

JELE

Journal of English Language and Education

Editorial Board

Chairperson : Dr. Hermayawati, M.Pd.

Editorial Staff : Elysa Hartati, S.Pd., M.Pd.
Restu Arini, S.Pd., M.Pd.
Agustinus Hary Setyawan, S.Pd., M.A.
Wilujeng Asih Purwani, S.Pd., M.A.
Ika Kurniawati, S.Pd., M.Pd.

Language Consultant : Prof. Dr. Soepomo Poedjosoedarmo (Gadjah Mada University)
Dr. Issy Yuliasri, M.Pd. (State University of Semarang)
Drs. Barli Bram, M.Ed, Ph.D (Sanata Dharma University)
Dr. Dwi Anggani L.B., M.Pd. (State University of Semarang)
Sayit Abdul Karim, M.Pd. (Technology University of Yogyakarta)

ISSN : 2460 - 7142

Address : English Education Study Program
Faculty of Teachers Training and Education
Mercu Buana University of Yogyakarta
Jl. Wates Km.10 Yogyakarta 55753

Phones : (0274) 6498211, 6498212

Fax : (0274) 6498213

Email : jurnal.umby@gmail.com

Journal of English Language and Education (JELE), to appear twice a year (in June and December) for lecturers, teachers and students, is published by the Unit of Scientific Publishing and Intellectual Property Rights, Mercu Buana University of Yogyakarta. This journal welcomes articles which have never been published elsewhere and are not under consideration for publication in other journals at the same time. Articles should be original and typed, 1.5 spaced, about 10-20 pages of quarto-sized (A4), and written in English. For the brief guidelines, it is attached in the end of this journal.

PREFACE

We proudly present the *Journal of English Language and Education (JELE)* Vol.1, No.2 which is presented for practitioners and researchers in accommodating their findings of research. By sharing the idea through this journal, it is expected that issues dealing with the English language and teaching can be overcome as it can be a reference to conduct a new research in the future.

This journal comprises seven articles concerning on linguistics and English language teaching. They are categorized into discourse analysis, syllabus design and techniques to teach English that aim to improve the quality of English learning.

We would like to thank to the contributors who have already participated in sharing the ideas towards the content of this journal. We would like also to express our sincere thanks to all members of editorial board who have worked hand in hand in creating this journal. We hope that this fine collection of articles will be beneficial and valuable to stimulate a further research.

Yogyakarta, December 2015

Editor

TABLE OF CONTENT
Vol.1 No.2, December 2015

| | |
|---|---------|
| Editorial board | ii |
| Preface | iii |
| Table of content | iv |
| | |
| “THE USE OF RECAST IN TEACHING OF GRAMMAR FOR HIGH AND LOW ACHIEVERS” <i>Olyvia Revalita Candraloka</i> | 108-118 |
| “PROJECT-BASED COLLABORATIVE WRITING IN TEACHING GRAMMAR FOR STUDENTS WITH HIGH AND LOW MOTIVATION” <i>KuntoNurcahyoko</i> | 119-135 |
| “INTEGRATIVE GRAMMAR IN TEACHING ACADEMIC WRITING” <i>Nicolas Lodawik Ouwpoly</i> | 136-150 |
| “THE REALIZATION OF INTERPERSONAL NEGOTIATION IN THE CONVERSATION” <i>Elysa Hartati</i> | 151-169 |
| “DISCOURSE AS SOCIAL PRACTICE ON ABDUL QODIR JAELANI (AQJ) CASE” <i>SuhartiniSyukri dan Isna Humaerah</i> | 170-183 |
| “THE EFFECTIVENESS OF CLASSROOM DISCUSSION IN IMPROVING ENGLISH SPEAKING SKILL AMONG THE STUDENTS OF SMP N 3 DEPOK” <i>Agustinus Hary Setyawan</i> | 184-202 |
| “THE 2013 CURRICULUM BASED SYLLABUS FOR SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL’S ENGLISH EXTRACURRICULAR PROGRAM” <i>Masrur Mustolih</i> | 203-215 |
| Notes for contributors | 216 |

**The Use of Recast in Teaching of Grammar
for High and Low Achievers
(The Case of Spoken Use of English by the Tenth Graders of
Nahdhatul Ulama Vocational High School of Ungaran**

Olyvia Revalita Candraloka
Nahdhatul Ulama Vocational High School of Ungaran
Email : ocandraloka@gmail.com

Abstract

The goals of this study were (1) to find out the effectiveness of recast in teaching of grammar for high achievers, (2) to find out the effectiveness of recast in teaching of grammar for low achievers, (3) to find out the effectiveness of clarification request in teaching of grammar for high achievers, (4) to find out the effectiveness of clarification request in teaching of grammar for low achievers, (5) to find out the difference of grammar of high and low achievers taught using recast, (6) to find out the difference of grammar of high and low achievers taught using clarification request, and the last (7) to explain to what extent the interaction of teaching strategy (recast and clarification request) and the influence of students' achievements (high and low) to the students' grammar at the tenth grade of SMK NU Ungaran is. This research applies a quantitative method with a factorial design. The experiment class was treated by using recast, while the control class was treated by using clarification request. The studied subjects were 48 students of grade ten of *Nahdhatul Ulama* vocational high school of Ungaran which consists of 24 students of an experiment class and 24 students of a control class. The results of the research revealed (1) recast is effective to teach grammar for high achievers, (2) recast is effective to teach grammar for low achievers, (3) clarification request is effective to teach grammar for high achievers, (4) clarification request is not effective to teach grammar for low achievers, (5) there is no significant difference between high and low achievers on grammar taught by using recast, (6) there is significant difference between high and low achievers on grammar taught by using clarification request, (7) there is significant interaction of teaching strategy (recast and clarification request) and types of students of achievement (high and low) to the students' grammar at the tenth grade of *Nahdhatul Ulama* vocational high school of Ungaran.

Keywords : *Achievement, Grammar, Recast*

INTRODUCTION

Grammar in vocational high school becomes the greater part of material received by the students. It is mentioned in syllabus that explaining activity in present, past, future, and

expressing something based on formula are the standard competency in vocational high school. Those are needed to achieve some basic competencies. To achieve those competencies, it is needed to master grammar such as using correct

grammatical of tense, conditional sentence, reported speech, preposition, etc. Students face difficulty in applying correct grammar either written or spoken.

In spoken process, students have no time to edit or correct errors made by themselves. So, teacher is not only required to instruct students some rules to follow but also guide them to have correct grammar. In guiding the students, teacher may use comments or corrections. In spoken use, the students tend to make errors or incorrect utterances in applying the formula of some tenses. For example in simple past tense, the students often make error in using simple past of verb. The student's error should be corrected in order to avoid the next error.

For teachers, feedback may facilitate assessments towards student's progress. Given that feedback may facilitate students' toward their progress, some researchers show how feedback gives contribution to students' grammar in spoken use. Research conducted by Chu (2011) showed corrective feedback has a positive effect on improving oral English accuracy.

Corrective feedback is a response which is given to learner whose utterances contain an error (Tarone, Bigelow, & Hansen, 2009: 28). The erroneous of utterances could be inappropriate grammatical, phonology, vocabulary, etc. There are several types of corrective feedback. Lyster & Ranta (1997: 46) classified there are six types of corrective feedback; explicit correction, recast, clarification request, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, and repetition. From those types of corrective feedback, recast become the most used type of corrective feedback.

Recast is one of corrective strategies that teachers employ to deal with learner errors (Ellis & Sheen, 2006: 576). Recasts such as this one have great appeal as correction strategies because they are minimally intrusive and occur within meaning-focused activities (Doughty, 2001). The situations above have led the researcher's interest to investigate the use of recast in teaching of grammar at *Nahdlatul Ulama* vocational high school of Ungaran.

Related to the background above, the researcher formulated the research problem as follows:

language use. In giving feedback, teachers can signal the occurrences of an error, get the learners to self-corrected, and drill of correct forms.

Corrective feedback is a response to learners' utterances that contain an error (Tarone, Bigelow, and Hansen, 2009: 28). When a learner produces an error, teacher may correct the utterance of the learner.

Types of Corrective Feedback

There some types of corrective feedback. Lyster&Ranta (1997) put forward six types of corrective feedback. The six types are:

1) Negative explicit feedback: teachers supply the correct form and clearly indicate that what the students say is incorrect.

For example : Student: he *take* the bus to go to school.

Teacher: oh, you should say he takes. He takes the bus to go to school

2) Recast : teacher implicitly reformulates all or part of the student's utterance.

For example : Student: he *take* the bus to go to school.

Teacher: He takes the bus to go to school.

3) Elicitation: teacher directly elicits asking questions or by pausing to allow students to complete teacher's utterance, or asking students to reformulate their utterance.

For example : Student: he *take* the bus to go to school.

Teacher: he?

Teacher: how do we form the third person singular form in English?

Teacher: can you correct that?

4) Metalinguistic feedback: to the well-formed of the student's utterance.

For example : Student: he *take* the bus to go to school.

Teacher: do we say he take?

Teacher: How do we say when it forms the third person singular form?

5) Clarification request: teacher's request for further information from a student about a previous utterance.

For example : Student: he *take* the bus to go to school.

Teacher: What do you mean by *take*?

6) Repetition: teacher repeats the student's ill-formed utterance,

adjusting intonation to highlight the error.

For example : Student: he *take* the bus to go to school.

Teacher: he take?

Recast

Recasts involve the teacher's reformulation of all or part of a student's utterance minus the error (Lyster and Ranta, 1997: 46). Meanwhile Tarone, Bigelow, and Hansen (2009: 29) defined recast is as immediate correct reformulation of a second language learners' erroneous utterance.

Tarone, Bigelow, and Hansen (2009: 28) suggested when a learner produces an erroneous second language form, for instance "what color it is?", a teacher may correct the utterances by using recast. Teacher gives feedback to the utterance directly to correct an error of form; that is "what color is it?". It can help students to reduce erroneous in producing utterance.

METHODS

Research Design

In designing this experiment, I used factorial design. It had two or more

independent variables acting on the dependent variable (Cohen, 2007:280).

Population and Samples

Population of the study was the tenth grade students of *Nahdlatul Ulama* vocational high school of Ungaran in academic year 2012/2013 which consisted of 354 students.

Samples of this research were two classes. The sample was taken by using stage techniques sampling. According to Cohen (2000: 101) Stage sampling involves selecting the sample in stages, which is, taking samples from samples. In this study, the samples were X-8 and X-9 that consisted of 36 students in both classes. In finding the subject of the study, I took the data from students' learning achievement report of odd semester to get high and low achievers before they were treated by recast for experimental group and clarification request for the control group.

Instruments

To collect data, I used a test, a set of questionnaires, and observation along teaching and learning process as instrument in this research. The test

was the instrument used in preliminary research and the end of the research. Meanwhile a set of questionnaires and observation were used for getting information in the preliminary research. A set of questionnaires was used to know the condition of the students before treatment. It was supported by observation. The observation was used to know how the teacher carried out teaching learning process and the students' activities in the classroom.

The test was conducted to evaluate the students' ability of grammar in spoken English. To get the data, I used the instrument of oral test to evaluate the students' ability of grammar which was recorded by an audio-recorder that could be used to assess the utterances produced during test. 20 pictures were selected. Each

pictures followed by 20 questions given orally. The test lasted for around 8 minutes for each participant. Students got same type of test in the beginning (pre test) and the end (post test).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

After gaining the data its normality and homogeneity, I tested the hypothesis proposed. In order to be able to test the hypothesis, I carried out ANOVA which was to know the whole result and paired sample t-test to see the detail of research hypothesis.

Null hypothesis 1: There is no significant effectiveness of using recast to the high achievers in grammar at the tenth grade students of *Nahdlatul Ulama* vocational high school of Ungaran.

Table 1. Paired Samples Test of the First Hypothesis

| | | Paired Differences | | | | | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|--------|--|---|----------------|-----------------|----------|----------|-------|----|-----------------|
| | | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | | | | |
| | | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | Lower | Upper | | | |
| Pair 1 | Post-test (Experiment-high) - Pre-test (Experiment-high) | 1.46667E1 | 7.30297 | 2.10819 | 10.02658 | 19.30675 | 6.957 | 11 | .000 |

The paired sample test as shown as table above indicates that t-value is $6.957 > t\text{-table } 2.201$, $\alpha = .000 < \alpha (0.05)$. The pretest and posttest score are significantly different. It can be concluded that using recast to teach grammar in spoken use for high

achievers is effective. It means the null hypothesis 1 is rejected.

Null hypothesis 2: There is no significant effectiveness of using recast to the low achievers in grammar at the tenth grade students of *Nahdlatul Ulama* vocational high school of Ungaran.

Table 2. Paired Samples Test of the Second Hypothesis

| | | Paired Differences | | | | | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|--------|--|---|----------------|-----------------|---------|----------|-------|----|-----------------|
| | | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | | | | |
| | | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | Lower | Upper | | | |
| Pair 2 | Post-test (Experiment-low) - Pre-test (Experiment-low) | 1.13333E1 | 10.17424 | 2.93705 | 4.86893 | 17.79774 | 3.859 | 11 | .003 |

The paired sample test as shown as table above indicates that that t-value is $3.859 > t\text{-table } 2.201$, $\alpha = .000 < \alpha (0.05)$. The pretest and posttest score are significantly different. It can be concluded that using recast to teach grammar in spoken use for low achievers is

effective. It means the null hypothesis 2 is rejected.

Null hypothesis 3: There is no significant effectiveness of using clarification request to the high achievers in grammar at the tenth grade students of *Nahdlatul Ulama* vocational high school of Ungaran.

Table 3. Paired Samples Test of the Third Hypothesis

| | | Paired Differences | | | | | t | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|--------|--|---|----------------|-----------------|----------|----------|-------|----|-----------------|
| | | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | | | | |
| | | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | Lower | Upper | | | |
| Pair 3 | Post-test (Control-high) - Pre-test (Control-high) | 1.45000E1 | 6.27404 | 1.81116 | 10.51366 | 18.48634 | 8.006 | 11 | .000 |

The paired sample test as shown as table above indicates that that t-value is $8.006 > t\text{-table } 2.201, \alpha = .000 < \alpha (0.05)$. The pretest and posttest score are significantly different. It can be concluded that using clarification request to teach grammar in spoken use for high

achievers is effective. It means the null hypothesis 3 is rejected.

Null hypothesis 4: There is no significant effectiveness of using clarification request to the low achievers in grammar at the tenth grade students of *Nahdlatul Ulama* vocational high school of Ungaran.

Table 4. Paired Samples Test of the Fourth Hypothesis

| | | Paired Differences | | | | | T | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|--------|--|---|----------------|-----------------|----------|--------|--------|----|-----------------|
| | | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | | | | |
| | | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | Lower | Upper | | | |
| Pair 4 | Post-test (Control-low) - Pre-test (Control-low) | -2.50000 | 4.35890 | 1.25831 | -5.26951 | .26951 | -1.987 | 11 | .072 |

The paired sample test as shown as table above indicates that t-value is $-1.987 < t\text{-table } 2.201, \alpha = .000 < \alpha (0.05)$. The pretest and posttest score are not significantly different. It can be concluded that using clarification request to teach grammar in spoken use for low achievers is not effective. It means the null hypothesis 4 is accepted.

school of Ungaran. The data shown on table below found that there is no significant difference of using recast, which was implemented for high 0.5214 and low achievers (0.2645) of grammar in spoken use of English taught using recast as shown in the same column. It means the null hypothesis 5 is accepted.

Null hypothesis 5: there is no significant difference of using recast to the high and low achievers in grammar at the tenth grade students of *Nahdlatul Ulama* vocational high

Tukey test is used to determine which mean or group of means are significantly different from the others. Based on the table of Tukey Test, the group which is different is low achievers of control group.

Table 5. Tukey Test Gain

| Tukey HSD | | | |
|--------------------|----|-------------------------|-------|
| Groups-achievement | N | Subset for alpha = 0.05 | |
| | | 1 | 2 |
| Control-low | 12 | -.1133 | |
| Experiment-low | 12 | | .2645 |
| Experiment-high | 12 | | .5214 |
| Control-high | 12 | | .5268 |
| Sig. | | 1.000 | .168 |

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Tukey test is used to determine which mean or group of means are significantly different from the others. Based on the table of Tukey Test, the group which is different is low achievers of control group.

Null hypothesis 6: there is no significant difference of using clarification request to the high and low achievers in grammar at the tenth grade students of *Nahdlatul Ulama* vocational high school of Ungaran. The data shown on table above found that there is significant difference of using clarification request, which was implemented for high (0.5268) and low achievers (-0.1133) of grammar taught by using clarification request as shown as shown in the different column. It means the null hypothesis 6 is rejected.

Null hypothesis 7: there is no

significant interaction of teaching strategy (recast and clarification request) and types of students of achievement (high and low) to the students' grammar at the tenth grade of *Nahdlatul Ulama* vocational high school of Ungaran.

From data analysis, it was found that there is significant interaction of teaching strategy (recast and clarification request) and result of students of achievement (high and low). It was shown $F\text{-value} = 4.467 > F\text{-table} = 4.061$ with the significance level of 0.05. So it means that the null hypothesis 7 is rejected.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Based on the results of the research, it is revealed that (1) recast is effective to teach grammar for high

achievers,(2) recast is effective to teach grammar for low achievers, (3) clarification request is effective to teach grammar for high achievers,(4) clarification request is not effective to teach grammar for low achievers, (5) there is no significant difference between high and low achievers on grammar taught by using recast, (6) there is significant difference between high and low achievers on grammar taught by using clarification request, (7) there is significant interaction of teaching strategy (recast and clarification request) and types of students of achievement (high and low) to the students' grammar at the tenth grade of *Nahdhatul Ulama* vocational high school of Ungaran. In general, it can be said that the use of recast is effective to teach grammar for low and high achievers. Teachers can utilize it in their teaching performance without mentioning the students' errors instead of stimulating the students' thought towards the utterances they produce.

REFERENCES

- Chu, R. 2011. Effects of Teacher's Corrective Feedback on Accuracy in the Oral English of English-Majors College Students. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 5, pp. 454-459, May 2011. Available online at <http://ojs.academypublisher.com/index.php/tpls/article/download/0105454459/3074>. Accessed on 06th Desember 2012.
- Celce- Murcia, M. 2001. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. 3rd ed. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Doughty, C. (2001). Cognitive underpinnings of focus on form. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 206-257). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, Rod. & Sheen, Younghee. 2006. Reexamining the Role of Recasts in Second Language Acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 28.2:575-600. Available online at http://ws.ajou.ac.kr/~edu/2003/z_b/data/4_EllisSheen2006Recasts.pdf. accessed on 25th Desember 2012.
- Harmer, J. 1998. *How to Teach English*. Harlow: Longman.
- Lightbown, P. M. & Spada. (1999). N. How language are learned. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Available online at <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/95n3d84b.pdf>. Accessed on 25th Desember 2012.
- Lyster, R.; Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms.

Studies in Second Language Acquisition 19: 37–66. Available online at http://people.mcgill.ca/files/roy.lyster/Lyster_Ranta1997_SSLA.pdf. Accessed on 06th Desember

2012.

Tarone, E, Bigelow, M, & Hansen, K. 2009. *Literacy and Second Language Oracy*. New York: Oxford University Press.