

Exploring the Implementation of Teacher's Corrective Feedback on Students' Pronunciation: A Case Study in an Indonesian Public High School

Faisal Abdul Rahman¹, Erni Haryanti Kahfi¹, R.Nadia R-P Dalimunthe¹

¹English Education Department, Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Jalan A.H. Nasution No. 105,

Keywords: Corrective Feedback, Pronunciation, Preference, Teacher, Student

Abstract: The study aims to investigate teachers' corrective feedback techniques used to correct students' pronunciation in teaching learning process and it also aims to identify teachers' preference toward the use of corrective feedback on students' pronunciation. This qualitative case study involved one English teacher and thirty students of eleventh-grade science in a public high school in Indonesia. The data were obtained from observation and interview. The results of the study revealed that the most commonly used type of corrective feedback was explicit and recast. The findings also showed that the teacher preferred to use explicit type to correct students' pronunciation error. In addition, in the timing of giving correction, the teacher tended to choose both immediate and delayed correction based on the students' activities in teaching learning process because the teacher did not want to interrupt their students, even though she recognized pronunciation errors. Therefore, it is suggested that it is important for the teachers to consider the corrective feedback techniques which would be implemented in a classroom.

1 INTRODUCTION

Be advised that papers in a technically unsuitable form will be returned for retyping. After returned the manuscript must be appropriately modified.

This research is intended to reveal the teacher's corrective feedback on students' English pronunciation. Pardede (2010) stated "intelligible pronunciation is an essential component of communication competence". Pronunciation is one of the components in speaking ability. This component plays a very important role in speaking ability because by pronouncing English words correctly, students are able to avoid misunderstanding when they are speaking.

Chongning (2009) stated "mastering the sounds and pronunciation of the target language is a high priority for the speaker of English". It means a good pronunciation will be the basis for students to master English well. According to Maniruzzaman (2008) pronunciation is considered as an integrated and integral component of second/foreign language learning, as it influences learners' communicative

competence and performance. In other words, if someone is difficult to hear English well, she or he will be isolated from the language. Consequently, students should be guided early as good as possible in order to have perfect pronunciation capabilities.

Otherwise, students will make fatal mistakes continuously. When students have applied the pronunciation of a particular word, they will always remember it and use it. Hence, the error in pronunciation will cause a misunderstanding when the students communicate in English.

Kim (2004) stated that corrective feedback provides information and correction regarding aspects of one's performance or understanding that students highly benefit from teacher. Hence, implementing corrective feedback is useful for the students to find out their mistakes when they pronounce the words. It makes them motivated to minimize their pronunciation error so that they are able to develop their competence in English pronunciation. According to Harmer (1983), when teaching pronunciation is applied in the class, teacher will make students intelligible in

pronunciation. Besides, Purnawarman (2011) stated that, teachers, as role model, are also responsible for helping students develop their capability to reach their learning goals through teacher's feedback.

In this research, based on the researchers' preliminary observation to the object of this research, it is found that the accuracy of students' English pronunciation can also be indicated that they still have difficulties to pronounce the words correctly due to mostly still strongly influenced by their mother tongue pronunciation.

There are several studies regarding teacher's feedback in teaching pronunciation. One research is conducted by Mendez et al. (2015). They investigated the role of corrective feedback on pronunciation in EFL classroom. They involved five English teachers from University of Quintana Roo in Mexico. To gain the data, an interview was used to find out the information from five language instructors from the language bachelors' program at their university. They used a semi-structured interview with 20 questions. The data showed that from the techniques of corrective feedback, the English teacher mostly used recast type to correct students. They also concluded that corrective feedback was important to be implemented due to the lack of accuracy of students' competence in English pronunciation.

The research is also conducted by Haryanto (2015) to five experienced teachers of The Daffodils English Course who were aware of giving corrective feedback on students' pronunciation. The results indicated that the five teachers as respondents gave corrective feedback at two different times that involved immediate and delayed correction and they influenced students' speaking performance.

This present research is different from the two researches above. The researchers focus on discovering both a teacher and the students in senior high school level in order to explore the corrective feedback techniques used by teacher to correct students' pronunciation error and teacher's preference towards the implementation of teacher's corrective feedback. Thus, the researchers conduct a research with the title "Exploring the Implementation of Teacher's Corrective Feedback on Students' Pronunciation".

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Pronunciation

In the study by Richards and Renandya (2002) pronunciation refers to sound of the language, or phonology; stress, rhythm; intonation and includes the role of individual sounds both segmental and supra segmental sounds. To understand pronunciation is able to entail the production and reception of sounds of speech and the achievement of the meaning.

Furthermore, Burgess and Spencer (2000) states that pronunciation is the practice and meaningful use of the target language phonological features in speaking, supported by practice in interpreting those phonological features in a target language discourse that one hears in language learning. It means pronunciation is a way to recognize words, pay attention the sounds of words and reproduce those sounds by speaking.

From those statements above, it can be said that pronunciation means the way of people produce and pronounce the words in terms of segmental and supra-segmental sound that is understood or generally accepted by listener.

2.1.1 Features of Pronunciation

According to Kelly (2006), the main features of pronunciation is divided into two categories. The first is phonemes or segmental, there are two branches of segmental, namely; consonants and vowels. The consonants consist of voiced and unvoiced, while vowels consist of single vowels and diphthongs, and the second is supra-segmental features. There are two kinds of supra-segmental features. They are intonation and stress. Stress consists of word stress and sentence stress.

The study of segmental features of pronunciation is known as phonetics, which refers to the sounds of words, letters, and how they are produced in the speech, as well as, their combination and representation by phonetic symbols. According to Darjowidjojo (2009) phonetics is defined as a science that deals with the sound of human language. In the study by Rogerson-Revell (2011) stated that segmental features are connected to the small units of pronunciation like vowels, consonant sounds, single and compound words; meanwhile, supra-segmental features are related to bigger units of spoken language like; word stress, intonation and connected speech.

Kelly (2006) stated that segmental features are sets of distinctive sounds of particular language and the supra-segmental features are related to intonation; stress and change of sounds in connected speech.

2.2 Corrective Feedback

Tomczyk (2013) stated that correction is defined as a reaction to an utterance produced by someone who has made an assessment that the part of its utterance is wrong. It means when the students are producing an error word in speaking English, the teacher should correct it in order to prevent the same error occurred. Hattie & Timperley (2007) stated that feedback is a process of sharing observations, concerns and suggestions between persons or divisions of the organization with an intention of improving both personal and organizational performance. They said that feedback is "one of the most powerful influences on learning and achievement". Further, feedback is conceptualized as information provided by an agent (e.g., teacher, peer, book, parent, self, experience) regarding aspects of one's performance or understanding. A teacher or parent can provide a corrective information, a peer can provide alternative strategy, a book can provide information to clarify ideas, a parent can provide encouragement, and a learner can look up the answers to evaluate correctness of a response. Feedback thus is "consequence" of performance. One of the most frequently used definitions of CF is provided by Ellis (2006) stated that any response to learner utterances containing error which is intended to correct the learners' erroneous utterance. It can be concluded that feedback becomes important thing in teaching and learning process. It is a way of correcting students' errors. Therefore, they do not make those errors again and try to enhance their capability to be better.

2.2.1 Types of Corrective Feedback

There are several categorization of corrective feedback which has been classified into six types by Lyster and Ranta (1997). *First*, explicit, refers to the explicit provision of the correct form. As the teacher provides the correct form, he or she clearly indicates that what the students had said was incorrect.

For example: Student : You have a bad story (/bed/). Teacher: You should say a bad (/bæd/) story. *Second*, recast, involves the teacher's reformulation of all part of a student's utterance, minus the error. Without directly indicating that the

student's utterance was incorrect, the teacher implicitly reformulates the student's error, or provides the correction. For example: Student : You have a bad story (/bed/), Teacher: You have a bad story (/bæd/) (Repeat with correction). *Third*, clarification request, indicates to students either that the teacher has misunderstood their utterance or that the utterance is ill-formed in some way and that a repetition of reformulation is required. Clarification request can include phrases such as "Pardon me", "Sorry", "Excuse me", "what", and "I do not understand what you just said" or repetition of the error as in "what do you mean by X?". For example: Student : You have a bad story (/bed/), Teacher: Pardon me?. *Fourth*, metalinguistic feedback refers to comments, information, or question related to the well-formedness of the students' utterance, without explicitly providing the correct form. For example: Student : You have a bad story (/bed/), Teacher: Do we say "bad" like that?. *Fifth*, elicitation refers to a technique that teachers use to directly elicit the correct form from the student. For example: Student : You have a bad story (/bed/), Teacher: You have..... (Ask to correct it). *Sixth*, repetition is the teacher's repetition, in isolation, of the student's error utterance. For example: Student: You have a bad story (/bed/), Teacher: bad? (/bed/) (Emphasis), Student: bad (/bæd/).

2.2.2 Teacher's Preference

Preference in this context is teacher's choice regarding the implementation of corrective feedback to students' pronunciation error. Therefore, teacher's preference is important since it offers a knowledge into students' perspective and it can lead to more effective teaching learning process as well as resulting more satisfactory learning outcome when it combined with the result of the effectiveness corrective feedback research (Ellis et al., 2006). In this present research, when the students make an error in classroom activity especially in pronunciation, the teacher decides to correct their error, and she or he may have many options. There are six types of corrective feedback proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997; also in Chandler, 2003; Ferris, 2010). Each of types has been decided by the teacher as techniques to correct students' pronunciation error.

3 METHOD

The method used in the research is a qualitative method. In the qualitative method, the researcher explores a problem and develops a detailed understanding of a central phenomenon (Creswell, 2002). A central phenomenon is the key idea, concept, or process studied in qualitative research (Creswell, 2002). The central phenomenon in this research is discovering the students' pronunciation error by giving teacher corrective feedback in teaching-learning process. Furthermore, the research approach used case study based on Creswell's (2002) theory that a case study is an in-depth exploration of a bounded system such as activity, event, process, or individuals based on extensive data collection. The case study is used because this research focuses on obtaining a deep description of the process of giving corrective feedback by the teacher to students' pronunciation error. There are two techniques for collecting data that are considered to assist in answering the research questions, namely; observation and interview. This research involved an English teacher and the second grade of senior high school. The recruitment of the participants was performed by employing purposive sampling (Creswell, 2002). There were actually two science classes in the second grade but only one class (IPA 1) based on teacher's recommendation because they were mostly ready to work cooperatively in conducting the research. Besides, based on the preliminary observation to that class, they should be follow up regarding their English pronunciation that should be improved by giving teacher's corrective feedback on their pronunciation error.

The observation conducts a teacher and the second-grade students at SMA Plus Al-Hasan Banjarsari Ciamis. In the observation, the researcher acts as a nonparticipant observer within the classroom activity. A nonparticipant observer is an observer who visits a site and records notes without becoming involved in the activities (Creswell, 2002). By the observation, the researcher records the process of giving corrective feedback using video-recorded and then transcribed. The observation takes place in a class of 30 students. The researcher also takes field notes in order to capture both teacher and students' dialogues and utterances.

The interview is used to check the accuracy of the data obtained through observation in order to find out the teacher's preference towards corrective feedback on students' pronunciation. The researcher also records the interview by audio-recorder and

note in order to keep the information from the respondent during interview session. The interview is done after the researcher conducted the observation.

4 FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the researchers' observation, it was found that the English teacher used some techniques to correct students' pronunciation in teaching-learning process. According to Lyster and Ranta (1997) there are six types of corrective feedback, namely explicit, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition (Chandler, 2003; Ferris, 2010). In fact, there were only five types used by the teacher to correct students' pronunciation found in the observation. The teacher only implemented explicit, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, and elicitation in correcting the students. These five types were calculated based on teacher's frequency in employing the correction on students' pronunciation error. The types of corrective feedback implemented by the teacher were shown by the following table 1.

Table 1: Teacher's frequency of using corrective feedback

NO	Types of CF	Teacher's Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
1	Explicit	15	41%
2	Recast	9	24
3	Clarification request	7	19%
4	Metalinguistic feedback	4	11%
5	Elicitation	2	5%
	Total	N=37	100%

Table 1 showed that the largest category was the explicit correction, which was calculated 41% of the total number of the teacher used corrective feedback. Besides, the other types of corrective feedback were distributed in decreasing frequency as follows: recast (24%), clarification request (19%), metalinguistic feedback (11%), and elicitation (5%). The last types of corrective feedback (repetition) did not occur in the classroom activities. Therefore, it was obtained that among five types of corrective feedback, explicit correction is the most frequently used by the English teacher to correct students' pronunciation.

The first type is explicit. There were 15 of teacher's frequency in three times observation. The data were found;

S: Let's *change* (/tʃæns/) the schedule.

T: you should say change (/tʃeɪndʒ/).

(Student and teacher's dialogue in observation 1)

S: could you taste (/test/) this food?

T: you have to pronounce taste (/teɪst/).

(Student and teacher's dialogue in observation 2)

S: I don't know (/naʊ/) where I put it.

T: you have to say know (/noʊ/).

(Student and teacher's dialogue in observation 3)

The second type is recast. There were 9 of teacher's frequency in three times observation. The data were found;

S: I don't have a partner (/ˈpɑːt.nə/) to speak English.

T: partner (/ˈpɑːrt.nə/).

(Student and teacher's dialogue in observation 1)

S: you have to follow my voice (/pɔɪs/) guys.

T: voice (/vɔɪs/).

S: you have to follow my voice (/vɔɪs/) guys.

T: nice.

(Student and teacher's dialogue in observation 2)

S: calm down (/dɑːn/), I can help you.

T: calm down (/dɑːn/).

(Student and teacher's dialogue in observation 3)

The third type is clarification request. There were 7 of teacher's frequency in three times observation. The data were found;

S: I cannot listen (/ˈlɪst.ən/) your voice.

T: pardon? Listen? (/ˈlɪst.ən/)

S: listen (/ˈlɪs.ən/).

T: yes, listen (/ˈlɪs.ən/) without "t"

(Student and teacher's dialogue in observation 1)

S: don't you remember this stuff (/stæf/).

T: what?

S: don't you remember this stuff (/stʌf/)?

T: yeah.

(Student and teacher's dialogue in observation 2)

S: today, our school has a new (/nyu:/) regulation for us.

T: what?

S: oh yeah, sorry, today, our school has a new (/nu:/) regulation for us.

(Student and teacher's dialogue in observation 3)

The fourth type is metalinguistic feedback.

There were 4 of teacher's frequency in three times observation. The data were found;

S: can we make (/mek/) it simple?

T: do we say "make" like that?

S: hmm, make (/mek/)?

T: make (/meɪk/).

S: can we make (/meɪk/) it simple?

T: that's right.

(Student and teacher's dialogue in observation 1)

S: don't touch (/tʌtʃ/) this table!

T: wait, you said touch (/tʌtʃ/), is that right? S:

don't touch (/tʌtʃ/) this table!

T: Ok good.

(Student and teacher's dialogue in observation 2)

S: In my opinion, we must stop smoking because it's dangerous (/ˈden.dʒə.əs/)? for our health.

T: hmmm, can you find the error?, do we say dangerous like that?

S: hmmm, dangerous (/ˈdem.dʒə.əs/)?

T: yeah.

S: In my opinion, we must stop smoking because it's dangerous (/ˈdem.dʒə.əs/)? for our health.

(Student and teacher's dialogue in observation 3)

The fifth type is elicitation. There were 2 of teacher's frequency in two times observation. The data were found;

T: partner (/ˈpɑːrt.nə/).

S: did you do your homework (/ˈhɒm.wɜːk/) last night?

T: No, you do your.....? S: hmmm, (/ˈhɒm.wɜːk/)?

T: homework (/ˈhɒm.wɜːk/) (Recast type)

S: did you do your homework (/ˈhɒm.wɜːk/)

Last night?

T: that's right.

(Student and teacher's dialogue in observation 1)

T: partner (/ˈpɑːrt.nə/).

S: should we go now? (/noʊ/) (low intonation) T: should we go?

S: (/noʊ/)?

T: now (/naʊ/) (Recast type) S: should we go now? (/naʊ/)

T: good.

(Student and teacher's dialogue in observation 2)

It can be concluded that from the third observations above, it was obtained that there were 37 times correction done by the teacher during teaching learning process. From the five types corrective feedback implemented by the teacher, the largest category was the explicit correction, which was calculated 41% of the total number of the teacher used corrective feedback. Besides, the other types of corrective feedback were distributed in decreasing frequency as follows: recast (24%), clarification request (19%), metalinguistic feedback (11%), and elicitation (5%).

In order to find out the information from the teacher, semi-structure interview was used to answer the research question number 2 regarding the teacher's preference. The teacher's preference in this context refers to the teacher's choice regarding implementing corrective feedback to pronunciation error. The interview was held after conducting the classroom observations and it took place in teacher's room. The result of interview data emphasized the findings from the observation related to teacher's practice inside classroom to implement corrective feedback on students' pronunciation.

In doing interview session, there were 10 list of questions given to the teacher, namely;

1. In teaching speaking, have you ever found the student's pronunciation error?
2. What error aspects did you find in students' pronunciation?
3. How are your techniques to correct students' pronunciation error?
4. How often do you give corrections to students' pronunciation error?
5. In your opinion, what is the most effective correction given in correcting students' pronunciation errors?
6. To correct student pronunciation errors, which one do you choose: correct them immediately or delay them?
7. In your opinion, how does the student feel after being given a correction?
8. What is the development of students' pronunciation after being given the correction?
9. Does your correction motivate the students to correct their errors in pronunciation?
10. In your opinion, what are the benefits of giving correction to the students' pronunciation?

Teacher's preference could be classified into two main points, namely; teacher's choice in using the types of corrective feedback techniques and the timing of giving correction.

Based on the 10 questions in the interview above, the researchers classified into three points, namely; first, asking the condition of students' pronunciation error in the classroom. Second, asking the teachers' techniques, frequency, and preference toward corrective feedback. Third, asking the students' condition based on teacher's perspective regarding the implementation of corrective feedback. The interview data showed the teacher's explanation about teacher's perspectives regarding

the use of corrective feedback implemented in teaching learning process. In the interview data, the researchers asked question number 1 and 2 "In teaching speaking, have you ever found the student's pronunciation error?" and "what error aspects did you find in students' pronunciation?" . Those questions were emphasized the condition of students' pronunciation error in the classroom that related to the observation. Then, the teacher answered:

"Of course, I've ever found it, even there are many students mispronounce the words when they are in speaking class. It's quite hard, because they seldom talk or just say "hello" in English. So, they still do many mistakes in pronouncing the words.

"Most students got error in spelling words either it is vowel or consonant. Because they are not used to speaking in English. Sometimes there were also some students who made errors in stressing or intonation, for example intonation sentences seemed like intonation statements."

The teacher's answers were appropriate with the students' condition in the classroom. It reported that in teaching learning process, there were many students who did error pronunciation. Most of them got error in spelling words either in vocal or consonant, and also intonation.

Next questions number 3 until 6, the researcher asked "How are your techniques to correct students' pronunciation error?", "How often do you give corrections to students' pronunciation error?", "In your opinion, what is the most effective correction given in correcting students' pronunciation errors?", and "To correct student pronunciation errors, which one do you choose: correct them immediately or delay them?". Those questions were aimed to find out teacher's techniques, frequency, and preference in correcting students' pronunciation error. The teacher answered:

"I often correct immediately their error words in spelling or in intonation. Sometimes I wrote first their pronunciation errors that I've heard. Well, at the end of the learning, I gave the words or intonation which was wrong when they said in practicing speaking, and the last I gave the correct pronunciation to them."

"It can be said very often, because many students who have been corrected, sometimes they still do mistakes again in pronouncing

word or in intonation. So I often corrected again. Every time I teach, there must be students who still mispronounce the words.

"If we say whether it is effective or not, I give correction depends on the students do their mistakes. There must be students who were confused and nervous. Besides, there were some students who were happy to be corrected. In fact, some of them ever said that they want to be corrected immediately by their teacher."

"I choose both of them, correcting immediately or delay it. The most often I did was correcting immediately. Because I always spontaneously want to correct them if they do their mistakes in pronouncing the words. But I also consider whether the students are ready or not to be corrected because somehow, they are so nervous if I correct them immediately."

These explanations proved that in every teaching, the students were often corrected their pronunciation by the teacher. Based on the observation, in the process of giving corrective feedback on students' pronunciation error, she used several techniques, such as explicit, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, and elicitation (Chandler, 2003; Ferris, 2010; Lyster and Ranta, 1997). After conducting the interview, it was found that the teacher preferred correcting students' pronunciation immediately by using explicit techniques. Besides, for the timing of correcting pronunciation error, she chose both immediate and delayed correction in speaking activities. Further, she also considered whether the students were ready or not to be corrected due to sometimes they were nervous given correction immediately, so that she delayed to correct till the students stopped speaking.

The last questions number 7, 8, 9 and 10 were aimed to find out the effect after giving corrective feedback to students' pronunciation error. The researcher asked:

"In your opinion, how does the student feel after being given a correction?", "What is the development of students' pronunciation after giving the correction?", "Does your correction motivate the students to correct their errors in pronunciation?", and "In your opinion, what are the benefits of giving correction to the students' pronunciation?". These questions were also intended to find out the students' condition based on teacher's perspective regarding giving correction in teaching learning process. The teacher answered:

"Yes, there were some students who were happy because of correction, and the rest of them did not like if I correct them because they might feel shy. Moreover, there were also who were very nervous till they lost their concentration."

"The development of students' pronunciation after being given teacher's correction, most of them can improve their pronunciation to better, even though few students still have not showed their progress."

There were some students that motivated to correct their mistakes, because every meeting I found the wrong words again from the students but actually I have corrected them frequently to pronounce the correct form."

"There are many benefits actually, by giving correction to students' pronunciation error, this is very useful for those who still lack of pronunciation. Step by step, they will understand and know their mistakes, and in the end they indirectly can correct his own mistakes without my correction. Then, by giving correction, they can improve their learning motivation and they want to correct themselves every time they make an error in their pronunciation."

From the teacher's explanations above, during implementing corrective feedback, the teacher showed her attention to development of students' pronunciation. It was found that the students gave their responses either positive attitude or negative attitude towards the corrective feedback. Even though there were some students who were still shy, nervous and confused after being given correction, but the majority of the students were motivated and able to improve their pronunciation to be better.

The following discussions are based on the research questions, namely; the teacher's techniques of giving corrective feedback on students' pronunciation and the teacher's preference toward the use of corrective feedback on students' pronunciation.

The first section to be discussed was the teacher's corrective feedback techniques on students' pronunciation. There were five types of corrective feedback found in classroom observation, namely; explicit, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, and elicitation. These refers to the theory proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997; also in Chandler, 2003; Ferris, 2010).

The observation showed that there were five types of corrective feedback which sorted from the most frequently used, namely; explicit, recast,

clarification request, metalinguistic feedback and elicitation. The data reported that the most frequently used were explicit correction which was distributed 41%, and recast was 24%. In other words, based on teacher's perspective, it was obtained that the teacher preferred choosing explicit correction. It showed that the most frequently used was explicit correction in this present study. This result is line with the previous study (Park, 2010) stated that explicit correction is the most frequently used by teacher. Then, another frequent correction implemented by the teacher was recast. It linked to the theory proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997; also in Chandler, 2003; Ferris, 2010) stated that recast is the most widely used type corrective feedback in language classroom. Besides, Haryanto (2015) and Mendez et al. (2010) found that recast is a favorite oral feedback method among teachers.

The second section to be discussed was teacher's preference toward corrective feedback on students' pronunciation error. The data were gained from interview which emphasized the data from classroom observation. It was found that the teacher preferred choosing to use explicit correction than the other techniques. This finding linked to the previous study conducted by Park (2010), stated that explicit correction is the most frequently used as his preference in choosing type of corrective feedback. More preference for explicit CF was also found in a study by Amador (2008) who investigated twenty-three beginners of English from the University of Costa Rica's School of Modern Languages. The students were given twenty different correction techniques for errors that took place in interactional dialogue between teacher – student or student-students. They were asked to choose their preference by circling the letter of their choice. The results were in line with Sheen (2006) indicating a preference for explicit corrective feedback techniques.

Further, it was also found in the interview data, based on timing of giving correction, the teacher tended to correct students' pronunciation error both immediate and delayed correction. This linked to the previous study conducted by Haryanto (2015) stated that immediate and delayed correction and the models of communicative task displayed by the students, it can influence students' psychological performance. As a result, in this present research, the teacher considered to give correction based on the students' activities in teaching learning process because she did not want to interrupt their students even though she recognized pronunciation errors.

There were several benefits from the corrective feedback implemented in correcting pronunciation

error. Based on the teacher's perspective, it was found that corrective feedback was important and it could improve students' pronunciation. This linked to the theory proposed by Hattie and Timperley (2014) stated that feedback was the most powerful moderator that enhanced achievement. In other words, theory from Lee et al. (2014) corrective feedback (CF) on errors facilitates pronunciation improvement of language learners. Then, it linked to the previous study conducted by Huang and Jia (2016) stated corrective feedback is not only important but necessary since the students still have pronunciation problems which need teacher's help.

5 CONCLUSIONS

There are two main conclusions that are discussed in this section. The first is corrective feedback strategies used by the teacher in correcting students' pronunciation and the second is teacher's preference toward the use of corrective feedback on students' pronunciation

First, it reveals the teacher's corrective feedback strategies implemented on students' pronunciation error. There are five corrective feedback used by the teacher in teaching learning process. Those are explicit, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, and elicitation. Based on the observation, interview, and questionnaire, it was found that the most frequent correction used by the teacher are explicit and recast in teaching learning process.

Second, it discovers the teacher's preference toward the use of corrective feedback on students' pronunciation. It was obtained from the findings, the teacher preferred choosing explicit techniques as her choice of corrector. Besides, in the timing of giving correction, the teacher tended to choose both immediate and delayed correction based on the students' activities in teaching learning process because she did not want to interrupt their students even though she recognized pronunciation errors.

REFERENCES

- Amador, Y.A. 2008. 'Learner attitudes toward error correction in a beginners English class'. *Rev. Comun.* 17, 18–28. <https://doi.org/10.18845/rc.v17i1.903>
- Burgess, J., Spencer, S. 2000. 'Phonology and pronunciation in integrated language teaching and teacher education'. *System* 28, 191–215.

- Chandler, J 2003. 'The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing'. *J. Second Lang. Writ.* 12, 267–296. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(03\)00038-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(03)00038-9)
- Chongning, X 2009. 'Students' feedback to their pronunciation learning'. *Teach. Engl. China CELEA J.* 32, 38–49.
- Creswell, J.W 2002. *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative*. Prentice Hall Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- Dardjowidjojo, S 2009. *English Phonetics & Phonology for Indonesians*. Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.
- Ellis, R., Loewen, S., Erlam, R 2006. 'Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar'. *Stud. Second Lang. Acquis.* 28, 339–368.
- Ferris, D.R., 2010. 'Second language writing research and written corrective feedback in SLA: Intersections and practical applications'. *Stud. Second Lang. Acquis.* 32, 181–201.
- Harmer, J 1983. 'The practice of English language teaching'. *ERIC*.
- Haryanto, E 2015. 'Teachers' corrective feedback on students' pronunciation at the daffodils english course kampung inggris pare Indonesia'. *Linguists* 2.
- Hattie, J., Timperley, H 2007. 'The power of feedback'. *Rev. Educ. Res.* 77, 81–112.
- Huang, X., Jia, X 2016. 'Corrective feedback on pronunciation: Students' and teachers' perceptions'. *Int. J. Engl. Linguist.* 6, 245.
- Kelly, G 2006. *How To Teach Pronunciation (With Cd)*. Pearson Education India.
- Kim, J.H 2004. 'Issues of corrective feedback in second language acquisition'. *Teachers College. Columbia University Working papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics*, 4 (2), 1–24.
- Lee, J., Jang, J., Plonsky, L 2014. 'The effectiveness of second language pronunciation instruction: A meta-analysis'. *Appl. Linguist.* 36, 345–366.
- Lyster, R., Ranta, L 1997. 'Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms'. *Stud. Second Lang. Acquis.* 19, 37–66.
- Maniruzzaman, M 2008. *Teaching EFL Pronunciation: Why, What and How?*
- Méndez, E.H., Cruz, R.R., Loyo, G.M 2010. 'Oral corrective feedback by EFL teachers at Universidad de Quintana Roo'. *Int. FEL Memo* Retrieved [Httpfel Uqroo Mxadminfilefilesmemoriashernandezmendezedit hetal2 Pdf](http://fel.uqroo.mx/admin/files/memoriashernandezmendezedit_hetal2.Pdf).
- Pardede, P 2010. 'The Role of Pronunciation in a Foreign Language Program. Univ. Kristen Indonesia'. Available from [Http sparlindunganpardede Wordpress Com20101007349](http://sparlindunganpardede.wordpress.com/2010/10/07/349).
- Park, H.-S 2010. *Teachers' and learners' preferences for error correction* (PhD Thesis).
- Purnawarman, P 2011. 'Impacts of different types of teacher corrective feedback in reducing grammatical errors on esl/efl students' writing (phd thesis)'. *Virginia Tech*.
- Richards, J.C., Renandya, W.A 2002. *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge university press.
- Rogerson-Revell, P 2011. *English phonology and pronunciation teaching*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Sheen, Y 2006. 'Exploring the relationship between characteristics of recasts and learner uptake'. *Lang. Teach. Res.* 10, 361–392.
- Tomczyk, E., 2013. Perceptions of Oral Errors and Their Corrective Feedback: Teachers vs. Students. *J. Lang. Teach. Res.* 4.