

THE EFFECT OF SELF CORRECTION AND PEER CORRECTION ON PRONUNCIATION OF SECOND SEMESTER STUDENTS OF ENGLISH EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM, STKIP PGRI LUBUKLINGGAU

*By Mardi Juansyah¹
(Email: mardi_juansyah@yahoo.com)*

ABSTRACT

It is indispensable for EFL learners to have a good pronunciation, because knowing a language means to understand and to be understood by people who know English. This research was carried out to find out if there was significant progress and significant difference on the achievement of English pronunciation of students who were taught by self correction and peer correction. The students' perception on self correction and peer correction in teaching English pronunciation was also assessed. The quasi-experimental design with pretest-posttest nonequivalent-groups design was used in this study. Sixty second semester students of English Education Study Program of STKIP PGRI Lubuklinggau in academic year of 2010/2011 were purposively selected as the sample. They were put into three groups. The obtained data which were analyzed using one-way ANOVA showed that there was significant progress on the achievement of English pronunciation of both groups of students who were taught by self correction and peer correction. However, the difference on the achievement of students' English pronunciation by self correction and peer correction was not significant. It was also found that there was students' positive perception on self correction and peer correction in teaching pronunciation. The evidence indicated that self correction and peer correction could improve the students' English pronunciation. Finally, the students' perception on the application of peer correction in teaching pronunciation was better than on self correction.

Keywords: self correction, peer correction, English pronunciation achievement.

A. Introduction

As English is not only written but also spoken language, pronunciation is indispensable with the speaker's communicative competence. Besides the mastery on grammar and vocabulary, the ability to pronounce English sounds correctly is considered important. It can determine the speaker's success in conveying the meaning of word in communication using English. Thus, it is linguistically acceptable that the teaching of pronunciation is as important as the teaching of other skills and aspects of English.

In line with this, Jenkins (2004:114) explains that pronunciation plays a critical role in preventing communication breakdowns and that the phonological and phonetic factors involved are not necessarily the same as those involved in communication between a native and nonnative speaker of the language. Thus, the teaching of pronunciation is beneficial to fulfill the nature of language as a means of communication, because without adequate pronunciation skill, the speakers' ability to communicate tends to be disturbed.

In relation to English as a Foreign Language (EFL), the teaching of pronunciation in Indonesia is useful and very important since English is different from Indonesian. The

differences are found at least in two areas: the speech sound and the sound system. For the former, it is obvious that there are some English sounds which do not exist nor has similar sound to Indonesian sound system, such as /ɜ:/, /æ/, /m/, /θ/, /ð/ and /x/. And if there are some sounds which is similar to Indonesian, the pronunciation is different in case of manner of articulation, such as plosive, affricate, and nasal sounds. And for the latter, it is also obvious that not as in Indonesian language, the pronunciation of English words commonly has little relation to the spelling of the word. The stress and intonation in English also seems strange as they do not exist in Indonesian. Thus, Indonesian learners tend to pronounce English words as they read Indonesian words which result to errors in pronunciation. These errors can, of course, disturb the success of communication.

As Kelly (2004:7-8) states that the lack of relation between spelling and pronunciation can cause difficulties for learners. The difficulties that individual learners have may be caused by (1) the concept of the learners' first language which has one-to-one relationship between sounds and spelling, while it does not occur for other language, (2) even if such concept is same, the learners still need to learn new sound-spelling relationships in new words, (3) some sounds or combinations of sounds in their first language which do not occur in English, (4) some sounds or combinations of sounds used in English which do not occur in their first language, or (5) the stress and intonation patterns used in English are strange to the learners. Those sources of difficulties can result to errors in pronunciation faced by learners of English.

In the college where the researcher teaches, undergraduate students of English Education Study Program must take Pronunciation Practice as one of the subjects at the first semester. This course discusses the pronunciation of English sounds, theoretically and practically. It covers the problems in pronouncing English sounds faced by the students (especially Indonesian students) and production of correct pronunciation. After joining this subject, the students are expected to perform correct pronunciation of English words, phrases, and sentences, as well as identifying correct sounds based on the phonetic symbols to get correct pronunciation.

However, looking at the last three years data, it was found that the students' pronunciation is still low. It was observed that this poor pronunciation achievement is due to the students' failure in producing correct English sounds and the fossilization of incorrect pronunciation. They tend to pronounce English words just based on what they heard from their teachers and friends without attempting to discover the correct

pronunciation based on the native speakers. It was also experienced that they tend to use Indonesian sounds when pronouncing English words, as they think that they are all the same.

Thus, with an intention to help the 'future teachers of English' in improving their English pronunciation, a research on the application of self correction and peer correction in teaching pronunciation was conducted. It was hopefully that it could find the answers for the three questions which were discussed in this study: (1) Was there any significant progress on the achievement of English pronunciation of students who were taught by self correction and peer correction? (2) Was there any significant difference on the achievement of the students' English pronunciation by self correction and peer correction? (3) What was the students' perception on self correction and peer correction in teaching English pronunciation?

B. Literature Review

According to Kelly (2004:13-14), there are two key problems in the teaching of pronunciation. Firstly, it tends to be neglected, and secondly when it is not neglected, it tends to be reactive to particular problem that has arisen in the classroom. For the former, the tendency to neglect the teaching of pronunciation may not be due to the teachers' lacking interest in the subject but rather to a feeling of doubt as how to teach it. In spite of teaching pronunciation, they feel more comfortable to teach grammar and vocabulary. For the latter, most of pronunciation teaching deals only with errors made by students in the classroom. It is, of course, absolutely necessary to improve the students' pronunciation, but a well planned activity in the classroom which includes the pronunciation as integral to any lesson will be much better. A strategically planned teaching activity of pronunciation will anticipate and present fuller analysis to learner and give them the fuller language practice. Therefore, in planning the teaching of pronunciation, (Andrew, 2010) suggested that the teachers can apply the imitation, explanation and practice activities.

Kelly (2004:11) explains that the consideration to the errors made by the students and the success of communication is the basis of the teaching of pronunciation in the classroom. Thus, in the condition where a learner tends to consistently mispronounce a range of phonemes can cause difficulty for a speaker from other language community to understand. This can be very frustrating for him who may have good mastery of grammar and lexis but have difficulty in understanding and being understood by other speakers.

Coder (1967) in Carranza (2007:84-85) argues that errors reflect the learners' transitional competence. Firstly, errors tell the teacher how far the learner has progressed towards the goal and consequently, how much he still has to learn. Secondly, errors also provide researchers with evidence on how language is acquired. Thirdly, errors are indispensable to the learner himself because they can be regarded as a device in order to learn. Finally, errors are a strategy used by both First Language (L1) and L2 learners.

Carranza (2007:86) states that self correction is a correction technique whose aim is to engage the learners in identifying and correcting their own errors. It is an effective way of addressing learners' errors because it involves the learner in the correction process. This technique is very effective because having learners do the correcting themselves helps them feel more motivated, independent, and cooperative.

In doing self correction, Ricard (1986:248) and Sharkey (2003:22-23) propose the similar steps, as follows:

1. Providing several materials for the students to tape or record their voice while producing the target sounds, stress patterns, and intonation.
2. Asking the students to listen back to their recordings several times in an effort to compare their pronunciation to that of the native speaker.
3. They can make notes or question marks on their texts when they have difficulty or uncertainty on the correct pronunciation.

Carranza (2007:86) states that peer correction is a form of positive automatic correction that result from the interlocutor's inability to comprehend an utterance. In this case, the speaker is then forced to make an effort to correct his or her previous utterance in order to get his or her idea(s) across. In this correction technique, the learners' are encouraged to help each other identify errors and correct them. The effect of this peer correction is almost the same with self correction, as it is a way of getting foreign language learners negotiate meaning and standard pronunciation.

Peer correction occurs in the classroom activity, when a student gives a response to other's error. As self correction, it is implemented in classrooms to enhance learner autonomy, cooperation, interaction, and involvement (Sultana, 2009:12). Peer correction happens when the teacher asks other students in the class for giving the correct form, such as pronunciation.

In doing peer correction, Sultana (2009:13); Ricard (1986:248); and Sharkey (2003:23) propose the activity as follow:

1. Students and teacher listen to the tape/recording together.
2. Both, students and teacher make comments and notes for asking questions or correction.
3. Then, mark comment on the text and the recording are returned to the students who will listen back to the recoding and read the feedback from the teacher and other students.
4. Finally, students produce a comprehensive final reading using the suggestion/correction from the feedback.

C. Methodology

This study used one of the quasi-experimental designs: pretest-posttest nonequivalent-groups design, involving three parallel groups. Both experimental groups received the pretest, posttest, and the treatment: the teaching of pronunciation by self correction and peer correction. The control group received the pretest and posttest only, without treatment. The research was done in 16 meetings including the pretest and posttest for about one and a half month. The treatment using self correction and peer correction in teaching pronunciation to the experimental groups was done in 14 meetings. In doing the treatment to the experimental groups, there were four meetings in a week, each meeting took 2 credit hours or 100 minutes.

The second semester students of English Education Study Program at STKIP PGRI Lubuklinggau in the academic year of 2010/2011 were the population of this study. There were 211 students. In selecting the sample, the purposive sampling technique was used. In this study, it was assumed that personal judgment of population could be used to judge whether a particular sample would be representative. Based on the data of the students' scores taken from the English education study program, there were 81 students under similar criteria.

After getting the sample, the members of each experimental and control groups were taken randomly by using lottery. There were 20 students for each of the first experimental group, the second experimental group and the control group. So, there were 60 students selected as sample of this study.

In collecting the data, oral production test was used. The test was administered twice, for pretest and posttest. In this study, the students were asked to read a paragraph aloud.

While the students read the paragraph, their voices were recorded. During the tests, each student was asked to read the paragraph loudly and do the recording.

In scoring the achievement of students' pronunciation in pretest and posttest, two raters were used. Besides oral production test, a questionnaire was also used to assess the students' perception on the application of self correction and peer correction. The questionnaire consisted of 15 items, 3 items were used to assess the students' perception on pronunciation teaching and learning, 6 items were used to assess the students' perception on self correction and the other 6 items were used to assess the students' perception on peer correction.

D. The Research and Discussion

Based on the total score of pretests and posttests of each group, it can be seen that the mean of pretest score in the first experimental group was 7.68 and the standard deviation was 0.774. The mean of posttest scores in the first experimental group was 8.06 and the standard deviation was 0.707. The mean of pretest scores in the second experimental group was 7.43 and the standard deviation was 0.591. The mean of posttest scores in the second experimental group was 7.85 and the standard deviation was 0.502. The mean of pretest scores in the control group was 7.44 and the standard deviation was 0.521. The mean of posttest scores in the control group was 7.72 and the standard deviation was 0.467.

By using one-way ANOVA, the multiple comparisons of test scores were found. Based on the result of multiple comparisons, the progress between pretest and posttest in three groups can be seen. The mean difference between pretest and posttest in the first experimental group was 0.38 and the significant value was 0.048. Since 0.048 was less than alpha level 0.05 (see Pallant, 2005:218), then the progress on the achievement of English pronunciation of students who were taught by self correction in the first experimental group was significant. H_{a1} was accepted.

The mean difference between pretest and posttest in the second experimental group was 0.42 while the significant value was 0.029. Since 0.029 was less than alpha level 0.05, then that the progress on the achievement of English pronunciation of students who were taught by peer correction in the second experimental group was significant. H_{a2} was accepted.

The mean difference between pretest and posttest in the control group was 0.28 while the significant value was 0.143. Since 0.143 was higher than alpha level 0.05, then the progress on the achievement of English pronunciation of students in the control group was not significant.

The result of ANOVA showed that F value was 1.828, the significant value was 0.170. Since 0.170 was higher than alpha level 0.05, then the difference on the achievement of students' English pronunciation by self correction and peer correction was not significant. H_{03} was accepted.

Table 1. ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.182	2	.591	1.828	.170
Within Groups	18.421	57	.323		
Total	19.602	59			

The result of questionnaire showed that the mean of items for assessing students' perception on teaching pronunciation (items 1-3) was 4.58. It means that the students' perception on pronunciation teaching and learning was good. The mean of self correction items (items 4-9) was 3.37. It means that the students' perception on self correction in teaching pronunciation was enough. The mean of peer correction items (items 10-15) was 4.17. It means that the students' perception on peer correction in teaching pronunciation was good.

Based on the findings above, some interpretations could be drawn. The significant progress in the achievement of English pronunciation indicated that the students' English pronunciation was improving because the students did make correction on their pronunciation errors either by self correction or peer correction. The increase in the achievement of the students' pronunciation in control group indicated that the students themselves realized on their errors and tried to find the correct pronunciation before the second recording.

The insignificant difference on the achievement of the students' pronunciation among groups indicated that there were still errors in pronunciation that self correction and peer correction could not deal with. These errors could be due to the students' fossilization on incorrect pronunciation, failure in producing certain sounds which are not found in Indonesian sound system, and tendency to pronounce English words based on the spelling. Besides, the students were still not familiar with the existence of stress syllable in certain

English words. As the result, they pronounced the words without stressing. Thus, although the students had listened to the correct pronunciation from the native speaker recordings, they still pronounced certain English sounds incorrectly (such as: /h/ in 'throughout'; /d/ in 'that', 'them', 'there'; /tʃ/ in 'temperature',), and words (such as: ending -ed /t/ in 'dropped' and 'increased'; 'widely', 'northeastern', 'actuality', and 'serious').

The result of questionnaire showed that the students had better perception on the application of peer correction than self correction. The result is in contrast with the findings of researches conducted by Sultana (2009) which showed that among 43 students, 20% responded in affirmation for peer correction but as large of 80% did not see much use of it, and Zhu (2010) which showed that 63.3% of 58 students as sample preferred to have teacher correction on their mistakes or errors, 16.7% of them preferred peer correction, and 20% of them preferred having self correction.

This might be because the students were not really sure with their own correction and they lack of knowledge of English sound system and speech sounds. It could also be because the students preferred to have such supportive and friendlier learning atmosphere in the classroom by having correction from their friends and correcting their friends' pronunciation errors. Besides, commenting and correcting others' errors could also be as an actual practice of pronouncing English words. This good perception on peer correction supported the result which showed that the progress in the second experimental group (teaching pronunciation by peer correction) was more than the progress in the first experimental group (teaching pronunciation by self correction).

The result of this research could be as recent data which showed that the application of self correction and peer correction could contribute to the improvement of English pronunciation. This could also be a good consideration for teachers in planning English language teaching activity in the classroom, that the teacher's and students' attitudes toward errors and errors correction could have great impact on the entire teaching learning process. Thus, in the future implementation of both correction strategies, the teacher should select appropriate correction technique depending on classroom condition and should be sure that all students participate actively and effectively in the teaching and learning process. Finally, the students' perception on the application of certain strategy could lead them to better learning effort to achieve maximum result.

E. Conclusion

Based on the research, it can be concluded: first, there was significant progress in the achievement of English pronunciation of students who were taught pronunciation by self correction and peer correction. In other word, self correction and peer correction could increase the achievement of students' English pronunciation. Second, there was no significant difference in the achievement of the students' English pronunciation by self correction and peer correction. Third, there was students' positive perception on self correction and peer correction in teaching pronunciation. The students' perception on peer correction was better than on self correction. The students preferred peer correction than self correction since peer correction offered supportive and friendlier learning atmosphere in the classroom by having correction from their friends and correcting their friends' pronunciation errors. Besides, commenting and correcting others' errors could also be as an actual practice of pronouncing English words for the students.

REFERENCES

- Andrew. 2010. *How to Teach Pronunciation: 3 Essential Elements*. (online), available in <http://busyteacher.org/4947-how-to-teach-pronunciation-3-essential-elements.html>. Retrieved on February 12th, 2011.
- Carranza, L. M. V. 2007. *Correction in the ESL Classroom: What Teachers Do in The Classroom and What They Think They Do*. *Revista Pensamiento Actual*, 7(8-9), 84-95. (online), available in <http://www.latindex.ucr.ac.cr/pensamiento-actual-8-9/pensamiento-actual-8-9-09.pdf>. Retrieved on February 12th, 2011.
- Jenkins, J. 2004. *Research in Teaching Pronunciation and Intonation*. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24(5), 109-125. (online), available in <http://arts.ucalgary.ca/lrc/sites/ucalgary.ca.lrc/files/Jenkins.pdf>. Retrieved on August 23th 2009.
- Kelly, G. (Ed). 2004. *How to Teach Pronunciation*. (6th ed). Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Ricard, E. 1986. *Beyond Fossilization: A Course on Strategies and Technique in Pronunciation for Advanced Adult Learners*. *TESL Canada Journal*, 1, 234-253. (online), available in <http://www.teslcanadajournal.ca/index.php/tesl/article/viewFile/1009/828>. Retrieved on May 30th, 2011.
- Sharkey, S. (2003). *Facilitating Communicative Competence for Adult non-Native English Speakers*. Unpublished master's thesis, Hamline University, Saint Paul, Minnesota.
- Sultana, A. (2009). *Peer Correction in Esl Classrooms*. *BRAC University Journal*, 6(1), 11-19.
- Zhu, H. (2010). *An Analysis of College Students' Attitudes Towards Error Correction in EFL Context*. *English Language Teaching*, 3(4). (online), available in <http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/elt/article/download/8384/6194>. Retrieved on May 30th, 2011.