

JURNAL

**THE EXPECTATION TOWARD LECTURER'S CORRECTIVE
FEEDBACK IN SPEAKING CLASS AT NUSANTARA PGRI KEDIRI
UNIVERSITY IN ACADEMIC YEAR 2016/2017**



NENI ARDIANA
13.1.01.08.0004

Advisors:

- 1. Dr. Diani Nurhajati, M.Pd.**
- 2. Lina Mariana. S.S. M.Pd.**

**ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION FACULTY
UNIVERSITY OF NUSANTARA PGRI KEDIRI**

2017

SURAT PERNYATAAN ARTIKEL SKRIPSI TAHUN 2017




Yang bertanda tangan di bawah ini:

Nama Lengkap : NENI ARDIANA
NPM : 13.1.01.08.0004
Telepon/HP : 089 622 540 614
Alamat Surel (Email) : neniardiana27@gmail.com
Judul Artikel : The Expectation toward Lecturer's Corrective Feedback
in Speaking Class at Nusantara PGRI Kediri University
in Academic Year 2016/2017
Fakultas – Program Studi : FKIP – Bahasa Inggris
Nama Perguruan Tinggi : Universitas Nusantara PGRI Kediri
Alamat Perguruan Tinggi : Jalan KH. Achmad Dahlan No. 76

Dengan ini menyatakan bahwa :

- a. artikel yang saya tulid merupakan karya saya pribadi (bersama tim penulis) dan bebas plagiarisme;
- b. artikel telah diteliti dan disetujui untuk diterbitkan oleh Dosen Pembimbing I dan II.

Demikian surat pernyataan ini saya buat dengan sesungguhnya. Apabila di kemudian hari ditemukan ketidaksesuaian data dengan pernyataan ini dan atau ada tuntutan dari pihak lain, saya bersedia bertanggungjawab dan diproses sesuai dengan ketentuan yang berlaku.

Mengetahui		Kediri, 12 JULI 2017
Pembimbing I  Dr. Diani Nurhajati, M.Pd. NIP / NIDN. 0711126302	Pembimbing II  Lina Mariana, S.S. M.Pd. NIP / NIDN. 0710097401	Penulis,  Neni Ardiana NPM. 13.1.01.08.0004

THE EXPECTATION TOWARD LECTURER'S CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN SPEAKING CLASS AT NUSANTARA PGRI KEDIRI UNIVERSITY IN ACADEMIC YEAR 2016/2017

Neni Ardiana

13.1.01.08.0004

FKIP – Bahasa Inggris

neniardiana27@gmail.com

Dr. Diani Nurhajati, M.Pd. and Lina Mariana, S.S. M.Pd.

UNIVERSITAS NUSANTARA PGRI KEDIRI

ABSTRACT

This research aims to investigate what aspects of speaking and what types of corrective feedbacks that are expected by the students. It used a survey technique to collect the data and descriptive quantitative approach to analyze the data. The subject of this research was 72 third year students of English Department who is chosen randomly. The instrument used to collect the data was questionnaire. The findings of this research show that students expect to get corrective feedback in some aspects of speaking. The aspects of speaking consist of pronunciation, choice of word, fluency, kinesics, voice and intonation. Some of them got the interval percentage in 62,5% - 80,9% while the rest got interval percentage in 81,3% - 100%. From both interval percentages, it means the whole aspects are expected by students. Then, the types of corrective feedback consist of explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repletion. All of them were expected by the students, but the most expected is explicit correction which got the interval percentage in 81,3%-100%. In brief, students expected to get corrective feedback in some aspect of speaking. In addition, they also agree that getting corrective feedback from their lecturer will improve their speaking ability.

Keywords: Students' expectation, Corrective Feedback, Speaking

I. Introduction

As a foreign language, English is very difficult to be mastered by the students who are not as native speaker. There are many students who get difficulties for speak fluently in English. Speaking itself can be defined as an ability to express feeling and thought in oral communication through conversations. It is supported by Brown (2001:267) who states that someone is

considered to be able to speak means that he or she is able to carry on reasonably competently in conversation. It means that speaking skill is an ability to deliver and express idea through oral language in conversation

However, Speaking is not only about an ability to express ideas in conversation but also the way how the students present the language in communication. According

to Barras (2006:1), speaking is not only about giving talk, but it is both conveying relevant information and self-presenting. It means speaking is also related with the way how students present the information which includes whether their voice is clear enough or not so the listener will understand easily, whether their gesture represent high confidence and well prepare or not, and also choice of word which influence the listeners' thought and feeling.

Furthermore, speaking is also considered to be difficult skill and deemed to be the most important skill that must be mastered well when students would like to communicate with others. Richard (2008: 19) stated that the mastery of speaking is a priority for many foreign language students. Therefore, the students sometimes reflect their success in language learning based on how they succeed to deliver and understand the meaning in conversation.

Unluckily, students usually get some difficulties in speaking because it is unfamiliar language for them. They also never use English in daily life communication except during the English class in small occasion. Then, they are limit of time and chance to practice. They also have limit partner to communicate using English, so they still do not have enough encouragement to practice English outside the class in order to get familiar with English. Therefore, the lecturers are

expected to help students evaluate their error in order to make them know the correct one and improve their speaking performance.

One that can be used by the lecturer to help students evaluate their errors is giving feedback. Feedback is one of the lecturer's activities in giving correction to students' error, so it usually refers to corrective feedback which also provides evaluating to the students' errors and very helpful for the students. It is supported by Sulistyani and Suhartono (2014:1) who stated that corrective feedback is an evaluative feedback which can be useful in facilitating the progression of students' skills toward more correct language use. Lightbown and Spada (2009) in Zhang et.al (2010:1) also define corrective feedback as any indication to the students that their use of target language is incorrect. It can be concluded that corrective feedback is the way how the lecturer explains the students' error and correct them. By giving correction to the students, it can bring positive effect to them because they can learn it and improve their skill.

There are many form of corrective feedback. According to Ellis (2009), there were six corrective feedback strategies that can be used in response to a learner error namely explicit correction, recast, repetition, clarification request, elicitation, and paralinguistic signal or can be define as

metalinguistic feedback. The lecturer can choose one of them for giving correction to the students' speaking production.

In accordance with the statement above, the researcher wanted to conduct a research in order to know students' expectation toward corrective feedback in speaking especially speaking for academic purposes at the third year students in Nusantara PGRI Kediri University. She wanted to know what aspects of speaking and what types of corrective feedback that are expected by the students from their lecturer.

II. Research Method

In this research, the researcher used quantitative research in the form of survey as research technique. Survey research is used to gain the data in describing the attitudes, behaviors, opinions or characteristics of the population which use questionnaire as the instrument of collecting data and it will use statistical analysis. It is supported by Creswell (2012: 376) who stated that survey research is a research design in quantitative research which collects the data of entire population of people to describe the attitudes, opinions, behaviors, or characteristics of the population. The researcher chose this research design because she would to survey what aspects of speaking and what type of corrective feedback that expected by the students.

To collect the data, the researcher chose English Department because she wanted to know the students' expectation toward lecturer's corrective feedback in speaking class. Furthermore, the researcher chose the whole third year students of English department which comprise 92 students for three classes as the population and 72 students of them as the sample. They were took as subjects of this research because they have the characteristic which is needed by the researcher because all of them got extensive speaking as the speaking subject means that they followed the speaking class and got the corrective feedback from the lecturer.

In addition, the researcher collected the data by using questionnaire as instrument. She used close-ended question as the instrument which use Likert-scale. The questionnaire provided twenty questions with answer's choices which consist of "Strongly Agree", "Agree", "Disagree", and "Strongly Disagree". In Each answer's choices have different scores. For the choice "Strongly Agree = 4", "Agree = 3", "Disagree = 2" and "Strongly Disagree = 1". The content of statements relates with aspect of speaking (fluency, pronunciation, choice of word, kinesics, voice and intonation) that students expect from their lecturer and types of corrective feedback (explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic

feedback, elicitation and repetition) that are given by the lecturer to them. The data that has been collected would be analyzed statistically analysis with the following formula:

$$DP = \frac{n}{N} \times 100\%$$

The descriptions of the formula above are:

DP : Descriptive Percentage

n : the score was gained

N : Ideal Score

The higher and lower aspects of corrective feedback which were expected by students based on the result of the percentage score above can be categorized in the table below:

Table Category of Percentage

Interval Percentage	Category
81,3%-100%	Very Expected
62,5%-80,9%	Expected
43,8%-62,2%	Unexpected
25%-43,4%	Very Unexpected

III. Finding and Discussion

The researcher investigated the aspects of speaking that students expect to get correction from lecturer. They consist of five main aspects such as fluency (how the students speak without any dysfluency markers), pronunciation (produce

comprehensible utterances), choice of word (vocabularies), kinesics (communicate using body movement), also voice and intonation (power, duration, and rhythm) which cover several detail elements for each aspect. The table below gives clear description about the aspect of speaking.

Table Description of Aspects in Speaking

No	Aspect	Item	Specification	Total	P	C
1	Pronunciation	1	-	249	86,5%	Very Expected
2	Choice of Word	2	Vocabulary	243	84,4%	Very Expected
		3	Structure	240	83,3%	Very Expected
		4	Relevance	227	78,8%	Expected
3	Fluency	5	-	216	75,0%	Expected
4	Kinesics	6	Facial sign	242	84,0%	Very Expected
		7	Illustrator	219	76,0%	Expected
		8	Posture	237	82,3%	Very Expected
		9	Adaptor	241	83,7%	Very Expected
		10	Regulator	227	78,8%	Expected
5	Voice and Intonation	11	Power	231	80,2%	Expected
		12	Rhythm/duration	215	74,7%	Expected
		13	Intonation	226	78,5%	Expected

In addition, the researcher also investigated what types of corrective feedback that is expected by the students. It includes explicit correction (directly giving correction), recast (reformulate the structure without showing the error), clarification request (ask question to clarify), metalinguistic feedback (ask about well-formedness), elicitation (directly elicit the correct form) and repetition. It will be clearly describe in the following table.

Table Description of Corrective Feedback

6	Explicit Correction	14	Provide correct form directly	246	85,4%	Very Expected
		15	Showing the error directly	251	87,2%	Very Expected
7	Recast	16	Reformulate the structure in different form.	227	78,8%	Expected
		17	Reformulate without showing error	190	66,0%	Expected
8	Clarification Request	18	-	209	72,6%	Expected
9	Metalinguistic Feedback	19	Ask about well-formedness	210	72,9%	Expected
10	Elicitation	20	Ask to complete	216	75,0%	Expected
		21	Giving question refers to correct form	220	76,4%	Expected
11	Repetition	22	Repeat	220	76,4%	Expected
		23	-	240	83,3%	Very Expected
		24	-	210	72,9%	Expected
		25	-	262	91,0%	Very Expected

Based on the data, the researcher can conclude that most of items got high percentage which is interval 62,5% until 80,9% and in interval 81,3% until 100%. She concluded that most of students expect to get corrective feedback in aspect of speaking. It can be seen in the table, there are seven items (relevance, fluency, illustrator, regulator, power, rhythm or duration, and intonation) in expected category. In addition, the students also have high expectation in some aspects of speaking especially in pronunciation, vocabulary, structure, facial sign, posture, and adaptor. Furthermore, the students also very expected to get explicit corrective feedback in the form of explicit correction (provide correct form and showing the error directly). However, the students also expected some ways to give corrective feedback that can be seen from the rest

items such as recast (reformulate the structure in different form and without showing the error), clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation (ask to complete and giving question refers to correct form) and repetition. Knowing about this result, it develops the finding of Mahdy and Saadany's research (2013) which only found that pronunciation and word choice as the expected aspect. In addition, the students also expect both explicit and implicit corrective feedback. But most of them expect to get correction in explicit ways. Furthermore, considering about the result of students' opinion toward corrective feedback, the students agree that getting corrective feedback can improve their speaking ability. It also develops the result of Wakhidah's research (2016) that showed corrective feedback is expected by some students in their writing performance and it can improve their writing skill. It can be conclude that corrective feedback is expected by students in four language skill in order to improve their skill performance.

IV. Conclusion and Suggestion

In conclusion, most of the third year students of English department in Nusantara PGRI Kediri University have high expectation toward corrective feedback which is given by the lecturer in speaking class. Most of them expect that their lecturer gives correction to some

aspects of speaking such as relevance, fluency, illustrator, regulator, power, rhythm or duration, and intonation. In addition, they expect their lecturer not only give more attention to their pronunciation and choice of word but also facial sign, posture, and adaptor when they speak in order to get the correction in those aspects. Furthermore, students also expect their lecturer deliver their feedback explicitly in order to make they understand the correct one clearly. They want their lecturer provide the correct one or indicate their incorrect utterances directly. It means that they hope that their teacher use explicit correction type.

Considering about the result, the lecturer especially speaking lecturers should give the same attention to all aspects of speaking because actually the students expected to get correction in those aspects. In addition, the lecturer also should consider the importance of corrective feedback in speaking because actually the students are strongly agree that giving corrective feedback can improve their speaking ability. Furthermore, the researcher hopes that the other researchers are able to use this research finding as reference for their research especially for the research with the same field. In addition, knowing that there is no perfect research, the researcher hopes to other researchers to develop this research finding

in their research in some point of view. For example considering the aspects may be the other researcher can conduct a research by adding interactive communication, appropriateness (field, tenor, channel, etc.) and complexity aspect in order to complete this research.

V. References

- Barrass, R. 2006. *Speaking for Yourself: A Guide for Students to Effective Communication*. New York: Routledge.
- Brown, H. D. 2001. *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Cresswell, J. W. 2012. *Educational Research (Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. 501 Boylston Street, Boston, MA 02116: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Ellis, R. 2009. *Corrective feedback and teacher development*. L2 Journal, UC Consortium for Language Learning & Teaching, UC Davis. (Online). available on: <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/2504d6w3>. Accessed on: November 22th, 2016
- Mahdy and Saadany. 2013. *Oral Feedback in the EFL classroom*. Malmö högskola. German
- Richards, J. 2008. *Teaching Listening and Speaking: From Theory to Practice*. Cambridge University Press.



- Sulistiyani, Suhartono. 2014. *Corrective Feedback And Repair Strategies in Meaning-Focused Language Classroom*. Nusantara of Research. Vol. 1, 116-124
- Wakhidah, S. 2016. *Students' Expectations toward Corrective Feedback on Writing Subject At University of*

Nusantara PGRI Kediri Academic Year 2015/2016. (Online), available on: simki.unpgrikedi.ac.id, Accessed on: November 22th, 2016

- Zhang, Y., Zhang L., M, L. 2010. *A Brief Analysis of Corrective Feedback in Oral Interaction*. Journal of Language Teaching and Research Vol. 1