Teacher's Interactional Feedback
in "Teen Conversation 1" Class

Shellania Hariningsih
English Department, Faculty of Letters, Petra Christian University
Surabaya, East Java, Indonesia
e-mail: shellania24@gmail.com

Abstract: This study is done to find out (1) the types of interactional feedback used by the teacher of *Teen Conversation 1* Class and (2) the types of interactional feedback used by the teacher of *Teen Conversation 1* Class toward each of the student. In order to answer the research questions, the writer chose the types of interactional feedback by Nassaji (2015) as her guideline. This study is a qualitative research. The writer collected the data by audio recording the classroom activities of *Teen Conversation 1* Class and having a semi-structured interview with the teacher. The findings of this study show that five out of seven types of interactional feedback appeared in the classroom. The five types of interactional feedback found in the class were Recast, Direct Correction, Clarification Request, Direct Elicitation, and Metalinguistic cues. Recast, especially Declarative Recast was the type of feedback used the most by the teacher. In conclusion, the teacher used different types of interactional feedback to each of the student, concerning their different needs and weaknesses.

Keywords: error, interaction, feedback, interactional feedback

Interaction is the moment when two or more people communicate with or react to each other. Interaction can happen anywhere such as at home, playgound, park, and even at school. In every classroom, teacher and student will be engaged in interaction. Van Lier (1988) in Walsh (2014), argues that "Interaction is the most important thing on the curriculum" (p. 3). Interaction will "access new knowledge, acquire and develop new skills, identify problems of understanding," and many others (Walsh, 2014, p. 3). It means classroom interaction has a crucial role in the context of education.

One of the most important features of classroom interaction is corrective feedback. "Corrective feedback can be both oral in response to oral errors and written in response to written errors" (Nassaji, 2015, p. 3). In corrective feedback, there is also a term called interactional feedback. According to Nassaji (2015), interactional feedback is "a form of corrective feedback that occurs in the course of communicative interaction" (p. 44). Interactional feedback is considered as an oral feedback because it is the kind of feedback which is quoted by Nassaji (2015) that happens during conversational interaction and the learners are engaged in communicative interaction (p. 45). According to Mackey (2006), as cited in Nassaji (2015), when learners receive interactional feedback, they could notice forms more than when they do not receive interactional feedback. According to Nassaji (2015), this means that interactional feedback is very influential.

In this present study, the writer chose to analyze the types of interactional feedback found in *Teen Conversation 1* Class. The writer chooses PLC because it is supported right under PCU, which is one of the most prestigious universities in Indonesia. PLC was established in 1985. It means PLC has many experiences in teaching language especially English to their students. According to the Coordinator of English Course in PLC (personal communication, February 23, 2017), there are some criteria in hiring English teachers to work in PLC. Teachers in PLC can be alumni or PCU students. They need to have GPA more than 3. They also must get A or B+ as the lowest grade for all skill subjects (speaking, listening, writing, reading). Students who apply in PLC need to consider those criteria with addition they must be at least in their 5th semester or more. In addition, the writer chose *Teen Conversation 1* Class

because the teacher of *Teen Conversation 1* Class, Ms. Siauw, has an educational background in English teaching and learning. She was also a student in English Department of PCU majoring in English Education Business (EEB). In her major, she has learned a lot about teaching methods and approaches such as *Teaching English to Young Learners, Language Teaching & Learning, Material Development*, and many others. Ms. Siauw also has been teaching in Petra Language Center (PLC) for almost one year and teaching *Teen Conversation* Class for six months.

In this study, the writer chose to focus on the types of interactional feedback used by Ms. Siauw, the teacher of *Teen Conversation 1* Class. The analysis of this study focused only on the interaction between teacher and students that happened in three class meetings. Furthermore, the writer was intended to find the types of interactional feedback used by the teacher in the class and the types of interactional feedback used by the teacher toward each of the student in the classroom.

In answering those questions, the writer used the theory of interactional feedback as proposed by Hossein Nassaji (2015). According to Nassaji (2015), there are two types of interactional feedback that can be found in a classroom: Reformulations and Elicitations. Reformulation is divided into ten subtypes and Elicitatio is divided into five subtypes. Looking at the importance of interactional feedback, in this study, the writer was inspired to observe the types of interactional feedback used by Ms. Melina Febrianti Siauw, the teacher in *Teen Conversation 1* Class, to her five students

Classroom interaction has an important role for both teachers and students. Every activity that happens in the classroom will require interactions. However, in every classroom, language learners may also make errors. As cited in Walsh (2014), according to van Lier (1988), "apart from questioning, the activity that most characterizes language classrooms is correction of errors" (p. 15). In other words, there is always correction from a teacher to the students who make errors in a language classroom. The correction from the teacher to his or her students is called as corrective feedback because according to Nassaji (2015), "corrective feedback is a term used to describe the procedure whereby learners' errors are corrected" (p. 2). "Corrective feedback can be both oral in response to oral errors and written in response to written errors" (Nassaji, 2015, p. 3). Furthermore, Nassaji (2015) says, "interactional feedback is a form of corrective feedback that occurs in the course of communicative interaction" (p. 44). Interactional feedback is considered as an oral feedback because it is the kind of feedback which is quoted by Nassaji (2015) that happens during conversational interaction and the learners are engaged in communicative interaction (p. 45). According to Nassaji (2015), types of interactional feedback are divided into Recasts, Direct Correction, Clarification Requests, Repetition, Direct Elicitation, Metalinguistic Cues, and Nonverbal Cues (p. 46).

METHODS

This study was done by using qualitative approach, specifically conversation analysis. As quoted by Walsh (2011), the purpose of conversation analysis is to examine interaction in which an utterance is linked one another and related to the context. The writer used the conversational analysis approach to interpret the data in analyzing teacher's interactional feedback.

The writer applied some steps in collecting the data for this study. First of all, the writer met the Head of Petra Language Center (PLC) on 28 September 2016 to ask for permission to record the teaching and learning process in *Teen Conversation 1* Class. After that, the writer went to the Administration Office of English Department for giving a permission letter to record the teaching and learning process in *Teen Conversation 1* Class, which later was submitted to the Coordinator of English Course in PLC on 3 October 2016. The permissions given to the writer were to record the class using audio recorder for seven class meetings starting from 10 October 2016 until 31 October 2016, to interview the teacher of *Teen Conversation 1* Class and her students, and to sit at the back when the writer was in the class.

Before starting the recording, the writer met the teacher of *Teen Conversation 1* Class, Ms. Melina Febrianti Siauw, to interview her in order to find out the types of interactional feedback that she preferred to employ in the class. The interview was held on 10 October 2016. The writer asked thirteen questions using Indonesian. The interview was done in semi-structured interview for approximately 10-15 minutes. Semi-structured interview was selected because according to Zacharias (2012), semi-

structured interview "allows for greater flexibility" which is including the changing of the questions order to provide opportunity for follow-up questions (p. 99).

The writer transcribed the recordings of three class meetings and the interview with the teacher. The writer used detail transcription, which means the focus of transcription is on the content of the conversation and the details of actual interaction (Walsh, 2011). Therefore, the writer adapted transcription system which is developed by van Lier (1988) and Johnson (1995), as cited in Walsh (2011).

After completing the transcript, the writer gave the three digits numbering system for each utterance in each class meeting. Then, the writer sorted out the teacher's utterances that could be used as the data for analysis. The writer used different font colors or highlight colors to sort out those utterances. After sorting out the data for the analysis, the writer continued the next step with her analysis on the data

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

In doing the analysis for this study, the writer found five out of seven types of interactional feedback proposed by Nassaji (2015) were found in *Teen Conversation 1* Class. The five types of interactional feedback found in the class were Recast, Direct Correction, Clarification Request, Direct Elicitation, and Metalinguistic cues. The following shows the summary of the teacher's use of types of interactional feedback in *Teen Conversation 1* Class.

Table 1: Summary of the Used of Interactional Feedback by the Teacher in *Teen Conversation 1* Class

Types of Interactional Feedback			Total Occurence
Reformulations	**Recasts**	DR	9
		IR	2
		ISR	4
		ER	-
		INR	-
		PR	2
		FR	1
		CORR	7
		COMR	-
	Direct Correction		2
Elicitations	**Clarification Request**		1
	Repetition		-
	Direct Elicitation		4
	Metalinguistic cues		10
	Nonverbal cues		-
	Total Occurence		**42**

In this study, the writer found Recast, especially Declarative Recast as the most used type of interactional feedback by the teacher. For recasts, the writer found that there are six out of nine subtypes of recast which are appeared in the class. Moreover, the writer did not find Embedded Recasts, Incorporated Recasts, and Communicative Recast appeared in *Teen Conversation 1* Class

Declarative and Interogative Recasts are the subtypes of recast that differentiate a recast "based on their structure and linguistic mode in the interaction" (Nassaji, 2015, p. 50). Declarative Recast happens when the teacher reformulates the student's utterance into a correct form with a confirmatory or declarative tone. While Interogative Recast happens when the teacher reformulates the student's utterance in a question form with a rising intonation. The examples of the teacher's feedback in Declarative Recast can be seen from the colored statements below:

Extract 1

L2 (1.3.7)   : eee playing music (**L2 wrongly pronounce the word 'music'. It sounds 'muzyik'**)
T (1.1.34)   : playing music (/ˈmjuː.zɪk/)

In Extract 1, the student made a pronunciation mistake when she pronounced the word 'music' (it sounds 'muzyik'). Then, the teacher tried to reformulate the student's error into the correct one. In this context, the teacher's feedback is considered as Declarative Recast because the teacher reformulate the student's error with a confirmatory tone.

On the other hand, Interogative Recasts happen if the teacher reformulates the student's error in a question form with a rising intonation (Nassaji, 2015). Eventhough this subtype of recast did not appear frequently, the teacher used it for asking confirmation to the student's error. The example of Interogative Recast can be seen as a colored statement below:

Extract 2
L5 (3.6.97)   : what is stubborn? (**L5 wrongly pronounce the word 'stubborn'. It sounds 'stuborn' not '/ˈstʌb.ɚn/'**)
T (3.1.204)   : what is . . . ?
L5 (3.6.98)   : stubborn (**L5 wrongly pronounce the word 'stubborn'. It sounds 'stuborn' not '/ˈstʌb.ɚn/'**)
L4 (3.5.54)   : keras kepala
T (3.1.205)   : stubborn? ('/ˈstʌb.ɚn/')

In Extract 2, the student made an error regarding to his pronunciation of the word 'stubborn'. Because of it, then the teacher reformulated the student's error with the correct pronunciation of the word 'stubborn' in a question form. The teacher gave it as a feedback to confirm whether 'stubborn' that he said before was right or not. In this context, the teacher's colored utterance refers to Interogative Recast because the teacher reformulated the student's error in a form of question.

In this class, the writer also found Isolated Recast. The teacher used Isolated Recast because she reformulated the student's error without repeating the other words in the student's utterance. The teacher did not combine or repeat the other words in the utterance. In the following, the example of Isolated Recast can be seen in a colored statement:

Extract 3
L5 (3.6.132)   : Yeni is quiet person
T (3.1.262)   : a! quiet person

The example in Extract 3 is Isolated Recast. As it is seen from the extract above, the student made error in the structural form. The student did not use 'a' in his utterance. The teacher's utterance in this extract is considered as Isolated Recast because instead of repeating the whole utterance or combining the error with the other words, the teacher chose to respond the student's error only by reformulating the error part.

Partial and Full Recasts can be differentiated by the terms of how much of the erroneous utterance the feedback corrects (Nassaji, 2015). In Partial Recast, the teacher reformulates only the error part in the utterance. Meanwhile, in Full Recast, the teacher reformulates the whole utterance that contains error. The example of Partial and Full Recasts can be seen in the following extracts in the colored statements:

Extract 4
L4 (3.5.65)   : Fifin personality are
T (3.1.300)   : ties! . . . are . . .
L4 (3.5.66)   : hah?
T (3.1.301)   : personalities

In Extract 4, it is seen that the student made a structural error. The Partial Recasts in this extract occured when the teacher reformulated the error part in one full word. In this context, the teacher's colored utterance are considered as Partial Recast because the teacher only reformulated the error part.

Extract 5
L5 (2.6.12)   : (**laughter**) I don't know for (1) what I want to be

T (2.1.16)   : aha you don't know what you want to be?

Other than Partial Recast, as it is seen in Extract 5, the student made an error for using 'for' in his utterance. In a formal English, the word 'for' in his utterance is unnecessary. The teacher did not only single out the error part but she reformulated the student's utterance in its entirety. It clearly shows that the teacher used Full Recast to correct the student's error.

Next, Corrective Recasts happen in the moment when the teacher decides to reformulate the student's error into the correct utterance. The example of Corrective Recast can be seen in a colored statement in the following:

Extract 6

L3 (1.4.9)   : Miss . . . Sasya have ((1))

T (1.1.134)   : what? Sasya has! what?

In Extract 6, it clearly shows that the learner made a grammatical error. Actually, the student should use 'has' instead of 'have'. Because of the structural error, the teacher reformulated the student's error into a correct form. The teacher's utterance is considered as Corrective Recast because the teacher reformulated the student's error into the correct form.

Another type of interactional feedback that is found in *Teen Conversation 1* Class is Direct Correction. In Direct Correction, the teacher uses the explicit word to indicate the students that their utterance contains error, for example using the word 'no', 'that is not correct', 'not ..., but ....', etc. (Nassaji, 2015). The example of Direct Correction can be seen in the colored statement below:

Extract 7

L2 (2.3.26)   : pretty (**L2 wrongly pronounced the word 'pretty'**)

T (2.1.253)   : aha ((3)) so it's <u>not</u> pretty (**in the wrong pronunciation**) ya <u>it's</u> pretty

In Extract 7, it is seen that the student made an error in her pronunciation. It is clearly seen that the teacher used the characteristic of Direct Correction such as using the explicit word to indicate her student that she has made an error. In this case, the teacher use the explicit word 'not ... it's ...'. It clearly shows that the teacher wanted to tell the student that her pronunciation is wrong and reformulated it into the correct one by using Direct Correction.

Another type of interactional feedback that occured in this class is Clarification Request. Clarification Request happens when the teacher does not fully understand the student's utterance, ask for clarification, and may use phrases such as 'pardon?', 'sorry?', etc. The example of Clarification Request is in a colored statement as below:

Extract 8

T (2.1.90)   : aha like? (16) it's so quiet today

LL (2.7.9)   : (**laughter**)

L1 (2.2.48)   : because Antony (1) is says (1) because Antony's says sads (1) sad sads

T (2.1.91)   : what are you trying to say? (1) because Antony's?

In Extract 8, it is seen that the student was trying to say something. However, the teacher could not fully understand what the student was trying to say. So, the teacher asked the student about the words that she wanted to say to her. It is clearly seen that the teacher's response in Extract 8 is categorized as Clarification Request, especially Specific Clarification Request because the teacher used question 'what are you trying to say? because Antony's?' as the focus of the error in order to ask the student for clarification.

Direct Elicitation is another type of interactional feedback that is found in *Teen Conversation 1* Class. It happens when the teacher encourages the student to provide the correct form by their own. The example of Direct Elicitation can be seen in a colored statement below:

Extract 9

L5 (2.6.89)   : he has (2) he has (1) he doesn't has a nice smile

T (2.1.175)   : he doesn't . . . ? (1)

In Extract 9, it is seen that the student made a grammatical error. Instead of using 'have', this student used 'has' in his utterance. Because of this grammatical error, the teacher tried to push the student to have self-correction. In this case, the teacher said 'he doesn't . . . ?' in order to wait her student to

correct his utterance by himself. In this context, the teacher's utterance is considered as Direct Elicitation because the teacher did not provide the student with correct answer but encouraged the student to do self-correction.

The last type of interactional feedback that is appeared in *Teen Conversation 1* Class is Metalinguistic cues. Nassaji (2015) states that "metalinguistic cues are feedback types that provide the learner with metalinguistic information" (p. 54). Metalinguistic cues can be in a comment or a question form that provides an opportunity for the students for self-repair and it can be in a feedback form that does not provide an opportunity for them to have self-repair.

Extract 10
L1 (2.2.135)   : on Monday
T (2.1.284)   : aha
L1 (2.2.136)   : I (1) didn't (1)
T (2.1.285)   : if you say didn't ((2)) it means that you? (**laughter**)

In Extract 10, it is clearly seen that the student made a grammatical error. In this context, the student wanted to tell the teacher that on the next Monday, she could not come to the class because she had a school activity. When she was trying to tell the teacher, she did not use future tense in her statement. Because of that, the teacher gave a feedback without the correct form so that it could provide the student with self-correction. In this context, the teacher's utterance is considered as Metalinguistic cue in a question form because the teacher did not provide the correct form to the student and gave a feedback in a form of question.

Based on the recordings and the writer's observation, L1 received Clarification Request, Direct Elicitation, and Metalinguistic cues. L2 received Declarative Recast, Corrective Recast, Direct Correction, and Metalinguistic cues. L3 only received Declarative Recast, Corrective Recast, and Metalinguistic cues. L4 received Declarative Recast, Isolated Recast, Partial Recast, Corrective Recast, and Metalinguistic cues. L5 received Declarative Recast, Interogative Recast, Isolated Recast, Partial Recast, Full Recast, Corrective Recast, Direct Elicitation, and Metalinguistic cues.

Based on the findings, the writer found that there are various types of interactional feedback appeared in *Teen Conversation 1* Class. In this class, the writer found that Recasts were mostly used by Ms. Siauw. The writer also found that each student received different types of feedback. It shows that each of the learners has different needs. Then, it encouraged Ms. Siauw to give feedback according to each of her student's needs.

First, L1 was the only student who received Clarification Request in *Teen Conversation 1* Class. This happened because L1 liked to participate a lot in the class. But, even when L1 participated in the class, she still tried to think about the structure or grammar about the utterance that she wanted to say before saying it in the class. Because of that, L1 had a difficulty in trying to tell things really well in English. In result, the teacher tried to ask her a clarification like Clarification Request type of feedback to L1. Next, L1 mostly received Metalinguistic cues in this class. It happened because it is related to the interview with Ms. Siauw where she said that she liked to provide an opportunity for her students to make self-correction. In this class, when L1 had a difficulty in speaking an utterance, then Ms. Siauw tried to help her giving a clue that L1 had made a mistake in her utterance and provided her the opportunity to have self-repair.

Second, L2 mostly received Declarative Recast in this class. L2 received the most Declarative Recast than the other students. Although L2 was a quiet student, she still wanted to participate in the class. L2 received the most Declarative Recast because she frequently made mistake in her pronunciation. Also, L2 received Direct Correction while the other students did not. At that time, the teacher gave a feedback mentioning the wrong and the correct pronunciation of a word. In this case, L2 received Direct Correction also because of her weakness in pronunciation.

Third, L3 mostly also received Declarative Recast in the class. L3 was a quiet student. She did not participate much in the discussion or any activity in the class. However, L3 received Declarative Recast because the teacher used a declarative or a confirmatory tone when giving her feedback, not because of her pronunciation errors.

Next, L4 was the smartest student in *Teen Conversation 1* Class. In this class, she did not received a lot of feedback. But, in each feedback it contained various types of interactional feedback. The types of interactional feedback that L4 received were Declarative Recast, Isolated Recast, Partial Recast, Corrective Recast, and Metalinguistic cues.

Finally, based on the findings, L5 was the student who received a lot of feedback. It happened because L5 was a very spontaneous student. In this class, L5 mostly received Corrective Recast and Metalinguistic cues among his friends. L5 received a lot of Corrective Recast because he liked to speak up without thinking about the structure and grammar of his utterances so that he made many structural errors. Moreover, L5 also received a lot of Metalinguistic cues because it is related to the writer's interview with Ms. Siauw. Ms. Siauw said, "*Kalau untuk menurutku sendiri sih sebenarnya lebih baik yang pertama ya... karena kan ada niat untuk murid-muridnya melakukan* self-correction (In my opinion, the first one is better... because the students have the intention to do self-correction)" which means that she preferred to give her students the opportunity to have self-repair that is related with Metalinguistic cues.

CONCLUSION

From the analysis, the writer found five out of seven types of interactional feedback used by the teacher in *Teen Conversation 1* Class. The five types of interactional feedback found in the class were Recast, Direct Correction, Clarification Request, Direct Elicitation, and Metalinguistic cues. The writer found that Recast, especially Declarative Recast appeared the most in this class. The other Recasts found in this class were Interogative, Isolated, Partial, Full, and Corrective Recast.

Based on the writer's analysis, the teacher gave several feedback that suit to each of them. In this class, L1 had weakness in thinking much about structure and grammar in speaking English. L2 had to improve her skills in speaking, especially pronunciation in English. Then, L3 had to improve her confidence to speak up in the class in order to learn English and to improve her English skills. Next, L4 had to study English more and more in order to be able to improve her skills in English. Finally, L5 should learn more about structure and grammar so that he could perform better in speaking English spontaneously.

In conclusion, the writer found that the teacher used various types of interactional feedback in teaching the learners. The writer realizes that the teacher had the understanding that each learner had different needs and weaknesses so that each of the learner can improve their English skills after receiving the teacher's feedback. The writer suggests that future researchers could include the student's point of view about types of interactional feedback, or to compare the types of interactional feedback found in two different English level classes such as Teenager vs. Adult class.

REFERENCES

Nassaji, H. (2015). *The interactional feedback dimension in instructed second language learning: Linking theory, research, and practice*. London: Bloomsbury.

Walsh, S. (2014). *Classroom interaction for language teachers.* Odenton: Gasch Printing.

Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action.* New York: Routledge.

Zacharias, N. T. (2012). *Qualitative research methods for second language education*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.