

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the researcher gives detail points of the research which consist of background, research questions, research purposes, rationale, and previous studies.

A. Background

In today's era, English has spread in many aspects of human life such as instructional things in how to use a product which stated in English, an English gadget guide book, quizzes in social media which delivered in English, and material of subjects that delivered in English for English major students. English has known as the official language of science and education world widely. There is a stereotype among Indonesian people that someone is considered mastering English if one can speak English well or just simply has a good pronunciation. It is every student's dream to have an advanced skill of speaking English after graduated from their university since speaking skill plays important role to convince learners' ability in foreign language.

Unfortunately, the recent condition of Indonesian EFL students' ability in speaking foreign language-in this case English has so many obstacles. During researcher's preliminary study in Karya Budi Junior and Senior High School, there are only 3 out of 10 students who are able to speak English fluently after learning English for 12 years at school. Most of them were having difficulty in pronouncing common words: differencing "study" and "student", "word" and "world", "ask" and "axe". One of millions reasons of this happened because speaking interaction in

every English class is rare to be happens. Most of the time, during the 90 minutes of English class is dominated by speaking L1 (Bahasa Indonesia) which is too good to be wasted.

Previous studies reported that the proficiency level of EFL students in speaking English is still low. As a research conducted by Al-Jamal & Al-Jamal (2013) showed that Iranian college students felt that they are not appropriate to speak English because of internal and external factors which influence their speaking ability. Another research done by Zhiping & Pramasivan (2013) in Malaysia among international students from Nigeria, Iran, and Algeria showed that there are reasons for EFL students (Iranian and Algerian) which make them hard to speak English. Form all the research results above, it showed that EFL speaking ability is still low regarding to the factors both internal and external which contribute a lot to their process of language acquisition.

There are many possible solutions to solve problems of EFL students' low competence in speaking English, one of them is through Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF). It is a natural thing for teacher to give their students feedback following their performance in classroom. It could be in form of written, spoken or just a simple praising as an intangible reward. This study has concern in spoken or oral form of feedback. There are many types of oral feedbacks. The most common one in education field is corrective feedback. In order to eliminate students' fossilization in erroneous of pronouncing word "student", the teacher or lecturer can use some types of Oral Corrective Feedback like *recast* or *explicit correction*.

In the event that Oral Corrective Feedback is delivered by teacher to their students, there is a respond which delivered by students following the feedback. The respond is called uptake. It is a good activity in English classes for having much interaction between teacher and students. Unfortunately, it is a rare phenomenon in EFL English classes for having an active class of teacher-students' interaction.

In recent decades, people have studied Oral Corrective Feedback and uptake in English classes of both ESL and EFL classrooms. Taipale (2012) conducted a research in Finnish high school with a focus on describing teachers' way of giving feedback on students' oral errors in foreign language classroom and the students' ways of responding to the feedback. Heift (2004) conducted a research on 177 Canadian university students by investigating the effects of corrective feedback on learner uptake in CALL (Computer- Assisted Language Learning). Samira, Masoud, & Nemat-t (2014) conducted a research attempted to investigate how frequently oral corrective feedback (reactive focus on form) is used in communicative- based classes and also examines the role of teachers' gender in provision of corrective feedback leading learners' uptake of different linguistics features. The participants were Iranian adult learners and teachers from West-Land Institute, Romania, Iran.

This research is having a purpose investigating the most common use type of Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) following the uptake of EFL students during speaking class activity in second semester of English education department. The focus of this study is the the allocation types of OCF that is given by the lecturer also the types of uptake given by the students as their responds following the

feedback and using coding data as the one which proposed by Panova & Lyster (2002). Considering those gaps, the researcher names this research as “ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK AND UPTAKE OF EFL STUDENTS IN SPEAKING INTERACTION.”

B. Research Questions

To address the issue stated above, this study explored the following research questions:

1. What are the types of oral corrective feedback (OCF) which commonly given to the learners?
2. What are the types of the learners' uptake following the lecturer's oral corrective feedback?

C. Research Purposes

From the research questions above, this study is aimed to:

1. Find out the types of oral corrective feedback (OCF) which commonly given to the learners.
2. Find out the types of the learners' uptake following the lecturer's oral corrective feedback.

D. Significances of Study

There are three significances of this study: theoretical, practical and professional aspects. Theoretically, this study is aimed to enrich readers about the urge of giving oral feedback to students. Practically, this study spreads the

awareness of giving oral corrective feedback to students, mostly for EFL learners to avoid fossilization of incorrect utterance. Professionally, this study is aimed to aware teachers and future teachers to give oral corrective feedback to their students, which is essential for their development of speaking performance.

E. Rationale

Guiora (1983) as cited in (Zhiping & Pramasivan, 2013) stated that language learning can be so painful for some students because the feeling of it threatens their face, sense of self, and worldview. The researcher of this study chooses a relatable research site and research participants following Guiora's word to see the activity of English learning process during speaking class of English education students. Higher education in this 21st century wants students to be an active learner (Gilsalom & Benlloch-dualde, 2016) and speaking used as its measurement to label students whether they are the active one or the passive one. Supporting that statement, the researcher concludes it is a good thing for English major students to have a good ability in speaking performance.

Since this study is an observational research on Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) and learner uptake during speaking class activity, as Chaudron (1997) stated that corrective feedback can be defined as every reaction of the teacher which transforms, disapprovingly, refers to, or even demands the learners' improvement in giving utterances as cited in Panova & Lyster (2002). In education field, Westberg and Hilliard (2001) defined feedback as information that students are

given about their performance with the intention of guiding them in acquiring desired attitudes and skills (Pirhonen, 2016).

Meanwhile, Lyster and Ranta (1997) defined uptake as student's utterance as a respond following the teacher's feedback and still in needs of repairs (Sheen, 2004). Lyster and Ranta (1997) distinguish two types of uptake: repair and needs repair. Repair refers to a correction that has been treated by the teacher, while needs repair refers to an uptake which the error is not corrected.

F. Previous Research

Oral corrective feedback and students' uptake have been used as one of teacher's measurement upon student's involvement during the learning process in classroom. Thus, this topic research has been investigated by many researchers since the 1990's, Lyster and Ranta (1997) started on doing a critical research about oral corrective feedback and students' uptake as a pioneer. Lyster and Ranta from McGill University and Concordia University in Canada (1997) did a research with two purposes: first, to develop an analytic model in an error treatment, and second, to documenting student-teacher interaction in L2 classrooms about the frequency and distribution in the relation of corrective feedback to learner uptake (i.e., student's responses to feedback). The research concerned with corrective feedback as an analytic teaching strategy. Lyster and Ranta were focused on reporting the types and corrective feedbacks distribution and their relationship to students' uptake. The result shows that teachers provided 62% feedbacks upon students' error. Unfortunately, teachers were only giving *recast* (is a feedback given by the

teacher that provides the correct form by reformulating all or part of the student's utterance without including the errors) and almost 70% of recasts did not lead to uptake.

Meanwhile, Taddarth (2010) from Montreal University did an experimental research upon 53 students Grade 6 and two teachers from Montreal French Language School. The research examined the effects of explicit and implicit recast in terms of uptake and learning, also investigated the relationship between uptake and L2 learning. The result shows that explicit recast is more effective than the implicit one. It was also revealed that uptake could help facilitate L2 learning.

Another research, done by Leiter (2010) from the University of Vienna took the advanced learner classroom of English Department in that university as the research site. The research examined errors, corrective feedback, and uptake. The study analyzed types of errors, how many errors were corrected and in which way, do some errors preferred to be corrected in certain way, reveal how students reacted to teacher's correction, and whether particular types of feedback cause more uptake than the others. The result shows that 71,90% of all errors were corrected. Unlike to past findings, recasts were not dominating as the most frequent feedback type. As a matter of fact, prompts were the most frequent type of feedback, while recasts were just only 16,25% of all feedback moves. Uptake followed 71,25% of all feedbacks and divided into two types: 40,36% uptake needs-repair and 59,64% uptake in repair. Uptake seemed to be more occur in prompts and explicit types of feedback.

On the EFL side, a research done by Fu & Nassaji (2016) in Chinese adult classroom. The research took place in an adult Chinese EFL classroom. The researchers were examined three things: teacher feedback, learner uptake, and teacher & student perception of feedback. The result shows that it was found that the teacher was found to use additional feedback types beside the types which proposed by Lyster & Ranta's (1997), they are: delayed recast, asking a direct question, directing question to other students, re-ask, and using L-1 English. For teacher and students' perception of feedback, it is shows that their perception was not match and both of them did not accurate in noticing the frequency of every feedback type.

This study has the same coding system as (Lyster & Ranta, 1997) to write the result of teacher feedbacks and student uptakes. Nevertheless, this research study has a difference in a term of focus. When Taddarth (2010) focus on the effects of explicit and implicit recast, this study is focus on the allocation types of both Oral Corrective feedback which given by the teacher and types of uptakes which recognized as students' responds toward the feedback. Meanwhile, Fu & Nassaji (2016) held the study on 13 students of Chinese adult foreign classroom and a native Mandarin teacher. The present study will be conducted in an English Speaking class the subject of Speaking for Academic class, consists of 39 EFL students of second semester in the major of English Education Department and an EFL lecturer.