**CHAPTER I**

**INTRODUCTION**

This chapter consists of background, problem statement, objectives, significance, and scope of the research.

1. Background

The pioneers of second language acquisition (SLA) studies such as Cummins (1981, 1983, 1991), Krashen(1982, 1985),Ellis (1985, 2009, 2013),Swain (1995, 1997) put serious attention on how language acquisition takes place. There are three major hypotheses which significantly contribute to this issue, namely input hypothesis, interactional hypothesis and output hypothesis.

Input hypothesis, commonly known as i + 1, is offered by Krashen (1985). In his view, he strongly believes that language acquisition is determined by input. He argues that “Human acquires language in only one way, that is by understanding message or by receiving comprehensible input” (Krashen, 1985:80).

However, Krashen’s view gets many criticisms. One of the criticisms comes from Swain (1997) who argued that even though the comprehensible input constituted a necessary condition, it is not sufficient for SLA. Supporting Swain’s view, Doughty and William in Safari (2013) found that certain linguistic features failed to develop. In attempt to fill this gap, Swain (1995)proposed output hypothesis. It fills the gap left by input hypothesis alone. The roles are; the students receive and comprehend the input. Then with their comprehensible input, they are forced to use that and produce output. According to Swain (1985, 1995), through producing the language, learners might consciously recognize some of their linguistic problems. To sum up, in order to have good comprehension in second language acquisition, learners are needed to be pushed to produce language and may try out new structures or modify their own speech.

Moreover, some researchers consider that input and output hypothesis in second language acquisition is still insufficient to support the learner’s language development. Some researcher such as Long (1991)proposed what he called interaction hypothesis. Accordingly, comprehension of the language which is shaped via interaction contributed strongly and directly to the acquisition.

Output hypothesis is closely related to interaction hypothesis, where the emphasis of language learning is on grammatical form in a context of communicative task and activities. Comprehensible output formed in the interaction will be directly affecting acquisition.

One way to shaped comprehensible output during the interaction is by receiving corrective feedback for the produced output. Corrective feedback is basically a term used to describe the teachers’ response to learners’ language errors (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). It is also known as ‘negative evidence’ (Marcus, 1992).

Corrective feedback is seen to contribute to learners’ language acquisition. However, there are many views on the critical role of corrective feedback. It has been debated by many pioneers on second language acquisition such as Krashen, (1985), Swain (1995), Truscott (1998). They are debating whether error is significant for language acquisition or not.

Error correction is firstly disapproved by Krashen (1988). He argued that error correction is a serious mistake. He offered two major reasons for this view. First, error correction put the students on the defensive. It makes the learner eliminate their mistakes by avoiding the use of complex construction on their sentence. Second, error correction only assists the development of “learned knowledge” and plays no role in “acquire knowledge” (Krashen, 1998: 75).

In contrast, Ellis (2009) has viewed that corrective feedback is facilitative in language learning alone is not enough. It does not improve learner’s language acquisition regarding to syntax and the production of output. The output hypothesis promoted by Swain (1995) is the solution for the blank part in input hypothesis. The output hypothesis enables the teacher to facilitate learner to have an opportunity to produce an output, so they can convey something in the target language in language learning process. Also, it gives the students a feedback to help them notice a part needed more attention in their utterance.

Another researcher, Van Patten in Mollakhan, *et al*. (2013) claims that corrective Feedback in the form of negotiating for meaning can help learners notice their errors and create form-meaning connection, thus aiding acquisition.

Hence, without over-estimating the contribution of corrective feedback, it is not excessive to say that corrective feedback is helpful in learning language. It helps the students to notice the errors coming up in their utterance and provides an opportunity for the learners to correct the errors they made. Therefore, it is clear that corrective feedback is uncontested in language learning in classroom.

Moreover, in responding to the teacher’s corrective feedback, students correct their sentences as the answer of teacher’s correction. The learners’ responses to the teacher’s corrective feedback called students’ uptake. 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 students’ initial utterance called uptake (Lyster & Ranta, 1997)

Uptake is considered significant for language acquisition. Lyster & Ranta (1977) stated that there are two major reasons of the importance of uptake to second language acquisition (1) uptake provide opportunities for learners to retrieve the knowledge of the target language after receiving a feedback. (2) When the students repair their utterance, they notice the error, draw the correct form, lead them to picture the correct form and reform their sentences.

There is no prove of the clear effect and relationship of corrective feedback and learner’s uptake, yet many researchers such as Ellis (2009), Heift (2004), Zhao (2009) Leiter (2010), has proved that certain types of teachers corrective feedback leads more uptake and affect the learners’ uptake as well.

Extensive studies have been done to explain the relationship between corrective feedback and learner’s uptake. Yet, the effect of the teacher’s corrective feedback has not been clearly defined in Indonesian context. Many educators seem to correct the learner’s error but not yet realize the role of the corrective feedback and its effect on learner’s uptake.

Hence, it is considered worthwhile to explore more on the teacher’s way in performing corrective feedback, also to examine its effect on learner’s uptake in the language learning in Indonesian context.

Finally, this study would like to examine the different patterns of way in correcting the student’s errors used by the teacher; the types of uptake followed different corrective feedback and investigated the effect of the corrective feedback used by the teacher to their uptake.

1. Problem Statements

This study in general would like to examine the teachers’ use of corrective feedback and analyze the effect of their corrective feedback to the students’ uptake. This general aim was going to study by proposing the specific research question:

1. What types of corrective feedback were used by the English teachers at senior secondary school students in Indonesian context?
2. What were students’ uptakes of those different types of teachers’ corrective feedback at senior secondary students in Indonesian context?
3. What was the effect of teachers’ corrective feedback on the students’ uptake in senior secondary students in Indonesian context?
4. To what extent do the teachers’ teaching experience and English proficiency level correlate with the teachers’ corrective feedback?
5. Objectives of the Research

Based on the research questions proposed above, the objectives of this research were intended to find out:

1. The types of corrective feedback used by the English teacher at senior secondary school students in Indonesian context.
2. Student’s uptake following different types of teachers’ corrective feedback at senior secondary students in Indonesian context.
3. The effect of teachers’ corrective feedback to the students’ uptake at senior secondary students in Indonesian context?
4. The extent to which teachers’ English proficiency level and teaching experience correlate with their corrective feedback.
5. Significance of the Research

The results of this research were expected to enrich to the existing literature on teachers’ corrective feedback and students’ uptake. It is worthwhile for the teacher to know the importance of corrective feedback and the way in giving the corrective feedback to the learners’ error.

In addition, the results of this current study were projected to provide insight on how the teacher’s corrective feedback affects the students’ uptake. Since helping the students to notice their errors and have a comprehensible output is as critical as comprehensible input to the learner. As a result, when the teacher knows the nature of corrective feedback and provides it to the student in an appropriate time and context, in some cases, it would effectively provide comprehensible output to help the learner in language learning.

1. Focus of The Research

The area of this research is second language acquisition dealing with the error treatment which is in this research known as corrective feedback. This assessment assessed the productive skills which focus on speaking ability.

This research was limited to the corrective feedback used by the teacher as the feedback to the students’ morph syntactic, lexical and semantic error, in oral presentation during the classroom interaction.