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The research aimed at (i) Finding out the effect of teacher error feedback minimizing the students’ weakness in speaking English; (ii) finding out the student responses and perceptions toward the error feedback given in teaching speaking activity. The research applied quasi-experimental and exploratory study. In this study, one treatment groups and one control group are used. The treatment group received in different types of feedback, while the control group received no speaking feedback on their conversation.

The findings indicated that (i) the students’ accuracy in speaking improved from poor to good category and the experimental class is higher than control class, the students speaking fluency has similarity because the comparison control class and experimental class showed that both improving the students speaking fluency, where experimental class is higher than control class, and the students’ speaking compensability is leading to the ability to be understood or intelligible because the result of data analysis in experimental class for the students comprehensibility in speaking shown that teacher error feedback gave effect. The mean score of pre-test 4.45 and mean score of post-test 7.87. In control class showed means score of pre-test 3.38 and mean score for post-test 6.45. (ii) The students’ response and perception for teacher error feedback indicated that students think their spoken error should be corrected when teaching language whatever English as foreign language and their errors usually to correct frequently, students also like very much if the timing the spoken error to be treated after finishing speaking, they also wanted their teacher focus more on their serious spoken errors than individual errors, the students responds shout treat their error generally strongly agree if their teacher gave them treat their error in speaking. They also was agree if their friends should treat their error, and the most popular corrective feedback in teaching speaking is explicit correction, elicitation, and repetition. They have effective function in detecting the students’ mispronunciation and low accuracy and fluency. The other corrective feedback like implicit correction, recast, clarification request, and metalinguistic feedback are not favored because the percentage is lower than other corrective feedback. It is indicated that not all corrective feedback effective use in speaking, depend on the skill.
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**ABSTRAK**

MUH. ARIEF MUHSIN. *Pengaruh Umpan Balik Terhadap Kemampuan Berbicara Mahasiswa dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris (Pembimbing Asfah Rahman dan Kisman Salija).*

Penelitian ini bertujuan (i) untuk mengetahui pengaruh umpan balik guru dalam meminimalisir kesulitan mahasiswa dalam berbicara bahasa Inggris; (ii) mengetahui respond an pendapat mahasiswa dalam memperoleh umpan balik yang diberikan oleh dosen dalam pembelajaran. Penelitian ini menggunakan *quasi experiment* dengan menggunakan satu kelas control dan satu kelas eksperimen. Kelas eksperimen menggunakan teori umpan balik dan kelas control menggunakan metode konvensional dengan presentasi, praktis, dan latihan.

Hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan (i) akurasi kemampuan berbicara mahasiswa meningkat dari kategori yang buruk ke kategori yang baik, kelancaran berbicara mahaiswa antara kelas control dan kelas eksperimental sama-sama meningkat. Kelas eksperimen menunjukkan bahwa hasil pembelajarannya lebih tinggi daripada kelas control baik akurasi, kelancaran, maupun pemahaman mahasiswa. Antara kelas eksperimen dan kelas control sama-sama menunjutkan peningkatan dimana rataan kelas eksperimental pada pre-test 4.45 dan 7.87 pada post-test. Untuk kelas control rataannya 3.38 untuk pre-test dan 6.45 untuk post-test. (i) Respon mahasiswa dengan umpan balik menunjukkan mereka menginginkan bahwa kesalahan berbahasa mereka harus dikoreksi dalam pembelajaran bahasa Inggris. Mahasiswa juga menginginkan selalu diperingatkan ketika berbuat kesalahan setelah pembelajaran. Mahasiswa juga setuju apabila kesalahan mereka dibenarkan oleh teman mereka. Jenis umpan balik yang paling sering digunakan adalah *explicit correction, elicitation,* dan *repetition*. Jenis umpan balik lainnya seperti i*mplicit correction, recast, clarification request,* dan *metalinguistic feedback* tidak sering digunakan. Hal ini menunjukkan tidak semua jenis umpan balik sering digunakan dalam pembelajaran berbicara.

**Kata Kunci: Umpan Balik, Guru, dan Kemampuan Berbicara**

1. **INTRODUCTION**

Many studies have investigated teacher’s preference for and the effectiveness feedback in EFL. Pan (2010:7) investigated the effect of teacher error feedback on the accuracy of EFL student writing. Ali (2005:9) investigated the effect of teachers’ feedback on the students’ ability to self-edit in l2 writing classes. Abedi (2010:10) investigated the effect of error correction versus error direction on Iranian pre-Intermediate EFL students writing achievement. Al Saeed (2010:5) investigated the effect of error correction types on grammatical accuracy in student essay revision. The entire researchers investigated the student writing class in giving error feedback.

Although many studies have investigated teachers’ preferences for and the effectiveness of error feedback in EFL, relatively few studies have investigated the difference among teachers’ and students’ preferences for error correction. Also, to my knowledge, no studies have explored regardless of whether students’ individual characteristics, especially anxiety, influence their preferences for corrective feedback. Besides that, when we read the articles that got, there wasn’t one of article took speaking skill as the subject of the research. Because of that true reason, the researcher tries doing investigation the error feedback of EFL speaking skill.

Although the students’ errors are natural phenomena in the language classroom, it is quite difficult to figure out if the teachers should ignore or treat them. If the teachers decided to correct the errors, each one will be faced with these questions: which errors should be corrected? And how can teachers help the students to make the errors work for them? The answers to these questions are as complex as learning the language itself. It is even generally accepted that for the last two decades the language practitioners have different opinions on how to deal with the students’ errors.

This assumption leads some people (such as Krashen and Truscott) to have believed that the negative feedback is unnecessary in language classrooms. Moreover, (Dekeyser (1993) in Johnson and Redmond, 2003) stated that error treatment did not improve the students’ oral proficiency. The opposing view, on the other hand, believe that error correction is important in language classroom because some studies have shown that if the correction is given in the right way, it can improve the students’ language skills. By providing the students with correction the students can learn which language item they need to work on and which feature they have made progress.

Knowing the function of feedback, the researcher interested to investigate the effectiveness of feedback in teaching and learning process. The researcher did researching to know the students weakness in making error in speaking skill. The researcher used teacher error feedback to minimize the student problem in speaking.

The investigation did at Muhammadiyah University of Makassar in English department program. After the researcher did pre investigation, ungrammatical, mispronunciation and low accuracy are the main problem of the students. For example ungrammatical sentence, the student said “My mom love me so much, she giving me money every day”, other student also said “in the morning I am usually get up on 9 o’clock” .Besides that, some of the students still poor in pronunciation; like vegetable they said “vegetabl”, evening they said “evening” and some words of English they get difficultly to say. Some of the students also didn’t know which need longer voice in the words and which need shorter voice is. In the other hand, the students have ability for speaking because they have rich in vocabularies. Generally, the students can speak while they at the class doing interaction. Even they can speak, more than half of them still make mistake especially in pronunciation.

1. **LITERATURE REVIEW**
2. **Previous Related Finding**

There were many researcher investigated about the feedback in teaching, they did the research almost the soft skills in English like writing, reading, listening and oral. Pan (2010) had investigated the teacher feedback on the accuracy of EFL student writing. He made conclusion in his research if teacher feedback had advanced the students in better linguistic knowledge and it develop improved accuracy the students writing with higher degree than beginner after receiving teacher error feedback. In the other hand, according to him, teacher error feedback was facilitated or harmful the students’ ability to write accurately.

The next researcher doing researcher about teachers’ feedback was done by Ali (2005:49). He had made conclusion the effect of different types of feedback on second language writing over the course of a year but found no significant difference on learner’s essays with regard to linguistic accuracy. He also noted that to be effective, systematic training in writing required systematic correction of individual scripts and also indicated that the correction of student compositions is often ineffective in reducing errors because teachers correct mistakes inconsistently. Ali (2005: 55) gave recommendation if the future the researcher could investigate the questions posed in this study with larger samples and/or different methodology. Further research is also recommended that will take into considerations the previously mentioned limitations and that will investigate factors that are most likely to be associated with teachers’ use of feedback in ESL writing classes. These factors may have significance in the context of second of foreign language teaching.
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According to Al Saeed (2010:60) who investigated the effect of error correction on grammatical accuracy in student essay revision, teacher feedback will always be an important topic for both teachers and students. Therefore researchers still need to investigate different feedback strategies to help students and teachers. The present study is a short termed and experimental study that has limitations, but it highlighted the possibility that some feedback strategies work better than others. However, it suggests that more research still needs to be done.

In the other research, Chu (2011) investigated; Effects of Teacher’s Corrective Feedback on Accuracy in the Oral English of English-Majors College Students. He made conclusion if corrective feedback has a positive effect on improving oral English accuracy. Compared with score of experimental classes and control class in post –test, the score of experimental class obvious is higher than that of control class. Besides that according to Chu (20011), corrective feedback has a better effect on English accuracy. Corrective feedback does make great effect on oral accuracy, but the effectiveness for different level of learner is different. For medium and low group learners, the effectiveness is better, because there is enough space for them to be improved. For high group learners, their oral accuracy is better, what they need to do is improve their oral fluency and complexity.

1. **Theory of Error Feedback**

When the teacher can give good oral error feedback strategies, it can boost the student motivation, advance language learning, and increase student perception of instructional effectiveness. We cannot deny also if the oral error feedback literature offers a confusing picture of what is appropriate feedback. Many teachers have heard that recasts a type of feedback that involves reformulating the student’s error into the correct form, is an appropriate approach, especially because it may avoid increasing student anxiety.

1. **The error**

In general, errors have been viewed as language learners’ speech that deviates from the model they are tried to master. The statement was supported by Park (2010:6), he made a distinction between mistakes and errors. He had used the term “errors” refer to systematic learner’s errors underlying knowledge of the language. These errors display the learner’s current developmental level of the target language. Besides that, the used term “mistakes” to refer to incorrect forms caused by memory lapses, slips of the tongue and other instances of performance errors. It is logical argued that foreign language learners can correct their own “mistakes” with assurance, but their “errors” are not amendable since their current linguistic developmental stage.

Researchers have categorized errors in various ways. According to Kazem (2005: 56) errors divide in two kind; global errors and local errors. Global errors refer to errors that significantly damage communication and those that affect from sentence organization, such as mistake word order, missing, wrong, or the place of sentence connectors. On the other problem, the affect of local errors single elements in a sentence but do not usually hinder communication significantly such as errors in noun and verb inflections, articles, and auxiliaries. Point out that correction for one global error clarifies the intended message more than the correction of several local errors.

From a slightly different perspective, Al Saeed (2010: 32) is categorized the errors firing from the strictly linguistic (phonological, morphological, syntactic) to subject matter content (factual and conceptual knowledge) and lexical items. Furthermore, the argued that high-frequency errors who made by students should be the first error for teacher should be correct in the classroom or another place that is suitable for them.

In the other argument, Mackey et al. (2000) errors will divide in four categorized their analysis of L2 interactional data. The four error types that had triggered the teacher using the feedback of corrective were phonology, morphosyntax, lexis, and semantics: (1) phonological errors were non-target-like pronunciation; (2) morphosyntactic errors were omitted plural *–s* and the preposition *in*; (3) lexical errors were inappropriate lexical items; (4) semantic errors were incorrect meanings or expressions. Some researchers also included a category that is relevant only to the specific target language. They have added logical argue because all of the types error is always come in teaching.

After we analysis of the theories, we can take précis if the error is of the important thing in teaching since they develop their linguistic stage. The error is come from the students’ subject because every moment has different mistake.

1. **The feedback**

An article research was written by Łęska (2008), according him the following definition of feedback is information concerning the comprehension and reception of the speaker’s message given by the listener. Paul (2011) also was giving argument that feedback is the information will be fine by listener during a conversation. It shows our attitude towards the listener and influences their attitude towards us. Everything we perform and that gives some response to our listener can be considered feedback.

According to Paul (2011), to make decision for identify the error, it is resulting at least two important think from the attributes to an error feedback interaction.  One is the identity of the error, which may be specifically pinpointed or left for the students to determine on their own. A second attribute is whether or not depend of feedback interaction explicitly identifies the fact that an error is made. Recasts, for instance, typically provide students a model of the correct form in a turn adjacent to their ill-formed utterance, and yet may offer no evidence that an error was committed. In case, the really complaints about recasts that they are confuse or difficult for learners to recognize as feedback (Lyster and Ranta, 2001:11) arise because the identification of the error may not be use of the interaction. Interpret recasts as implicit feedback and take prompts or elicitations for explicit, regardless of how teachers handle the error identification attribute, did not mention the support issues. Consequently, the recasts of Lyster and Ranta’s (2001:12) study and those of Doughty and Varela’s (2000:8) research is not the same thing at all. As a result, one must be very careful when reading subject, the error feedback literature because it is difficult to know the true characteristics of error feedback categorized into convenient, but importantly types. Regardless of the research issue, the important takeaway is that teachers can increase and decrease explicitness via the identification attributes in feedback interactions, and by the one choice they make.

Ellis, et al (2006: 33) consist this attribute important, designed recasting their study that clearly about the errors. There are two causes to consider regarding error identity: (a) knowing students that an error was made, and (b) drawing their attention to the exact nature of the error. The more important that teachers should focus on doing this identification, the more students will notice the error feedback, and the more explicit the feedback becomes. Explicit versus implicit feedback is an area that has knowing much research interest.

The typical of the feedback approach, however, has unfortunately obscured inquiry in this area (Margollis, 2007:26). For example, researchers tend to the main good of this attributes model is that it highlights choices available to teachers that allow them to give feedback for the specific needs in learning process. For students who demonstrate a great degree of anxiety and discomfort about oral error feedback, for instance, teachers might provide recasts or prompts with little or no identification of the error. While for students who possess confidence, teachers might more boldly identify the fact an error was committed and, possibly, the specific nature of the error.

Long and Robinson (1998:23) make a statement between negative and positive feedback: negative points of feedback is out to the learners that their utterances are faulty in some way, and all feedback that is not negative is positive. Long (1996:429) defines negative feedback as giving correction by following an ungrammatical learner system. Long claimed that negative feedback is generally facilitative of L2 acquisition and Foreign Language acquisition because negative feedback, such as recasts, contains positive evidence, which provides the correct form.

Lyster & Ranta (2001:67) developed six types of feedback used by teachers in response to learner errors:

1. *Explicit correction* refers to the explicit provision of the correct form. As the teacher provides the correct form, he or she clearly indicates that what the student said is incorrect (e.g., “Oh, you mean,” “You should say”).

2. *Recasts* involve the teacher’s reformulation of all or part of a student’s utterance, minus the error.

3. *Clarification requests* indicate to students either that their utterance has not been understood by the teacher or that the utterance is ill-formed in some way and that a repetition or a reformulation is required. A clarification request includes phrases such as “Pardon me?”

4. *Metalinguistic feedback* contains comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the student’s utterance, without explicitly providing the correct form (e.g., “Can you find your error?”).

5. *Elicitation* refers to a technique that teachers use to directly elicit the correct form from the student. Teachers elicit completion of their own utterance by strategically pausing to allow students to “fill in the blank.”

6. *Repetition* refers to the teacher’s repetition, in isolation, of the student’s erroneous utterance. In most cases, teachers adjust their intonation so as to highlight the error.

After we knew some case of feedback according to the researcher, models of Lyster and Ranta is agree used by teacher to give feedback for the student. This model will be used to do investigation in this research.

1. **Teaching Speaking**

Shortage of opportunities for practice is identified as an important contributing factor to speaking subject. And by practice is meant, not practice in grammar and vocabulary, but practice in interactive and meaningful speaking itself.

According with the communicative statement, and the sociocultural theory, all learning - including the learning of a foreign language - is mediated through social and cultural activity (Park, 2010: 28). To fine autonomy in a skill, the learner first needs to experience other-regulation, that is, the mediation of a “better other”. This typically takes the form of assisted performance, as the teacher instruction with the learner to provide a supportive framework within the learners can extend their present competence. According this shared activity, new knowledge is constructed until the learners are in a position to appropriate it. At this stage the scaffolding can be gradually dismantled. Learners are now able to function independently is a state of self-regulation.

That is, learning, as seen through this theory, is fundamentally a social phenomenon, requiring both activity and interactivity (Alqahtani at all, 2011: 7). In classroom terms, it takes place in cycles of assisted performance, in which learning is collaborative, co-constructed, and scaffold.

According to Alqahtani at all, (2011: 9) was giving for the speaking opportunities and increasing the chances that students will be experienced autonomous language use, any situations need to be met:

1. *Productivity -* a speaking problem needs to be maximally language productive in order to provide the best conditions for autonomous language use. If students can do a task by simply exchanging isolated words, or if only a couple of students participate in a group discussion, the task may not justify the time spent on it.
2. *Purposefulness –* the good Language can be increased by making sure the speaking activity has a clear outcome, especially one which requires learners to work together to achieve a common purpose.
3. *Interactivity*- activities should require learners to take into account the effect they are having on their audience. There should be a real person present, one which can demonstrate interest, understanding, and even ask questions or make comments.
4. *Challenge*- the task should stretch the learners so that they are forced to draw on their available communicative resources to achieve the outcome. This will help them to experience the sense of achievement that is part of autonomous language use. But if the degree of challenge is too high, this can be counterproductive, inhibiting learners or reducing them to speaking in their L1. The teacher needs to be sensitive to the degree of difficulty a task presents individual learners and to adjust it accordingly.
5. *Safety*– in learning process should be attention they also need to feel confident that, when meeting those challenges and attempting autonomous language use, they can do so without too much risk. The classroom should be good conditions for experimentation, including a situation of classroom dynamic and a non-judgmental attitude to errors. Also, learners need to be known in the knowledge that the teacher will always be there to guide and support them in their learning process.
6. *Authenticity*- speaking tasks should have some relation to real-life language use. Learners will need to experience a quality of communication in the classroom that is essentially the same as communication outside the classroom. This means that they will need to perform in real operating conditions. It also means that the kind of topics, genres and situations that are selected for speaking tasks bear some relation to the learners´ perceived needs and interests.
7. **RESEARCH METHOD**
8. **Research Design**

This study was a quasi-experimental, applying, exploratory study. In this study, one treatment groups and one control group are used. The two treatment group received different types of feedback (code and encode), while the control group is received no speaking feedback on their conversation.

The present study explored the effects of error feedback the students speaking accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility. This means, that the independent variable (feedback) manipulated (because all types of feedback are used) to examine any possible change in the speaking accuracy (dependent variable). Therefore, this study is a quasi-experimental study. The design of the research formulated as follows:

O1 X O2

---------------------

O1 X O2

O1 = Pre-test for group 1

O2 = Post-test for group 1

X = Treatment

O1 = Pre-test for group 2

O2 = post-test for group 2

(Gay, 2006)

1. **Research Variable and Operational Definitions**
2. **Research variable**

The research consisted of one independent variable and two dependents variable. The independent variable of the research is teacher error feedback and the dependent variables are speaking skill and the students’ responds and perceptions toward the error feedback given by teacher in speaking activities.

1. **Operation definition**

The operational variable was the specification of how the researcher defines and measures the variable. The variable termed that related to this research are as follow:

1. The error refers to systematic learner’s errors underlying knowledge of the language.
2. Feedback is some response information concerning the comprehension and reception of the speaker’s message given by the listener during a conversation.
3. Speaking is probably the language skill that most language learners wish to perfect as soon as possible, it is the delivery of language through the mouth and create sounds using many parts of our body, including the lungs, vocal tract, vocal chords, tongue, teeth and lips..
4. **Population and Sample**
5. **Population**

The population of the research was at English Department of Muhammadiyah University Makassar in academic 2012/2013. The researcher took the second semesters including seven classes namely 2A, 2B, 2C, 2D, 2E, 2F, and 2G every class consists of 35 students. Actually there were some grades semesters for this year like the second grade, the fourth grade, the six grades, and the eighth grade. The researcher had chosen the second grade semester because they as the beginner in speaking class. So the total of the students for the second semester at English Department of Muhammadiyah University Makassar was 245 students.

1. **Sample**

The sample of the research was the students at English Department of Muhammadiyah University Makassar in academic 2012/2013 especially for class 2F and Class 2A. There were two classes used in this research, the first was treatment class and the second was control class. The first class consisted of 33 students namely 2F and for treatment class and 2A for control class which consisted of 32 students. The researcher chosen both of them because they had similarity for the students performance after the researcher did observation. The researcher had taken two of them as the sample of the research.

1. **FINDINGS**

The research finding was taken from the teaching process which consists of the description the result of the data analysis. The data analysis are the students speaking performance in teaching that skill in presenting the teacher error feedback. It was taken from the sample of the research which collected from 65 students at English Department of Muhammadiyah University Makassar in academic 2012/2013 especially for class 2F and Class 2A.

In collecting the data, the researcher was taken through pre-test that aims to know the students ability before giving treatment. Pre-test can give us information the students attitude before the research is started doing it. At the end of the meeting, the researcher gave the students post-test in order to know the effect teacher feedback in speaking ability after applying the treatment. The data also took from control class to compare with experimental class.

1. **The descriptive of applying feedback**

The research started on October 2013 and finished on December 2013. In applying teacher error feedback for experimental class, the researcher designed in to eight meeting. The first meeting was a pre-test, the second meetings until the seventh were activities in the classroom, and the eight was a post-test. In teaching, the activity was divided into three mains action like presentation, practicing, and production. The activities set base on the steps of our lesson plan for teacher error feedback.

The first material was about telling experience for example, there were some mistakes made the students while they are speaking as follow;

“I will tell my experience in spending night…there are some competition; I want to talking my experience in English department; my experience in English department… I get study and get many knowledge; I can coming join in English department.”

The researcher was using *explicit correction* to help the students correcting ungrammatical. It was always used because the students’ stiles could be listened clearly. The researcher sometime used *recast* feedback to reformulate the students’ utterance. In the other hand, the students also were produced mispronunciation like; abaut (about) for /ǝ’bawt/; cheng (chance) for /cӕns/; difikol (difficult) for /difǝkǝlt/. The researcher applied *repetitions* for correcting the students’ mispronunciation. In the last activities, the researcher sometime explained some general mistakes were made by students with *metalinguistic feedback*, it was a way to clarify the mistake and giving general information to the students.

The second material was about apologizing. In this activity, the students were divided into several groups and every group should practice. The researcher was given *explicit correction* and *recasts* when the students practicing how to apologize someone. It was applied like; I am sorry … I am come late; pardon me because I have make you wait me; and some ungrammatical. The researcher was given also *repetitions* for some mispronunciation like; my vegetabel (vegetable) for /vejtǝbǝl/; forgifme (forgive) for /fǝr’gif/, etc. There was no *recast* and *elicitation* in these activities, but in the last activities the researcher applied *metalinguistic feedback* to give comment and information about some ways to apologize politely.

The next materials in this research were describing object, people physically, and personality, include also about asking and giving opinion. These was same with the past materials, generally the students mistake were ungrammatical and mispronunciation. The most frequency of feedback was *explicit correction* and *repetition*, but sometime also used *recast, elicitation,* and *metalinguistics feedback*. It was seldom used *clarification request*.

Incorrect students’ speaking was a classical problem for foreigner. It could correct with give positive feedback to them because it can motivate the students still getting spirit and loyalty studying English.

For control class, in every meeting the researcher was applied presenting, practicing, and producing. In presentation, the material was explained to the students based on the lesson plan. The material was same for experimental class but only the way to deliver the knowledge was different. The next activity after presentation was practicing the materials; it was applied for empowering the students’ knowledge from the researcher. While the students’ practicing the material, teacher was written their mistake. The last activities were producing and the students practice to produce base on the material. In the last activities, the researcher explained some notes from the past activities for giving correction to the students.

1. **The result of descriptive data analysis**

In scoring the speaking skill, the row score of the students is obtained through instrument and had been tabulated base on three criteria in assessing speaking namely accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility. All the criteria and the percentage of the student score for experimental class in pre-test and post-test as follow:

1. **Accuracy**

***1) Experimental class***

The result of the data analysis from pre-test and post-test of the students in accuracy criteria for speaking is shown on the following table:

*Table 4.1. The distribution of frequency and percentage score students’ speaking in terms of accuracy in pre-test and pots-test.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | Score | Pre-test | | Post-test | |
| Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Excellent | 9,6 – 10 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 15.15 |
| Very good | 8,6 – 9,5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Good | 7,6 – 8,5 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 45.45 |
| Fairly good | 6,6 – 7,5 | 6 | 18.18 | 11 | 33.33 |
| Fair | 5,6 – 6,5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Poor | 3,6 – 5,5 | 14 | 42.42 | 2 | 6.06 |
| Very poor | 0 – 3,5 | 13 | 39.39 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | | 33 | 100 | 33 | 100 |

Based on the table above after the research analyzing the data, pre-test shows there were 13 (39.39 %) of 33 students were included in very poor criteria. In poor level there were 14 (42.42 %) from 33 students as the sample, and there were 6 (18.18%) classified as fairly good. After the researcher got the students speaking test, we concluded that the students’ speaking accuracy was poor in pre-test.

In the other hand, the table above also shows that no one of the students classified as very poor in accuracy. There were 2 (6.06 %) in poor level, 11 (33.33%) classified in fairly good, 15 (45.45%) students obtained good, and 5 (15.15%) were classified as excellent. The comparison between pre-test and post-test was showed that the students’ accuracy in post-test is higher than pre-test.

The score and standard deviation also presented in the following table:

*Table 4.2. The mean score and standard deviation of the students speaking ability in terms of the students’ speaking in terms of accuracy in pre-test and pots-test*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Test** | **Mean score** | **Standard deviation** |
| Pre-test | 4.45 | 1.53 |
| Post-test | 7.87 | 1.34 |
| Different | 3,42 | 0,19 |

The table above showed the means score of the students’ accuracy in pre-test was 4.45 and 1.53 for the standard deviation. In post-test the means score of the students were 7.87 and 1.34 for standard aviation. The description between mean score and standard deviation of the students in post-test was higher than pre-test. It is same with the distribution of frequency and percentage students’ ability in terms of accuracy.

***2) Control Class***

The result of the data analysis from pre-test and post-test of the students in accuracy criteria for speaking is shown on the following table:

*Table 4.3. The distribution of frequency and percentage score students’ speaking in terms of accuracy for control class in pre-test and pots-test.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | Score | Pre-test | | Post-test | |
| Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Excellent | 9,6 – 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.13 |
| Very good | 8,6 – 9,5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Good | 7,6 – 8,5 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12.5 |
| Fairly good | 6,6 – 7,5 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 53.13 |
| Fair | 5,6 – 6,5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Poor | 3,6 – 5,5 | 7 | 21.86 | 10 | 31.25 |
| Very poor | 0 – 3,5 | 25 | 75.75 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | | 32 | 0 | 32 | 0 |

Based on the table in control class, it showed that there were 25 (75.75%) students included in very poor class, and there were 7(21.86) students in poor class. After the researcher got the students speaking test, we concluded that the students’ speaking accuracy was very poor in pre-test for control class.

In post-test, there were 10 (3125%) included poor class between 32 students, 17(53.13) students were included in fairly poor from 32 students, and only 1 (3.13%) student included in excellent criteria. The comparison between pre-test and post-test was showed that the students’ accuracy in post-test is higher than pre-test in control class.

The score and standard deviation also in control class presented in the following table:

*Table 4.4. The mean score and standard deviation of the students speaking ability in terms of the student students’ speaking in terms of accuracy in pre-test and pots-test*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Test** | **Mean score** | **Standard deviation** |
| Pre-test | 3.38 | 1,08 |
| Post-test | 6,45 | 1.24 |
| Different | 3,07 | 0,16 |

The table above showed the means score of the students’ accuracy in pre-test for control class was 3.38 and 1,08 for the standard deviation. In post-test the means score of the students were 6,45 and 1.24 for standard aviation. The description between mean score and standard deviation of the students in post-test was higher than pre-test. It is same with the distribution of frequency and percentage students’ ability in terms of accuracy.

After calculating the students score both of experimental class and control class in pre-test and post-test, the means score and standard deviation both of experimental class and control class in pre-test and post-test were presented in the following table:

*Table 4.5.The means score and standard deviation both of experimental class and control class in pre-test and post-test*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Experimental | Pre-test | 4.45 | 1.53 |
| Post-test | 7.87 | 1.34 |
| Different |  | 3.42 | 0.19 |
| Control | Pre-test | 3.38 | 1,08 |
| Post-test | 6,45 | 1.24 |
| Different |  | 3,07 | 0,16 |

1. **Fluency**

***1) Experimental class***

The result of the data analysis from pre-test and post-test of the students in fluency criteria for speaking is shown on the following table:

*Table 4.6. The distribution of frequency and percentage score students’ speaking in terms of fluency in pre-test and pots-test.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | Score | Pre-test | | Post-test | |
| Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Excellent | 9,6 – 10 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 18.18 |
| Very good | 8,6 – 9,5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Good | 7,6 – 8,5 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 42.42 |
| Fairly good | 6,6 – 7,5 | 9 | 27.27 | 12 | 36.36 |
| Fair | 5,6 – 6,5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Poor | 3,6 – 5,5 | 16 | 48.48 | 1 | 3.03 |
| Very poor | 0 – 3,5 | 8 | 24.24 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | | 33 | 100 | 33 | 100 |

Based on the table above pre-test shows there were 8 (24.24%) of 33 students were included in very poor criteria. In poor level there were 16 (48.48 %) from 33 students as the sample, and there were 9 (27.27%) classified as fairly good. After the researcher got the students speaking test, we concluded that the students’ speaking fluency was poor in pre-test.

In the other hand, the table above also shows that no one of the students classified as very poor in fluency. There was 1 (3.03 %) in poor level, 12 (36.36%) classified in fairly good, 14 (42.45%) students obtained good, and 6 (18.18%) were classified as excellent. The comparison between pre-test and post-test was showed that the students’ fluency in post-test is higher than pre-test.

The score and standard deviation also presented in the following table

*Table 4.7. The mean score and standard deviation of the students speaking ability in terms of the student students’ speaking in terms of fluency in pre-test and pots-test*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Test** | **Mean score** | **Standard deviation** |
| Pre-test | 5.03 | 1.32 |
| Post-test | 7.92 | 1.31 |
| Different | 2,89 | 0,01 |

The table above showed the means score of the students’ fluency in pre-test was 5.03 and 1.32 for the standard deviation. In post-test the means score of the students were 7.92 and 1.31 for standard aviation. The description between mean score and standard deviation of the students in post-test was higher than pre-test. It is same with the distribution of frequency and percentage students’ ability in terms of fluency.

*2). Control Class*

The result of the data analysis from pre-test and post-test of the students in fluency criteria for speaking in control class is shown on the following table:

*Table 4.8. The distribution of frequency and percentage score students’ speaking in terms of fluency for control class in pre-test and pots-test.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | Score | Pre-test | | Post-test | |
| Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Excellent | 9,6 – 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Very good | 8,6 – 9,5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Good | 7,6 – 8,5 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 18.75 |
| Fairly good | 6,6 – 7,5 | 2 | 6.25 | 14 | 43.75 |
| Fair | 5,6 – 6,5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Poor | 3,6 – 5,5 | 10 | 31.25 | 12 | 37.5 |
| Very poor | 0 – 3,5 | 20 | 62.5 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | | 32 | 100 | 32 | 100 |

Based on the table above pre-test shows there were 20 (62.5%) of 32 students were included in very poor criteria. In poor level there were 10 (31.25 %) from 32 students as the sample, and there were 2 (6.25%) classified as fairly good. After the researcher got the students speaking test, we concluded that the students’ speaking fluency was very poor in pre-test.

In the other hand, the table above also shows that no one of the students classified as very poor in fluency. There was 12 (37.5 %) in poor level, 12 (36.36%) classified in fairly good, 14 (43.75%) students obtained fairly good, and 6 (18.17%) were classified as good. The comparison between pre-test and post-test was showed that the students’ fluency in post-test is higher than pre-test.

The score and standard deviation also presented in the following table

*Table 4.9. The mean score and standard deviation of the students speaking ability in terms of the students’ speaking in terms of fluency in pre-test and pots-test*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Test** | **Mean score** | **Standard deviation** |
| Pre-test | 3.95 | 1.32 |
| Post-test | 6.30 | 1.31 |
| Different | 2,35 | 0,01 |

The table above showed the means score of the students’ fluency in pre-test was 3.95 and 1.32 for the standard deviation. In post-test the means score of the students was 6.30 and 1.31 for standard aviation. The description between mean score and standard deviation of the students in post-test was higher than pre-test. It is same with the distribution of frequency and percentage students’ ability in terms of fluency.

1. **Comprehensibility**

***1) The experimental class***

The result of the data analysis from pre-test and post-test of the students in comprehensibility criteria for speaking is shown on the following table:

*Table 4.10. The distribution of frequency and percentage score students’ speaking in terms of comprehensibility in pre-test and pots-test.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | Score | Pre-test | | Post-test | |
| Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Excellent | 9,6 – 10 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12.12 |
| Very good | 8,6 – 9,5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Good | 7,6 – 8,5 | 1 | 3.03 | 15 | 45.45 |
| Fairly good | 6,6 – 7,5 | 3 | 9.09 | 12 | 36.36 |
| Fair | 5,6 – 6,5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Poor | 3,6 – 5,5 | 16 | 48.48 | 2 | 6.06 |
| Very poor | 0 – 3,5 | 13 | 39,39 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | | 33 | 100 | 33 | 100 |

The table above shows that in pre-test there were 13 (39.39%) students got very poor, 16 (48.48%) classified in poor students, 3 (9.09%) and 1 (3.03%) classified good student. The conclusion of the data analysis showed that the comprehensibility of the students was poor.

The table above also showed in post-test that no one student classified as very poor in comprehensibility. There were 2 (6.06%) classified in poor level. There were 12 (36.36%) students obtained fairly good classification, and 4 (12.12%) classified in excellent. After we classified the data from post-test activity, we can take conclusion the post-test is higher than post-test.

The score and standard deviation also presented in the following table

*Table 4.11. The mean score and standard deviation of the students speaking ability in terms of the student students’ speaking in terms of comprehensibility in pre-test and pots-test*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Test** | **Mean score** | **Standard deviation** |
| Pre-test | 4.45 | 1.53 |
| Pre-test | 7.87 | 1.34 |
| Different | 3,42 | 0,19 |

In table 4.6 is the means score and standard deviation. The table above showed that the means score of the students comprehensibly in pre-test was 4.45 mean score and 1.53 for standard deviation. The score in post-test showed 7.87 mean score and 1.34 for standard deviation. The description between mean score and standard deviation of the students in post-test was higher than pre-test. It is same with the distribution of frequency and percentage students’ ability in terms of compressibility.

***2) Control Class***

The result of the data analysis from pre-test and post-test of the students in comprehensibility criteria for speaking for control class is shown on the following table:

*Table 4.12. The distribution of frequency and percentage score students’ speaking in terms of comprehensibility in pre-test and pots-test.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | Score | Pre-test | | Post-test | |
| Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Excellent | 9,6 – 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Very good | 8,6 – 9,5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Good | 7,6 – 8,5 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 31.25 |
| Fairly good | 6,6 – 7,5 | 2 | 6.25 | 13 | 40.63 |
| Fair | 5,6 – 6,5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Poor | 3,6 – 5,5 | 13 | 40.63 | 2 | 6.25 |
| Very poor | 0 – 3,5 | 17 | 53.13 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | | 32 | 100 | 32 | 100 |

The table above shows that in pre-test there was 17 (53.13%) students got very poor, 13 (40.63%) classified in poor students, 3 (9.09%) and 2 (6.25%) classified fairly good student. The conclusion of the data analysis showed that the comprehensibility of the students was poor.

The table above also showed in post-test that no one student classified as very poor in comprehensibility. There was 2 (6.25%) classified in poor level. There was 13 (40.63%) students obtained fairly good classification, and 10 (31.25%) classified in good. There was no one classified in very good and excellent. After we classified the data from post-test activity, we can take conclusion the post-test is higher than post-test.

The score and standard deviation also presented in the following table

*Table 4.13. The mean score and standard deviation of the students speaking ability in terms of the student students’ speaking in terms of comprehensibility in pre-test and pots-test*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Test** | **Mean score** | **Standard deviation** |
| Pre-test | 4.16 | 1.26 |
| Pre-test | 7.44 | 1.19 |
| Different | 3,28 | 0,07 |

In table 4.6 is the means score and standard deviation. The table above showed that the means score of the students comprehensibly in pre-test was 4.16 mean score and 1.26 for standard deviation. The score in post-test showed 7.44 mean score and 1.19 for standard deviation. The description between mean score and standard deviation of the students in post-test was higher than pre-test. It is same with the distribution of frequency and percentage students’ ability in terms of compressibility.

1. **Speaking ability**

***1) Experimental class***

The result of the data analysis from pre-test of the students ability which consist of 33 students as the sample of the research in measuring the effect of teacher feedback is shown on the following table:

*Table 4.14. The distribution of frequency and percentage score students’ speaking in pre-test and pots-test.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | Score | Pre-test | | Post-test | |
| Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Excellent | 9,6 – 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Very good | 8,6 – 9,5 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 27.27 |
| Good | 7,6 – 8,5 | 1 | 3.03 | 10 | 30.30 |
| Fairly good | 6,6 – 7,5 | 4 | 9.09 | 13 | 39.39 |
| Fair | 5,6 – 6,5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Poor | 3,6 – 5,5 | 19 | 48.48 | 1 | 3.03 |
| Very poor | 0 – 3,5 | 9 | 39,39 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | | 33 | 100 | 33 | 100 |

Based on the table above showed final score in experimental research for pre-test, there were 9 (39.39%) from 33 students classified as very poor, 19 (48.48%) students classified into poor score level. There were 4 (9.09%) classified fairly good, and only 1 (3.03%) classified as very good score for speaking ability. The result of the data analysis concluded that the ability of the students was poor.

While in post-test, the table in final score showed that there was no one students classified in very poor score. Only 1 (3.03%) students were classified in poor score. There were 13 (39.39%) students classified into fairly good, 10 (30.30%) students classified in good class, and 9 (27.27%) students classified into very good class. The data was showed that the ability of the students was good after given treatment.

The score and standard deviation also presented in the following table below:

*Table 4.15. The mean score and standard deviation of the students speaking ability in terms of the student students’ speaking in terms of comprehensibility in pre-test and pots-test*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Test** | **Mean score** | **Standard deviation** |
| Pre-test | 4.66 | 1.10 |
| Post-test | 7.84 | 1.08 |
| Different | 3,18 | 0,02 |

Base on the table 4.8, the mean score of the students speaking ability in pre-test was 4.66 and 1.10 for standard deviation. The post-test the means score 7.84 and 1.08 for standard deviation. It can be concluded that the mean score of the students speaking ability in post test is higher than pre-test, while the standard deviation in post-test is higher than a pre-test.

***2) Control class***

The result of the data analysis from pre-test of the students ability which consist of 32 students as the sample of the research in measuring the effect of teacher teaching is shown on the following table:

*Table 4.16. The distribution of frequency and percentage score students’ speaking in pre-test and pots-test for control class.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | Score | Pre-test | | Post-test | |
| Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Excellent | 9,6 – 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Very good | 8,6 – 9,5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Good | 7,6 – 8,5 | 6 | 18.75 | 7 | 21.88 |
| Fairly good | 6,6 – 7,5 | 17 | 53.13 | 14 | 43.75 |
| Fair | 5,6 – 6,5 | 6 | 18.75 | 8 | 25 |
| Poor | 3,6 – 5,5 | 3 | 9.38 | 3 | 9.38 |
| Very poor | 0 – 3,5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | | 32 | 100 | 32 | 100 |

Based on the table above showed final score in control class research for pre-test, there were 3 (9.38%) from 32 students classified as poor, 6 (18.75%) students classified fair level. There was 17 (53.13%) classified fairly good, and 6 (18.75%) classified as good score for speaking ability. The result of the data analysis concluded that the ability of the students was fairly good.

While in post-test, the table in final score showed that there was no one students classified in very poor score. Only 3 (9.38%) students were classified in poor score. There were 8 (25%) students classified into fair, 14 (43.75%) students classified in fairly good class, and 7 (21.88%) students classified into good class. The data was showed that the ability of the students was fairly good after teaching process.

The score and standard deviation also presented in the following table below:

*Table 4.17. The mean score and standard deviation of the students speaking ability in terms of the student students’ speaking in terms of comprehensibility in pre-test and pots-test*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Test** | **Mean score** | **Standard deviation** |
| Pre-test | 4.83 | 0.85 |
| Post-test | 6.75 | 0.76 |
| Different | 1,92 | 0,09 |

Based on the table 4.8, the mean score of the students speaking ability in pre-test were 4.83 and 0.85 for standard deviation. The post-test the means score 6.75 and 0.76 for standard deviation. It can be concluded that the mean score of the students speaking ability in post test is higher than pre-test, while the standard deviation in post-test is higher than a pre-test

1. **The result of the inferential statistical analysis**

**a). Experimental class**

Statistical analysis is used to answer the research hypothesis. In order to know the level of significance 0.05 for variables in pre-test and post-test with degrees of freedom (df)= N-1, where N is the number of students (experimental class is 33 students), and t-test for non independent was applied the following table:

*Table 4.18: t-test value and t-table value of accuracy*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Accuracy** | t-test | t-table |
| 19.88 | 2.036 |

The table 4.17 shows that t-test value (32) for accuracy is higher than t-table value (2.036). In the other hand, for the level of significant (α)= 0.05 and degree of freedom (df)= 32 than t-test value =19.88 and t-table = 2.036. The value of t-test is greater than t-table (19.88>2.036). It means that the result of the students’ value after the researcher was given error feedback that there was significant difference between the pre-test and post-test of the students’ accuracy of speaking.

*Table 4.19: t-test value and t-table value of fluency*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Fluency** | t-test | t-table |
| 13.27 | 2.036 |

The table 4.18 shows that t-test value (32) for fluency is higher than t-table value (2.036). In the other hand, for the level of significant (α)= 0.05 and degree of freedom (df)= 32 than t-test value =13.27 and t-table = 2.036. The value of t-test is greater than t-table (13.27>2.036). It means that the result of the students’ value after the researcher was given error feedback that there was significant difference between the pre-test and post-test of the students’ fluency of speaking.

*Table 4.20: t-test value and t-table value of comprehensibility*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Comprehensibility** | t-test | t-table |
| 13.25 | 2.036 |

The table 4.18 shows that t-test value (32) for comprehensibility is higher than t-table value (2.036). In the other hand, for the level of significant (α)= 0.05 and degree of freedom (df)= 32 than t-test value =13.25 and t-table = 2.036. The value of t-test is greater than t-table (13.25>2.036). It means that the result of the students’ value after the researcher was given error feedback that there was significant difference between the pre-test and post-test of the students’ comprehensibility of speaking.

*Table 4.21: t-test of the students*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | t-test | t-table |
| X2-X1 | 4.86 | 2.036 |

Table 4.20 shows that for the level significance (α)= 0.05 and degree of freedom (df)= 32 than t-test value =4.86 and t-table = 2.036. In the other hand, for the level of significant (α)= 0.05 and degree of freedom (df)= 32 than t-test value =4.86 and t-table = 2.036. The value of t-test is greater than t-table (13.25>2.036). It means that there was significant difference between the pre-test and post-test of the students speaking ability after given feedback in teaching process.

**b) Control class**

Statistical analysis is used to answer the research hypothesis. In order to know the level of significance 0.05 for variables in pre-test and post-test with degrees of freedom (df)= N-1, where N is the number of students (control class is 32 students), and t-test for non independent was applied the following table:

*Table 4.22: t-test value and t-table value of accuracy*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Accuracy** | t-test | t-table |
| 3.65 | 2.039 |

The table 4.17 shows that t-test value (31) for accuracy is higher than t-table value (2.039). In the other hand, for the level of significant (α)= 0.05 and degree of freedom (df)= 31 than t-test value =3.65 and t-table = 2.039. The value of t-test is greater than t-table (3.65>2.039). It means that the result of the students’ value after the researcher was taught that there was difference between the pre-test and post-test of the students’ accuracy of speaking.

*Table 4.23: t-test value and t-table value of fluency*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Fluency** | t-test | t-table |
| 9.75 | 2.039 |

The table 4.22 shows that t-test value (31) for fluency is higher than t-table value (2.039). In the other hand, for the level of significant (α)= 0.05 and degree of freedom (df)= 31 than t-test value =9.75 and t-table = 2.039. The value of t-test is greater than t-table (9.75>2.039). It means that the result of the students’ value after the researcher was taught that there was difference between the pre-test and post-test of the students’ fluency of speaking.

*Table 4.24: t-test value and t-table value of comprehensibility*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Comprehensibility** | t-test | t-table |
| 13.67 | 2.039 |

The table 4.17 shows that t-test value (31) for comprehensibility is higher than t-table value (2.039). In the other hand, for the level of significant (α)= 0.05 and degree of freedom (df)= 31 than t-test value =13.67 and t-table = 2.039. The value of t-test is greater than t-table (13.67>2.039). It means that the result of the students’ value after the researcher was taught that there was difference between the pre-test and post-test of the students’ comprehensibility of speaking.

*Table 4.25: t-test of the students*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | t-test | t-table |
| X2-X1 | 29.6 | 2.036 |

Table 4.20 shows that for the level significance (α)= 0.05 and degree of freedom (df)= 31 than t-test value =29.6 and t-table = 2.036. In the other hand, for the level of significant (α)= 0.05 and degree of freedom (df)= 31 than t-test value =4.86 and t-table = 2.036. The value of t-test is greater than t-table (29.6>2.036). It means that there was significant difference between the pre-test and post-test of the students speaking ability after given feedback in teaching process.

1. **The students’ response necessity of feedback**

In getting the students’ illustration the necessity of feedback, researcher was given some questionnaires. The questionnaires were made to know the students’ response from the teachers’ feedback. It was made by using liker’s scale. There were 22 questions including all the activities which were shown when teacher is teaching in the classroom. The questionnaires were classified into some criteria like the frequency of feedback, the timing for treating students’ error, the rate of each feedback, and the persons should treat the students’ error.

There were 33 students given the questionnaire to know their response. The students’ responses were shown the following table:

1. The essential of error feedback

*Table 4.26 Students response of the essential teacher error feedback*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly agree | | Agree | | Neutral | | Disagree | | Strongly disagree | |
| 11 | 33.33% | 21 | 63.63% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 3.03% | 0 | 0% |

Table 4.17 is shown the response of the students in regarding the essential of error correction in teaching English. There were 11 or 33.33% students responded strongly agree the essential of error feedback, 21 or 63.63% agree, and only 1 or 3.03% disagree. It means that the students agree that they wanted their error to be corrected and gotten feedback by the teacher

*Table 4.27. The students response for error feedback frequency*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Always | | Usually | | sometimes | | Occasionally | | Never | |
| 10 | 30.30% | 19 | 57.57% | 2 | 6.06% | 2 | 6.06% | 0 | 0% |

Table 4.18 is shown that there were 10 students or 30.30% choosing “always” feedback frequency from their teacher, there were 19 students (57.57%) answered “usually” get feedback, 2 (6.06%) were chosen “sometime, and only 2 students (6.06%) were chosen “occasionally”. No one students was chosen “never”.

1. The timing the spoken error to be treated

*Table 4.28. The result answer of the timing spoken error to be treated in giving feedback*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The timing for treatment | Strongly agree/ Agree | | Neutral | | Disagree/ Strongly Disagree | |
| As soon as error are made | 6 | 18,18 | 10 | 30,30 | 17 | 51,51 |
| After finish speaking | 30 | 90,90 | 0 | 0,00 | 3 | 0,90 |
| After activities | 16 | 48,48 | 8 | 24,24 | 9 | 27,27 |
| The end of the class | 7 | 21,21 | 11 | 33,33 | 15 | 45,45 |

Table 4.26 is illustrated the result of timing error to be treated for feedback from teacher. The agreement of the students got error feedback as soon as error are made, there were 6 (18.18%) students strongly agree, 10 (30.30%) students were neutral, and there were many students disagree or strongly disagree gotten feedback as soon as error made. If we compare between as soon as and after finish speaking, after finish speaking is more higher, we can see on the table there were 30 students or 90.90% strongly agree, no one was chosen neutral and only 3 students or 0.90% disagree. For the fifth question after the activities, there were 16 (48.48%) students strongly agree, 8 (24.24%) students were neutral, and 9 (27.27%) strongly disagree. In the other hand, there were 7 (21.21%) students strongly agree getting feedback in the end of the class, 11 (33.33%) students were choosing neutral, and there were 15 (45.45%) strongly disagree getting feedback in the end of the class.

1. The students response on the types of error which need is treated

*Table 4.29. Students response on type of error which need treating in teaching English*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Error types | Always | | Usually | | Sometime | | Occasionally | | Never | |
| Serious | 1 | 3,03 | 4 | 12,12 | 23 | 69,69 | 2 | 6.06 | 3 | 9,09 |
| Less serious | 1 | 3,03 | 23 | 69,69 | 3 | 0,90 | 6 | 18,18 | 0 | 0,00 |
| Frequent | 1 | 3,03 | 2 | 6.06 | 25 | 75,75 | 5 | 15,15 | 0 | 0,00 |
| Infrequent | 0 | 0,00 | 3 | 9.09 | 22 | 66,66 | 7 | 21,21 | 1 | 3,03 |
| Individual | 0 | 0,00 | 0 | 0,00 | 24 | 72,72 | 8 | 24,24 | 1 | 3,03 |

Table 4.27 shows that in the students highest anxiety group was 23 (69.69%) wanted serious error to be sometime treated, and 4 (12.12%) students were serious error to be usually treated, 5 (15.15%) students wanted to be occasionally, only 1 (3.03%) student was wanted to be always treated, but there were 3 (9.09%) students to be never treated. It closed with serious error, less serious and frequent were in the highest group, the less serious there were 23 (69.60%) students wanted to be usually treated and 3 (0.90%) wanted to be sometime treated, 6 (18.18%) students wanted to be occasionally treated, only 1 ( 3.03%) wanted to be always treated and also no one wanted to be never treated. In frequent group also wanted similar, 1 (3.03%) student to be always treated, 3 (3.03%) students wanted to be usually treated, 22 (66.66%) students wanted to be sometime treated, 7 (21.21%) students wanted to be occasionally treated, and only 1 (3.03%) wanted to be never treated.

1. The rate of each feedback

*Table 4.30. The rate of feedback from the teacher in speaking*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Feedback types | Very effective/ effective | | Neutral | | Ineffective/ very ineffective | |
| Implicit correction | 11 | 33.33% | 14 | 42.42% | 8 | 24.24% |
| Explicit correction | 30 | 90.90% | 3 | 9.09 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Recasts | 18 | 54.54% | 10 | 30.30% | 5 | 15.15% |
| Clarification requests | 18 | 54.54% | 6 | 18.18% | 9 | 27.27% |
| Metalinguistic feedback | 16 | 48.48% | 8 | 24.24% | 9 | 27.27% |
| Elicitation | 21 | 63.63% | 12 | 36.36% | 0 | 0.0% |
| No corrective feedback | 6 | 18.18% | 10 | 30.30% | 17 | 51.51% |
| Repetition | 20 | 60.60% | 6 | 18.18% | 7 | 21.21% |

Table 4.28 shows that almost kinds of feedback were given responses similar. In implicit correction, the students response were 11 (33.33%) chosen very effective, 14 (42.42%) were neutral, and only 8 (24.24%) were chosen very ineffective. The most popular type of feedback is explicit correction where there were 30 (90.90%) students chosen as an very effective feedback, only 3 (9.09%) were neutral and no one answered very ineffective. Different of recasts, there were 18 (54.54%) students responded ferry effective, 10 (30.30%) were chosen neutral, and 5 (15.15%) were chosen as very ineffective. In classification requests, there were 18 (54.54%) students answered very effective, 6 (18.18%) students were neutral, and 9 (27.27%) students were very effective. For metalinguistic feedback, there were 16 (48.48%) students agree if it was very effective, 8 (24.24%) students were neutral, and 9 (27.27%) students were answered very ineffective. Elicitation is gotten higher response after explicit correction, 21 (63.63%) students were answered that elicitation very effective, only 12 (36.35%) were chosen neutral and no one students were chosen very ineffective. The next item about no corrective feedback, only 6 (18.18%) students answered very effective, 10 (30.30%) students were chosen neutral, and 17 (51.51%) students were answered very ineffective if no corrective feedback. The last item is repetition, there were 20 (60.60%) students chosen if repetition very effective, 6(18.18%) students were neutral, but 7 (21.21%) students were answered very ineffective. After we rate kinds of feedback, we can take conclusion if generally all kinds of feedback is needed depend on the skill the teacher is learned in learning activity.

1. the persons should treat the students error

*Table 4. 30 The students respond should treat their error*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Agents | Strongly agree/ Agree | | Neutral | | Disagree/ Strongly Disagree | |
| Classmates | 17 | 51.51% | 13 | 39.39% | 3 | 9.09% |
| Teachers | 21 | 63.63% | 5 | 15.15% | 7 | 21.21% |
| Students | 20 | 60.60% | 10 | 30.30% | 3 | 9.09% |

Table 4.29 shows the students respond who should treat their error in speaking English. There were 17 students (51.51%) strongly agree with their classmates, 13 (39.39%) were chosen neutral, but there were 3 (9.09%) students strongly disagree if their classmates treat their error. In the other section, there were 21 (63.63%) students strongly agree if their teacher gave them treat in their error, there were 5 (15.15%) students neutral and only 7 (21.21%) were strongly disagree. Besides that, students also were given response if their friends should treat their error, in this case there were 20 (60.60%) students strongly agree another students gave them treat, 10 (30.30%) students were chosen neutral, and only 3 (9.09%) were chosen strongly disagree.

1. **CONCLUTION**

There are three criteria in assessing speaking namely accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility. All the criteria was measured from the students to know the effectiveness teacher error feedback.

1. The students speaking accuracy in experimental class is higher than control class even both improving the students’ ability. The data analysis in experimental class showed the students’ speaking in terms of accuracy in pre-test and pots-test for experimental class. The mean score of pre-test 4.45 and mean score of post-test 7.87. In control class showed means score of pre-test 3.38 and mean score for post-test 6.45. It is indicated that effect of teacher error feedback more effective than conventional method.
2. The students speaking fluency also was improved after the treatment because experimental class is higher than control class. The mean score of pre-test is 5.03 and the mean score of post-test is 7.92. The result of data analysis concluded that there was significant improvement of students’ fluency in speaking.
3. The result of data analysis in experimental class for the students comprehensibility in speaking was shown that teacher error feedback was given effect, the mean score of pre-test is 4.45 and the mean score of post test is 7.85. It is indicated that Teacher error feedback was given good effect in helping students improving their skill in speaking English.
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1. The students respond about the essential of error feedback shown that There were 11 or 33.33% students responded strongly agree the essential of error feedback, 21 or 63.63% agree, and only 1 or 3.03% disagree. It means that the students agree that they wanted their error to be corrected and gotten feedback by the teacher. The students response for error feedback frequency that there were 10 students or 30.30% choosing “always” feedback frequency from their teacher, there were 19 students (57.57%) answered “usually” get feedback, 2 (6.06%) were chosen “sometime, and only 2 students (6.06%) were chosen “occasionally”. None of the students was chosen *never*.
2. The students responds shout treat their error generally strongly agree if their teacher gives them treat their error in speaking. They also agree if their friends should treat their error.
3. The most popular corrective feedback in teaching speaking is explicit correction, elicitation, and repetition. They have effective function in detecting the students mispronunciation and low accuracy and fluency . The other corrective feedback like implicit correction, recast, clarification request, and metalinguistic feedback are not favored because the percentage is lower than other corrective feedback. It is indicated that not all corrective feedback effective use in speaking, depend on the skill.
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