Lembaran Ilmu Kependidikan

Meaning Negotiation and Learners' Uptake in The Process Of Teacher's Corrective Feedback

Eki Nurwulandari ✉, Ahmad Sofwan

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Abstrak
_____

Dalam interaksi, ada memiliki negosiasi makna. Secara kualitatif, penelitian ini menggambarkan cara peserta didik memberikan serapan untuk umpan balik korektif guru di dialog transaksional siswa dengan mengumpulkan data. Secara quantitative, peneliti menganalisi presentase yang didapat dari masing –masing type yang digunakan pada umpan balik guru dan serapan dari peserta didik, dan presentase quesioner siswa dengan mempresentase kan masing- masing bagian dari quesioner. Peneliti bertujuan untuk menganalisis bagaimana dan dimana guru mengoreksi kesalahan yang diucapkan selama suatu aktivitas tertentu di kelas XI SMK Medika. Hasil juga memperlihatkan bahwa corrective feedback sangat efektif dalam menghasilkan perbaikan siswa secara relatif yang jarang terjadi di kelas. Berdasarkan studi ini menuang kembali, meminta klarifikasi, penimbulan, pengulangan, dan perbaikan secara eksplisit sukses membuat siswa melakukan perbaikan yang jarang digunakan oleh guru. Data dasar terdiri trancripts dari 10 jam interaksi kelas naruralistic direkam dari kelas guru. Dari total berubah, peneliti telah menghitung 228 episode masing-masing berisi kesalahan yang dihasilkan oleh pelajar, sebuah Umpan bergerak korektif dari guru dan serapan berikutnya pelajar dalam menanggapi CF. Episode umpan balik korektif diidentifikasi dan diklasifikasikan menggunakan model modifikasi dari Lyster dan Ranta (1997).

Abstract
_____

This research described and analyzed the teacher's corrective feedback and learners' uptake in the classroom interaction. This is a descriptive research. The sample of this research was 34 students of the eleventh graders of Medika Vocational High School Pekalongan. The data comprised of trancripts of 10 hours of narural classroom interactions recorded from a class of a teacher. The findings show that recast, clarification request, elicitation, repetition and explicit correction which successfully lead to student-generated repair, are rarely used by the teacher.

✉ Alamat korespondensi:
  E-mail: eki88nurwulandari@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Negotiation of meaning is the strategy that language users employ for communication until successful comprehension is achieved. In second language acquisition (SLA) research, where the goal is to account for the development of L2 knowledge and skills, negotiation of meaning has been operationalized more specifically as a set of conversational moves used in dyadic interaction.

The tools learners and instructors use in negotiating for meaning include discourse strategies such as repetitions, confirmation checks, clarification request, and reformulations or recasts.

Negotiation was defined by Pica (1994) as indications that a speaker was requesting message clarification or confirmation. Types of negotiation moves are presented below.

Table 1. Types of negotiation moves

Signal type	Example
Clarification request	A: He is sitting and around his face, at the bottom of his face, he is tied by some cloth. B: um? A: so that he cannot speak B: ah, I see.
Confirmation Check	A: is that all? At the center of the picture, there is a boy. B: boy? Is this a boy? A: yeah, and he is sitting.
Comprehension check	A: right side of his head? B: yeah. Does it make sense? A: yeah

One of the key concerns of this research is learner uptake. Lyster and Ranta (1997) define an uptake as a student's utterance that immediately follows the teacher's feedback and that constitutes a reaction in some way to the teacher's intention to draw attention to some aspect of the student's initial utterance. In their study, no uptake referred to the case where teacher's feedback was not responded to nor reacted to by the student at all. They distinguished four kinds of repair in their study: repetition, self- repair, peer- repair, and incorporation. The other type of uptake is needs-repair. There are six types of needs-repair: acknowledgement, same error, different error, off-target, and partial repair In (Lyster and Ranta, 1997).

Feedback is included as one of the concept of error correction. Corrective feedback is any type of oral or written comment, information or question provided to learners that indicates that there is an error in their usage of the L2. Corrective feedback is an indication to a learner that his or her use the target language is incorrect, and

includes a variety of responses that a language learner receives.

Dulay and Burt (1982) stated that errors are classified into two categories. The first, clarification is global errors. It refers to errors that significantly obstruct communication and those that affect overall sentence organization, wrong word order, and missing, wrong or misplaced sentence connectors. Second, clarification is local error. "Local errors affect single elements in a sentence but do not usually obstruct communication significantly such as errors in noun and verb inflections, articles, and auxiliaries". Based on Chaudron (1988) categorizes the range of errors from strictly "linguistic including phonological, morphological, syntactic to subject matter content including factual and conceptual knowledge, and lexical items".

Lyster and Ranta (1997) provide more detail definition, examples and picture of Corrective Feedback which is included in error treatment sequence. They states that six different CF types, as it is stated in their research:

Explicit correction – the explicit provision of the correct form ("Oh, you mean…" "You should say…"

Recast – reformulation by the teacher of the student's utterance, minus the error.

Clarification Request – indicates that the student's utterance was misunderstood by the teacher or that the utterance is ill-formed in some way (can refer to either problems in accuracy or comprehensibility, or both).

Metalinguistic Feedback – contains either comments, information or questions related to the well-formedness of the student's utterance without explicitly providing the correct form ("Can you find your error?") Points to the nature of the error but attempts to elicit the information from the student.

Elicitation – strategic pauses to allow students to fill in the blanks, questions to elicit correct forms (not yes/no), or asking students to reformulate utterances.

Repetition – repetition to isolate student's utterance, with changes in tone or inflection to highlight the error.

This study would like to look at some concern of feedback or negotiation of the student's dyads in English class. More specifically, this study examined the nature of negotiation and offer ideas to make negotiation more effective in the future.

The object of this study was the elevent graders of *Medika* Vocational High School. Second language learners often engage in *negotiation for meaning* with their teachers or instructors or with their peers while carrying out second language learning activities (or tasks). One of the natural aspects in the world which is quiet related with human being is error. Mostly, in the second language teaching learning process, error has always been seen as something negative which must be avoided. The tools learners and instructors use in negotiating for meaning include discourse strategies such as repetitions, confirmation checks, clarification requests, and reformulations or recasts.

In general, in negotiation of meaning, learners notice a particular discrepancy between what they know about target language and the accurate target linguistic terms. The ongoing argument is which factors facilitate teacher-learner negotiation and learner SLA. The present study investigated the teacher's CF applied on students' transactional dialogues, and the way learners give uptakes that situated within the current discussion in classroom foreign language learning in *Medika* vocational high school. The attention then focused to explain learners emotionally respond to the oral corrective feedbacks process. The objectives of the study are to describe teacher's Corrective Feedbacks behavior in the classroom using an adapted form of the model developed by Lyster and Ranta (1997), to describe the way learners give uptake to the teacher's Corrective Feedbacks on students' transactional dialogues, to find out a Relationship between oral Corrective Feedback type and error, to find out types of meaning negotiation used in the students' transactional dialogues, and to explain learners' emotionally respond to the oral corrective feedbacks process.

METHODS

This research is descriptive. It designed to manipulate a variety of corrective feedbacks (CFs) variables in *Medika* vocational school classroom discourse to investigate the efficiency of teacher error treatment for the development of interactional moves, strategies, or learner uptake. This pedagogy applied in L2 instruction with a view to document the frequency and distribution of CFs in relation both to learners' meaning negotiation enhancement and to their uptake as well.

The population of this research was the eleventh graders of *Medika* Vocational High School Pekalongan in the academic year 2013/ 2014 which consists of 232 students. The sample of this research was the *Analis Kesehatan,* 34 students. The researcher took *Analis Kesehatan* in the eleventh graders as the sample because in this research, the researcher only needed a class as the subject of the study. It provided with 5 times meeting means 10- lessons weekly English class which has been defined by general curriculum of education.

The researcher audiotaped and measured all the data including the amount of negative feedback used by the teacher as well as the patterns of learners' uptake, self-repair and topic continuation

being in learners' utterances. The audiotaped teacher and learner interaction was then precisely transcribed and coded by the researcher. After transcribed the data, the researcher ensured the removal of any incompatibility. The last, to analyze the learners' emotionally respond, the researcher gave questionnaire to the respondents. Because the distributed questionnaire was categorized as close- ended questions, the respondents just write a checklist (V) on the available columns.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The researcher used recording and checklists and questionnaires to analysis the data is done. Due to the focus of this research which intends to identify the patterns of corrective feedback and their effects on learners' uptake, the absolute number of errors generated by learners is not reported. Rather, the number of total turns, episodes including errors which lead to learners' uptake and immediate repair are meticulously taken into account.

The answer to the first question in this part "how does the teacher apply corrective feedbacks to the learners?" is all the six types identified in Lyster and Ranta (1997), there are clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and explicit correction. In this regard, a total of 376 student turns as well as 298 teacher turns were counted. Of the total turns, the researcher computed 228 episodes each containing a trigger (error) produced by the learner, a CF move from the teacher and a learner's subsequent uptake in response to the CF. The present findings, recast was by far the most frequent corrective feedback move at 51.75%. This finding is interestingly close to that of Panova and Lyster (2002), who found recast accounted for 55% of the corrective feedback. Elicitation and repetition are two other Corrective feedback types which were also frequently utilized in such a context. Elicitation was the second most frequent corrective feedback type with (17.54%). The third CF frequently used was Repetition.

An important objective of this research is to find out the amount of uptake each CF type resulted in. In fact, the topic continuation might begin from the teacher or the learner. This study uses four kinds of repair identified in Lyster and Ranta's model as the following: repetition, self-repair, peer-repair and incorporation. Recast is shown to be the most frequently used type of CF technique in this present study which is successful at generating 44.91% of successful students' repair, whereas 55.08% of such moves are of no use to lead to any uptake. It means learners do not respond to 55.08% of teacher's CF in the form of recasts.

Student generated repair is successfully elicited by more than half of the corrective feedback techniques (61.84%), as shown in table 4.3. Of the total feedback moves used in such a context, (23.68%) leads to needs repair. While just 14.36% of feedback turns was no uptake. In order words, students largely recognized teacher's feedback as corrective feedback so that they almost successfully reacted to it 85.52% of the time.

Of the 10 lessons observed for the research, 3 were partially or fully on speaking, 3 were partially or fully on grammar, and only 2 were partially or fully on lexical. To questionnaire and final meeting, the researcher needed 2 lessons. The data revealed that phonological and grammatical errors were mostly provided by explicit and recast. The findings interesting, that 98, 76, and 54 out of the total number of errors were phonological, grammatical, and lexical errors, respectively. It seems to suggest that the teacher may have lees tolerance for phonological errors. According to Lyster, teacher does not choose to negotiate grammar because 'syntactic knowledge involves complex system- driven rules that might not be easily retrievable' (Lyster, 1998a: 207).

Negotiation was defined according to Pica (1994), indications that a speaker was requesting message clarification or confirmation were counted by identifying: confirmation checks, clarification request, comprehension checks. The emergence of clarification requests and confirmation checks resulted in greater total instances of negotiation moves. In summary, it found that the quantity and quality of negotiation was enhanced.

Qualitative data from the questionnaire were only utilized for descriptive statistics to answer the last research questions. After the data-

gathering process, the next step was to synthesize and analyze the results. The statements which obtain the highest percentage are statement 1 and 2 which concerns the effectiveness of the oral feedback process. In fact, most respondents 80% (24 students) declare that corrective feedback is not only necessary & helpful but also they have learned a lot (statement 1 and statement 2) which concerns the effectiveness of the oral corrective feedback process. It is somehow suggested that oral corrective feedback is essential and helpful in developing inter-language competence. Statement 9 is about students' feeling. The nine feeling are angry, embarrassed, sorry, happy, satisfied, bothered, indifference, nervous and overwhelmed. The feeling which obtained the highest percentage is satisfied. Feeling satisfied is the top choice (23.53%), the second choice is feeling embarrassed (17.65%) and then feeling indifference (14.71%). The other choices are less than 12%. The most participants think about their reasons why they make mistakes (namely, 44.12%), becoming thus the top choice, followed by their refusal to continue speaking for the rest of the lesson (32.35%).

The findings were consistent with that of Lyster and Ranta's (1997) study. Indeed, similar to their study, the current study's data revealed that the feedback-uptake sequence helped the learners engage more actively when the teachers do not provide the correct form to the learners, as recasts and explicit correction do, students attempted to reformulate their erroneous utterance more actively. This might mean that these six types of feedback are potentially more useful in helping learners notice their linguistic inadequacies.

CONCLUSION

This research was inspired by Lyster and Ranta's study (1997). It investigated the relationship between error types and corrective feedback, as well as the relationship between corrective feedback and uptake, in an adolescent learner's context. Corrective feedback is significant to second language development because it provides the learner with an opportunity to reflect on the utterance and consider other possibilities. These benefits of corrective feedback are also applicable to the foreign language context, in the sense that it may trigger the cognitive processes required for acquisition. The notion of corrective feedback in communicative language classroom is one of with important theoretical and pedagogical implications for researchers, theories, and classroom teachers. Through a greater understanding of the characteristics and methods of corrective feedback, educator will be better to make sound pedagogical decisions regarding its implementation. The considered and well-conceived implementation of corrective feedback in the language classroom will foster the overall communicative language competencies of learners, leading to second language acquisition.

It is recommended that the topic of Corrective Feedback has attracted the attention of several SLA researchers. Teachers need to be guided by research but also to establish to what extent its findings are applicable to their own classrooms. In other words, they should not accept pedagogic proposals without submitting them to their own empirical enquiry. Teachers should ascertain their students' attitudes towards CF, apprise them of the value of CF, and negotiate agreed goals for CF with them. The goals are likely to vary according to the social and situational context. CF (both oral and written) works and so teachers should not be afraid to correct students' errors. This is true for both accuracy and fluency work, so CF has a place in both. Focused CF is potentially more effective than unfocused CF, so teachers should identify specific linguistic targets for correction in different lessons. Teachers need to be able to implement a variety of oral and written CF strategies and to adapt the specific strategies they use to the particular learner they are correcting. Teachers need to create space following the corrective move for learners to uptake the correction. Teachers should be prepared to vary who, when, and how they correct in accordance with the cognitive and affective needs of the individual learner.

REFERENCES

Batstone R. and Ellis R. 2009. *Principled grammar teaching, System, 37, 194-204.*

Chaudron, C. 1998. *Second Language Classrooms. Research on Teaching and Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chesterfield, R & Chesterfield K. 1985. Natural order in Children's use of second language learning strategies. *Applied Linguistic, 6*, pp. 45-59.

Dulay and Burt. 1982. *Language Two*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H. and Loewen, S. 2002. Doing focus on form. *System, 30*, 419- 432.

Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg & C. Kramsch (eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 39-52.

Lyster, R. 1998. Recasts, repetition, and ambiguity in L2 classroom discourse. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 20, pp. 51-81.

Lyster, R. & L. Ranta (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 19, pp. 37-66.

Lyster, R., & Mori, H. (2006). Interactional feedback and instructional counterbalance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28*, pp. 269-300.

Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second-language learning conditions, processes, and outcomes? *Language Learning* 44(3), pp. 493–527.