

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter contains four points. Firstly, the general description of research site where the researcher obtained during the research process. Secondly, it analyzes and discusses the distribution of types of corrective feedback as strategies implemented by the teacher in teaching learning process. Next, it reports teacher's preference towards the use of corrective feedback on students' pronunciation. Lastly, it discusses students' responses towards the implementation of teacher corrective feedback on pronunciation.

A. General Description of Research Site

This part describes the general description of SMA Plus Al-Hasan Banjarsari as the site, where the researcher conducted the research regarding the implementation of teacher's corrective feedback on students' pronunciation.

SMA Plus Al-Hasan Banjarsari is a private high school located in Jl. Kawasen No. 80 Banjarsari Ciamis, Jawa Barat. This school is part of the institution of Al-Hasan foundation which was built in 2000. There are some facilities to support English teaching and learning process, such as classroom, library and language laboratory. It can facilitate in conveying the materials and the students in learning English.

In this school, English subject is taught by two teachers. They are Lealiah, S.Pd., and Ipah Latipah, S.Pd. The second-grade students are taught by Ipah Latipah, S.Pd. She is the teacher involved in the research process.

The curriculum of 2013 is used in the teaching learning process. In this school, English subject in each classes consists of 45 minutes per hour and it takes two meetings in a week. The English teachers use various techniques to develop students' speaking skill in teaching learning process. The techniques used make the students more active, more creative and more enthusiastic in teaching learning process especially in speaking activity in the classroom. The techniques also make the students not bored, enjoyed and confident in learning process. Based on the observation, the English teachers said that the use of techniques in teaching learning process is very important to make situation in classroom more interesting and make the student enthusiastic in learning process.

The total number of students in the academic year 2017-2018 is 257 students. There are two majors in SMA Plus Al-Hasan Banjarsari, they are IPA and IPS major. In the first grade or class X, there are 2 IPA classes and 1 IPS class. Besides, in the second grade or class XI, there are 2 IPA classes and 1 IPS class. In the third grade or class XII, there are 2 IPA classes and 1 IPA class.

B. Findings

The researcher conducted the research and the data were obtained from all the techniques included observation, interview, and questionnaire. To answer the research questions, the research findings were analyzed systematically and accurately in order to give meaningful interpretation and draw inferences. They were reported in the following three sections, namely; the teacher's techniques in giving corrective feedback on students' pronunciation, the teacher's preference toward the use of corrective feedback on students' pronunciation, and the students'

responses toward the use of teacher's corrective feedback on students' pronunciation. These were specified as follows:

1. The Implementation of Teacher's Corrective Feedback Techniques in Correcting Students' Pronunciation in Teaching Learning Process

This section discussed the findings concerned with the types of corrective feedback implemented by the teacher on students' pronunciation in teaching learning process. The classroom observation was used in conducting the research. It was held on March 27, 28, and 29, 2018. The researcher involved one English teacher and the students of XI IPA 1 in teaching-learning process that was observed and video-recorded. It took three times of observation with 45 minutes per hour. The video recording was transcribed and coded based on categorization that proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997).

Based on the researchers' observation, it was found that the English teacher used some techniques to correct students' pronunciation in teaching-learning process. According to Lyster and Ranta (1997), there are six types of corrective feedback, namely explicit, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition. In fact, there were only five types used by the teacher to correct students' pronunciation found in the observation. The teacher only implemented explicit, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, and elicitation in correcting the students. These five types were calculated based on teacher's frequency in employing the correction on students' pronunciation error. The types of corrective feedback implemented by the teacher were shown by the following table 4.1.

Table 4. 1 Teacher's frequency of using corrective feedback

No	Types of CF	Teacher's frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
1.	Explicit	15	41%
2.	Recast	9	24%
3.	Clarification request	7	19%
4.	Metalinguistic feedback	4	11%
5.	Elicitation	2	5%
Total		n= 37	100%

Table 4.1 showed that the largest category was the explicit correction, which was calculated 41% of the total number of the teacher used corrective feedback. Besides, the other types of corrective feedback were distributed in decreasing frequency as follows: recast (24%), clarification request (19%), metalinguistic feedback (11%), and elicitation (5%). The last types of corrective feedback (repetition) did not occur in the classroom activities. Therefore, it was obtained that among five types of corrective feedback, explicit correction is the most frequently used by the English teacher to correct students' pronunciation. The detail explanation about teacher's corrective feedback occurred in teaching learning process will be elaborated in the section below:

a. Explicit

Explicit correction is the explicit provision of the correct form. As the teacher provides the correct form, he or she clearly indicates that what the students have said is incorrect (Lyster and Ranta, 1997). This explicit type was used to correct pronunciation error done by the teacher in teaching learning process. The data which were obtained based on the researcher's observation and field notes. It

was distributed 41% of the total number of corrective feedback. The classroom dialogues between teacher and students were shown in the table 4.2.

Table 4. 2 Explicit of Classroom Dialogues

No	Classroom Dialogues Students (S)-Teacher (T)	Observation
1	S: Let's <i>change</i> (/tʃæns/) the schedule. T: you should say change (/tʃeɪndʒ/).	Observation 1 th , on March 27, 2018
2	S: could you taste (/test/) this food? T: you have to pronounce taste (/teɪst/).	
3	S: hey, will you make it fast (/pɑːst/)? T: you should say fast (/fæst/).	
4	S: miss, I'm feeling great (/gri:t/). T: you have to say (/gret/).	
5	S: today is embarrassing (/ɪm'breɪs. ə.sɪŋ / day for me T: you have to say embarrassing (/ɪm'ber. ə.sɪŋ/).	
6	S: what's bad (/bed/) story in your life? T: you have to say bad /bæd/, not bed (/bed/).	Observation 2 nd , on March 28, 2018
7	S: I think (/tɪŋ/) it's a nice day T: you have to pronounce think (/θɪŋk/).	
8	S: I don't know (/naʊ/) where I put it. T: you have to say know (/noʊ/).	
9	S: someone knocks the door (/dɔr/) T: you have to say door (/dɔːr/).	
10	S: whose bag (/beg/) is it? T: you have to say bag (/bæg/).	
11	S: will you come (/kɑ:m) to my house?	

	T: you should pronounce come (/ kʌm/).	Observation 3 rd , on March 29, 2018
12	S: she is very good (/gu:d/). T: you have to say (/gʊd/)	
13	S: everyone has to pay (/feɪ/) this one. T: you should say pay (/peɪ/).	
14	S: move (/mu:p/) a bit please! T: you should pronounce (/mu:v/)	
15	S: take /ti:k/ it slowly!. T: you have to say take (/teɪk/).	

Table 4.2 showed that there were 15 explicit corrections done by the teacher toward the students' pronunciation error during three times observations. The dialogues between teacher and the students were recorded by video and noted in observation sheet (it can be seen in the appendix II).

b. Recast

In this type, teacher reformulates all of parts of the students' utterance, minus the error (Lyster and Ranta, 1997). This means that teacher provided students with the correct form without directly indicating that the students' utterance was incorrect. Recast was one of corrective feedback types commonly used in teaching learning process. Recast was distributed 24% of the total use of corrective feedback on students' pronunciation error. It was found the classroom dialogues using recast type as following the table 4.3.

Table 4. 3 Recast of classroom dialogues

No	Classroom Dialogues Students (S)-Teacher (T)	Observation
1	S: I don't have a partner (/ 'pɑ:t.nə/) to speak English. T: partner (/ 'pɑ:rt.nə/).	Observation 1 th , on March 27, 2018

	<p>S: oh ya, I don't have a partner (/ˈpɑ:rt.nə/) to speak English.</p> <p>T: partner (/ˈpɑ:rt.nə/) (word stressing)</p>	
2	<p>S: I want to taste (/test/) this oranges.</p> <p>T: taste (/teɪst/).</p> <p>S: hmmm, I want to taste (/teɪst/) this oranges.</p> <p>T: Ok good.</p>	
3	<p>S: yesterday I did my homework fast (/pɑ:st/).</p> <p>T: fast (/fæst/).</p> <p>S: Oh ya, I forget, yesterday I did my homework fast (/fæst/).</p>	
4	<p>S: could we go to another place (/ple:s/)?</p> <p>T: could we go to another place (/pleɪs/)?</p> <p>S: ok miss, could we go to another place (/pleɪs/)?</p>	
5	<p>S: you have to follow my voice (/pɔɪs/) guys.</p> <p>T: voice (/vɔɪs/).</p> <p>S: you have to follow my voice (/vɔɪs/) guys.</p> <p>T: nice.</p>	Observation 2 nd , on March 28, 2018
6	<p>S: hi guys, I want to present (/ˈprez.ənt/) my story.</p> <p>T: I want to present (/ˈprɪz.ənt/) my story.</p> <p>S: thanks miss.</p> <p>T: okay.</p>	
7	<p>S: it's time to show (/soʊ/) guys.</p>	

	T: it's time to show (/ʃoʊ/). S: oh ya, it's time to show (/ʃoʊ/).	Observation 3 rd , on March 29, 2018
8	S: is there anybody wants to help me? (wrong intonation) T: is there anybody wants to help me?(correct intonation). S: ok miss, is there anybody wants to help me?(correct intonation).	
9	S: calm down (/dɑ:n/), I can help you. T: calm down (/dɑ:n/).	

Table 4.3 showed that there were 9 recast corrections done by the teacher toward the students' pronunciation error during three times observations. The dialogues between teacher and the students were recorded by video and noted in observation sheet (it can be seen in the appendix II).

c. Clarification Request

Clarification request is the type of corrective feedback, which indicates to students either the teacher has misunderstood their utterance or that the utterance is ill-formed in some ways and the repetition of reformulation is required (lyster and Ranta, 1997). This types was implemented by teacher when she did not understand or listen what the students uttered, so that the teacher tried to clarified students' utterance. This type of correction was calculated 19% of the total use of corrective feedback on students' pronunciation error. It was found the classroom dialogues using clarification types as following the table 4.4.

Table 4. 4 Clarification request of classroom dialogues

No	Classroom Dialogues Students (S)-Teacher (T)	Observation
1	S: I cannot listen (/ˈlɪst.ən/) your voice. T: pardon? Listen? (/ˈlɪst.ən/) S: listen (/ˈlɪs.ən/). T: yes, listen (/ˈlɪs.ən/) without “t”	Observation 1 th , on March 27, 2018
2	S: I want to taste (/test/) this oranges. T: I don't understand what you said, test (/test/).? S: I want to taste (/teɪst/) this oranges. T: Ok good.	
3	S: I'm sorry I didn't mean (/meɪ:n/) to do that. T: excuse me? S: I'm sorry I didn't mean (/mi:n/) to do that. T: yes, that's right.	Observation 2 nd , on March 28, 2018
4	S: don't you remember this stuff (/stæf/). T: what? S: don't you remember this stuff (/stʌf/)? T: yeah.	
5	S: hey, shut up! (/ʃu:t/) Don't be noisy! T: sorry?, shoot up! (/ʃu:t)? S: shut up (/ʃʌt/) up.	

6	<p>S: We don't have enough (/ə'nɒg/) time to celebrate this party.</p> <p>T: pardon?</p> <p>S: We don't have enough (/ɪ'nʌf/) time to celebrate this party.</p> <p>T: okay, good.</p>	
7	<p>S: today, our school has a new (/nyu:/) regulation for us.</p> <p>T: what?</p> <p>S: oh yeah, sorry, today, our school has a new (/nu:/) regulation for us.</p>	<p>Observation 3rd, on March 29, 2018</p>

Table 4.4 showed that there were 7 clarification request corrections done by the teacher toward the students' pronunciation error during three times observations. The dialogues between teacher and the students were recorded by video and noted in observation sheet (it can be seen in the appendix II).

d. Metalinguistic Feedback

According to Lyster and Ranta (1997), metalinguistic feedback implicitly provides students with a hint to lend them self-correct their erroneous utterance. It contains either a comment, information, or questions related to the well-formed of the students' utterance, without explicitly providing the correct form. This types was used to help and facilitate students to know and find the error themselves and let them do self-repair. This type of correction was distributed 11% of the total use of corrective feedback on students' pronunciation error. It was found the classroom dialogues using metalinguistic feedback types as following the table 4.5.

Table 4. 5 Metalinguistic feedback of classroom dialogues

No	Classroom Dialogues Students (S)-Teacher (T)	Observation
1	<p>S: can we make (/mek/) it simple? T: do we say “make” like that? S: hmm, make (/mek/)? T: make (/meik/). S: can we make (/meik/) it simple? T: that’s right.</p>	<p>Observation 1th, on March 27, 2018</p>
2	<p>S: don’t touch (/totf/) this table! T: wait, you said touch (/totf/), is that right? S: don’t touch (/tatf/) this table! T: Ok good.</p>	<p>Observation 2nd, on March 28, 2018</p>
3	<p>S: my family went to the beach (/bitf/) yesterday. T: hmm, do we pronounce “beach” like that? What’s the right one? S: my family went to the beach /bi:tʃ/ T: good, that’s it.</p>	<p>Observation 2nd, on March 28, 2018</p>
4	<p>S: In my opinion, we must stop smoking because it’s dangerous (/'den.dʒə.əs/)? for our health. T: hmmm, can you find the error?, do we say dangerous like that? S: hmmm, dangerous (/'dem.dʒə.əs/)? T: yeah.</p>	<p>Observation 3rd, on March 29, 2018</p>

	S: In my opinion, we must stop smoking because it's dangerous (/ 'dem.dʒə.əs/) for our health.	
--	--	--

Table 4.5 showed that there were 4 metalinguistic corrections done by the teacher toward the students' pronunciation error during three times observations. The dialogues between teacher and the students were recorded by video and noted in observation sheet (it can be seen in the appendix II).

e. Elicitation

Elicitation refers to at least three techniques that teachers use to directly elicit the correct form the student (Lyster and Ranta, 1997). Those techniques are (1) the use "fill in the blank form", (2) the use of open question, and (3) occasional reformulation of utterance. Based on observation, it was obtained the data that elicitation was seldom used by the teacher to correct students' pronunciation. It was calculated only 5% from the total number of its usage. Further, it was also found the classroom dialogues using elicitation types as following the table 4.6.

Table 4. 6 Elicitation of classroom dialogues

No	Classroom Dialogues Students (S)-Teacher (T)	Observation
1	S: did you do your homework (/ 'hom.wə:k/) last night? T: No, you do your.....? S: hmmm, (/ 'hom.wə:k/)? T: homework (/ 'hoʊm.wə:k/) (Recast type) S: did you do your homework (/ 'hoʊm.wə:k/) last night? T: that's right.	Observation 1 st , on March 27, 2018

2	<p>S: should we go now?(/noʊ/) (low intonation)</p> <p>T: should we go?</p> <p>S: (/noʊ/)?</p> <p>T: now (/naʊ/) (Recast type)</p> <p>S: should we go now? (/naʊ/)</p> <p>T: good.</p>	<p>Observation 2nd, on March 28, 2018</p>
---	---	--

Table 4.6 showed that there were only 2 elicitation corrections done by the teacher toward the students' pronunciation error during three times observations. The dialogues between teacher and the students were recorded by video and noted in observation sheet (it can be seen in the appendix II).

It can be concluded that from the third observations above, it was obtained that there were 37 times correction done by the teacher during teaching learning process. From the five types corrective feedback implemented by the teacher, the largest category was the explicit correction, which was calculated 41% of the total number of the teacher used corrective feedback. Besides, the other types of corrective feedback were distributed in decreasing frequency as follows: recast (24%), clarification request (19%), metalinguistic feedback (11%), and elicitation (5%).

2. Teacher's Preference towards the use of corrective feedback on Students' Pronunciation

This section presents the teacher's preference towards the implementation of corrective feedback on pronunciation error in teaching learning process. In order to find out the information from the teacher, semi-structure interview was used to answer the research question number 2 regarding the teacher's preference. The teacher's preference in this context refers to the teacher's choice regarding

implementing corrective feedback to pronunciation error. The interview was held on March 29, 2018 after conducting the classroom observations and it took place in teacher's room. The result of interview data emphasized the findings from the observation related to teacher's practice inside classroom to implement corrective feedback on students' pronunciation.

In doing interview session, there were 10 list of questions given to the teacher, namely;

1. In teaching speaking, have you ever found the student's pronunciation error?
2. What error aspects did you find in students' pronunciation?
3. How are your techniques to correct students' pronunciation error?
4. How often do you give corrections to students' pronunciation error?
5. In your opinion, what is the most effective correction given in correcting students' pronunciation errors?
6. To correct student pronunciation errors, which one do you choose: correct them immediately or delay them?
7. In your opinion, how does the student feel after being given a correction?
8. What is the development of students' pronunciation after being given the correction?
9. Does your correction motivate the students to correct their errors in pronunciation?
10. In your opinion, what are the benefits of giving correction to the students' pronunciation?

Teacher's preference could be classified into two main points, namely; teacher's choice in using the types of corrective feedback techniques and the timing of giving correction.

Based on the 10 questions in the interview above, the researcher classified into three points, namely; first, asking the condition of students' pronunciation error in the classroom. Second, asking the teachers' techniques, frequency, and preference toward corrective feedback. Third, asking the students' condition based on teacher's perspective regarding the implementation of corrective feedback. The interview data showed the teacher's explanation about teacher's perspectives regarding the use of corrective feedback implemented in teaching learning process. (It can be seen in the appendix II).

In the interview data, the researcher asked question number 1 and 2 "*In teaching speaking, have you ever found the student's pronunciation error?*" and "*what error aspects did you find in students' pronunciation?*" . Those questions were emphasized the condition of students' pronunciation error in the classroom that related to the observation. Then, the teacher answered:

"Of course, I've ever found it, even there are many students mispronounce the words when they are in speaking class. It's quite hard, because they seldom talk or just say "hello" in English. So, they still do many mistakes in pronouncing the words.

"Most students got error in spelling words either it is vowel or consonant. Because they are not used to speaking in English. Sometimes there were also some students who made errors in stressing or intonation, for example intonation sentences seemed like intonation statements."

The teacher's answers were appropriate with the students' condition in the classroom. It reported that in teaching learning process, there were many students

who did error pronunciation. Most of them got error in spelling words either in vocal or consonant, and also intonation.

Next questions number 3 until 6, the researcher asked “How are your techniques to correct students’ pronunciation error?”, “How often do you give corrections to students’ pronunciation error?”, “In your opinion, what is the most effective correction given in correcting students’ pronunciation errors?”, and “To correct student pronunciation errors, which one do you choose: correct them immediately or delay them?”. Those questions were aimed to find out teacher’s techniques, frequency, and preference in correcting students’ pronunciation error.

The teacher answered:

“I often correct immediately their error words in spelling or in intonation. Sometimes I wrote first their pronunciation errors that I’ve heard. Well, at the end of the learning, I gave the words or intonation which was wrong when they said in practicing speaking, and the last I gave the correct pronunciation to them.”

“It can be said very often, because many students who have been corrected, sometimes they still do mistakes again in pronouncing word or in intonation. So I often corrected again. Every time I teach, there must be students who still mispronounce the words.

“If we say whether it is effective or not, I give correction depends on the students do their mistakes. There must be students who were confused and nervous. Besides, there were some students who were happy to be corrected. In fact, some of them ever said that they want to be corrected immediately by their teacher.”

“I choose both of them, correcting immediately or delay it. The most often I did was correcting immediately. Because I always spontaneously want to correct them if they do their mistakes in pronouncing the words. But I also consider whether the students are ready or not to be corrected because somehow, they are so nervous if I correct them immediately.”

These explanations proved that in every teaching, the students were often corrected their pronunciation by the teacher. Based on the observation, in the process of giving corrective feedback on students' pronunciation error, she used several techniques, such as explicit, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, and elicitation (Lyster and Ranta, 1997). After conducting the interview, it was found that the teacher preferred correcting students' pronunciation immediately by using explicit techniques. Besides, for the timing of correcting pronunciation error, she chose both immediate and delayed correction in speaking activities. Further, she also considered whether the students were ready or not to be corrected due to sometimes they were nervous given correction immediately, so that she delayed to correct till the students stopped speaking.

The last questions number 7, 8, 9 and 10 were aimed to find out the effect after giving corrective feedback to students' pronunciation error. The researcher asked:

“In your opinion, how does the student feel after being given a correction?”, “What is the development of students' pronunciation after giving the correction?”, “Does your correction motivate the students to correct their errors in pronunciation?”, and “In your opinion, what are the benefits of giving correction to the students' pronunciation?”. These questions were also intended to find out the students' condition based on teacher's perspective regarding giving correction in teaching learning process. The teacher answered:

“Yes, there were some students who were happy because of correction, and the rest of them did not like if I correct them because they might feel shy. Moreover, there were also who were very nervous till they lost their concentration.”

“The development of students’ pronunciation after being given teacher’s correction, most of them can improve their pronunciation to better, even though few students still have not showed their progress.

There were some students that motivated to correct their mistakes, because every meeting I found the wrong words again from the students but actually I have corrected them frequently to pronounce the correct form.”

“There are many benefits actually, by giving correction to students’ pronunciation error, this is very useful for those who still lack of pronunciation. Step by step, they will understand and know their mistakes, and in the end they indirectly can correct his own mistakes without my correction. Then, by giving correction, they can improve their learning motivation and they want to correct themselves every time they make an error in their pronunciation.”

From the teacher’s explanations above, during implementing corrective feedback, the teacher showed her attention to development of students’ pronunciation. It was found that the students gave their responses either positive attitude or negative attitude towards the corrective feedback. Even though there were some students who were still shy, nervous and confused after being given correction, but the majority of the students were motivated and able to improve their pronunciation to be better.

3. Students’ Responses toward the Implementation of Teacher’s Corrective Feedback on Students’ Pronunciation

This section presents students’ responses regarding the use of teacher’s corrective feedback in correcting students’ pronunciation error. There were 25 statements covered by questionnaire given to the students in order to find out the response based on students’ perspective towards the real implementation of

corrective feedback on their pronunciation error. This questionnaire was given on March 31, 2018 after the observation and interview.

The questionnaire provides the optional answers and combines the 5-point scales in Likert form. The statements in questionnaire were discussed and divided into three sections. The first section deals with the students' opinion about the content of teaching. The second section presents the students' opinion about error correction generally which classified into two points, namely, based on students' frequency given corrective feedback, and students' attitudes. The third section deals with the students' opinion about the different corrective feedback techniques. Further, the students were asked to choose the optional answers and to give their responses in five options; strongly disagree (STS), disagree (TS), neutral or undecided (N), agree (S), and strongly agree (SS).

a. Students' Opinion about the Content of Teaching

The first section presents the students' opinion about the teaching learning process especially in English activities implemented in a classroom. They were given the optional answers available in the questionnaires. Then, the students' responses were calculated as the following the table 4.8.

Table 4. 7 The results of students' opinion about the content of teaching

1.	Aktifitas pembelajaran bahasa inggris di kelas saya menarik.			
	Ya		Tidak	
	23	76,67%	7	23,33%
2.	Aktifitas pembelajaran bahasa inggris di kelas saya tidak sesuai dengan tingkat kemampuan bahasa inggris saya.			
	Ya		Tidak	
	11	36,67%	19	63,33%

3.	Aktifitas pembelajaran bahasa Inggris di kelas saya mudah dipahami.			
	Ya		Tidak	
	23	76,67%	7	23,33%

Table 4.8 showed that there were 23 students agreed that English activities in teaching learning process are interesting. There were 76,67% of students who chose Yes with the statement and the rest of them 23,33% chose No with the statement. Next, the students who reported that the English learning activities in the class was not up to their level of English competence were calculated by 63,33% of the students chose No, while 36,67% chose Yes about the statement. It means a half of the students felt that their English competence was appropriate with the lesson in teaching learning process. Besides, There were 76,67% chose Yes and 3,33% of the students chose No that the English activities taught by the teacher was understandable.

b. Students' Opinion about Error Correction Generally

The second section reports the students' opinion about error correction in general generally. This section was divided and classified into three categories, namely; based on students' frequency given corrective feedback, students' positive attitude, and students' negative attitude regarding the responses towards teacher's corrective feedback implementation in teaching learning process. These categorization of students' opinion about correction will be distributed as following the table 4.9.

- **Students' Frequency Given Corrective Feedback**

Table 4. 8 The results of students' frequency given corrective feedback

Guru saya memberikan koreksi terhadap kesalahan pengucapan ketika saya berbicara dalam bahasa Inggris.

Selalu	Sering	Kadang	Jarang	Tidak Pernah
Selalu	N = 30	13	43,33%	
Sering		8	26,67%	
Kadang		5	16,67%	
Jarang		4	13,33%	
Tidak Pernah		-	-	
		N = 30	100%	

Table 4.9 showed that there were 13 students and calculated 43,33 % stated that the teacher always gave correction to pronunciation error. There were 8 students and calculated 26,67 % stated that teacher often gave correction. Besides, 16,67 % of the students chose “sometimes” with the statement, 13,33% of the students chose “seldom” with the statement and there were no students who chose “never”. It can be concluded that the teacher gave correction in teaching learning process to students’ pronunciation error and the majority of them chose “always” as their responses.

- **Students' Positive Attitude on Corrective Feedback**

Table 4. 9 The results of students' positive attitude

No	Statements	N	STS	TS	N	S	SS
			1	2	3	4	5
1.	Original	30	-	-	5 16,67%	4 13,33%	21 70%
	<i>Koreksi yang guru berikan terhadap kesalahan saya dalam pengucapan bahasa Inggris mudah untuk dipahami.</i>						
	Translated						
	The teacher's correction towards my pronunciation error is easy to understand.						
2.	Original	30	-	-	4 13,33%	8 26,67%	18 60%
	<i>Saya senang guru mengoreksi kesalahan saya dalam pengucapan bahasa Inggris.</i>						
	Translated						
	I am excited if the teacher corrects my pronunciation error.						
3.	Original	30	-	-	5 16,67%	6 20%	11 36,67%
	<i>Koreksi tersebut mempermudah saya memperbaiki pengucapan bahasa Inggris saya.</i>						
	Translated						
	The correction makes me easy to correct my pronunciation.						
4.	Original	30	-	-	2 6,67%	5 16,67%	23 76,67%
	<i>Koreksi tersebut membantu saya meningkatkan</i>						

	<i>kemampuan berbicara bahasa Inggris saya.</i>						
	Translated						
	The correction helps me to improve my speaking skills.						
5.	Original	30	-	3 10%	6 20%	20 66,67%	1 3,33%
	<i>Saya merasa percaya diri ketika guru mengoreksi kesalahan saya.</i>						
	Translated						
	I feel confident when the teacher corrects my pronunciation error.						
6.	Original	30	-	1 3,33%	17 56,67%	12 40%	
	<i>Koreksi tersebut membuat saya semakin percaya diri untuk berbicara dalam bahasa Inggris.</i>						
	Translated						
	The correction makes me feel more confident to speak English.						
7.	Original	30	-	-	2 6,67%	5 16,67%	23 76,67%
	Koreksi yang guru berikan terhadap kesalahan pengucapan bahasa Inggris adalah bentuk perhatian beliau terhadap saya.						
	Translated						
	The teacher's correction towards my pronunciation error is an attention to me.						

From the table above, it was found that there were 70% and 33,33% of the students gave responses positively to choose strongly agree and agree toward the

statement stated that teacher's correction was easily understood by them . The rest of them 16,67% did not give their responses. Then, the majority of the students agreed that they were happy if the teacher corrected their pronunciation error. It was distributed 60% of the students strongly agreed, 26,67% of the students agreed, and the rest of them did not give their response only 13,33%. This means, most of students were happy when the teacher corrected their pronunciation error. It could be linked to interview data which stated that the majority of the students were happy after being given correction.

The statement which stated that the teacher's correction makes the students easy to understand was distributed by 56,67% of the students agreed, while the rest of them 16,67% preferred to choose undecided to give their response. Then, most of the students agreed that the correction could help them to improve their speaking skills. It was obtained 76,67% and 16,67% of the students chose strongly agree and agree with the statement. This could be compared to the findings from interview data. Based on teacher's perspective, by giving correction, the majority of the students were able to improve their pronunciation to be better.

Then, the statement which stated that the correction could build the students' confidence to speak English, they mostly agreed with the statement. It was only 10% who disagreed with the statement.

The last statement deals with the students' feeling stated that the teacher cared about students' pronunciation development. There were 76,67% of the students strongly agreed and 16,67% of the students agreed with the statement and the rest of them were only 6,67% of the students did not give their responses.

- **Students' Negative Attitude on Corrective Feedback**

Table 4. 10 The results of students' negative attitude

No	Statements	N	STS	TS	N	S	SS
			1	2	3	4	5
1.	Original	30	19 63,33%	4 13,33%	7 23,33%	-	-
	<i>Koreksi yang guru berikan terhadap kesalahan saya dalam pengucapan bahasa Inggris sulit untuk dipahami.</i>						
	Translated						
	The teacher's correction given to my pronunciation error is hard to understand.						
2.	Original	30	18 60%	12 40%	-	-	-
	<i>Saya kecewa ketika guru mengoreksi kesalahan saya.</i>						
	Translated						
	I am disappointed when the teacher corrects my error.						
3.	Original	30	-	17 56,67%	4 13,33%	3 10%	6 20%
	<i>Saya malu ketika saya mengulangi kesalahan yang sama.</i>						
	Translated						
	I am shy when I repeat the same error.						
4.	Original	30	5 16,67%	11 36,67%	4 13,33%	10 33,33	-
	<i>Saya gugup ketika guru mengoreksi kesalahan saya.</i>						

	Translated						
	I am nervous when the teacher corrects my error.						
5.	Original						
	Saya bersikap cuek ketika guru mengoreksi kesalahan saya.	30	16 56,33%	13 43,33%	1 3,33%	-	-
	Translated						
	I am ignorant when the teacher corrects my error.						
6.	Original						
	<i>Koreksi yang guru berikan terhadap kesalahan saya dalam pengucapan bahasa Inggris sama sekali tidak membantu saya meningkatkan kemampuan berbicara dalam bahasa Inggris.</i>	30	24 80%	5 16,67%	1 3,33%	-	-
	Translated						
	The teacher's correction given to my pronunciation error does not help me to improve my speaking skills.						
7.	Original						
	Saya butuh waktu yang lama untuk memahami kesalahan saya.	30	1 3,33%	8 26,67%	19 63,33%	2 6,67%	-
	Translated						
	I need much time to understand my error.						

From the table above, the students reported that the teacher's correction given to their pronunciation error is hard to understand. There were 63,33% and 33,33% of the students disagreed with the statement, and the rest of them who did not decide their choice were 23,33% of the students. Next statement, stated that the students were disappointed when the teacher corrected their pronunciation. None of the students who chose neither agree nor strongly agree. All the students disagreed with the statement. Then, the statement stated that the students were shy when they repeated the same error. The majority of them disagreed, while there were only 30% of the students agreed with the statement. It means, there were few students who still felt shy after being given correction from the teacher. It could be inferred that there were 30% of the students who were still shy after being given correction from the teacher.

In the statement which stated that the students were nervous when the teacher corrected their error, there were 16,67% of the students chose strongly disagreed, while 36,67% of the students disagreed with the statement. The students who agreed were 33,33% and the rest of them, 13,33% of the students did not give their responses. Then, the statement stated that the students were ignorant when the teacher corrected their error. There were 99,66% from the total of the students in disagree position, the undecided option was obtained only 1,33%. It means most of students appreciated their teachers when they were being corrected. The next statement stated that the teacher's correction given to students' pronunciation error did not help to improve their speaking skills. There were almost the total of the

students disagreed with the statement and reached 99,96%, while there was only 1 student who did not give their response. The last statement stated that the students need much time to understand their error. It was gained that there were 63,33% of the students chose undecided option. There were 30% of the students disagreed, while 6,67% of the students agreed with the statement. It could be inferred that there were many students who still confused to decide whether they understand their pronunciation error or not.

c. Students' Opinion about the Different Corrective Feedback Techniques

The third section presents the students' opinion after being given correction by the teacher on their pronunciation error. This section examines the theory from Lyster and Ranta (1997) stated that there are six types of corrective feedback, namely; explicit, recast, clarification, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition. Based on observation and interview data, the teacher almost used all the types of corrective feedback, except repetition was not found in teaching learning process. In this questionnaires, it was found the general responses toward the implementation teacher's corrective feedback on pronunciation error which will be distributed as following the table below:

Table 4. 11 The results of students' opinion about different CF techniques

No	Statements	N	STS	TS	N	S	SS
			1	2	3	4	5
1.	Original	30	-	-	5 16,67%	17 56,67%	8 26,67%
	<i>Saya senang jika guru mengoreksi kesalahan saya secara langsung.</i>						

	Translated						
	I am happy if the teacher immediately corrects my error.						
2.	Original	30	-	-	12 40%	15 50%	3 10%
	<i>Saya ingin guru menunjukkan kesalahan saya terlebih dahulu, kemudian memberikan pelafalan yang benar.</i>						
	Translated						
	I want my teacher show my error first, then provide the correct pronunciation.						
3.	Original	30	-	20 66,67%	4 13,33%	6 20%	-
	<i>Saya senang jika guru mengoreksi kesalahan saya tidak secara langsung.</i>						
	Translated						
	I am happy if the teacher indirectly corrects my error.						
4.	Original	30	-	-	7 23,33%	19 63,33%	4 13,33%
	<i>Jika saya melakukan kesalahan dalam pengucapan bahasa Inggris, saya ingin guru langsung memberikan pengucapan yang benar.</i>						
	Translated						
	If I get an error in pronouncing English						

	words, I want my teacher directly provide the correct pronunciation.						
5.	Original	30	-	19 63,33%	-	6 20%	5 16,67
	<i>Ketika pelafalan bahasa Inggris saya kurang jelas atau salah, saya senang jika diminta untuk memperjelas atau memperbaikinya.</i>						
	Translated						
	If my pronunciation is not clear or error, I am happy if I am asked by the teacher to correct it.						
6.	Original	30	-	18 60%	5 16,67%	2 6,67%	5 16,67%
	<i>Saya lebih senang jika diberikan tanda (clue) oleh guru terhadap kesalahan saya daripada dikoreksi secara langsung dan gamblang.</i>						
	Translated						
	I prefer to be given a clue by the teacher towards my error rather than being corrected immediately.						
7.	Original	30	-	15 50%	4 13,33%	9 30%	2 6,67%
	<i>Saya mampu memperbaiki kesalahan saya dengan tanda (clue) yang guru berikan.</i>						

	Translated								
	I am able to correct my error using the clue given by my teacher.								

This table discussed not only the students' opinion about corrective feedback techniques but also students' preference toward the use of corrective feedback types which implemented in teaching learning process. The first statement stated that the students were happy if the teacher immediately corrected their error. The data showed that there were 83,34% in the agree position, while there were 16,67 did not give their responses. It means, most of students liked the teacher's ways in correcting students' pronunciation error. It could be linked to interview and observation data which found that the teacher was frequently used correction with explicit techniques.

Next, in the form of statement which stated the students wanted their teacher showed their error first, then provided the correct pronunciation, there were 60% of the students agreed with the statement, while there were 40% did not give their responses. Then, the statement stated that the students were happy if the teacher indirectly corrected their error. The majority of the students did not like this corrective feedback type. It showed that there were 66,67% of the students disagreed with the statement, 20% of the students agreed with the statement and the rest of them 20% 13,33% did not give their response.

Next, the statement stated that if the students got an error in pronouncing English words, they wanted their teacher directly provided the correct

pronunciation. It was obtained that there were 73,66% of the students agreed with the statement, while 33,33% of the students chose undecided option. It could be inferred that most of the students like this recast type. Based on the observation, this type is the second type that the most frequently used by the teacher to correct pronunciation error.

The next statement stated that if students' pronunciation was not clear or error, they were happy if they were asked by the teacher to correct it. It was gained the data that there were 36,67% of the students agreed and 63,33% of the students disagreed with this statement. It could be inferred that the majority of the students did not like these clarification and metalinguistic feedback. Both of types were actually used by the teacher based on classroom observation.

Next statement stated that the students preferred to be given a clue by the teacher towards their error rather than being corrected immediately. There were 23,34% of the students agreed, 60% of the students disagreed, and 16,67% did not decide their responses. It means, a half of the students did not like this correction techniques. And the last statement stated that the students were able to correct their error using the clue given by their teacher. It was obtained that there were 50% of the students disagreed, 36,67% of the students agreed, and the rest of them 13,33% of the students did not give their responses. It could be concluded that a half of the students disagree with this correction techniques.

C. Discussion

This research investigated the corrective feedback techniques used by the teacher, teacher's preference, and also students' responses towards the

implementation of corrective feedback on students' pronunciation at SMA Plus Al-Hasan Banjarsari Ciamis. It involved a teacher and 30 students as the research participants in conducting the research. This research used qualitative method with a case study approach. Further, the following discussions are based on the research questions, namely; the teacher's techniques of giving corrective feedback on students' pronunciation, teacher's preference toward the use of corrective feedback on students' pronunciation, and the students' responses toward the use of teacher's corrective feedback on students' pronunciation.

The first section to be discussed was the teacher's corrective feedback techniques on students' pronunciation. There were five types of corrective feedback found in classroom observation, namely; explicit, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, and elicitation. These refers to the theory proposed by Lsyter and Ranta (1997).

The observation showed that there were five types of corrective feedback which sorted from the most frequently used, namely; explicit, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback and elicitation. The data reported that the most frequently used were explicit correction which was distributed 41%, and recast was 24%. In other words, based on teacher's perspective, it was obtained that the teacher preferred choosing explicit correction. It showed that the most frequently used was explicit correction in this present study. This result is line with the previous study (Park, 2010) stated that explicit correction is the most frequently used by teacher in correcting students' pronunciation error. Then, another frequent correction implemented by the teacher was recast. It linked to the theory proposed by Lyster

and Ranta (1997) stated that recast is the most widely used type corrective feedback in language classroom. Besides, Haryanto (2015), Alghaei (2013) and Mendez & Cruz (2012) found that recast is a favorite oral feedback method among teachers.

The second section to be discussed was teacher's preference toward corrective feedback on students' pronunciation error. The data were gained from interview which emphasized the data from classroom observation. It was found that the teacher preferred choosing to use explicit correction than the other techniques. It was the same with students' preference found in questionnaire data. Both teacher and students had the same preferences. This finding linked to the previous study conducted by Yoshida (2008) stated that the teacher's preference toward the use of corrective feedback in general are the same from the students' preference of feedback. The teachers chose particular corrective feedback in accordance with learner characteristics such as students' proficiency levels and learning styles.

Further, it was also found in the interview data, based on timing of giving correction, the teacher tended to correct students' pronunciation error both immediate and delayed correction. This linked to the previous study conducted by Haryanto (2015) stated that immediate and delayed correction and the models of communicative task displayed by the students, it can influence students' psychological performance. As a result, in this present research, the teacher considered to give correction based on the students' activities in teaching learning process because she did not want to interrupt their students even though she recognized pronunciation errors.

There were several benefits from the corrective feedback implemented in correcting pronunciation error. Based on the teacher's perspective, it was found that corrective feedback was important and it could improve students' pronunciation. This linked to the theory proposed by Hattie (2007) stated that feedback was the most powerful moderator that enhanced achievement. In other words, theory from Lee (2015) corrective feedback (CF) on errors facilitates pronunciation improvement of language learners. Then, it linked to the previous study conducted by Huang (2015) stated corrective feedback is not only important but necessary since the students still have pronunciation problems which need teacher's help.

The third section to be discussed was the students' responses toward the implementation of corrective feedback on pronunciation. In this section the findings were classified into three main points, namely; students' opinion about the content, students' opinion about error correction generally, and students' opinion about different corrective feedback techniques.

To find out the students' responses, the researcher used questionnaire techniques to gain students' perspective toward the corrective feedback on pronunciation. **The first point**, it was found the data from the students' opinion about the content of teaching showed that the majority of the students stated that English activities were interesting especially the lesson taught by the teacher in teaching learning process. Further, the materials were easy to understand by the students and appropriate with level of their English competence. This means, the students might give a positive response to the interesting English activities. This

finding linked to the previous study conducted by Maraya (2007) and Huang (2015).

The second point, it was found the data from the students' opinion about the error correction generally which also consisted of three sub points, namely; teacher's frequency, students' positive attitude, and students' negative attitude. In teacher's frequency, it was gained that based on the students' perspective, the teacher always gave correction towards pronunciation error. This could be compared with the findings from classroom observation and interview. It showed that the teacher frequently corrected students' pronunciation error in every teaching learning process due to the teacher always found the students' pronunciation error. This linked to the theory from Lightbown & Spada (1999) stated that corrective feedback is needed in pronunciation to prevent mispronounce and to give any information about how to pronounce properly. That was why the teacher frequently gave correction to students' pronunciation error.

Next, in the discussion of students' positive attitude, it was found that the majority of the students agreed that they felt happy, confident and motivated to be corrected by their teacher. This linked to the previous study conducted by Schulz's, (1996) as cited by Faqeih (2014) stated that the students had a positive attitude towards error correction more than their teacher's attitudes.

Furthermore, in the discussion of students' negative attitude, it was found that there were few students who were shy and not confident to be corrected by their teacher. They might be nervous when the teacher corrected and interrupted their error utterances immediately in front of their friends. The finding linked to the

previous study conducted by Kiptui and Mbugua (2009) showed that negative attitude towards English was the most effective and psychological factor that resulted in the students' poor performance in English. Besides, the negative attitude towards English was one of the factors that affected academic achievement.

The third point was reported the students' opinion about different corrective feedback techniques implemented by the teacher. It was found that the majority of the students liked the explicit technique and recast as their choices. It could be compared with the findings from classroom observation, the teacher's frequency of giving corrective feedback by using explicit and recast were the same with the result of questionnaire. In the questionnaire, there were 83,34% of the students chose agree in their statement.

Further, the clarification, metalinguistic feedback and elicitation were also used by the teacher in giving correction. Based on observation, these types were the least correction used by teacher. Contrastively, it is interesting to be discussed, in fact, based on students' responses, the majority of the students did not like these types to be implemented in teaching learning process. These types were good to be used in giving correction based on the previous study conducted by Maolida (2013). He stated that these techniques are considered more successful than input providing such as recast and explicit correction in drawing learner uptake since it gives the opportunity for the learners to modify their utterance. As a result, the students only chose explicit and recast as their corrective feedback's preference. Finally, this would become the new findings for the researcher.