

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents an overview of the research. It covers the background of the present research, research questions, research purposes, research significances, rationale, and previous studies.

A. Background

Teaching pronunciation is an essential aspect of TESOL. Hismanoglu (2006) stated that pronunciation teaching has a vital role in oral communication. In line with Hismanoglu, Yuzawa (2007) also showed that pronunciation mastery is needed to use English as a means of verbal communication. Willing (as cited in Chongning, 2009) stated that mastering the sound and pronunciation of the target language is a foremost priority for English speakers. It means that good pronunciation is going to be the basis for learners to gain English well.

Morley (1991 cited in Gilakjani, 2012) argues that pronunciation is vital for students learning English for international communication to speak correctly and intelligibly—not like natives, but well enough to be understood. The primary objectives for teaching pronunciation in any course are intelligible pronunciation, not perfect pronunciation (Gilakjani, 2012). A speaker has intelligible pronunciation when other people can understand what they mean. Intelligible pronunciation is a critical component of communicative competence. Pronunciation teaching should aim to enable learners to achieve intelligibility, which is more realistic and attainable. Intelligibility has become a legitimate goal of pronunciation teaching (Moedjito, 2019).

Since the last seven decades of TESOL in Indonesia, there are still a lot of challenges and problems in pronunciation classes faced by both English teachers and learners. Nimako (2018) argued that English classes had not supported students' sufficient understanding of English pronunciation since the primary level. She added that English teachers provide students with less feedback on their pronunciations. In the EFL teaching and learning process, students commonly make some errors in their pronunciation. In this situation, teachers take the most

crucial role in giving students feedback about their errors to make them learn and understand their errors before. Clear and concise feedback plays a significant role in students' development of English pronunciation. It gives students an incomplete picture of what they are weak at and what they need to improve (Grami, 2005).

To provide feedback, teachers could use different techniques. Corrective feedback techniques are divided into two, explicit and implicit. In implicit error correction, teachers do not tell students directly that they made errors. In explicit correction, the teachers show the students' errors and provide the correction (Ellis, 2009 cited in Husna, 2019). Linguists provide several corrective feedback. According to Lyster & Ranta (as mentioned in Husna, 2019), teachers can use various strategies to provide corrective feedback, such as recast, metalinguistic feedback, clarification request, explicit feedback, elicitation, and repetition. A decade later, these types were classified into two broad corrective feedback categories: reformulations and prompts. In 2012, they extended the classes to include 'paralinguistic signal.' Meanwhile, Tunstal and Gipps (1996), as cited in Anggraeni (2012), classified corrective feedback into eight types: rewarding, approving, specifying attainment, construction achievement, punishing, disapproving, and selecting improvement, and constructing the way forward-mutual critical appraisal. According to Wolsey (2009), he divided feedback into four types; there is feedback as an affirmation, feedback as clarification, feedback as observation, questions, exploration, and the last is feedback as a correction (cited in Anggraeni, 2012).

There are several studies examining teachers' corrective feedback on English pronunciation. The first study was conducted by Nurmiati (2017), who investigated the corrective feedback strategies used by an Indonesian Junior High School teacher. The result concluded that the teacher used recast in correcting students' errors. The second study was conducted by Arianto (2019), who investigated the types of teachers' corrective feedback on students' pronunciation errors. He concluded that the teacher used three types of corrective feedback:

recast, explicit correction, and repetition. He added that teachers' corrective feedback could improve the students' pronunciation ability.

In this pandemic situation, the government limited everything and teaching-learning processes or school activities conducted online. Based on the pre-observation explored in SMP Al-Hasan Bandung, The researcher found they completed the English teaching and learning process online. Google Meet is the online platform for running the teaching and learning process in this pandemic situation. This junior high school also used WhatsApp as the platform for submitting the students' assignments. The teacher held the meeting 40 minutes per hour, and it takes one session a week.

Nurmiati's (2017) and Arianto's (2019) studies have the same concern as the present research, which investigates the teachers' types of corrective feedback of English pronunciation. Based on the phenomenon, this current research focused on analyzing the corrective feedback strategies used by the teacher on correcting students' pronunciation errors in SMP Al-Hasan Bandung in Google Meet. The researcher designed this research to determine the corrective feedback used by the teacher to correct students' pronunciation errors when conducting the teaching-learning process in Google Meet. Therefore, the researcher becomes curious and tries to investigate this with a research entitled "EXPLORING THE TEACHERS' CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON STUDENTS' PRONUNCIATION ERRORS IN VIRTUAL CLASSROOM."

B. Research Questions

The research concern is defined into the following questions:

1. What are the teachers' corrective feedback strategies used to correct students' pronunciation errors in the virtual classroom?
2. What are the teacher's preferences toward implementing corrective feedback on students' pronunciation errors in the virtual classroom?
3. What are the students' responses toward the teachers' corrective feedback on their pronunciation errors in the virtual classroom?

C. Research Purposes

From the research questions above, this study is aimed at obtaining three following objectives:

1. To find out corrective feedback strategies are used to correct students' pronunciation errors in the virtual classroom
2. To find out the teacher's preferences toward implementing corrective feedback on students' pronunciation errors in the virtual classroom
3. To find out the students' responses toward the teachers' corrective feedback on their pronunciation errors in the virtual classroom

D. Research Significances

This study has two significant perspectives; theoretically and practically. Theoretically, this study enriches the notion of teachers' corrective feedback on students' pronunciation errors in the virtual classroom. Practically, the research results can recommend English teachers who want to improve their feedback in online pronunciation classes.

E. Rationale

Pronunciation refers to the sound of a language or phonology, including stress, rhythm, intonation, and the role of individual sounds, both segmental and supra-segmental (Richard, 2002). Pronunciation is the act or manner of pronouncing words; utterance of speech. It is a way of speaking a word, especially a way that is accepted or understood (Otlowski, 2004). Kristina (2016) also stated that pronunciation could involve producing and receiving speech sounds and meaning-making.

Regarding the importance of pronunciation in TESOL, corrective feedback plays a significant role. Hattie (2007) stated that feedback was the most potent moderator that enhanced achievement. He explained that a teacher should provide information on how and why students understand and misunderstand something and what the students should do or say to improve. Corrective feedback is the awareness of teachers to identify and correct student errors. Ellis (1994, cited in Haryanto, 2015) defined corrective feedback as information provided to learners to revise their inter-language. From this definition, the teacher assumes corrective

feedback to be essential for students to achieve the target language. In teaching oral skills or speaking to students, teachers need to provide corrective feedback to avoid systematic or continuous errors made by students in the target language they learn.

Corrective feedback is critical in language teaching, including teaching pronunciation. Mariana (2017) explained the importance of corrective feedback as it provides information about reactions to a product, a person's performance of a task, is used as a basis for improvement. In teaching pronunciation, the responses mean the teachers' correction towards the students' performance on pronunciation. The product here is the students' performance when they speak using the target language in the classroom. The students need corrective feedback to improve their pronunciation ability. Lamb (2007) wrote that corrective feedback could become a strategy for the teacher to interact with the students positively. It encourages them to handle language problems in a way that does not lower their self-confidence and willingness to learn. Ellis (2009) admitted that feedback is seen as contributing to language learning. Then, research by Nurmiati (2017) found out that corrective feedback is helpful for the students to know the parts of the errors they made. It also helps them to avoid the same error in future performance. Besides, they learned much from the corrective feedback. Next, Fadilah (2017) said that corrective feedback could boost the students' awareness of the errors. In short, corrective feedback is helpful for the students as it informs weaknesses and helps them avoid making the same error in their future performance.

There are several different types of corrective feedback provided by several linguists. Lyster & Ranta (1997 cited in Husna, 2019) divided corrective feedback into six major categories: recast, elicitation, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, explicit correction, and repetition. A decade later, these types were classified into two broad corrective feedback categories: reformulations and prompts. Moreover, in 2012, they extended the types to include 'paralinguistic signal.' Meanwhile, Tunstall and Gipps (1996 cited in Husna, 2019) classified corrective feedback into eight types: rewarding, approving, specifying attainment, construction achievement, punishing, disapproving, selecting improvement, and

constructing the way forward-mutual critical appraisal. There is another classification of feedback proposed by Wolsey (2009 cited in Anggraeni, 2012). According to him, not all feedbacks merely focus on the error, although they should correct mistakes. He divides feedback into four types: feedback as affirmation; feedback that clarifies; feedback as observation, questions, and exploration; and feedback as a correction.

F. Limitation of Research

This research focuses on the teachers' corrective feedback strategies on students' English pronunciation errors in Google Meet. The results are valid only for the 22 students who took part in this research. This research considers the teachers' corrective feedback of English pronunciation in this context only. It cannot be overgeneralized to another similar phenomenon out of context.

G. Previous Studies

There are three previous studies relating to the teachers' corrective feedback on students' pronunciation errors. The results of previous studies are helpful for consideration in this present research.

The first study was conducted by Nurmiati (2017), who investigated corrective feedback strategies used by the teacher to respond to students' speaking errors and explain students' perception toward corrective feedback using the case study method. The participants in this research were an English teacher and 40 students of the tenth grade of marketing 1, SMKN 3 Pontianak. From direct observation, it was found that the corrective feedback strategies used by the teacher were recast (31.82%), explicit correction (22.73%), elicitation (18.18%), repetition (15.91%) and clarification request (11.36%). The strategy that mostly appeared was recast. To correct the students' errors in speaking, the teacher directly facilitated the students with the correct form.

Furthermore, there were two questionnaires given to the students to know students' perception toward corrective feedback. The result showed that most of the students (50%) preferred explicit correction because they thought that it was helpful for them to know the part of their error and made it easier to correct the error to avoid the same error in the future performance. The students also gave

positive responses because they thought that corrective feedback given by the teacher was constructive. They also learned much from the feedback. They felt satisfied and did not resent being corrected and believed to correct their error.

The second study was conducted by Huang (2016) that focused on similarities and differences between teacher and student perceptions of corrective feedback. Using a group interview and a questionnaire survey, she investigated the corrective feedback on pronunciation for students' presentations in advanced English class. This research involved several participants; there were 73 students (68 females and five males) of the School of Foreign Languages, Beijing Forestry University, among whom 40 were junior English-major students and 33 senior English-major students, aged from 20 to 24. Based on the data, the participants have completed basic training of English language skills, such as speaking, listening, writing, and reading instead of English pronunciation. Besides, another group of participants involved 25 teachers who have been experienced in teaching English. Using a well-designed questionnaire and interview in the research, she obtained the results that corrective feedback is necessary for the students since they still have pronunciation errors that need teachers' help to correct them. Moreover, both teachers and students agreed that corrective feedback would be better if applied after presenting, not interrupting when speaking.

The third study was conducted by Van Ha et al. (2021), who investigated the teachers' and learners' perspectives toward oral corrective feedback in English as a foreign language classrooms. This study used the qualitative descriptive method. It was conducted to the Vietnamese English teachers and students. The data consisted of questionnaires with 250 students, interview 15 of those who completed the questionnaires, and interview with 24 teachers at four public secondary schools in Vietnam. The researcher observed the students' and teachers' beliefs toward the implementation of oral corrective feedback in the English classroom, the types of oral corrective feedback, and the timing of giving oral corrective feedback. As a result, the data findings showed some matches and mismatches between the teachers' and students' beliefs. Both the teachers and students highly valued the efficacy of feedback and were positive about explicit

feedback types such as explicit correction and metalinguistic feedback. Metalinguistic feedback is the most frequently used by teachers. They stated that it helped students understand the errors and have a chance to self-correct. Regarding feedback timing, the students preferred immediate feedback. At the same time, the teachers expressed their concerns about the students' personal state and the possibility of disruption of immediate feedback on the flow of students' speech.

This present research is quite different from those studies above. This research is conducted on an online platform. This research explores the teachers' strategies in giving corrective feedback on students' pronunciation errors in a virtual classroom (Google Meet) and investigates students' responses after the corrective feedback has been given. English teachers and EFL students at the junior high school level are involved in the research process.





uin

UNIVERSITAS ISLAM NEGERI
SUNAN GUNUNG DJATI
BANDUNG