

**Teacher Feedback And Students' Participation in Classroom
Interaction**

1st Arsita Wulan Cahyani and 2nd Ivorie Rahiema Verandra Asyigah

3rd Ruqoyyah Amilia Andania

1st 2nd STKIP Al Hikmah Surabaya, 3rd National Dong Hwa University

Surabaya, Indonesia

1st byarsitawulanc@gmail.com 2nd ivorieasyigah2@gmail.com

3rd 811188119@gms.ndhu.edu.tw

Abstract: This study aims to explore the teacher feedback that use to promote classroom interaction. A descriptive qualitative research approach was utilized, incorporating observations, interviews, and questionnaires for data collection. The participants in this study two English teachers of senior high school. The result revealed that the EFL teacher generally employs evaluative feedback to acknowledge and encourage students, making it the most common sort of verbal feedback in the transcript. This technique promotes a positive learning environment and encourages students to participate in the session actively. To improve the learning experience, teachers should balance the use of evaluative, interactive, and corrective feedback. Increasing interactive feedback by asking open-ended questions and promoting student discussion might help students grasp more deeply. More detailed corrective feedback, as well as opportunities for self- and peer-correction, can increase learners' awareness and accountability. Regular evaluation of feedback practices, as well as incorporating student feedback, helps ensure that the methods utilized fit the different requirements of students.

Keywords: Classroom language, Classroom interaction, discourse analysis, Teachers' feedback.

INTRODUCTION

Feedback serves as an important component of efficient language learning, providing a vital link between the teaching and learning processes. In the field of second language acquisition (SLA), teacher feedback on students' responses is very important since it can improve language proficiency, encourage learner autonomy, and establish a positive learning environment (Li & Vuono, 2019; Lyster, 2020). Recent research has highlighted the relevance of feedback in supporting linguistic growth and boosting overall communicative competence, with new ideas on how to best utilize it in a variety of learning scenarios.

Verbal engagement in the classroom is the foundation of language instruction, with teacher-student interactions offering enough chances for language practice, meaning negotiation, and linguistic development. Teachers frequently respond to students' utterances with various forms of feedback, ranging from basic acknowledgments to detailed explanations and incorrect corrections (Nassaji 2016).

The quality and form of these verbal encounters have a major impact on the success of language learning (Loewen & Sato, 2018). Recent research has shown that meaningful classroom interactions not only give chances for language usage but also foster a supportive environment in which learners feel safe taking risks with the target language (Philp & Duchesne, 2016; Sato & Loewen, 2019).

The classification of feedback in language classes is still being researched extensively, with scholars developing classifications to better understand its nature and impact. Recent research have expanded on prior work to investigate the intricacies of various feedback forms and their effects. For example, Li et al. (2016) did a meta-analysis to

investigate the effectiveness of oral corrective feedback, discovering varying impacts depending on feedback kind and learning context. Expanding on these typologies, researchers investigated the complexities of various feedback modalities.

For example, Lyster et al. (2013) and, more recently, Nassaji (2020) investigated the function of interactional feedback in second language learning, emphasizing the importance of negotiating methods and reformulations. The quality of feedback is still paramount in assessing its impact on language acquisition. High-quality feedback is timely, specific, constructive, and customized to the learner's requirements and skill level. It should not only focus on language accuracy but also develop communicative skills and learner reflection (Han & Hyland, 2019; Ur, 2020). Recent research has also underlined the relevance of learner engagement with feedback, implying that the success of feedback is determined not just by its presentation but also by how students process and apply it (Ellis, 2017; Han, 2017).

The quality of feedback can be evaluated on a variety of aspects. Brookhart (2017) advises evaluating feedback quality in terms of timing, amount, mode, and audience. Furthermore, the focus of feedback (whether on task, process, self-regulation, or self) has a major impact on its effectiveness (Hattie & Clarke, 2018). Given the context of language acquisition, feedback quality takes into account linguistic targets, cultural sensitivity, and pedagogical goals (Lyster, 2020).

Recent studies have also investigated novel techniques to improve feedback quality. For example, Bitchener and Storch (2016) investigated the possibilities of dynamic textual corrective feedback, which takes a more dialogic approach to feedback delivery. Similarly,

the incorporation of technology into feedback practices has received attention, with studies investigating computer-mediated feedback and its impact on language learning (Li & Hegelheimer, 2021).

Various contextual and individual factors influence feedback's effectiveness. Learner variables such as skill level, learning style, and motivation can have a major impact on how feedback is received and applied (Li & Vuono, 2019). Furthermore, the learning context, which includes classroom dynamics and cultural aspects, can influence how feedback is perceived and ultimately successful (Sato & Loewen, 2019).

This study aims to analyze teachers' verbal feedback on students' responses in language classrooms, examining the types of feedback provided, and frequency. By investigating these aspects, researcher hopes to contribute to a better understanding of feedback practices and their implications for language teaching and learning in educational contexts..

LITERATURE REVIEW

Classroom Discourse

The classroom serves as a unique social environment for interactions between students and the teacher, and this extends to classroom discourse. When considering classroom discourse, it's important to recognize the classroom as a distinct context, different from other contexts. Understanding the classroom context can be seen as straightforward, characterized by specific routines and procedures (Walsh, 2011). For instance, when discussing the classroom context, we refer to factors like the learners' age, proficiency level, use of first or second language, the teacher, and the materials used. These elements help in planning lessons, instructional methods, materials, and curriculum development.

Conversely, the classroom context can also be viewed as a complex web of interactions between students and the teacher during the teaching and learning process (Walsh, 2011). This perspective focuses on how specific utterances impact students' progress toward educational goals, considering language functions, extended wait times, elicitation, and feedback. It helps us understand each interaction and the teacher's real-time decision-making (Hariri, 2022).

The classroom context allows teachers to assess their teaching practices and evaluate the effectiveness of their interactions with students (Douglas, 2001). It provides insight into what is happening in the classroom and, more importantly, why it is happening. This understanding helps teachers be mindful of their language and students' responses, enabling them to refine and enhance interactions for future classes.

Teacher Interaction

The teacher's interaction is the most crucial element of the teaching and learning process, as it guides the class towards achieving its learning objectives. Moreover, the teacher's rhetorical style of interaction significantly influences how students respond (Walsh, 2006). The effectiveness of the learning experience largely depends on the teacher's interactions, which enable students to acquire new knowledge, practice and retain new skills, build relationships, and more (Coulthard, 2002).

Similarly, a teacher can be compared to an orchestra conductor. Just as each movement of the conductor's hand results in different music and tones, each interaction a teacher initiates leads students to various activities and skill practices (Tardif, 1994). Therefore, teachers must facilitate supportive interactions to help students achieve the class

objectives. In conclusion, the teacher's interaction is the most critical factor in determining the success of the class.

METHODOLOGY

In this study, the researcher applied a descriptive qualitative research. The purpose of choosing this design in this study is to portray the phenomenon through observing and documenting, interviewing (Ary et al. 2010). In the observation the researchers made a check list of classroom language that has been used by the teacher. In addition, the transcript from the documentation of the classroom activities enabled the researcher to understand comprehensively. Furthermore, the interview helped to clarify the analysis that has been made. Eventually, the researchers wanted to know teachers' verbal feedback on students' responses in language classrooms, examining the types of feedback provided, and frequency.

The subjects of the study were two English teachers in the senior high school. The researcher used Miles and Huberman (1994) data analysis model. The steps of data analysis were data collection, condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

a. Positive feedback

This type of feedback includes positive reinforcement and acknowledgment of correct answers or efforts.

98. Teacher: So, before we close the class I want to ask you. What have you learn in this meeting? [I]

99. Students: we learn about the legend of Lutung Kasarung. [R]

100. Teacher: Good job, and then what's else? [F evaluative and I]

101. Student: We try to create some simple past sentence [R]

102. Teacher: Goodjob [F evaluative]

b. **Interactive Feedback**

The teacher uses interactive feedback to encourage further discussion or clarification.

35. Teacher: What story do you like? [I]

36. Students: frozen [R]

37. Teacher: oh so you like fairytales [F interactive]

41. Teacher: So, for today's meeting our learning objectives are four. The first one, the students are able to understand elements of the narrative text they read. The second, the students are able to identify the use of verb 2 in text that will be presented. The third, the students are able to organize the jumble story with small group discussion. So, this class, I think I already divide this class into 2 groups. Boys and girls. And then the last one, the students are able to create simple sentences in simple past form. Alright, before we jump into the next slide, I want to ask you. In the previous meeting, we already learned about the generic structure, we learned about what kind of narrative texts are. So, what is the purpose of learning narrative text? in your opinion [I]

42. Students: to learn about past experience [R]

43. Teacher: from legend, what can we learn from legend? We learn about? [F interactive]

44. Students: asal usul suatu daerah, the history of a place. [R]

45. Teacher: Good job and from that history we learn how to be a better person in the future, right? [F interactive]

46. Students: right [R]

c. Corrective Feedback

This type of feedback involves engaging with the students' responses and providing additional information or instructions. It often includes follow-up questions or statements that encourage further thinking or clarification.

38. Teacher: In the previous meeting, we already learned about the generic structure of narrative text, right? Do you remember what is the generic structure of narrative text? [I]

39. Students: Orientation, complication, resolution, re-orientation [R]

40. Teacher: Good job. Re-orientation is optional. [F corrective]

From the descriptions above regarding three types of feedback, it can be concluded that good job is mentioned multiple times (at least 18 instances). Other forms of positive reinforcement like "Alhamdulillah" and "Give applause for" are also used. In comparison, interactive feedback and corrective feedback are used less frequently.

Teacher feedback toward the Students' response

In the observation, the initiations occurred in a long explanation which means the teacher tried harder to involve and get the students' responses. The initiations done were great due to it was the first meeting in 2nd semester, so, the teacher wanted to review and reinforce the previous material that the students learned in Junior High School. The observer analyzed that the teacher is similar to the elicitation technique, in which the teacher tried to get students' responses in generating the initiations. According to Walsh in his book Classroom Discourse and Teacher Development, the elicitation technique frequently creates many

questions in detail to reach the students' involvement. It is shown by the line numbers [006], [007], and [008],

[006] [T]: Tentang apa itu report text biasanya? Judulnya apa, judulnya?I

[007] [T]: Hmm? Or the characteristic maybe? Review aja, review ya. We are going to—I explain about report text deeply after this meeting. Ya. Ok= I

[008] [T]: =still remember? Masih ingat gak waktu SMP, report text itu belajar apa? Yang dibaca apa sama gurunya? Kalian membaca apa? I

which means that the teacher asked continuously until she got the responses from the students. The elicitation technique used aims to ensure the student's motivation in learning and surely the response is one of the indicators of motivation. Moreover, the elicitation technique in the initiation of what the teacher had done was to check the concept and check the students' understanding before the teacher went deeply into the main discussion about the report text.

Further, by the elicitation technique, the teacher's initiation focused on guiding the students toward a particular response at the first stage. By displaying the questions to engage the students, the teacher can reinforce the basic knowledge of the students about what will be discussed. It refers to line [073] as an example of engagement in getting the responses from the students.

[073] [T]: =mam akan bahas di roses itu. But when my text in title in white rose, in this text, containing only, discussing only about the rose which is in white color, gitu, ya. Mam tidak membahas bunga mawar yang warnanya pink, yang warnanya merah. tapi hanya membahas tentang bunga mawar yang warnanya pu= **I**

The line [073] shows an initiation that has a previous explanation to trigger the students' understanding of the topic discussed.

Additionally, referring to the IRF structure, the initiation that the teacher had done was typical of the teacher-learner interaction, which frequently occurs in the classroom by saying so in the first opening like in line number [001].

[001] [T]: So, the first one is report text. This material is not something new for you because, in junior high school, you also have this material. Still remember? Masih ingat ya? **I**

The line number [001] shows that the teacher did the apperception to open the topic discussion. The IRF structure and the elicitation technique are tied into each other in this class session proving that the teacher's way worked in engaging the students. Despite the teacher tried hard to get the students' responses and attention, the expectation to reach the students' motivation in learning was achieved. The classroom language was chosen successfully to engage the first secondary level.

The student's basic knowledge was improved by asking questions from a contextual perspective. It helped the students to understand the real context without giving more specific cues even though the teacher had been through hardly in the way of explaining. It means the way was

run must be in long explanation, but the language she implemented has the contextual example to ease the students to understand the topic discussed.

CONCLUSION

The EFL teacher generally employs evaluative feedback to acknowledge and encourage students, making it the most common sort of verbal feedback in the transcript. This technique promotes a positive learning environment and encourages students to participate in the session actively. To improve the learning experience, teachers should balance the use of evaluative, interactive, and corrective feedback. Increasing interactive feedback by asking open-ended questions and promoting student discussion might help students grasp more deeply. More detailed corrective feedback, as well as opportunities for self- and peer-correction, can increase learners' awareness and accountability. Regular evaluation of feedback practices, as well as incorporating student feedback, helps ensure that the methods utilized fit the different requirements of students.

REFERENCE

- Bitchener, J., & Storch, N. (2016). Written Corrective Feedback for L2 Development. *Multilingual Matters*.
- Brookhart, S. M. (2017). *How To Give Effective Feedback to Your Students* (2nd ed.). ASCD.
- Ellis, R. (2017). Oral corrective feedback in L2 classrooms: What we know so far. In H. Nassaji & E. Kartchava (Eds.), *Corrective Feedback in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 3-18). Routledge.

- Han, Y. (2017). Mediating and Being Mediated: Learner Beliefs and Learner Engagement with Written Corrective Feedback. *System*, 69, 133-142.
- Han, Y., & Hyland, F. (2019). Academic Emotions in Written Corrective Feedback Situations. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 38, 1-13.
- Hariri, Alfian (2022). The Analysis Of Teacher's Interaction By Using Self-Evaluation Teacher Talk (Sett) In Smpn 13 Surabaya , *English, Teaching, Learning, and Research Journal (ETERNAL)* <https://doi.org/10.24252/Eternal.V82.2022.A1>
- Hattie, J., & Clarke, S. (2018). *Visible learning: Feedback*. Routledge.
- Li, J., & Hegelheimer, V. (2021). The Role of Technology in Second Language Feedback: A Review of The Literature. *System*, 98, 102537.
- Li, S., & Vuono, A. (2019). Twenty-five years of research on oral and written corrective feedback in *System*. *System*, 84 , 93-109.
- Li, S., Zhu, Y., & Ellis, R. (2016). The Effects of The Timing Of Corrective Feedback on The Acquisition of A New Linguistic Structure. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100 (1), 276-295.
- Loewen, S., & Sato, M. (2018). Interaction and Instructed Second Language Acquisition. *Language Teaching*, 51(3), 285-329.
- Lyster, R. (2020). Interactional feedback in L2 classroom contexts: A research synthesis. In H.
- Nassaji & E. Kartchava (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook Of Corrective Feedback In Second Language Learning and Teaching* (pp. 209-228). Cambridge University Press.
- Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral Corrective Feedback in Second Language Classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 46(1), 1-40.
- Nassaji, H. (2016). Anniversary Article: Interactional Feedback in Second Language Teaching and Learning: A Synthesis and Analysis of Current Research. *Language Teaching Research*, 20(4), 535-562.
- Nassaji, H. (2020). Assessing the Effectiveness of Interactional Feedback for L2 Acquisition: Issues and Challenges. *Language Teaching*, 53(1), 3-28.

- Philp, J., & Duchesne, S. (2016). Exploring Engagement in Tasks in The Language Classroom. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 36, 50-72.
- Sato, M., & Loewen, S. (2019). *Evidence-Based Second Language Pedagogy: A Collection Of Instructed Second Language Acquisition Studies*. Routledge.
- Ur, P. (2020). *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice And Theory* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.