | Partial Information Access | Weak Lexical Representation in Memory | Ahmad Zakir |
| "It feels like the word is very close in my memory, but hard [to produce]."                                                                 | word feels close but cannot be produced                          | Partial Information Access | Weak Lexical Representation in Memory | Ahmad Zakir |
| "Usually the first thing I do is explain with body movements."                                                                              | body gestures as partial representation of the target word       | Partial Information Access | Weak Lexical Representation in Memory | Janesa      |

| Data Segment                                                                                               | Code                                                               | Sub-Category                            | Category                              | Interviewee |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------|
| "I know the word, I've studied and heard it often, but when I need it, it just disappears."                | weak lexical trace despite the word being familiar                 | Strength of Lexical Representation      | Weak Lexical Representation in Memory | Ahmad Zakir |
| "Even though I had studied it before."                                                                     | old representation not strong enough for production                | Strength of Lexical Representation      | Weak Lexical Representation in Memory | Janesa      |
| "I know the intended meaning of the word, but suddenly I can't recall its form in English."                | intact lemma, lexeme fails to be produced                          | Selective Impairment: Lemma vs. Lexeme  | Phonological Encoding Failure         | Ahmad Zakir |
| "Yes, during a presentation I once felt embarrassed like that, so I switched to Indonesian."               | phonological production failure → code-switching to L1             | Selective Impairment: Lemma vs. Lexeme  | Phonological Encoding Failure         | Janesa      |
| "How to pronounce the word and how its structural form is, which makes me forget to say it."               | difficulty at the phonological and morphological level of the word | Selective Impairment: Lemma vs. Lexeme  | Phonological Encoding Failure         | Janesa      |
| "Words that are rarely used in daily conversation are harder to remember, especially academic vocabulary." | academic/rarely-used vocabulary → weak productive access           | Receptive vs. Productive Vocabulary Gap | Phonological Encoding Failure         | Ahmad Zakir |
| "I understand the meaning when reading, but it's hard to produce it when speaking."                        | receptive comprehension exceeds active production                  | Receptive vs. Productive Vocabulary Gap | Phonological Encoding Failure         | Ahmad Zakir |
| "It's usually formal verbs that are difficult."                                                            | formal verbs harder to produce spontaneously                       | Receptive vs. Productive Vocabulary Gap | Phonological Encoding Failure         | Janesa      |
| "Difficult, especially words I've just heard."                                                             | new polysyllabic words → phonological production more difficult    | Receptive vs. Productive Vocabulary Gap | Phonological Encoding Failure         | Janesa      |
| "There are so many things I think about at the same time. I think about grammar, vocabulary,               | simultaneous processing: grammar +                                 | Working Memory Overload                 | Excessive Cognitive Load              | Ahmad Zakir |

| Data Segment                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Code                                                                       | Sub-Category                        | Category                            | Interviewee |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| <i>pronunciation, and whether I'm conveying my intended meaning or not."</i>                                                                                                                                 | vocabulary +<br>pronunciation +<br>meaning                                 |                                     |                                     |             |
| <i>"Because I think too much, I become slower when speaking."</i>                                                                                                                                            | cognitive overload<br>→ slower speech<br>production                        | Working Memory<br>Overload          | Excessive<br>Cognitive Load         | Ahmad Zakir |
| <i>"It's usually chaotic, panicked, and my heart races too."</i>                                                                                                                                             | chaotic state of<br>mind while<br>searching for a word                     | Working Memory<br>Overload          | Excessive<br>Cognitive Load         | Janesa      |
| <i>"I feel it most often when presenting in front of the class. Besides having to explain the material, I also have to think about pronunciation, grammar, presentation content, and audience response."</i> | multitasking during<br>presentations<br>triggers extreme<br>cognitive load | High-Pressure<br>Context & ToT      | Excessive<br>Cognitive Load         | Ahmad Zakir |
| <i>"If there's a sudden question from the lecturer or a friend, I get even more nervous and experience word loss more often."</i>                                                                            | sudden questions<br>worsen cognitive<br>overload                           | High-Pressure<br>Context & ToT      | Excessive<br>Cognitive Load         | Ahmad Zakir |
| <i>"The situations faced, like presentations, are formal ... for daily communication, it might be when chatting with friends."</i>                                                                           | cognitive load arises<br>in both formal and<br>informal settings           | High-Pressure<br>Context & ToT      | Excessive<br>Cognitive Load         | Janesa      |
| <i>"What comes to mind first is actually the word in Indonesian. After that, I try to translate it into English."</i>                                                                                        | L1 dominance<br>emerges before L2                                          | L1 Dominance &<br>Intrusion         | First Language (L1)<br>Interference | Ahmad Zakir |
| <i>"Sometimes that process makes me slow to speak. There are times when I know the meaning in Indonesian, but find it hard to find the equivalent."</i>                                                      | L1→L2 translation<br>process hinders<br>fluency                            | L1 Dominance &<br>Intrusion         | First Language (L1)<br>Interference | Ahmad Zakir |
| <i>"I sometimes mix in Indonesian so the conversation can continue."</i>                                                                                                                                     | code-switching to L1<br>as a strategy to<br>continue<br>communication      | Code-Switching as<br>a ToT Response | First Language (L1)<br>Interference | Ahmad Zakir |

| Data Segment                                                                                                | Code                                                                  | Sub-Category                                      | Category                         | Interviewee |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------|
| "Switching to Indonesian during presentations ... [due to] nervousness and forgetting."                     | code-switching to L1 triggered by nervousness + forgetting            | Code-Switching as a ToT Response                  | First Language (L1) Interference | Janesa      |
| "When I forget, my focus becomes less ... [I end up] simply replacing it, changing it to Indonesian."       | forgetting a word → giving up, switching directly to L1               | Code-Switching as a ToT Response                  | First Language (L1) Interference | Janesa      |
| "I feel it most often during presentations ... increasingly nervous and experiencing word loss more often." | formal presentations = context of highest situational anxiety         | Situational Anxiety & Fear of Negative Evaluation | Speaking Anxiety                 | Ahmad Zakir |
| "I still often feel nervous and lack confidence. I'm afraid of making grammar or pronunciation mistakes."   | fear of negative evaluation: grammar & pronunciation                  | Situational Anxiety & Fear of Negative Evaluation | Speaking Anxiety                 | Ahmad Zakir |
| "The pressure is strong, so I get nervous and often forget, even though I've already prepared."             | classroom evaluative pressure triggers ToT despite preparation        | Situational Anxiety & Fear of Negative Evaluation | Speaking Anxiety                 | Janesa      |
| "Nervous and afraid of making mistakes."                                                                    | emotional anxiety response during spontaneous speech                  | Situational Anxiety & Fear of Negative Evaluation | Speaking Anxiety                 | Janesa      |
| "Physically, my heart usually beats faster and my hands become somewhat cold or shaky."                     | physical manifestation: racing heart + shaky/cold hands               | Physical & Psychological Anxiety Manifestation    | Speaking Anxiety                 | Ahmad Zakir |
| "I feel panicked and also embarrassed, especially when everyone is watching me."                            | psychological manifestation: panic + embarrassment when being watched | Physical & Psychological Anxiety Manifestation    | Speaking Anxiety                 | Ahmad Zakir |
| "My heart pounds hard too, somewhat."                                                                       | physical manifestation: pounding heart                                | Physical & Psychological Anxiety Manifestation    | Speaking Anxiety                 | Janesa      |
| "After forgetting a word once, I become even more nervous and afraid of forgetting again. As a              | one ToT episode → escalating anxiety →                                | Negative Anxiety Cycle                            | Speaking Anxiety                 | Ahmad Zakir |

| Data Segment                                                                                                                                     | Code                                                                              | Sub-Category                              | Category                   | Interviewee |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------|
| <i>result, I find it even harder to focus."</i>                                                                                                  | subsequent ToT                                                                    |                                           |                            |             |
| <i>"One small moment can affect my performance until the end of the presentation or discussion."</i>                                             | snowball effect of anxiety throughout the speaking session                        | Negative Anxiety Cycle                    | Speaking Anxiety           | Ahmad Zakir |
| <i>"The more anxious it gets ... I just end up continuing to read my notes, it's fine."</i>                                                      | escalating anxiety → escape strategy of relying on notes                          | Negative Anxiety Cycle                    | Speaking Anxiety           | Janesa      |
| <i>"I usually use an easier word or explain its meaning indirectly."</i>                                                                         | simple lexical substitution during ToT                                            | Disruption to Speech Fluency              | Impact on Speaking Fluency | Ahmad Zakir |
| <i>"I usually stay silent first and repeat the previous word again."</i>                                                                         | pausing + repetition as a speech-delay strategy                                   | Disruption to Speech Fluency              | Impact on Speaking Fluency | Janesa      |
| <i>"I prefer to switch to Indonesian."</i>                                                                                                       | message simplification: switching language instead of searching for an equivalent | Simplification of Linguistic Output       | Impact on Speaking Fluency | Janesa      |
| <i>"I felt like I failed at doing the presentation at that time."</i>                                                                            | feeling of failure resulting from switching to L1                                 | Simplification of Linguistic Output       | Impact on Speaking Fluency | Janesa      |
| <i>"It's not just fluency that's disrupted, but also grammar and pronunciation."</i>                                                             | ToT has a multidimensional impact: fluency + grammar + pronunciation              | Impact on Multiple Dimensions of Speaking | Impact on Speaking Fluency | Ahmad Zakir |
| <i>"I once focused too much on finding one word, and ended up using the wrong tense, and the pronunciation of several words became unclear."</i> | ToT causes tense errors & unclear pronunciation                                   | Impact on Multiple Dimensions of Speaking | Impact on Speaking Fluency | Ahmad Zakir |
| <i>"It affects fluency ... once I forget once, it's certain to affect the fluency that follows."</i>                                             | ToT reduces fluency in subsequent speech                                          | Impact on Multiple Dimensions of Speaking | Impact on Speaking Fluency | Janesa      |

| Data Segment                                                                                                                                              | Code                                                                      | Sub-Category                             | Category                              | Interviewee |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------|
| "Sometimes I feel less confident in my speaking ability. I end up often comparing myself with friends who speak more fluently."                           | ToT lowers self-efficacy & triggers social comparison                     | Decline in Speaking Self-Efficacy        | Impact on Self-Confidence             | Ahmad Zakir |
| "It always decreases."                                                                                                                                    | consistent decline in confidence along with ToT frequency                 | Decline in Speaking Self-Efficacy        | Impact on Self-Confidence             | Janesa      |
| "Yes, it also affects my confidence, and my anxiety also rises because of that lack of confidence."                                                       | cycle: ToT → decreased confidence → increased anxiety → more frequent ToT | Decline in Speaking Self-Efficacy        | Impact on Self-Confidence             | Janesa      |
| "The experience of forgetting words sometimes makes me hesitant to be too active in speaking in class. I often fear suddenly going blank while speaking." | avoidance of active participation for fear of going blank                 | Reduced Willingness to Communicate (WTC) | Impact on Self-Confidence             | Ahmad Zakir |
| "I prefer to stay silent or wait for another friend to answer first."                                                                                     | withdrawal from taking a speaking turn                                    | Reduced Willingness to Communicate (WTC) | Impact on Self-Confidence             | Ahmad Zakir |
| "Avoiding eye contact and losing focus."                                                                                                                  | nonverbal withdrawal: avoiding eye contact + losing focus                 | Reduced Willingness to Communicate (WTC) | Impact on Self-Confidence             | Janesa      |
| "I focus too much on remembering one word until I lose the thread of my own point. As a result, I become confused about continuing my explanation."       | metacognitive overload → losing the thread of the message                 | Metacognitive Overload                   | Impact on Self-Confidence             | Ahmad Zakir |
| "I become less brave about trying to use new vocabulary when speaking. As a result, I more often use safe and simple words."                              | ToT hinders the expansion of productive vocabulary                        | Limited Linguistic Output                | Impact on Second Language Acquisition | Ahmad Zakir |
| "In my opinion it affects fluency ... once I forget once, it's certain to                                                                                 | ToT hinders overall speaking fluency                                      | Limited Linguistic Output                | Impact on Second Language             | Janesa      |

| Data Segment                                                                                               | Code                                                                  | Sub-Category                                | Category                              | Interviewee |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------|
| <i>affect the fluency that follows."</i>                                                                   | development                                                           |                                             | Acquisition                           |             |
| <i>"I usually try to do more speaking practice and memorize vocabulary that is frequently used daily."</i> | strategy: speaking practice + memorizing daily vocabulary             | Coping Strategies & Metacognitive Awareness | Impact on Second Language Acquisition | Ahmad Zakir |
| <i>"Trying to speak more relaxed and not thinking too much about grammar."</i>                             | cognitive relaxation strategy: reducing grammar monitoring            | Coping Strategies & Metacognitive Awareness | Impact on Second Language Acquisition | Ahmad Zakir |
| <i>"Preparing more thoroughly."</i>                                                                        | thorough preparation as a preventive strategy against ToT             | Coping Strategies & Metacognitive Awareness | Impact on Second Language Acquisition | Janesa      |
| <i>"Learning to remember by understanding parts rather than memorizing, but truly comprehending."</i>      | deep-understanding strategy > rote memorization for lexical retention | Coping Strategies & Metacognitive Awareness | Impact on Second Language Acquisition | Janesa      |

Note: Data segments are direct quotations from the interview transcripts (shown in italics). Codes are derived from the interviewees' own words (inductive). Sub-Categories & Categories are derived from the aspects of the interview instrument (deductive).

## pendix 5. Instrument

### PANDUAN WAWANCARA

*Fenomena Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT) pada Mahasiswa EFL di IAIN Curup*

*Instrumen Penelitian Kualitatif*

| Aspek                                             | Indikator               | Sub-Indikator                             |  | Item Pertanyaan & Dasar Teoretis                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|---------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| INTERNAL Representasi Leksikal Lemah dalam Memori | Frekuensi & Konteks ToT | Tingkat kejadian ToT dalam ujaran spontan |  | <p>Q1.a. Seberapa sering Anda tiba-tiba lupa kata bahasa Inggris yang sebenarnya Anda ketahui saat sedang berbicara?</p> <p>Q1.b. Ceritakan situasi saat hal itu biasanya terjadi!</p> <p>Q2. Seberapa sering Anda aktif menggunakan bahasa Inggris di luar kelas? Apakah menurut Anda hal ini memengaruhi kemampuan Anda berbicara secara spontan?</p> <p><i>{Fahmi, di bagian ini pertanyaannya masih numpuk dua hal sekaligus, yaitu frekuensi pakai bahasa Inggris sama dampaknya ke kemampuan spontan. Jadi, berpotensi bikin responden bingung atau jawabannya nggak fokus. Selain itu, bagian "do you think it affects..." terlalu analitis, jadi responden dipaksa mikir sebab-akibat,</i></p> |

| Aspek | Indikator | Sub-Indikator |  | Item Pertanyaan & Dasar Teoretis                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|-------|-----------|---------------|--|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|       |           |               |  | <p><i>padahal di fenomenologi kita lebih butuh cerita pengalaman langsung. Coba dipisah jadi dua pertanyaan dan diarahkan ke pengalaman nyata, misalnya minta mereka cerita kapan dan bagaimana mereka pakai bahasa Inggris, lalu baru gali perasaan atau pengalaman mereka saat ngomong spontan.}</i></p> <p><i>Contoh pertanyaan yang ideal:</i></p> <p>Q2.a. Seberapa sering Anda menggunakan bahasa Inggris di luar kelas?</p> <p>Q2.b. Ceritakan dalam situasi apa saja Anda biasanya menggunakannya!</p> <p>Q2.c. Ketika menggunakan bahasa Inggris dalam situasi tersebut, bagaimana perasaan Anda saat berbicara secara spontan?</p> |

| Aspek | Indikator               | Sub-Indikator                                          |  | Item Pertanyaan & Dasar Teoretis                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|-------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|--|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|       | Akses Informasi Parsial | Akses fonologis & semantik residual saat mengalami ToT |  | <p>Q3. Ketika Anda mengalami momen ToT, informasi apa tentang kata tersebut yang masih bisa Anda ingat? Misalnya, huruf pertama, makna, panjang kata, atau jumlah suku kata?</p> <p><i>{Pertanyaan ini sebenarnya bagus secara teori, tapi terlalu "mengarahkan" karena langsung memberikan contoh detail seperti huruf awal, suku kata, dll, sehingga responden bisa hanya mengikuti opsi tersebut saja, bukan menceritakan pengalaman mereka sendiri. Dalam fenomenologi, lebih baik dibuka dulu secara umum, agar mereka bebas bercerita apa yang mereka alami, baru kalau perlu Fahmi probing pelan-pelan. Jadi intinya, kurangi leading dan beri ruang jawaban yang lebih</i></p> |

| Aspek | Indikator                      | Sub-Indikator                                                     | Item Pertanyaan & Dasar Teoretis                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|-------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|       |                                |                                                                   | <p><i>natural.}</i></p> <p><i>Contoh pertanyaan ideal:</i><br/> Q3. Ketika Anda mengalami momen di mana tidak bisa mengingat suatu kata, apa yang masih Anda ingat tentang kata tersebut?<br/> (Probe jika diperlukan:<br/> Misalnya, apakah Anda mengingat sesuatu tentang cara pengucapannya atau artinya?<br/> Ceritakan lebih lanjut!)</p> |
|       | Kekuatan Representasi Leksikal | Kesiapan leksikal self-assessed untuk produksi B2 tanpa persiapan | <p>Q4. Apakah Anda merasa kosakata bahasa Inggris Anda cukup kuat untuk mendukung komunikasi spontan tanpa persiapan?<br/> Mengapa atau mengapa tidak?</p> <p><i>{Pertanyaan ini terlalu abstrak dan lebih ke penilaian diri secara umum, bukan pengalaman konkret, jadi kurang cocok untuk pendekatan fenomenologi.</i></p>                   |

| Aspek                                         | Indikator                            | Sub-Indikator                                                              |  | Item Pertanyaan & Dasar Teoretis                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                               |                                      |                                                                            |  | <p><i>Responden bisa menjawab secara normatif tanpa benar-benar menceritakan kejadian nyata. Lebih baik Fahmi arahkan ke pengalaman spesifik, misalnya minta mereka menceritakan kejadian tertentu saat harus berbicara tanpa persiapan, lalu gali kesulitannya.}</i></p> <p><i>Contoh pertanyaan ideal:</i><br/> Q4.a. Ceritakan sebuah kondisi saat Anda mencoba berbicara bahasa Inggris tanpa persiapan!<br/> Q4.b. Kesulitan apa yang Anda alami pada saat itu?</p> |
| INTERNAL Kegagalan dalam Pengkodean Fonologis | Kerusakan Selektif: Lemma vs. Lexeme | Akses level lemma yang utuh dengan kegagalan output fonologis level lexeme |  | <p>Q5. Pernahkah Anda benar-benar tahu arti suatu kata — bahkan kelas katanya (kata benda, kata kerja, kata sifat) — tetapi tetap tidak dapat mengucapkan bunyinya? Bisakah Anda menggambarkan pengalaman</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |

| Aspek | Indikator                         | Sub-Indikator                    |  | Item Pertanyaan & Dasar Teoretis                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|-------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|       |                                   |                                  |  | <p>tersebut?</p> <p><i>{Ini terlalu berat secara istilah karena masuk ke konsep linguistik seperti word class, yang belum tentu dipahami mahasiswa. Jadi ada risiko mereka bingung atau jawabannya tidak natural. Lebih aman pakai bahasa sehari-hari saja, fokus ke pengalaman "tahu tapi tidak bisa mengucapkan", karena itu sebenarnya sudah mewakili konsep teorinya tanpa harus disebutkan.}</i></p> <p><i>Contoh</i><br/> <i>Pertanyaan ideal:</i><br/>           Q5.a. Pernahkah Anda dengan jelas mengetahui apa yang ingin Anda katakan dalam bahasa Inggris, tetapi tiba-tiba tidak bisa mengucapkan katanya?<br/>           Q5.b. Apa yang terjadi pada saat itu?</p> |
|       | Kesenjangan Kosakata Reseptif vs. | Kelemahan akses produktif akibat |  | Q6. Apakah ToT lebih sering terjadi pada kata-kata                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |

| Aspek                                 | Indikator                    | Sub-Indikator                                   |  | Item Pertanyaan & Dasar Teoretis                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                       | Produktif                    | rendahnya output B2                             |  | <p>yang sering Anda dengar atau baca tetapi jarang Anda gunakan sendiri saat berbicara?</p> <p><i>{Pertanyaan ini adalah yes/no Question, sehingga tidak ada probing lebih untuk mendapat data lebih mendalam.}</i></p> <p><i>Contoh pertanyaan ideal:</i><br/>Q6. Jenis kata bahasa Inggris apa yang menurut Anda sulit untuk diingat saat berbicara?<br/>(Probe: Apakah kata-kata tersebut sering Anda dengar atau baca tetapi jarang Anda gunakan sendiri?)</p> |
| INTERNAL<br>Beban Kognitif Berlebihan | Kelebihan Beban Memori Kerja | Beban pemrosesan multitasking dalam produksi B2 |  | <p>Q7. Saat berbicara bahasa Inggris, apa yang Anda pikirkan secara bersamaan?<br/>Misalnya, memilih kata, membentuk kalimat, mengorganisir ide, dan memantau pengucapan Anda?</p> <p><i>{Pertanyaan ini</i></p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |

| Aspek | Indikator                       | Sub-Indikator                                                           |  | Item Pertanyaan & Dasar Teoretis                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|-------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|       |                                 |                                                                         |  | <p><i>terlalu padat dan penuh daftar, sehingga bisa membuat responden kewalahan dan jawabannya menjadi dangkal. Fahmi sebenarnya ingin menggali cognitive load, tapi jangan disajikan sebagai daftar proses. Lebih baik dibuat sederhana dan reflektif, agar mereka menceritakan apa yang mereka rasakan di pikiran saat berbicara.}</i></p> <p><i>Contoh pertanyaan ideal:</i><br/> Q7.a. Ketika Anda sedang berbicara bahasa Inggris, apa yang biasanya ada di pikiran Anda?<br/> Q7.b. Apakah Anda merasa mudah atau sulit mengelola semua hal tersebut sambil berbicara? Ceritakan!</p> |
|       | Konteks Bertekanan Tinggi & ToT | Kelebihan beban kognitif bergantung konteks saat tugas berbicara formal |  | Q8. Apakah Anda mengalami ToT lebih sering ketika harus berbicara sambil mengelola berbagai tuntutan sekaligus, seperti saat presentasi di                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |

| Aspek                                      | Indikator             | Sub-Indikator                                         |  | Item Pertanyaan & Dasar Teoretis                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                            |                       |                                                       |  | <p>kelas atau diskusi kelompok besar?</p> <p>[Dipertahankan]</p> <p><i>{Ini adalah yes/no Question. Dalam fenomenologi, meski kita mengajukan yes/no Question, kita butuh probing lebih. Bahkan selain bertanya, kita bisa meminta partisipan untuk bercerita!}</i></p> <p><i>Contoh pertanyaan ideal:</i></p> <p>Q8. Ceritakan situasi-situasi di mana Anda merasa kesulitan berbicara bahasa Inggris karena harus mengelola banyak hal sekaligus?</p> <p>(Probe: seperti saat presentasi atau diskusi kelompok)</p> |
| EKSTERNAL Interferensi Bahasa Pertama (B1) | Dominasi & Intrusi B1 | Penghambatan B1 yang tidak memadai selama produksi B2 |  | <p>Q9. Saat mencari kata bahasa Inggris, apakah kata dalam bahasa Indonesia atau bahasa daerah cenderung muncul lebih dulu di pikiran — dan sejauh mana Anda pikir kebiasaan berpikir dalam bahasa</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |

| Aspek | Indikator | Sub-Indikator | Item Pertanyaan & Dasar Teoretis                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|-------|-----------|---------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|       |           |               | <p>Indonesia memengaruhi kesulitan Anda mengambil kata bahasa Inggris saat berbicara?</p> <p><i>{Di sini bahkan ada 3 ide yang ditanyakan tapi dikemas dalam satu kali ujaran tanya. Bahkan terkesan multiple-barreled. Sebaiknya Fahmi pisahkan menjadi pertanyaan induk dan beberapa pertanyaan probing, pertanyaan tambahan untuk menggali isu lebih dalam.}</i></p> <p><i>Contoh pertanyaan ideal:</i><br/> Q9. Ceritakan apa yang terjadi di pikiran Anda ketika Anda mencoba menemukan kata bahasa Inggris saat berbicara!<br/> (Probe 1: Apakah kata-kata dalam bahasa Indonesia atau bahasa daerah muncul di pikiran Anda pada saat itu?)<br/> (Probe 2: Apa yang biasanya</p> |

| Aspek                            | Indikator                                          | Sub-Indikator                                                         |  | Item Pertanyaan & Dasar Teoretis                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                  |                                                    |                                                                       |  | Anda lakukan ketika hal itu terjadi?)<br>(Probe 3: Apakah Anda merasa hal itu membuat Anda semakin sulit menemukan kata bahasa Inggris? Mengapa?)                                                                                                                                          |
|                                  | Alih Kode sebagai Respons ToT                      | Perilaku beralih bahasa di bawah tekanan dominasi B1                  |  | Q10. Pernahkah Anda beralih ke bahasa Indonesia saat mengalami momen ToT?<br>(Probe 1: Apa yang mendorong Anda melakukan itu?)<br>(Probe 2: Bagaimana respons lawan bicara Anda terhadap hal tersebut?)                                                                                    |
| EKSTERNAL<br>Kecemasan Berbicara | Kecemasan Situasional & Ketakutan Evaluasi Negatif | Tekanan situasional dan ancaman evaluatif sebagai pemicu ToT gabungan |  | Q11. Apakah Anda mengalami ToT lebih sering saat berbicara di depan kelas atau dosen dibandingkan percakapan santai dengan teman — dan apakah ketakutan dinilai negatif berperan dalam hal itu?<br><br><i>{Ini juga masih double-barreled dan agak leading karena langsung menyebutkan</i> |

| Aspek | Indikator                                | Sub-Indikator                                      |  | Item Pertanyaan & Dasar Teoretis                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|-------|------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|       |                                          |                                                    |  | <p><i>"fear of being judged", sehingga responden bisa terarah ke sana meskipun mungkin bukan pengalaman utama mereka. Sebaiknya dipisah menjadi dua: satu soal konteks (formal vs santai), satu lagi soal perasaan. Dengan begitu jawabannya lebih jujur dan tidak bias.}</i></p> <p><i>Contoh pertanyaan ideal:</i><br/> Q11.a. Apakah Anda mengalami lupa kata lebih sering saat berbicara di depan kelas atau saat berbicara dengan teman? Ceritakan!<br/> Q11.b. Bagaimana perasaan Anda saat berbicara di depan orang lain?</p> |
|       | Manifestasi Kecemasan Fisik & Psikologis | Respons fisiologis dan afektif internal selama ToT |  | <p>Q12. Apa yang Anda rasakan secara fisik dan psikologis ketika Anda tiba-tiba tidak bisa menemukan kata saat berbicara? Misalnya, jantung berdebar, kencang, panik,</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |

| Aspek                       | Indikator                          | Sub-Indikator                                                       |  | Item Pertanyaan & Dasar Teoretis                                                                                                                                                                         |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|--|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                             |                                    |                                                                     |  | atau dorongan untuk diam?                                                                                                                                                                                |
|                             | Siklus Kecemasan Negatif           | Siklus kecemasan-ToT rekursif dalam satu sesi berbicara             |  | Q13. Setelah mengalami satu momen ToT dalam sesi berbicara, apakah Anda mendapati diri Anda menjadi semakin cemas dan mengalami lebih banyak insiden ToT dalam sesi yang sama? Jelaskan!                 |
| DAMPAK Kelancaran Berbicara | Gangguan pada Kelancaran Ujaran    | Perilaku ketidaklancaran dan dampak pemahaman pendengar             |  | Q14. Apa yang biasanya Anda lakukan ketika mengalami ToT di tengah percakapan atau presentasi? Misalnya, berhenti dalam waktu lama, mengulang kata, atau menggunakan pengisi seperti 'um' atau 'uh'?     |
|                             | Penyederhanaan Keluaran Linguistik | Respons emosional terhadap penyederhanaan pesan yang disebabkan ToT |  | Q15. Ketika Anda tidak bisa menemukan kata yang tepat saat berbicara, apakah Anda akhirnya menyederhanakan atau mengubah pesan yang ingin Anda sampaikan — dan bagaimana perasaan Anda tentang kemampuan |

| Aspek | Indikator            | Sub-Indikator     |  | Item Pertanyaan & Dasar Teoretis                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|-------|----------------------|-------------------|--|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|       |                      |                   |  | <p>mengekspresikan diri dalam bahasa Inggris?</p> <p><i>{Di sini Fahmi menggabungkan strategi dan perasaan dalam satu pertanyaan, sehingga responden bisa menjawab setengah-setengah. Padahal keduanya penting. Lebih baik dipisah agar Fahmi bisa menggali strategi komunikasi mereka dulu, baru emosi atau perasaan setelahnya.}</i></p> <p><i>Contoh pertanyaan ideal:</i></p> <p>Q15.a. Ketika Anda tidak bisa menemukan kata yang tepat, apa yang biasanya Anda lakukan untuk tetap melanjutkan berbicara?</p> <p>Q15.b. Bagaimana perasaan Anda ketika harus mengubah pesan Anda?</p> |
|       | Dampak pada Berbagai | Gangguan performa |  | Q16. Di luar kelancaran,                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |

| Aspek | Indikator         | Sub-Indikator                               |  | Item Pertanyaan & Dasar Teoretis                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|-------|-------------------|---------------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|       | Dimensi Berbicara | multidimensi di berbagai komponen berbicara |  | <p>apakah ToT juga memengaruhi aspek lain dari berbicara Anda, seperti pengucapan, ketepatan tata bahasa, atau seberapa jelas pesan Anda tersampaikan kepada pendengar?</p> <p><i>{Ini secara teknis belum selesai (tidak ada tanda tanya), dan isinya masih terlalu umum. Jika dibiarkan, responden bisa menjawab sangat singkat. Lebih baik Fahmi buka dengan pertanyaan umum lalu langsung minta contoh agar datanya lebih kaya.}</i></p> <p><i>Contoh pertanyaan ideal:</i><br/> Q16.a. Selain kelancaran, apakah Anda merasa lupa kata memengaruhi aspek lain dari berbicara Anda? Ceritakan!<br/> Q16.b. Berikan contoh!</p> |

| Aspek                   | Indikator                                | Sub-Indikator                                                      |  | Item Pertanyaan & Dasar Teoretis                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| DAMPAK Kepercayaan Diri | Penurunan Self-Efficacy Berbicara        | Efek beban metakognitif pada penilaian diri seiring waktu          |  | Q17. Bagaimana perasaan Anda tentang kemampuan berbicara bahasa Inggris setelah berulang kali mengalami ToT? (Probe: Apakah kepercayaan diri Anda sebagai pembicara bahasa Inggris telah menurun seiring waktu?)                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|                         | Berkurangnya Kemauan Berkomunikasi (WTC) | Penarikan diri dari partisipasi dan penghindaran situasi berbicara |  | <p>Q18. Apakah mengalami ToT membuat Anda kurang mau berbicara atau berpartisipasi di kelas — dan pernahkah Anda sengaja menghindari situasi berbicara tertentu karena hal itu?</p> <p><i>{Pertanyaan ini masih yes/no Question dan memberi peluang partisipan menjawab singkat sehingga kurang data. Sebaiknya dibuat pertanyaan utama dan probing.}</i></p> <p><i>Contoh pertanyaan ideal:</i><br/>Q18. Ceritakan</p> |

| Aspek                        | Indikator                         | Sub-Indikator                                                                   |  | Item Pertanyaan & Dasar Teoretis                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                              |                                   |                                                                                 |  | bagaimana pengalaman lupa kata memengaruhi partisipasi Anda dalam kegiatan berbicara?<br>(Probe: Pernahkah Anda menghindari situasi tertentu karena hal ini? Apa yang terjadi?)                                                                                         |
|                              | Kelebihan Beban Metakognitif      | Pengambilalihan perhatian oleh pemantauan pengambilan selama ujaran berlangsung |  | Q19. Ketika mengalami ToT, apakah Anda menjadi begitu fokus mencoba mengingat kata tersebut sehingga Anda kehilangan jejak pesan utama yang semula ingin Anda sampaikan? Ceritakan lebih lanjut!                                                                        |
| DAMPAK Akuisisi Bahasa Kedua | Keluaran Linguistik yang Terbatas | Akuisisi B2 yang suboptimal akibat hilangnya kesempatan produksi                |  | <i>Q19. [Catatan: Ini seharusnya nomor 20. Sesuaikan penomoran selanjutnya.]</i><br>Apakah Anda merasa bahwa sering mengalami ToT telah menghambat perkembangan Anda secara keseluruhan sebagai pembicara bahasa Inggris? Jelaskan berdasarkan pengalaman pribadi Anda. |

| Aspek | Indikator                                    | Sub-Indikator                                                              |  | Item Pertanyaan & Dasar Teoretis                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|-------|----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|       |                                              |                                                                            |  | <p><i>{Bagian ini agak keluar dari fokus research question Fahmi, karena masuk ke perkembangan bahasa secara umum (SLA), sementara RQ Fahmi fokus ke faktor dan dampak pada speaking &amp; confidence. Kalau mau dipakai, lebih baik tetap ditarik ke konteks speaking saja, agar tetap konsisten dan tidak melebar.}</i></p> <p><i>Contoh pertanyaan ideal:</i><br/> Q20.a. Apakah Anda merasa bahwa mengalami tip of tongue memengaruhi kemajuan Anda dalam berbicara bahasa Inggris?<br/> Q20.b. Dalam hal apa?</p> |
|       | Strategi Penanganan & Kesadaran Metakognitif | Penggunaan strategi leksikal dan kesadaran reflektif tentang manajemen ToT |  | Q20.a. Apakah Anda memiliki strategi tertentu untuk mengatasi atau mencegah ToT saat berbicara?<br>Jelaskan!<br>Q20.b. Strategi mana yang                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |

| Aspek | Indikator | Sub-Indikator |  | Item Pertanyaan & Dasar Teoretis          |
|-------|-----------|---------------|--|-------------------------------------------|
|       |           |               |  | menurut Anda paling membantu dan mengapa? |

### DAFTAR PERIKSA OBSERVASI

*Fenomena Tip-of-the-Tongue (ToT) pada Mahasiswa EFL di IAIN Curup*  
*Instrumen Penelitian Kualitatif*

| Aspek                                             | Indikator                          | Perilaku yang Dapat Diamati                                                                                                                                                                                          | Tidak Teramati | Kadang Teramati | Sering Teramati | Catatan |
|---------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------|
| INTERNAL Representasi Leksikal Lemah dalam Memori | <b>Frekuensi &amp; konteks ToT</b> | O1. Siswa tampak mencari kata meskipun konteks percakapan sudah jelas, menunjukkan tanda-tanda nyata dari upaya pengambilan (misalnya, menatap ke atas, berhenti di tengah kalimat, menggerakkan bibir tanpa suara). | ( )            | ( )             | ( )             |         |
|                                                   | <b>Akses informasi parsial</b>     | O2. Siswa memberikan petunjuk parsial tentang kata target — seperti menunjukkan huruf pertama dengan gestur, mengindikasikan panjang kata dengan jari, atau mendeskripsi                                             | ( )            | ( )             | ( )             |         |

| Aspek                                            | Indikator                                   | Perilaku yang Dapat Diamati                                                                                                                                                                                  | Tidak Teramati | Kadang Teramati | Sering Teramati | Catatan |
|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------|
|                                                  |                                             | kan maknanya — tanpa bisa memproduksi kata lengkapnya.                                                                                                                                                       |                |                 |                 |         |
|                                                  | <b>Kekuatan representasi leksikal</b>       | O3. Siswa menggunakan parafrase atau kata pengganti karena tidak dapat mengambil kata target, menunjukkan bahwa representasi leksikal kata tersebut tidak tersimpan dengan kuat dalam memori jangka panjang. | ( )            | ( )             | ( )             |         |
| INTERNAL<br>Kegagalan dalam Pengkodean Fonologis | <b>Kerusakan selektif: lemma vs. lexeme</b> | O4. Siswa tampak mengetahui makna dan kelas kata dari kata target tetapi gagal memproduksi bentuk fonologisnya, menunjukkan kerusakan pada level lexeme sementara level lemma                                | ( )            | ( )             | ( )             |         |

| Aspek                              | Indikator                                                          | Perilaku yang Dapat Diamati                                                                                                                                                                                                    | Tidak Teramati | Kadang Teramati | Sering Teramati | Catatan |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------|
|                                    |                                                                    | tetap utuh.                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |                |                 |                 |         |
|                                    | <b>Kesenjangan kosakata reseptif vs. produktif</b>                 | O5. Siswa memproduksi kata yang secara semantis dekat tetapi secara fonologis berbeda dari kata target (misalnya, mengatakan 'afraid' alih-alih 'terrified'), menunjukkan bahwa pengetahuan reseptif melebihi akses produktif. | ( )            | ( )             | ( )             |         |
| INTERNAL Beban Kognitif Berlebihan | <b>Kelebihan beban memori kerja (dikutip dalam Temuan Terkait)</b> | O6. Siswa sering berhenti di tengah kalimat dan tampak sedang 'memproses' sebelum melanjutkan, menunjukkan bahwa tuntutan simultan — memilih kata, membentuk tata bahasa, dan memantau ujaran —                                | ( )            | ( )             | ( )             |         |

| Aspek | Indikator                                             | Perilaku yang Dapat Diamati                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | Tidak Teramati | Kadang Teramati | Sering Teramati | Catatan |
|-------|-------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------|
|       |                                                       | membebani kapasitas memori kerja.                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                |                 |                 |         |
|       | <b>Penyederhanaan akibat kelebihan beban kognitif</b> | O7. Siswa memproduksi kalimat yang terlihat sangat sederhana, tidak lengkap, atau tereduksi secara gramatikal yang tidak mencerminkan tingkat bahasa mereka yang diketahui, menunjukkan bahwa kelebihan beban kognitif menyebabkan penyederhanaan output. | ( )            | ( )             | ( )             |         |
|       | <b>Penggunaan pengisi sebagai penyangga kognitif</b>  | O8. Siswa berulang kali menggunakan kata atau frasa pengisi (misalnya, 'um', 'uh', 'you know', 'like') atau mengulang kata atau frasa yang sama sebagai alat penunda sementara mencari kata                                                               | ( )            | ( )             | ( )             |         |

| Aspek                                      | Indikator                            | Perilaku yang Dapat Diamati                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Tidak Teramati | Kadang Teramati | Sering Teramati | Catatan |
|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------|
|                                            |                                      | target.                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |                |                 |                 |         |
| EKSTERNAL Interferensi Bahasa Pertama (B1) | <b>Dominasi &amp; intrusi B1</b>     | O9. Siswa menyisipkan kata dalam bahasa Indonesia atau bahasa daerah ke dalam ujaran bahasa Inggris ketika mengalami kesulitan pengambilan, mengindikasikan bahwa B1 yang dominan tidak cukup terhambat selama produksi B2. | ( )            | ( )             | ( )             |         |
|                                            | <b>Alih kode sebagai respons ToT</b> | O10. Siswa sepenuhnya beralih ke bahasa Indonesia di tengah ujaran sebagai strategi yang disengaja untuk mengatasi ToT, kemudian mencoba kembali ke bahasa Inggris — mencerminkan mekanisme kontrol bahasa yang             | ( )            | ( )             | ( )             |         |

| Aspek                            | Indikator                           | Perilaku yang Dapat Diamati                                                                                                                                                                                             | Tidak Teramati | Kadang Teramati | Sering Teramati | Catatan |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------|
|                                  |                                     | adaptif namun didominasi B1.                                                                                                                                                                                            |                |                 |                 |         |
|                                  | <b>Transfer struktur kalimat B1</b> | O11. Siswa menyusun kalimat bahasa Inggris yang mengikuti pola gramatikal bahasa Indonesia (misalnya, menghilangkan artikel, urutan kata yang salah), menunjukkan bahwa dominasi struktural B1 mengganggu formulasi B2. | ( )            | ( )             | ( )             |         |
| EKSTERNAL<br>Kecemasan Berbicara | <b>Manifestasi kecemasan fisik</b>  | O12. Siswa menampilkan tanda-tanda fisik kecemasan yang terlihat saat berbicara — seperti tangan atau suara gemetar, menghindari kontak mata, tertawa gugup, atau berkedip cepat — terutama saat                        | ( )            | ( )             | ( )             |         |

| Aspek | Indikator                            | Perilaku yang Dapat Diamati                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | Tidak Teramati | Kadang Teramati | Sering Teramati | Catatan |
|-------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------|
|       |                                      | mengalami momen ToT.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                |                 |                 |         |
|       | <b>Siklus kecemasan negatif</b>      | O13. Setelah satu episode ToT, ujaran siswa menjadi semakin terganggu — dengan jeda yang lebih sering, lebih banyak keraguan, atau lebih banyak alih kode — menunjukkan bahwa satu insiden ToT meningkatkan kecemasan dan memicu kegagalan pengambilan lebih lanjut. | ( )            | ( )             | ( )             |         |
|       | <b>Kontras kecemasan situasional</b> | O14. Siswa menunjukkan perilaku terkait ToT yang jauh lebih banyak (jeda, pengisi, alih kode) selama tugas formal seperti presentasi atau diskusi kelas penuh dibandingkan interaksi kelompok kecil,                                                                 | ( )            | ( )             | ( )             |         |

| Aspek                       | Indikator                                    | Perilaku yang Dapat Diamati                                                                                                                                                                         | Tidak Teramati | Kadang Teramati | Sering Teramati | Catatan |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------|
|                             |                                              | menunjukkan bahwa tekanan situasional memperparah kegagalan pengambilan.                                                                                                                            |                |                 |                 |         |
|                             | <b>Ketakutan evaluasi negatif</b>            | O15. Siswa tampak ragu atau membeku ketika disapa langsung oleh dosen atau ketika perhatian kelas diarahkan kepada mereka, menunjukkan bahwa kesadaran akan being evaluated memperkuat keadaan ToT. | ( )            | ( )             | ( )             |         |
| DAMPAK Kelancaran Berbicara | <b>Jeda berkepanjangan &amp; salah mulai</b> | O16. Siswa berhenti lebih dari 3 detik di tengah ujaran atau berulang kali memulai ulang kalimat sebelum menyelesaikannya (false starts), menunjukkan bahwa ToT mengganggu kelancaran               | ( )            | ( )             | ( )             |         |

| Aspek | Indikator                                              | Perilaku yang Dapat Diamati                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Tidak Teramati | Kadang Teramati | Sering Teramati | Catatan |
|-------|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------|
|       |                                                        | produksi ujaran.                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                |                 |                 |         |
|       | <b>Penggunaan pengisi &amp; pengulangan berlebihan</b> | O17. Siswa menggunakan kata pengisi dalam jumlah berlebihan (misalnya, 'um', 'uh', 'well', 'you know') atau mengulang kata atau frasa yang sama berkali-kali dalam satu ujaran sebagai strategi kompensasi selama ToT.        | ( )            | ( )             | ( )             |         |
|       | <b>Gangguan pemahaman pendengar</b>                    | O18. Pendengar (dosen, teman, atau pengamat) menunjukkan tanda-tanda kebingungan atau meminta klarifikasi selama atau setelah ujaran siswa, menunjukkan bahwa ketidaklancaran yang diinduksi ToT telah mengganggu penyampaian | ( )            | ( )             | ( )             |         |

| Aspek                   | Indikator                                       | Perilaku yang Dapat Diamati                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | Tidak Teramati | Kadang Teramati | Sering Teramati | Catatan |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------|
|                         |                                                 | pesan yang efektif.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |                |                 |                 |         |
|                         | <b>Gangguan berbicara multidimensi</b>          | O19. Di luar kelancaran, episode ToT siswa bertepatan dengan kesalahan pengucapan yang dapat diamati, ketidaktepatan gramatikal, atau pergeseran intonasi, menunjukkan bahwa ToT memengaruhi berbagai dimensi performa berbicara secara bersamaan. | ( )            | ( )             | ( )             |         |
| DAMPAK Kepercayaan Diri | <b>Penurunan kepercayaan diri yang terlihat</b> | O20. Setelah episode ToT, siswa menunjukkan tanda-tanda nonverbal dari berkurangnya kepercayaan diri — seperti menunduk, berbicara lebih pelan, atau menghela napas — menunjukkan                                                                  | ( )            | ( )             | ( )             |         |

| Aspek | Indikator                                 | Perilaku yang Dapat Diamati                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Tidak Teramati | Kadang Teramati | Sering Teramati | Catatan |
|-------|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------|
|       |                                           | bahwa kesadaran metakognitif atas kegagalan pengambilan melemahkan keyakinan diri saat berbicara.                                                                                                                                                                               |                |                 |                 |         |
|       | <b>Berkurangnya kemauan berkomunikasi</b> | O21. Siswa mempersingkat respons mereka, berhenti berbicara lebih awal dari yang diharapkan, atau menolak untuk menjawab secara sukarela setelah mengalami ToT, menunjukkan bahwa fenomena tersebut mengurangi kemauan mereka untuk terlibat lebih jauh dalam komunikasi lisan. | ( )            | ( )             | ( )             |         |
|       | <b>Kelebihan beban metakognitif &amp;</b> | O22. Siswa tampak 'terjebak' pada satu                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | ( )            | ( )             | ( )             |         |

| Aspek                        | Indikator                                             | Perilaku yang Dapat Diamati                                                                                                                                                                                            | Tidak Teramati | Kadang Teramati | Sering Teramati | Catatan |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------|
|                              | <b>kehilangan arah</b>                                | kata dan selanjutnya kehilangan benang merah pesan aslinya, mencerminkan bahwa pemantauan otomatis atas kegagalan pengambilan menghabiskan sumber daya kognitif yang dibutuhkan untuk ujaran yang koheren.             |                |                 |                 |         |
| DAMPAK Akuisisi Bahasa Kedua | <b>Keluaran leksikal yang terbatas &amp; berulang</b> | O23. Ujaran siswa sepanjang sesi dicirikan oleh rentang kosakata yang sempit dan berulang, menunjukkan bahwa ToT yang sering membatasi kesempatan untuk mempraktikkan dan memperkuat item leksikal B2 yang lebih luas. | ( )            | ( )             | ( )             |         |
|                              | <b>Penghindaran topik &amp; leksikal</b>              | O24. Siswa terlihat menghindari                                                                                                                                                                                        | ( )            | ( )             | ( )             |         |

| Aspek | Indikator               | Perilaku yang Dapat Diamati                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Tidak Teramati | Kadang Teramati | Sering Teramati | Catatan |
|-------|-------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------|
|       | (pendekatan intervensi) | topik tertentu atau dengan sengaja memparafrasekan ide untuk menghindari penggunaan kata-kata yang mungkin memicu ToT, menunjukkan bahwa fenomena tersebut membatasi luasnya output komunikatif dan menghambat akuisisi B2 yang alami. |                |                 |                 |         |

*Catatan: Panduan observasi sudah detail dan bagus.*

## CATATAN VALIDATOR

- Blueprint wawancara dan observasi yang Fahmi buat sudah memiliki kerangka indikator teoretis yang sudah bagus, begitu juga dengan sub-indikator.
- Kerangka panduan wawancara dan observasi juga sudah merepresentasikan kebutuhan untuk menjawab pertanyaan penelitian 1 dan pertanyaan penelitian 2.
- Bagaimanapun juga, dalam tuturan pertanyaan wawancara, awalnya masih banyak pola yes/no Questions, sementara ini penelitian fenomenologi yang butuh data yang kaya sebagai manifestasi pengalaman partisipan atas isu yang digali. Silahkan Fahmi pelajari kritik dan saran validator dan perbaiki seperti contoh tuturan pertanyaan yang validator contohkan. Atau, silahkan Fahmi gunakan contoh tuturan pertanyaan alternatif yang validator sudah buat.
- Komentar berwarna merah adalah kritik dan saran validator. Yang berwarna biru adalah contoh revisi yang validator contohkan. Silahkan Fahmi revisi seperti contoh, atau boleh gunakan contoh yang validator sudah buat.
- Terkait panduan observasi, karena indikator, sub-indikator, serta situasi yang diobservasi sudah relevan dan format observasi juga sudah bagus, maka tidak perlu diubah lagi.

- Menurut validator, jika Fahmi merevisi panduan pengambilan data ini seperti yang dicontohkan validator, instrumen ini akan valid secara konten dan sudah siap untuk ke fase pengambilan data.
- Fahmi idealnya mempersiapkan versi terjemahan Indonesia khusus untuk pertanyaan-pertanyaan wawancara sebagai antisipasi siapa tahu partisipan lebih nyaman diwawancarai menggunakan Bahasa Indonesia.
- Catatan penting: ini adalah penelitian kualitatif fenomenologi. Yang kita (peneliti) bisa lakukan adalah mempersiapkan pertanyaan-pertanyaan wawancara dan aspek-aspek yang kemungkinan observable. Meski demikian, kenyataan saat ambil data bisa berubah, sehingga tuturan pertanyaan dan aspek observasi juga bisa saja berubah mengikuti realita lapangan saat ambil data. Jadi peneliti tetap sebagai instrumen utama dalam penelitian kualitatif, jadi Fahmi tetap harus mengantisipasi siapa tahu di lapangan butuh pertanyaan tambahan atau butuh mempersiapkan banyak pertanyaan probing untuk mengejar data hingga data jenuh.

**Curup, 03 Mei 2025**

**Validator**

**Ruly Morganna, M.Pd.**

## **AUTOBIOGRAPHY**



Fahmi Alfarissi is the author of this thesis. He was born in Taba Anyar Lebong, on 12nd of December, 2004. He is the eldest of three siblings, born to Mr. Man Suruddin and Mrs. Yulyani. The author began his education at Alqur'an Rabbi Radhiyya Kindergarten, graduating in 2010. He then continued his education at MI Muhammadiyah 14 Talang Ulu, Rejang Lebong, graduating in 2016. Following this, he attended MTs Muhammadiyah, Rejang Lebong, and graduated in 2019. He pursued his high school education at SMAN 04 Curup Selatan, Rejang Lebong, majoring in science, and graduated in 2022.

The author furthered his studies at IAIN Curup, choosing to major in English. During his time at the university, he was an active member of HMPS. With determination and perseverance, the author completed this thesis and earned his bachelor's degree (S.Pd.).

Lastly, the author would like to express his deepest gratitude for the completion of this thesis, titled “Factors Trigger Tip of The Tongue Phenomenon Among EFL.” It is hoped that this final project will contribute to the field of education.