

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background of Study

This study explores teacher's oral corrective feedback and student's perception. Feedback is an essential element that is considered a difficult issue in the higher education level, especially its implementation to improve student's learning process (Al-Bashir et al., 2016). Chong (2020) states that to understand feedback and to raise student's confidence about their understanding on the feedback, students must develop their capacity to act on the feedback they receive.

A broader conceptualization from Hattie & Timperley (2007), feedback informs learners not only about their learning target but also about their performance in achieving them and what they should do next. If feedback is exchanged between teachers and students, complex activities may become quite simple and easy to understand (Sobhani, 2015). Feedback can be an essential pedagogical tool in learning development (Saliu-Abdulahi et al., 2017).

One of the most common criticisms of feedback has to do with the main unitary approach to conceptualizing and formulating it in higher education (see Boud and Molloy 2013; Evans 2013; Nicol 2010 Cited in Ajjawi & Boud, 2018). Corrective feedback plays a central role in learning because it highlights the mistakes made by learners and enables them to eliminate such mistakes in the future (Alsolami, 2019). A study using conversation feedback and discourse analysis emphasized the characteristics of linguistic, quasi-verbal, and non-verbal communication, which led to the inclusion of corrective feedback comments in their interactions and reduced student face loss as reported by Rizan et al. (2014) (see Ajjawi & Boud,

2018 for further details). Corrective feedback will lead to good teacher-student interaction, which is very important in language courses (Şakiroğlu, 2020). Oral corrective feedback is one of the feedback strategies that a teacher can use. Understanding the learner as well as the teacher's preference can be done with several ways of feedback in oral studies and it depends on their level (Alsolami, 2019). For Şakiroğlu (2020), oral correction feedback cannot usually be assessed because it is usually designed to highlight learners' mistakes and trigger self-correction.

In Indonesia, English is known as a foreign language. One of the skills that students learn in English is writing. Writing is a skill that must be learned well and seems to be the most challenging skill for EFL learners (Sobhani, 2015). The difficulties in the writing process may be faced by the students. The ultimate goal of foreign language teaching is to achieve a higher level of language competence in providing maximum language exposure and minimum learner error (Şakiroğlu, 2020). To achieve that goal, a teacher needs to give feedback for correcting a learner's mistakes. Transformation of feedback has been realized in at least two types of feedback, that is, written and oral (Sobhani, 2015). He found that feedback could be more effective if oral feedback is combined with written feedback for greater performance in essay writing.

Based on a preliminary investigation at SMP PLUS Bandung Timur, teachers often gave oral feedback on students' tasks completed on student's English workbooks (known as LKS). The English teacher said that she often gives the feedback verbally toward the student's task at that time or once in a month. The current researcher wants to observe deeply the teacher's oral feedback in correcting student's writing. Procedure text was chosen as the material for their writing because there are generic structure and language features as a reference to see their understanding of the text.

There are previous studies related to oral corrective feedback. Sawaluddin & Tajuddin, (2017) Oral Corrective Feedback (CF), including

teacher's selection in actual practices on student's oral errors by using an observation checklist, the necessary information including student's name, types of errors, types of corrective feedback, and the timing of corrective feedback used by teachers were recorded. The result showed that they were all aware of the using types of CF in their language classrooms and offline CF or delayed feedback for the preference timing. In particular, Rassaei, (2019) compared the effects of oral feedback in response to L2 learners' written errors from the sociocultural and cognitive-interactionist perspectives (called dynamic and non-dynamic feedback during dyadic and small group interactions). The findings showed that dynamic feedback was more effective when provided to a group of learners than when provided to a single learner during dyadic interactions. This study will present types of teacher's oral corrective feedback on student's writing procedural text and student's perception toward oral corrective feedback that given by the teacher.

## **1.2 Research Questions**

Some questions are to be discussed in this study:

1. What are types of oral corrective feedback strategies used by the teacher?
2. How is the student's perception toward the oral corrective feedback strategy given by the teacher?

## **1.3 Research Purposes**

The purposes of this study are:

1. To analyze types of oral corrective feedback strategy are used by the teacher.
2. To find out student's perceptions toward the feedback strategies are given by the teacher.

#### **1.4 Research Significance**

Theoretically, this study is expected to encourage the readers of giving the students oral corrective feedback in the classroom. In particular, this study is expected to give the awareness for the teachers or future teachers to use oral corrective feedback to their students in the writing process.

#### **1.5 Research Scope**

Feedback has an important role in the learning process. Oral corrective feedback has a significant positive impact on the language skills of learners to enhance the spoken language and develop written language and grammar skills in the learner (Asolami, 2019). While writing is the most difficult skill for EFL learners because it is a skill that must be well (Sobhani, 2015), this study will focus on the teacher's oral corrective feedback accomplished by the teacher on student's writing texts.

#### **1.6 Research Framework**

Writing is one of the English language skills to develop critical thinking in the learning process. It is because writing is the process of arranging ideas that can increase intelligence (Junianti et al., 2020). In the education field, writing is an essential skill for learners. Writing allows learners to share information, opinions, feelings, arguments, beliefs, theories, explanations, and etcetera. Writing skills entail multifaceted and complex in the existence of guiding the students to focus on "how to generate ideas, how to organize them coherently, how to use discourse markers and rhetorical conventions to put them cohesively into a written text, how to revise text for clearer meaning, how to edit text for appropriate grammar, and how to produce a final product" (Brown, 2007 p. 335).

Writing is a tool for increasing the ability to use language. In learning English, students are required to do their writing such as assignments. Besides, writing also a skill that can improve others

considerably and support other skills (Huy, 2015). Particularly, writing is required in many contexts throughout life such as communicate with other people using email overseas.

Previous study has found the problems of writing skill. Most English as a foreign language (EFL) students feel that writing English is a difficult thing because they have to use the appropriate English grammar and vocabulary, apply what they have learned about writing skills, and merge the knowledge with their previous experience on the topic given when writing (Hermilinda, 2016).

The writing process is commonly learned in an environment of constant criticism and repeated failure (Carroll, 1990). Moreover, for complex tasks such as writing, the teachers need to give more feedback on student's writing. Nelson & Schunn (2009) state that one of the broad meanings of feedback that particular important is informational meaning, which feedback might consist of information to change performance in a certain direction.

Corrective feedback is a preceding given from the teacher to eliminate student's errors made in producing the target language (Nurkamto, 2018). Lyster & Ranta, (1997) classified corrective feedback into six categories as recasts, explicit correction, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition. There is study that applies cognitive-interactionist and sociocultural perspective on corrective feedback that called dynamic and non-dynamic feedback (Rassaei, 2019). The study state there are three main factors that play a central role in language acquisition in the cognitive-interactionist perspective, namely linguistic input, student output, and paying attention to target features in input.

## **1.7 Previous Study**

A growing number of studies are beginning to relate oral corrective feedback with student's writing. For example, Sawaluddin & Tajuddin

(2017) observed this phenomenon by focusing on teacher's selection in actual practices on student's oral errors. The participants were four teachers and 140 students. The purposive sampling was chosen and used a qualitative research design. This study used an observation checklist, the necessary information including the student's name, types of errors, types of corrective feedback, and the timing of corrective feedback used by teachers were recorded. The result showed that the teachers did not correct all the students, is 42% of errors received corrections. The teachers tended to correct the major error. The types of CF among the teachers were only concentrated on the two types of CF; recast and explicit correction. The other types of CF (metalinguistic, asking clarification, repetition, and elicitation) also being used based on the observation conducted. The timing of CF 'offline' or delayed response was being the main preference. This study showed that they were all aware of the using types of CF in their language classrooms and offline CF or delayed feedback for the preference timing.

Asolami (2019) explores the impact of Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) on student's language skills. The study used quantitative and qualitative design. Interview and observation records are analyzed to support the quantitative information. The effect of oral corrective feedback showed from the scores and language skills of the students from both groups. Oral corrective feedback has a significant positive impact on the language skills of learners. It does not only enhance the spoken language, but it also plays a critical role in the development of written language and grammar skills in the learner.

Furthermore, Sephrinia & Mehdizadeh (2016) investigate teacher's practices and beliefs about oral correction. The participants in this study were 37 Iranian EFL teachers. The data collection used interviews and observation. The result showed feedback is, in general, effective and it is teachers' responsibility to correct errors and make the students self-conscious. Most of the teachers interviewed believed that giving feedback is

emotionally more flexible and is more intrinsically motivated to learn. The result of observation showed the 7 teachers made 231 corrections (relating to 58% of all erroneous utterances) leaving 167 erroneous utterances (42%) uncorrected. The teachers have different styles and approaches to oral error correction. The dominant preference by the teachers was the recast.

The next study from Kleij & Adie (2020) examined teachers and students perceptions in English and mathematics classroom interactions. A case study design was used and this study investigated two cases, one conducted in the discipline of English teaching and mathematics. The participants are experienced English teachers and mathematics teachers, and the students in their respective Year 8 classes (students aged 13–14). This study focuses analysis on differences and similarities in individual participants' perceptions of feedback by examining their non-overlapping and overlapping VSR video pauses and the nature of their VSR commentary. The result showed that during class interactions, oral feedback provided will be differentially received by students, and frequently not perceived as intended.

Rassaei (2019) investigated the effect of oral feedback to L2 learner's written errors and comparing it during dyadic and small group interactions from sociocultural and cognitive-interactionist perspective called dynamic and non-dynamic feedback. The method used an experimental design and using post & delay post-test. The participants were 96 Persian EFL learners and 32 students were assigned to each of the three groups enrolled in the study. The findings revealed that dynamic feedback was more effective when provided to a group of learners than when provided to a single learner during dyadic interactions.

From those studies, the researcher can conclude that oral corrective feedback is important to develop student's language skills. Feedback should be more effective if it is supported by other perspectives such as sociocultural and cognitive-interactionist perspectives (Rassaei, 2019). This study analyzes the teacher's oral corrective feedback on students' writing

using observation categorized on students' name, types of errors, types of corrective feedback, and the timing of corrective feedback (Sawaluddin & Tajuddin, 2017), find out teacher's awareness of using the sociocultural and cognitive-interactionist perspectives, and student's perception after getting the feedback.

