

## **CHAPTER I**

### **INTRODUCTION**

This chapter presents some aspects related to the background of the study. It also includes the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the significance of the study, the scope of the study, clarification of terms, and the thesis organization.

#### **1.1 Background of the Study**

In second language learning classrooms, teacher usually provides feedback to correct students' erroneous utterance. This kind of feedback is known as corrective feedback. According to Ellis (2009), corrective feedback refers to the teacher's responses to the students' utterance containing linguistic error. The responses can consist of indication that an error has been committed, provision of the correct target language form, metalinguistic information about the nature of error, or any combination of these (Ellis, et al, 2006 and Ellis, 2009).

Corrective feedback has various types. Lyster and Ranta (1997) develop six types of corrective feedback. They are explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation and repetition. The same type of corrective feedback is also offered by Panova and Lyster (2002) with the addition of translation and Ellis (2009) with the addition of paralinguistic signal. In conclusion, corrective feedback may come in eight different forms.

Corrective feedback is found to have positive influence on the students' second language acquisition. Through corrective feedback, the students will be aware of their error (Schmidt, 2001; Swain, 2010; Corpuz, 2011; and Jeong, 2013). They will realize that there is a gap between what they have already said and the correct rule of the target language (Long, 1996; Rutherford and White in Hashimoto, 2002; Beuningen, 2010; Park, 2010, and Vanpatten in Ellis, 2009, Swain, 2010, and Corpuz, 2011). This can promote improvement in their second

language production (Park, 2010) and contribute to their acquisition in a long term (Chaudron in Ellis, 1994 and Vanpatten in Ellis, 2009).

Apart from the positive effect offered by corrective feedback, there are several factors influencing the use of corrective feedback in the classroom activities. One of them is students' language proficiency levels. Students' language proficiency levels may influence the teacher's choice of corrective feedback types (see Lyster and Ranta, 1997; Kennedy, 2010; Ajideh and Aghdam, 2012; Al-Naqbi, 2009; and Anghari and Amirzadeh, 2011). For the intermediate and advance students, for instance, the teacher tends to use corrective feedback types in which the correct form is not provided and force them to correct the error by themselves (Kennedy, 2010). This is because the students are assumed to have more linguistic knowledge about the target language than the beginning students (Kennedy, 2010). In contrast, for the beginning students, who may not have as much knowledge about the target language, the teacher provides corrective feedback in which the repair work is actually provided, such as explicit correction and recast (Kennedy, 2010).

In other countries, the studies relating to the use of corrective feedback for students' of different proficiency levels have been widely conducted. In the case of recast in which the teachers reformulate the students' error, for instance, Lyster and Ranta (1997) found that teacher tended to use for the beginning and advanced students. Ajideh and Aghdam (2012) study discovered that recast was used not only for the beginning and advanced students, but also for the intermediate one. On the contrary to those two studies, Anghari and Amirzadeh (2011) study revealed that the teacher reduced the use of recast for the advanced students and incorporated others types of corrective feedback such as clarification request. This is similar to Kennedy's study (2010) which found that recast was only used to correct the error produced by the beginning students. For the intermediate and advanced students, the teacher used other types of corrective feedback in which there is no correct form, such as metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, clarification request, and repetition.

Meanwhile, in Indonesia, most studies (e.g. Khaerunisa, 2002; Jarkasi, 2007; and Maolida, 2013) focused on investigating the implementation of corrective feedback on students' spoken error, students' uptake, the teacher's role in giving corrective feedback to the students' spoken error, the type of error that teacher prefers to respond, and the strategy that teacher chooses to employ in treating the error. The studies have depicted the use of corrective feedback in classroom activities, but have not touched upon other factors, such as students' language proficiency levels.

Based on the facts above, this study is intended to observe and explore the oral corrective feedback that a teacher provides for the students of different proficiency levels. In addition, the study also attempts to investigate the types of corrective feedback contributing to more uptake and the students' attitude to the use of oral corrective feedback. It is expected that the findings of this study will offer a different insight in term of the use of oral corrective feedback in the foreign language classroom.

## **1.2 Statement of the Problem**

Based on the explanation in the background of the study above, there are three research questions that will be answered in this study. They are:

1. What types of oral corrective feedback does a teacher provide for the students in low, mid, and high proficiency levels?
2. What are the types of oral corrective feedback contributing to more uptake in low, mid, and high proficiency levels?
3. What attitude do the students of different proficiency levels hold to the oral corrective feedback used by a teacher in the classroom activity?

### **1.3 Purpose of the Study**

This study is intended to:

1. Discover the types of oral corrective feedback that a teacher provides for the students in low, mid, and high proficiency levels.
2. Discover the types of oral corrective feedback contributing to more uptake in low, mid, and high proficiency levels.
3. Discover the attitude of the students of different proficiency levels toward the oral corrective feedback used by a teacher in the classroom activity.

### **1.4 Significance of the Study**

This study is considerably significant in three aspects. Theoretically, the result of this study is expected to enrich the literature of English teaching since it offers a different insight on the use oral corrective feedback in classroom activities. Practically, the result of this study can provide information regarding the actual condition of the teacher's use of oral corrective feedback for students of different proficiency levels, the types of corrective feedback that lead to more uptake, and the students' attitude to the use of oral corrective feedback. Professionally, the result of this study can be made as guidance for teachers so that they can carefully select the types of oral corrective feedback to correct students' errors.

### **1.5 Scope of the Study**

Since corrective feedback can be used in both written and oral language, this study mainly focuses on the second one. The study only examines the types of corrective feedback used by a teacher across beginning, intermediate, and advance levels, the types of corrective feedback contributing to more uptake, and the students' attitude to the use of corrective feedback.

Regarding the site and participants, this study will be conducted in one of the department in a polytechnique in Bandung. A teacher and first year students will be selected as participants. The students are selected since they are considered to have heterogeneous levels of English proficiency.

## **1.6 Clarification of Terms**

- Oral Corrective Feedback: The feedback that the students receive on the error they make in their oral target language production.
- Students' Proficiency Levels: The degree of skill in which the students can use the target language. In this study, students' proficiency levels deals with how well the students can speak.
- Uptake: The students' response to the teacher's corrective feedback.
- Students' Attitude: Students' tendency to response to the implementation of corrective feedback. It has three components, which are cognitive (belief), affective (feeling), and behavioral (action).

## **1.7 Thesis Organization**

This thesis is started with introduction chapter, which contains background, research questions, research objectives, scope of the study, and thesis organization. The second chapter is mainly designed to review theories that will be used in the study. The third chapter provides some information on methodology which includes research design, site and participants, data collection method, and data analysis.

Next, the fourth chapter of this study covers the report on the implementation of corrective feedback for the students of different proficiency levels, the types of corrective feedback contributing to more uptake, and the students' attitude to the corrective feedback that a teacher uses in the classroom activity. The last chapter, chapter five, presents a conclusion and suggestion for further research.