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Abstract

This study aimed to find out the types of oral corrective feedback that teachers used in teaching pronunciation. It was a qualitative research which used descriptive way in analyzing the data. The participants were three teachers who teach English in SMK Dian Kirana Sragen, Central Java, Indonesia. The data were obtained through observation to the teachers in their classroom activities. Each participant was observed in his teaching and learning process. The finding revealed that all teachers used Recast, Explicit correction, Repetition, Elicitation and Metalinguistics clue. On the other hand, there were no teacher used Clarification Request in their teaching learning process. This study hopefully could be useful for English teachers, especially who were teaching pronunciation. Hopefully they could give oral corrective feedback to every student’s mispronunciation. Thus, the students would get the advantages and would be more productive in learning English.
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INTRODUCTION

Many people thought that the most important parts in learning English as a foreign language were learning grammar and vocabulary. Folega (2012) stated that “grammar is very important, no matter how much the rules change, as it is what makes it possible for us all to communicate and understand what we see, and
what we say”. In her explanation, she put her attention to the importance of grammar. Folse (2004) stated that “For far too long, the emphasis in ESL has mistakenly been on grammar. Learner can express themselves with poor grammar; in fact, much to the chagrin of ESL teachers, they do this quite frequently. However, with poor vocabulary, communication is constrained considerably. You can get by without grammar; you cannot get by without vocabulary” (p.2). It was supported by Swan & Walter (1984) that “Vocabulary acquisition is the largest and most important task facing the language learner”. It showed that they emphasized that vocabulary was important in learning English. Many Indonesian students that I have met told that in learning English, some of them communicated with correct grammar but pronounced some words with improper pronunciation, although they understand what they were talking about. For example; she ate my food, in a spoken language this sentence should be “she ate my /fuːd/”. When the speaker mispronounced food /fuːd/ to be foot /fʊt/, the meaning would be different and it made the listener misunderstand. That was why pronouncing English vocabulary correctly had an important role for those who wanted to be able to speak English accurately and delivered the message clearly. According to some interviews to the writer’s friends who were in Senior High School, while they were learning English as a foreign language, mispronunciations often occurred. One of the ways that could be done by teachers for better students’ pronunciations was by giving corrective feedback.

In the writer’s experience when she was in Senior High School, when teacher gave correction feedback orally, she knew how to pronounce properly.
However, not every mispronunciation was corrected by teachers. She felt that teacher should know which one was necessary to be corrected, which one was not, depending on the difficulties of pronunciation; therefore students were happy in accepting oral corrective feedback. If students could accept oral corrective feedback, finally they would learn target language more comfortably. It would be great if the oral corrective feedback was given to every mispronunciation. Based on the experience, the writer was interested to know the type of oral corrective feedback that teachers recently used in school.

This study aimed to find out the types of oral corrective feedback that teachers used in teaching pronunciation. Based on the writer’s interest, she conducted a research on the use of oral corrective feedback in pronunciation in SMK Dian Kirana Sragen. This school was located near her house; thus it would be more effective to conduct a research in SMK Dian Kirana. To guide this study, the writer used a research Question “What type of oral corrective feedback used by teachers in teaching pronunciation?”

Chu (2011) conducted a research about the effect of corrective feedback on oral accuracy. The research that she used was the same with the writer’s of this research; on the other hand, the subject was different. The result of this research was corrective feedback has a positive effect on improving oral English accuracy. Other researchers who conducted a research on corrective feedback and learner uptake were Lyster & Ranta (1997). The types on giving oral feedback were quite the same, but it was different on the subject of the
research. The findings indicated an overwhelming tendency for teachers to use recasts in spite of the latter’s ineffectiveness at eliciting student-generated repair. Four other feedback types like elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, clarification requests, and repetition, lead to student repair more successfully. Other researchers that have conducted a similar research were Tedick & Gortari (1998). They have conducted a research on Error Correction and Implications for Classroom Teaching. The research that they used were the same, still the subject was different. The result showed that the types of corrective feedback techniques that elicit student-generated repairs were clearly more appropriate for the more cognitively mature and L2 proficient learners. Since from those three researchers have done the researches that contain the similar problem with the writer of this research which was the use of oral corrective feedback, therefore she was prefer to analyze the types of oral feedback which are proposed by Tedick & Gortari (1998).

This study hopefully could be useful for English teachers in general, especially in teaching pronunciation by giving oral corrective feedback to every student’s mispronounce. Hopefully the teachers could use the types of oral corrective feedback in their teaching pronunciation, thus the students would get the advantages and would be more extensive in learning English. Second, for the student teachers who would teach English, hopefully it would give an input for them to be able to use oral corrective feedback in their teaching pronunciation. The last, this study hopefully could be a benefit for the writer herself, it was
important to learn how to use oral corrective feedback and the application in language learning process.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Definition of Feedback

To set a theoretical framework for this study, the writer discussed the definition of feedback. Hattie (1999) stated that feedback was the most powerful moderator that enhanced achievement. He explained that for improving education, teacher should provide information on how and why students understand and misunderstand about something, and what should the students do or say to improve. It is supported by Wiggins (2012), he stated that if we wanted to reach the goal, we needed any information about what we were doing. In this statement, he explored an idea about how information might affect our behavior in reaching the goal. It was quite similar with feedback according to Ramaprasad (1983) “Feedback is information about the gap between the actual level and the reference level of a system parameter which is used to alter the gap in some way” (p.4). Feedback contained any information about what was the correct and the incorrect form of something. Bartol & Martin (2013) said that learners needed to have a response as a feedback in order to interpret the message. The main idea of feedback on this statement was a response. When people pronounced words improperly, they should get a response. It might be a sign for them that the message could not be interpreted. From those definitions of feedback, the writer
concluded that feedback was information from the receiver which gave responses on how to interpret the message.

In correlation to the explanation feedback, it was not enough if teacher simply gave feedback without any correction. That was why correction feedback was needed in pronunciation to prevent mispronounce and gave any information about how to pronounce properly. According to Lightbown & Spada (1999, p 171), corrective feedback was an indication of incorrectness of the learner’s target language. In corrective feedback, students did not only know whether their pronunciation was correct or incorrect. Méndez, Arguelles, & Castro (2010, p 266) stated that corrective feedback would help to improve the students’ learning strategies and gave confidence to them. By encouraging them to receive corrective feedback from teachers, it would avoid them to produce the same mistakes. Hattie & Timperley (2007) stated that corrective feedback was critical influences on students’ learning process. It suggested that corrective feedback was better than just a feedback. To make it more specific, the writer conducted this research of oral corrective feedback in teaching pronunciation. Gilakjani (2012) stated that:

> pronunciation refers to the production of sounds that we use to make meaning. It includes attention to the particular sounds of a language (segments), aspects of speech beyond the level of the individual sound, such as intonation, phrasing, stress, timing, rhythm (suprasegmental aspects), how the voice is projected (voice quality) and, in its broadest definition, attention to gestures and expressions that are closely related to the way we speak a language.” (p.96)

Oral corrective feedback in teaching pronunciation according to the writer’s opinion was any information from receiver which indicates incorrectness of learners’ pronunciation which is given orally. Corrective feedback could be given
in two models, written feedback and oral feedback. In the writer’s opinion, written feedback was feedback which was given in a written style, while oral feedback was feedback which was delivered in spoken. In this case, the writer would only focus on Oral Feedback.

**Oral Feedback**

According to an article on edugains (2010), “Oral feedback can be highly effective because it can be provided easily in the ‘teachable moment’ and in a timely way”. This statement meant, when oral feedback was given in a right time, it might be more effective. Whereas the examples of oral feedback according to Tedick and Gortari (1998; p 2-3), such as *Explicit Correction, Recast, Clarification request, Metalinguistics clues, Elicitation, and Repetition*. The writer would explain them one by one.

**Explicit Correction**

According to Tedick & Gortari (1998, p 2) *Explicit Correction* was “clearly indicating that the student’s utterance was incorrect, the teacher provides the correct form”. Since Lyster & Ranta (1997) stated that “Explicit correction refers to the explicit provision of the correct form”. For example:

Student: ”she works /waːks/ eight hours a day”.
Teacher: ”she works /wɜːks/. We say /wɜːks/”.

It needed a direct response from teacher. It seemed that when a teacher missed a part of students’ speech, it would be messy.

**Recast**
Tedick & Gortari (1998) stated *Recast* “Without directly indicating that the student’s utterance was incorrect, the teacher implicitly reformulates the student’s error, or provides the correction” (p 2). It was supported by Lyster & Ranta (1997) “Recasts involve the teacher’s reformulation of all or part of a student’s utterance, minus the error”. For example:

Child: "mom, my bag /bæk/ was broken.”
Mom: ”my what?"
Child: ”my bag /bæk/”
Mom: "my back /bæk/ or my bag /bæg/?”
Child: ”my bag /bæg/ was broken”

**Clarification Request**

According to Tedick & Gortari (1998) “By using phrases like ‘Excuse me?’ or ‘I don’t understand’, the teacher indicates that the message has not been understood or that the student’s utterance contained some kind of mistake and that a repetition or a reformulation is required” (p 3). While Lyster & Ranta (1997, p 47) state “A clarification request includes phrases such as “Pardon me?”. For example:

Teacher: “Where is John?”
Student: “He go to the toilet”
Teacher: “Excuse me?”
Student: “He goes to the toilet”

**Metalinguistics Clue**

*Metalinguistics clue* was given “without providing the correct form, the teacher poses questions or provides comments or information related to the formation of the student’s utterance” (Tedick & Gortari, 1998, p 3). While according to Lyster & Ranta (1997) “Metalinguistic feedback contains either
comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the student’s utterance, without explicitly providing the correct form”. For example:

Student: ”I can not find the answer, mam”
Teacher: ”Do we say ens_wer?”

Elicitation

Tedick & Gortari (1998, p 3) stated that “the teacher directly elicits the correct form from the student by asking questions (e.g., "How do we say that in French?")", by pausing to allow the student to complete the teacher’s utterance (e.g., "It’s a.....") or by asking students to reformulate the utterance (e.g., "Say that again."). While Elicitation according to Panova & Lyster (2002) in Rezaei, Mozaffari, & Hatef (2011) was “a correction technique that prompts the learner to self-correct and may be accomplished in one of three following ways during face-to-face interaction, each of which vary in their degree of implicitness or explicitness” (p 4). For example:

Student: ”the globe is on the top of the..place where we put our books there”
Teacher: ”So the place where we put our books is.....?”

Repetition

Tedick & Gortari (1998) stated that in Repetition, “the teacher repeats the student's error and adjusts intonation to draw student's attention to it”. While according to Lyster & Ranta (1997), Repetition refered to the teacher’s repetition, in isolation, of the student’s erroneous utterance. It was supported by Panova & Lyster (2002, p.584) in Rezaei, Mozaffari, & Hatef (2011), “This feedback is
simply the teachers or interlocutors’ repetition ‘of the ill-formed part of the student's utterance, usually with a change in intonation’’. For example:

Student: "I see the..the..elephant at zoo"
Teacher: "I see the elephant at zoo"

Teaching pronunciation in SMK Dian Kirana Sragesn was quite difficult. The difficulties came from the students. Some of them were difficult on pronouncing a particular word. Pronounced using dialect was one of the reasons why mispronounce was frequently happened. Therefore in teaching learning process in SMK Dian Kirana, teachers provided oral corrective feedback for students’ mispronounce. It was for preventing misunderstands in communication.

The reason why oral corrective feedback was important was that to inform the students that their pronunciations were incorrect. It was for identifying the students’ strengths and weaknesses in pronunciation. If the strengths and weaknesses have found, therefore the students would be able to pronounce properly.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The type of this research was descriptive and qualitative. According to Bogdan and Biglen (1982) in Sugiyono (2007, p 14) one of the characteristics of qualitative research was that “the data collected is in a form of words rather than number”. The writer used qualitative research and analyzed the data descriptively, since she would like to find out the types of oral corrective feedback that teachers used in their teaching pronunciation. She would not use number in
her research to find out the types of oral corrective feedback. That was why the 
writer used descriptive and qualitative in doing this research.

**Context of the Study**

The writer conducted a research in SMK Dian Kirana, which was located in Jalan Raya Sukowati Barat KM 2.5 Gambiran Sine, Sragen. Sragen was a small city that became a border between Central and East Java, Indonesia. SMK Dian Kirana was a vocational school. In that school, there were four majors of study, such as engineering, automotive mechanical engineering, computer network engineering, and audio visual engineering. Even though SMK Dian Kirana was a vocational school, however the students should have to learn English.

**Participant**

In SMK Dian Kirana there were only three English teachers. In this study, the writer determined all English teachers as the participant of this study. She used all the English teachers because there were only few of respondents. The reason why the writer chose the participants was supported by Sugiyono (2007, p 246) that all English teachers in SMK Dian Kirana were considered have all the data that the writer’s needed, which was the use of oral corrective feedback in teaching pronunciation.

**Data Collection Instrument**

The data of this research was collected through observation. During the observation, the writer used an observation protocol to note what type of oral corrective feedback that teacher used in teaching pronunciation. To avoid the
missing information, the writer used a recorder to record the teaching and learning process.

**Data Collection Procedure**

In this research, the writer conducted an observation on the use of oral corrective feedback in pronunciation. To analyze the research question which was “How do teachers use oral corrective feedback in pronunciation?” she observed the teachers’ methods on how they used oral corrective feedback in teaching pronunciation. To get the data, the writer revealed the use of oral corrective feedback in pronunciation in SMK Dian Kirana through class observation. Specifically, *passive participation* will be used in class observation since according to Sugiyono (2007, p 256) “passive participation means the research is present at the scene of action but does not interact or participate”. To support the observation, she used passive participation in her research; therefore the writer did not participate in teaching learning process. While collecting data, the writer observed three different classes. First day she observed teacher A in class XI TKJ. The following day, she came to class XI TP2 to observe teacher B. Day three she observed teacher C in class XI TKR3. The first three days she has got a lot of data that contain types of oral corrective feedback. The second week she observed in the same class with the previous week. At the time she has got nothing for her observation because the teachers were just discussing some exercises. The third week, she observed all teachers still in their class. It was the same with the first week that she has got a lot of data that contain the use of oral corrective feedback. It was easy to observe one teacher in the same class, rather
than observed one teacher in the different classes, because the teaching styles of the teachers were different in one class to another. That’s why she observed one teacher in the same class. In order to collect the data, she only recorded the process of teaching and learning. Furthermore, to know the method of oral corrective feedback that teachers’ use in teaching pronunciation, the writer analyzed using observation protocol.
Figure. Observation Protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Types of Oral Corrective Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Analysis Procedure

To analyze the data, the writer recorded the conversation. After that, she transcribed the recording and then identified the types of oral corrective feedback that teachers’ used. The last two steps, she classified the types of oral corrective feedback and then put ticks on the observation protocol on the suitable column to know the types of oral corrective feedback that the most until less frequently used by the teachers.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The type of oral corrective feedback that teachers used in teaching pronunciation in SMK Dian Kirana Sragen would be presented one by one. The result showed that all teachers did not use all types of oral corrective feedback. Teacher A used only 3 out of 6 types of oral feedback, which were Recast, Explicit Correction, and Elicitation. Teacher B used 5 types which were Recast, Elicitation, Repetition, Explicit Correction, and Metalinguistics Clue. Teacher C used Recast, Repetition, Explicit Correction, Elicitation, and Metalinguistics Clue.
**Recast**

This type of oral corrective feedback is the most frequently used by all teachers in SMK Dian Kirana. The type of oral corrective feedback that teacher A used in teaching pronunciation can be seen in Extract 1. Recast that was used by teacher B can be shown in Extract 2. Extract 3 provided the type of oral corrective feedback that teacher C used. In this type, teachers provided the correct form of the word and gave it directly.

**Extract 1.**

Student 1 : can I help you?
Student 2 : yes, I’m looking for /ʃɪːt/ (shirt).
Teacher A : /ʃɝːt/ (shirt)
Student 2 : /ʃɝːt/ (shirt)
Student 1 : what /sɪz/ (size) are you?
Teacher A : /saɪz/ (size)
Student 1 : /saɪz/ (size)
Student 2 : /ˌfaɪvˈtiːn/ (15)...
Teacher A : /ˌfɪfˈtiːn/ (15)

(observational 1)

**Extract 2**

Student 10 : pair of shoes for my /sʌn/ (son)
Teacher B : /sʌn/ (son)
Student 10 : /sʌn/ (son)
Student 9 : what brand do you like?
Student 10 : /eː.gl/ (EAGLE).
Teacher B : /ˈiː.gl/ (EAGLE).
Student 10 : /ˈiː.gl/ (EAGLE).

(observational 3)

**Extract 3**

Student 12 : yes, I’m looking for a pair of shoes for my /sʌn/ (son)
Teacher C : /sʌn/ (son)
Recast according to Tedick & Gortari (1998, p. 2), the teacher implicitly reformulates the student's error, or provides the correction. In this case, teacher A, B, and C simply mention the correct form, it meant that they provided the correction to the students. Recast was used by the teachers to make the students aware that they have pronounced the word improperly. It seemed like recast was the effective way to give oral corrective feedback in teaching pronunciation, because the students gave response directly after the teacher used recast.

** Explicit Correction **

Extract 4 presented Explicit Correction used by teacher A. Explicit correction used by teacher B provided in Extract 5. Extract 6 shown Explicit correction that used by Teacher C.

**Extract 4**

Student 2 : it’s /wʌn/ /ˈhʌn.drəd/ /ˌfʌɪvˈti/ /ruːˈpiː.ə/ (Rp 150.000)
Student 2 : can you make it /wʌn/ /ˈhʌn.drəd/ /ruːˈpiː.ə/ (Rp 100.000)?
Teacher A : /wʌn/ /ˈhʌn.drəd/ /ˈθaʊ.zən/ /ruːˈpiː.ə/ (Rp 100.000). /ˈθaʊ.zən/ (thousand) jangan lupa.

( observation 1)
Student 10: yes, I’m looking for a /pair/ (pair)...
Teacher B: /ˈpɛər/ (pair). A pair itu sepasang.

Student 10: I don’t know /ɪɡˈzækt .li/ (exactly; stammering). But she is /ˈfɔːr.tj/ (14) years old.
Teacher B: /ˌfɔːˈtiːn/ (14). /tiːn/ (teen) itu belas, kalau /ˈtɪj/ (ty) itu puluh.

Student 10: /ˌfɔːˈtiːn/ (14).
Student 9: I see. And what /ˈkɔlər/ (color)?
Teacher B: /ˈkʌl.ər/ (color). Kalau /ˈkɔlər/ (color) itu sing mbok pakai itu.

(observation 3)

Extract 6

Student 6: wow, this is nice…Where is the /ˈfaɪt.ɪŋ/ (fitting) room?
Teacher C: /ˈfɪt.ɪŋ/ (fitting). Kalau /ˈfaɪt.ɪŋ/ itu mau ngajak berantem. Where is……

Student 6: it’s nice but it is a little big. Can you give me size /ˈfɔːr.tj/ (14), please?
Teacher C: /ˌfɔːˈtiːn/ (14). /ˈfɔːr.tj/ itu empat puluh (40) lho. Can you……

Student 6: I don’t know /ɪɡˈzækr.li/ (exactly; stammering)... But she is /ˌfɔːˈtiːn/ (14; stammering) years old.

Student 6: /ˌfɔːˈtiːn/ (14).
Student 5: I see. And what /ˈkɔlər/ (color)?
Teacher C: /ˈkʌl.ər/ (color). Nanti jadi kolor ijo nanti.

(observation 1)

Tedick & Gortari (1998, p 2) emphasized that the teacher clearly indicating that the student's utterance was incorrect and then provides the correct form. Teacher A used this type when a student did the same miss pronounce many times. After the teacher corrected the mispronounce, he emphasized the correct form of the words or sentences. He used L1 to remind the students not to forget the correct form of the words. It was quite different from teacher B. He
used this type when a student did not know the meaning of the word, however the teacher gave the meaning of the word. Teacher B used a joke after giving Explicit correction to remind the students that their utterances were incorrect. It was interesting because in this case, jokes made the students became excited and paid attention to the material. It seemed quite the same with Teacher C in using this type when a student couldn’t differentiate how to pronounce a particular word, which relatively no differences with the other words. He used a joke to make the students knew that their pronunciations were incorrect.

**Elicitation**

This type of oral corrective feedback used by all teachers in SMK Dian Kirana. In Extract 7, it provided teacher A used Elicitation in teaching pronunciation. Teacher B used Elicitation could be shown in Extract 8, and Elicitation used by teacher C could be seen in Extract 9. Most of the teachers used question to elicit the correct form.

**Extract 7**

Student 3 : /wʌn/ /ˈhʌn.drəd/ /ənd/ /ˌfɪfˈti/ /ˈθaʊ.zənd/ (Rp 150.000)
Teacher A : apanya yang lupa?
Student 3 : /wʌn/ /ˈhʌn.drəd/ /ənd/ /ˌfɪfˈti/ /ˈθaʊ.zənd/ /ruːˈpiː.ə/ (Rp 150.000)

(observasi 3)

**Extract 8**

Student 4 : can you make it /wʌn/ /ˈθaʊ.zənd/ /ruːˈpiː.ə/ (Rp 100.000)?
Teacher B : *seratus ribu rupiah itu apa? Ratus (100) apa ratus?*
Other students: /ˈhʌn.drəd/ (hundred)
Teacher B : *ribu (1000)?*
Other students: *……../ˈθaʊ.zənd/
Teacher B : *berarti kalau seratus ribu rupiah? Kamu?*
Student 4 : /wʌn/ /ˈhʌn.drəd/ /ˈθaʊ.zənd/ /ruːˈpiː.ə/ (Rp 100.000)
Student 5: sorry, sir price is /fɪks/ (fixed), but we give you /ˈdɪs.kɔnt/ (discount).

Teacher C: /fɪkst/ (fixed). Kalian itu kalau ada belakangnya ed selalu ketinggalan. /ˈdɪs.kɔnt/ apa /ˈdɪs.kəʊnt/ (discount)? Kamu?

Tedick & Gortari (1998, p 3) emphasized that the teacher directly elicits the correct form by asking questions, pausing to allow the student to complete the teacher's utterance, or by asking students to reformulate the utterance. Based on Extract 7, 8, and 9, it seemed that teachers asked questions to remind the students that they have made mistakes or pronounced improperly. It seemed that teacher A, B, and C used L1 while asking them questions to enable them to reformulate their utterances.

**Repetition**

This type of oral corrective feedback was only used by two teachers. It seemed that teacher A did not use this type in teaching pronunciation. Teacher C used Repetition more often than teacher B. In Extract 10 provided Repetition that used by teacher B, while Repetition used by teacher C can be seen in Extract 11.

Extract 10

Student 10: let me see. It’s great, but little big. Do you have /smɔːl-ər/ (smaller) ones in this /ˈmɒd.əl/ (model)?

Teacher B: Do you have /smɔːl-ər/ (smaller) ones in this /ˈmɒd.əl/ (model)

Student 9: here is the /tʃændʒ/ (change). Do you need anything else?

Teacher B: here is the /tʃeɪndʒ/ (change).
Repetition according to Tedick & Gortari (1998) stated that the teacher repeats the student’s error, while Lyster & Ranta (1997), Repetition refers to the teacher’s repetition of the student’s erroneous utterance. In teaching pronunciation in SMK Dian Kirana, it seemed that teacher B and C used Repetition to let the student know that they have pronounced the word improperly. Teachers repeated one full sentence which contain the mis pronounced word.

**Metalinguistics Clue**

It’s quite similar with Repetition, Metalinguistics Clue was only used by two teachers. The use of Metalinguistics Clue by teacher B provided in Extract 12, whereas Metalinguistics Clue used by teacher C can be seen in Extract 13. In other words, teacher A did not use Metalinguistic Clue to deliver oral corrective feedback.

**Extract 11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student 5</th>
<th>it’s /wan/ /ˈthɔːzənd/ /ˈfɪfˈtiːn/ (stammering)…. (Rp 150.000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher C</td>
<td>it’s /wan/ /ˈhʌn.drəd/ /ˌfɪfˈtiːn/ /ˈthɔːzənd/ /ruːˈpiː.ə/ (Rp 150.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 5</td>
<td>it’s /wan/ /ˈhʌn.drəd/ /ˌfɪfˈtiːn/ /ˈthɔːzənd/ /ruːˈpiː.ə/ (Rp 150.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 6</td>
<td>can you make it /wan/ /ˈhʌn.drəd/ …./ˈthɔːzənd/ (stammering) /ruːˈpiː.ə/ (Rp 100.000)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher C</td>
<td>can you make it /wan/ /ˈhʌn.drəd/ /ˈthɔːzənd/ /ruːˈpiː.ə/ (Rp 100.000)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(observance 10)
Teacher B : *nol tiga dibelakang itu namanya apa? Jangan sampai lupa!*

Student 9 : */ˈθaʊ.zənd/ (thousand). /ˈhʌn.drəd/ /ˈθɜː.ti/ /ˈθaʊ.zənd/ /ruːˈpiː.ə/ (Rp 150.000)*

Student 9 : I’m sorry mom. We still lost. Ok, I give you a fixed price /ˈhʌn.drəd/ /ˈθɜː.ti/ /ruːˈpiː.ə/ (Rp 130.000)

Teacher B : *nol nya lupa lagi. Apa hayo? Rp nya lupa juga.*

Student 9 : */ˈθaʊ.zənd/ (thousand) /ruːˈpiː.ə/ (rupiah). /ˈhʌn.drəd/ /ˈθɜː.ti/ /ˈθaʊ.zənd/ /ruːˈpiː.ə/ (Rp 130.000)*

(observations 3)

Extract 13

Student 12 : I don’t know /ɪgˈzæk.ti.li/ (exactly; stammering)... But she is /ˌfɔːˈtiːn/ (14; stammering) years old.


(observations 3)

Metalinguistics clue according to Lyster & Ranta (1997) contains either comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the student’s utterance, without explicitly providing the correct form. While using this type of oral corrective feedback, teachers gave comment, or question, even provided the information related to the formation of the students’ utterances. It looked like while using this type, teacher might know the students’ capability of understanding the teacher’s comment. If students did not understand teacher’s comment, they were just silent and waiting for the corrections.

According to the observation’s result, all teachers did not use clarification request to give oral corrective feedback in teaching pronunciation. In clarification request, it usually used a question to clarify whether the pronunciation of the word was correct or not. It looked like when the teacher used clarification request to
give oral corrective feedback to the students, they just kept silent, smile, and did nothing.

Reflected to the findings above related to the use of oral corrective feedback in pronunciation in SMK Dian Kirana, the writer found out that types of oral corrective feedback that all teachers used are Recast, Explicit correction, and Repetition. Recast was the highest frequently used by all teachers. Elicitation and metalinguistics clue were only used by teacher B and C. The data analysis showed that Recast was the effective way to deliver oral corrective feedback to the students’ mispronounce. By contrast, there was only one type that teachers did not use in their teaching pronunciation, which was Clarification request. It seemed that Clarification request was quite difficult to be applied in SMK Dian Kirana as a vocational school.

Data Interpretation

The findings of the data above showed that English teachers in SMK Dian Kirana did not use all types of oral corrective feedback in teaching pronunciation. Recast was the most frequently used by all teachers. It seemed that Recast was the easiest way to deliver oral corrective feedback. The writer agree that Recast was the effective way. Teacher simply gave directly the correct form of the mispronounce word, therefore students would only repeat it. The writer indicated that Recast was suitable to be applied in a vocational school like SMK Dian Kirana. By contrast, Clarification request was the type that teachers did not use in their teaching pronunciation. The writer thought that it was quite difficult to give oral corrective feedback by using Clarification request. It was because the students in
SMK Dian Kirana would only keep silent while teachers giving a question to get a clarification from students. The condition might be different if it was applied in public school. Based on the writer’s interview with many students who studied in public and vocational school, in this region, many students in public school were very active in learning activity. In contrast, many students in vocational school were less active in learning activity. In this research, teachers in SMK Dian Kirana used most types of oral corrective feedback. It shown that English teachers in SMK Dian Kirana used Recast, Explicit correction, Elicitation, Repetition, and Metalinguistic clue; whether Clarification Request was not used in giving oral corrective feedback in teaching pronunciation.

CONCLUSION

The aim of this study was to find out the type of oral corrective feedback that teachers used in teaching pronunciation in SMK Dian Kirana. According to the observation’s result, the writer concluded that all teachers used most the types of oral corrective feedback. They used different types of oral corrective feedback. The result of the observation showed that teacher used different types of oral corrective feedback in teaching pronunciation. All teachers used Recast. They used the method of oral corrective feedback by paying attention to the students’ response. It meant that, if teacher used a particular type but the students were just keep silent, and then teacher tried the other type. Therefore, one teacher did not use only one type of oral corrective feedback in teaching learning process.
Based on the result, it seemed that every teacher in SMK Dian Kirana had their own style in giving oral corrective feedback. They used particular types of oral corrective feedback in their teaching pronunciation. However, to avoid the monotonous in giving oral corrective feedback, it would be better if teachers used different types of oral corrective feedback to deliver oral corrective feedback in teaching pronunciation. The monotonous in teaching learning activity could be avoided by giving various different types of feedback rather than using one or two types continuously.

Meanwhile, this study only involved three English teachers in SMK Dian Kirana for the participants. All the English teachers were used as the data of this study. However, this study revealed the use of oral corrective feedback in pronunciation that has different style in giving oral corrective feedback for each teacher. That was why this study could not be generalized for English teachers in other schools. In other vocational or public school, the result might be different.

Further research could be done in a broader scale, for example to know about students’ perception on the use of oral corrective feedback in pronunciation. It could be conducted whether in Vocational school or Public school. Similar research could also be conducted on different level and different school, like first or third grade in Vocational school or might in public school. Therefore, the writer needed to know whether on the lower or higher level in Vocational school and what if the research was conducted on the same or different level in public school. The result might be different.
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