

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 The Background of the Study

Speaking is claimed as one of the pivotal skill that should be achieved and mastered for language learners. According to Derakhsan, Khalili, and Baheshti (2015) as cited in Derakhsan et al. (2016), the past four decades have witnessed the rapid development of speaking skill in second language learning because speaking plays an important role in learners' language development. In addition, speaking is considered to be the skill that is used to measure the success of English learning to some foreign language students (Widiati & Cahyono, 2006; Mattarima & Hamdan, 2011). Rocio (2012) also states that speaking is generally thought to be the most important of the four skills. Therefore, the mastery of speaking skills in English is a priority for many second language or foreign language learners (see Richards, 2008).

Despite the importance of speaking that has been highlighted in some theories, Indonesian learners still consider speaking to be one of the most challenging skills to be acquired. Speaking is an even more problematic skill to be mastered by foreign language students (Al-Saadi, Tonawanik, & Al-Harthy, 2013). Indeed, some frustration commonly voiced by learners is that they have spent years studying English, but still they cannot speak it. This could happen because of the lack of speaking exposure (Ramesh, 2012). It is evident that Indonesian learners still face some problems in learning spoken English (Widiati & Cahyono, 2006; Sayuri, 2016; Yusuf & Zuraini, 2016).

The evidence of students' problem in spoken English can be found in several works. Pramuditha (2015) investigates students' difficulties in speaking English and their strategies to overcome the difficulties. The results of this study showed that the students had issues in speaking English, For example, lack of understanding of grammatical patterns, vocabulary, incorrect pronunciation and others. It is also supported by Hojati (2013) who states that a non-native speaker, especially at the initial and intermediate stages of learning, may find it difficult in learning to speak

**Frisilla Wulan Tersta, 2017**

*AN ANALYSIS OF ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK TO SCAFFOLD STUDENTS IN LEARNING SPOKEN ENGLISH*  
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

English. As a result, the learners maintain to code-switch, to think about speaking patterns, and to prevent communication breakdowns which result in deviations or ‘errors’ in speaking (Robinson & Ellis 2008).

However, the students remain to make mistakes which may lead to get the errors fossilized (see Harmer, 2001). According to Martinez (2006), in order to lead students to be aware of some errors, learners need to receive comprehensible input from teachers who can help them improve their competence and performance. However, in a similar vein, Lengkanawati (2017) argues that teacher as a facilitator in the classroom should let the students involved in the process of learning itself to give them an autonomous learning experience.

Teachers play an important role in helping students solve their difficulties in speaking, if they can perform their teaching as a moderator who guides the students’ learning process. According to Martinez (2006), a good teacher is the one who can see beyond the face of the students and beyond the grammar books he is using to accomplish his teaching. In other words, teachers should be able to be skillful in giving some kinds of feedback to the students in developing their capacity.

One of the strategies to scaffold the students is providing feedback as comprehensible input for students. There are several strategies in providing feedback, such as evaluative feedback and interactive feedback (Cullen, 2002; Richard & Lockhart, 1996 as cited in Ran & Danli, 2016). The feedback given by the teacher may contribute to develop students’ capacity or may only correct students’ error to help students complete the task (Thompson, 2010).

The most common feedback that teachers usually employ in their teaching is corrective feedback (Fawbush, 2010). Hen (2008, as cited in Méndez & Cruz, 2012) suggests that corrective feedback is a more general way of providing some clues, or eliciting some correction, in addition to the direct correction made by the teacher. Moreover, corrective feedback can push the students to modify their faulty utterances (Swain in Lowen & Reinders, 2011) and prevent fossilization (Gass, 1991; Mendez & Cruz, 2010). Corrective feedback is defined as a teacher’s reactive move that invites the learners to attend to the grammatical accuracy of the utterance which is produced

by the learner (Sheen, 2007). According to Ellis, Lowen, and Erlam (2006), corrective feedback takes the form of one or a combination of the following responses by a teacher when a learner makes an error. Therefore, teachers use the corrective feedback to avoid the students having difficulties in speaking.

However, there is a controversy in the field of corrective feedback. The position of corrective feedback that is postulated as a helping tool to decrease students' error is not without many debates. Some of the researchers believe that by giving the corrective feedback to the students, it can be beneficial for them (Chu, 2010 as cited in Bhuana, 2014), while others claim that corrective feedback can just make the students feel ashamed (Agudo, 2013). According to Long (1996), the feedback is believed effective in developing students' second language acquisition since it helps students move from an incorrect hypothesis to correct one when they make some errors. On the other hand, some scholars believe that corrective feedback should be abandoned because it can have potential negative effects on learners and hence impeding the flow of communication (Krashen, 1981a; 1982b; Truscott, 1999).

Some researchers have investigated the role of corrective feedback. For example, Fajriah (2015) investigated the effectiveness of comprehensible input, explicit teaching and corrective feedback in teaching spoken hortatory exposition. The analysis showed that comprehensible input, explicit teaching and corrective feedback develop students' skills in spoken hortatory exposition. In addition, Maolida (2013) investigated various types of oral corrective feedback. The finding revealed that the teacher employed seven types of oral corrective feedback: recast, elicitation, clarification request, explicit correction, repetition, metalinguistic feedback, and paralinguistic signal. Those two studies focus on types of corrective feedback.

To expand on the existing types of corrective feedback, this study focuses on exploring the potential of corrective feedback for scaffolding students in their learning of spoken English. One study related to corrective feedback has been conducted by Ran and Danli (2010) who investigated how scaffolding effects verbal feedback in English classes of China's secondary schools. This study identified the

concept of corrective feedback as a means of offering modified input to students, which could consequently lead to modified output by the students. This study affirms that corrective feedback is part of scaffolding, although some findings show that some other types of corrective feedback offered by the teacher in this study are not considered corrective feedback. Similarly, this study attempts to identify some corrective feedback that is not considered scaffolding.

More in this study is an attempt to explore how corrective feedback could scaffold learners. More specifically, this study aims to investigate the types of oral corrective feedback that are frequently used to scaffold students in learning spoken English and to examine how scaffolding oral corrective feedback influences the students' improvement in learning spoken English.

## **1.2 Statements of the Problem**

This study is guided by the following research questions:

1. What kind of oral corrective feedback is frequently used to scaffold students in learning spoken English?
2. How does scaffolding oral corrective feedback influence the students' improvement in spoken English competence?

## **1.3 Purposes of the Study**

Concerning the statement of the problems above, this study is embarked on achieving the objectives of this study. Firstly, this study aims to investigate various types of oral corrective feedback that is frequently used to scaffold student in learning spoken English. Secondly, this study examines how scaffolding oral corrective feedback can influence the students' improvement in learning spoken English.

## **1.4 Scope of the Study**

The study is narrowed in order to give clear understanding and to avoid the ambiguity. Firstly, there are two modes of feedback; written feedback and oral feedback, and this study explores on the oral corrective feedback strategies to scaffold the students in learning spoken English. Secondly, the focus of the subject is in one

class which involves one teacher and students in the classroom. Thirdly, this study concerns only in one unit of the learning process. Finally, the analysis, findings, conclusions of this study limited to and based upon the analysis of the data obtained from participants only. There are no extraneous factors in affecting the research questions.

### **1.5 Significance of the Study**

This study is potentially significant in three aspects of contribution: theoretical, practical, and professional benefits. Theoretically, the study is expected to enrich the literature on the oral corrective feedback in English teaching and learning, especially in students' spoken competence, meanwhile it deals with the students' improvement which has not been much concern in any research in Indonesia context.

Practically, this research expected to give further information for teachers in recognizing the different types of oral corrective feedback and applying them in their classroom interaction by looking at the students' needs and level. Teachers also can have an insight point of view to determine what kind of oral corrective feedback that is effective for the students' improvement. In addition, as it is explained by some researchers that feedback is a part of scaffolding, this study can give some overview of the implementation of corrective feedback that relates to the characteristics of scaffolding.

Professionally, the result of this study can be a guide for teachers in selecting types of oral corrective feedback and as a reflection for teachers and researcher in giving oral corrective feedback to the learners. Furthermore, teachers can also determine the concept between scaffolding and rescuing in the development of language learners.

### **1.6 Definition of Terms**

In order to make clear about the definition of the terms and to avoid misunderstanding and misinterpretation, the terms are defined as follows:

**Speaking:** Speaking is an interactive process of constructing meaning that involves producing and receiving and processing information (Brown, 1994; Burns & Joyce, 1997). In conclusion, speaking is an activity which contains information based on someone experiences.

**Corrective Feedback:** Corrective feedback is defined as “responses to learner utterance containing an error” (Lyster & Saito & Sato, 2013, p. 2). It can be concluded that corrective feedback is any correction that the students received from the teacher during the classroom activities.

**Scaffolding:** The term scaffolding can be defined as temporary assistance that teachers provide for their students to assist them to complete a task or develop new understandings, so that they will later be able to complete similar tasks alone (Hammond, 2001). To sum up, scaffolding is the teacher-students’ effort in understanding the knowledge.

**Students’ Error:** Any utterance that should not be produced by learners such as dealing with something that grammatically incorrect or mispronounced word.