



European Journal of Educational Research

Volume 12, Issue 1, 29 - 40.

ISSN: 2165-8714

<https://www.eu-jer.com/>

‘Thank You Very Much’: Feedback Strategies in University English Literature Lecture Interaction

Akhyar Rido 

Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia,
INDONESIA

Bagus Hary Prakoso 

National Research and Innovation Agency,
INDONESIA

Heri Kuswoyo* 

Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia,
INDONESIA

Received: May 11, 2022 • Revised: August 19, 2022 • Accepted: November 4, 2022

Abstract: Learning literature is considered challenging for university students, especially in Indonesia, as they must perform assigned tasks and communicate with one another, in addition to receiving and transmitting comprehensible literature content knowledge from and to their lecturers. In many cases, students do not get sufficient feedback on what they are doing. The objective of this study was to investigate the use of feedback strategies by lecturers in English literature lectures in a higher learning institution in Indonesia. Using a qualitative approach, this study involved three lecturers of the English literature department. Meanwhile, data were collected through 300 minutes of video recordings of drama, literary criticism, and prose lectures. The results revealed that the lecturers generated both negative and positive feedback strategies during the lectures. In terms of negative feedback strategies, they criticized students' responses. By contrast, in terms of positive feedback strategies, they accepted, appreciated, and praised as well as repeated and answered students' responses. The results also indicated that the feedback strategies became effective tools to improve students' language competence, literary knowledge, and participation. This study suggested that lecturers use more positive feedback followed by additional comments during lectures as these could foster students' engagement and keep learning longer.

Keywords: *English literature lectures, feedback strategies, Indonesian university.*

To cite this article: Rido, A., Prakoso, B. H., & Kuswoyo, H. (2023). 'Thank you very much': Feedback strategies in university English literature lecture interaction. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 12(1), 29-40. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.12.1.29>

Introduction

This study looks at the use of feedback strategies in English literature lectures in a university in Indonesia. In university English literature lectures, students study literature components such as characterizations, dialogs, and actions from literary works (Angelianawati, 2019). Students also learn emotional attitudes of characters, which can lead them to explore characterizations, so they experience strong emotion when they are dealing with conflict within literary works (Brouillette, 2012; Heyward, 2010). In other words, students analyze, interpret, criticize, evaluate, and produce literary works (Akbulut & Vural, 2017; Angelianawati, 2019; Fard, 2016; Ilyas, 2016; Shi, 2013); therefore, during the lectures, they are required to actively ask and respond questions as well as involve in discussions and share ideas to exercise their critical thinking and communication skills (Rido et al., 2021; Rido, Kuswoyo, & Ayu, 2020; Rido, Kuswoyo, & Nuansa, 2020; Maison et al., 2022). After expressing their responses and ideas, students normally expect feedback from their lecturers (Akpınar, 2018; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Mackey, 1999; Rido, 2018).

However, there are still growing concerns on English literature lectures. Students find that learning literature has been challenging for nonnative speakers of English, especially in Asia (Kuswoyo, Sujatna, Indrayani, & Rido, 2020; Kuswoyo, Sujatna, Rido, & Indrayani, 2020; Nguyen & Luu, 2022; Rido, Kuswoyo, & Ayu, 2020; Rido et al., 2021; Shi, 2013; Supakorn, 2020). A study by Muhsin (2016) reported that in many cases students gave irrelevant responses and ideas and it was challenging for the lecturers to accept, ignore, or correct those responses and ideas because not all feedback gave positive impacts on students' learning. Some feedback even confused and demotivated students. Another study conducted by Razavi and Naghizadeh (2014) also found that a lecturer's lack of knowledge in employing feedback strategies discouraged students from expressing their opinions and made them lose their self-confidence. Therefore, lecturers must be aware of the use of feedback strategies during lectures to enable students to improve their language competence and literary knowledge (Rido, Kuswoyo, & Nuansa, 2020; Shi, 2013; Supakorn, 2020).

* Corresponding author:

Heri Kuswoyo, Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia, Bandar Lampung, Indonesia. ✉ hery@teknokrat.ac.id

The present study is initiated based on these concerns. All English literature lecturers must be able to use feedback strategies based on the needs of students to enable them to be communicative and critical-thinking individuals. Studies on feedback strategies have been widely conducted and revealed that feedback has become one of the most important interaction strategies in university lectures. Feedback principally functions as responses provided by lecturers in the form of comments, suggestions, criticism, opinion, and advice toward students' responses to help them learn (Al-Bashir et al., 2016; Dahal, 2016; Gormally et al., 2014; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Noor et al., 2010). Here feedback from lecturers plays an essential role as tools to inform students' strengths and weaknesses as well as provide evaluation on how to scaffold and improve their learning (Al-Bashir et al., 2016; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Ibrahim Almohizea, 2018; Rido et al., 2014). In their study, Walsh (2011) and Xuerong (2012) claimed that the use of feedback enables lecturers to manage classroom interaction, encourage students to be more active, and boost their confidence. However, studies on the use of feedback in English literature lectures in the Indonesian context are still limited. The present study is an effort to fill the gap in the existing literature. Thus, this study tried to investigate and provide a clearer picture on the types of feedback strategies used and manifested by lecturers in English literature lectures in an Indonesian university setting.

Literature Review

In the university lecture context, feedback principally refers to negotiation strategies that include confirmation checks, requests for clarification, comprehension checks, and recasts. Feedback is very important as it facilitates negotiation of meaning (Kuswoyo et al., 2021), which gives students chances to focus on and improve both their content knowledge and language production (Gass & Mackey, 2007; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975), thus leading to learning. Basically, feedback strategies consist of three types—positive, neglecting, and negative (Rido, 2018). Negative feedback is normally manifested by criticizing students' incorrect response, while neglecting feedback is manifested by responding to student's answer in a nonevaluative manner. In addition, positive feedback is manifested by accepting students' response, praising students for their correct response, repeating students' response, quoting students' response, summarizing students' response, modifying the idea by rephrasing or conceptualizing it, and listening to students' response. The general functions of this type of feedback are as the lecturer's input, correction, or evaluation toward students' response, acting as a signal for students to adjust their production. It also functions to show approval or agreement, to motivate students, to make students feel appreciated, to indicate that the lecturer likes the response, and to emphasize that the response is acceptable.

A number of studies have focused on feedback strategies to enhance students' learning in classroom. Tabatabaei and Banitalebi (2011) examined how the lecturer employed feedback strategies in a reading class in a language institute. The study revealed that the lecturer used positive and corrective feedback. In positive feedback, the lecturer repeated students' responses to increase students' exposure, as a comprehensible input to the target language. In corrective feedback, the lecturer, as the learning model, tended to provide explicit correction related to the nature of errors done by students such as in grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation when students were considered incapable to correct the errors by themselves. This study suggested that lecturers have a deeper look at the concept of feedback strategies and be more aware of what is going on in the classroom to help their students learn.

Dabiri (2018) looked at feedback patterns of four lecturers in English classrooms. This study discovered that feedback can be positive and negative. Through positive feedback, the lecturers accepted students' responses by saying "ok," "yes," "well," and "good" and repeated students' responses. This positive feedback was employed to build students' confidence as the lecturers were interested in the response and approved it. The lecturers also employed negative feedback where they corrected students' errors to give them an idea on how to improve the errors. This study also found that feedback was beneficial to enable the students to do better and not repeat the same error in the future.

Rahmat and Munir (2018) investigated the feedback strategies used by teachers at an English language classroom at a senior high school. This study revealed that teachers implemented various kinds of positive verbal feedback strategies such as praising, clarifying, commenting, repeating, and questioning. It was found that the functions of feedback were to establish interaction and evaluate students' responses.

Methodology

Research Design

The key concern of this study was to investigate the use of feedback strategies by lecturers in English literature lectures in its natural Indonesian university setting from their own perspectives. With such perspective, this study located itself within the qualitative research tradition (Creswell, 2014; Merriam, 2009).

Sample and Data Collection

This study was conducted in a university in Lampung, Indonesia, and involved three lecturers of the English literature department as the participants. They were Mrs. Dona, who teaches drama (LE-1); Mr. Steven, who teaches literary criticism (LE-2); and Mr. David, who teaches prose (LE-3). They used pseudonyms and were purposively selected based

on four criteria including at least having a master's degree in literature and experience of five years or more in teaching literature. In addition, they must be recommended by the head of the English literature department as well as willing to be the participants of this study. Before all participants gave their permission to be part of this study, first they were given pertinent information to make an "informed" consent to participate including the purpose of the study, identity of the researcher, participants' right in the process, participants' name used in this study, and benefit from participating in the study.

To collect data, the researchers used a video recording with duration of 100 minutes for each lecture, and in total, there were three lectures with 300 minutes of recordings. Video recording was chosen as it improves the density of data and provides a clear picture of who were speaking, the lecturers' gesture, and types of feedback strategies used and how they were manifested during the lectures. In addition, this also enables the researchers to replay the event to get more accurate data before drawing a conclusion (DuFon, 2002; Rido, 2017; Rido, Kuswoyo, & Ayu, 2020).

The lectures were recorded by a camera mounted to a tripod at the back of lecture room. Then, the video recordings were transcribed orthographically using the transcription conventions adopted from Jefferson (2004) and Simpson et al. (2002). To get detailed and accurate transcriptions, the researchers played the videos repeatedly, and it took approximately four weeks to complete the transcriptions. In transforming video recordings into transcriptions, the researchers looked at the details of the gesture, intonation, and posture of the lecturers. After the transcription results were neatly written in Microsoft Word, a linguist helped the researchers check the accuracy of transcriptions. Last, the researchers asked the participants to check and validate the result of transcriptions for verification to establish credibility of the data.

Data Analysis

In the present study, the data analysis procedure comprised five steps (Merriam, 2009). The first step was building a database. All data obtained from video recordings were arranged and labeled in separate files in one folder, so a total of three folders contained the data. Second, open coding was done. In this step, the data were identified and analyzed carefully, and the researchers were open to any possible feedback categories found. Third, the researchers conducted focused coding. This was done by classifying the data into subcategories based on the conceptual framework. Fourth, emergent themes were drawn. The researchers focused on similar feedback strategies that might be developed, and then emergent themes were identified. Lastly, after the emergent themes were identified, the findings were presented.

Results

This study looked at the use of feedback strategies by English literature lecturers in literature lectures in the Indonesian university context. The results showed that all lecturers utilized two feedback strategies, negative and positive, in their lectures.

Negative Feedback

The findings indicated that all lecturers employed negative feedback by criticizing students' responses. This strategy was employed when the lecturers felt dissatisfied with students' response or ideas and identified linguistic errors such as inaccurate pronunciation and grammar, including their poor reading habit. The function was as input and correction as well as a signal for students to adjust their production, making them more critical in giving responses and improving their linguistic competence. In Extract 1, Mrs. Dona criticized her student's response by pointing and repairing his pronunciation error.

EXTRACT 1 (LE-1):

- 84 L How many characters guys do you see here? ((raising her left hand and pointing to the screen))
 85 S Six.
 86 L Who are they? ((raising her right hand and pointing to the screen))
 87 Ss King Lear, Romeo and Juliet, Hamlet, Matchbeth, Othelo, William Shekespeare,
 88 L Macbeth ((raising her right hand and looking at the screen)).
 89 S Matchbeth.
 90 L *Not Matchbeth but Macbeth* ((fixing pronunciation of a student)).

Extract 1 shows that Mrs. Dona was discussing characters, and in lines 84–85, she asked the students to identify the characters on the screen. Then, a student responded by saying "six" (line 85). Right after that, Mrs. Dona asked the floor to mention the names of the characters (lines 86–87), which indicated that she wanted to recall their memories about literature figures. After getting the response (lines 89–90), she realized that the students mispronounced "Macbeth" and directly corrected it (line 90), showing her correction toward students' response.

Similarly, during his lecture, Mr. Steven also criticized a student's inaccurate pronunciation and grammatical error while delivering his response, as shown in Extract 2.

EXTRACT 2 (LE-2):

- 39 S: Ok I would like to share you about ee the example of the literature criticism ee I found it the first ee
 40 examples, in the guardian critics Philip Hook (...) It has portrayed Beckett's play ee it is *waiting for Godot*
 41 L: *Waiting for godogh*
 42 S: Ya
 43 L: *We say, we pronounce it as waiting for godogh*
 44 S: Waiting for goddogh, have you ever ee heard this literature critics of *this plays*
 45 L: *Play (.) a play*
 46 S: Oh ya, a *play ya, play*

In the beginning of his lecture, Mr. Steven was discussing the examples of literary critics. In lines 39–40, a student started sharing his example found in *Philip Hook; Waiting for Godogh*. However, Mr. Steven realized that the student produced incorrect pronunciation (line 40) and directly repaired it in lines 41. Right after getting such feedback, the student continued his explanation (lines 42–46), but in line 44, again, the lecturer found a grammatical error and corrected it, emphasizing the difference between the singular and plural forms of “play” as well as signaling him to adjust his production. In line 46, the student immediately repaired his response.

Criticizing a student's linguistic error was also done by Mr. Steven. In Extract 3, he used the negative feedback strategy when he found a student produced an ungrammatical statement.

EXTRACT 3 (LE-2):

- 94 L Roesmita (.) ok (/)
 95 S What I got from last week, why literature does matter, yes, it does matter because from the literary work
 96 we can develop our thinking skills and beside that we also can improve our *communicative skills*, and also
 97 L *Communication skill*
 98 S Yes, *communication skill* and besides, from the literary work we also can get the value that contains in the
 99 literary works itself.

In Extract 3, Mr. Steven was discussing the importance of literature with the students. Afterward, he nominated a female student named Roesmita to explain her idea (line 94). In lines 95–96, she explained that literature could develop students' critical thinking and communication skills. In the middle of her explanation, Mr. Steven identified a grammatical error, “communicative skills,” which he directly repaired to “communication skill” (line 97). Here the lecturer evaluated the student's response and signaled to adjust her production. In lines 98–99, the student accepted the repaired error and continued delivering her idea.

Moreover, the lecturers also criticized the contents of a student's response. In the next example, Mr. David criticized a student's response, which was the same answer delivered previously by his friend, as he could not give a new idea.

EXTRACT 4 (LE-3):

- 151 L: Alright, that's Leonardo DiCaprio. So, do you know his characterization? Now, we talk about physical
 152 appearance. What do you think about his physical appearance?
 153 S: Ee has light skin.
 154 L: What?
 155 S: Light skin.
 156 L: Light skin. Next? ((moving to another student))
 157 S: Handsome.
 158 L: Handsome. Thank you very much
 159 Ss: ((laugh))
 160 S: Chubby.
 161 L: Chubby ((approaching another student))
 162 S: Brown hair.
 163 L: Brown hair ((moving to another student))
 164 S: Brown hair.
 165 L: *Brown hair again. Brown hair again. What about you?*
 166 S: Brown hair.
 167 Ss: ((laugh))
 168 L: *Another physical? Come on. This is easy, right.*

In Extract 4, Mr. David was discussing the physical appearance of characters and mentioned Leonardo DiCaprio as an example. In lines 151–152, he asked the entire class about Leonardo's appearance. A student responded by saying “Ee has light skin” (lines 154). After getting a response from the student, he moved to another student to manage the distribution of question (line 156). In line 157, this student gave his idea by saying “handsome.” Next, Mr. David replied

by repeating the student's response and saying "thank you" as he thought the student referred to him (line 158), indicating that he tried to make a joke. As a result, all students in the class laughed (line 159). Following that, a student also responded by saying "chubby" (line 160). Again, in line 161, Mr. David approached one more student, indicating that he wanted more response. The student mentioned "brown hair" (line 162). After that, Mr. David approached the next student (line 163). In line 164, the student also mentioned "brown hair." At this point, Mr. David criticized the student's response, as he repeated the previous answer of his friend. Therefore, he moved to another student (line 165), who also repeated the same answer, "brown hair" (line 166). In line 168, Mr. David criticized the student's response, saying "Come on. This is easy, right." It showed that he was not satisfied with the response and demanded another response from the student. Meanwhile, in Extract 5, Mrs. Dona criticized students' poor reading habit in her drama lecture.

EXTRACT 5 (LE-1):

- 72 L Ok. Have you read Hamlet?
 73 Ss No.
 74 L So *what did you do in this semester then?* ((clicking the keyboard using left hand to change the slide on
 75 the screen)) Robin Goodfellow also, but I ((inaudible)) then we have also King Lear (.) King Lear is also
 76 drama from Shakespeare (.) Robin Goodfellow is actually from Othello but I didn't put him here (.) Have
 77 you watched Macbeth?
 78 Ss No.
 79 L *No (/) I think you never read it (.)*

Mrs. Dona started her lecture with a stimulating question. She asked whether the students had read Hamlet before discussing the material further (line 72). The students responded in chorus by saying "no" (line 73). Getting such a response from the entire class led Mrs. Dona to ask what the students actually did during the semester (line 74), showing that she was not happy with the response. After that, in lines 75–78, she mentioned several literary works from Shakespeare, and in line 76–77, she posed another question, checking if the students have watched Macbeth or not. Again, the students responded by saying "no" (line 78). Thus, she gave negative feedback by saying "No (/) I think you never read it" (line 79). This indicated that she criticized students' attitude for not reading Hamlet and watching Macbeth.

Positive Feedback

The findings revealed that the lecturers employed positive feedback by accepting, appreciating and praising, repeating, and answering the students' responses.

Accept Student's Response

During the lectures, accepting student's response was a common form of

positive feedback used by the lecturers. The general functions were to indicate an approval toward students' responses and to invite more participation. In Extract 6, Mrs. Dona accepted students' response during her drama lecture by using the word "okay."

EXTRACT 6 (LE-1):

- 244 L: So then whenever the conversation (.) What do you know about him when you watch the movie (.)
 245 What do you get from the conversation?
 246 S: Oo, He is a (...) anger man (.) And he (...) even when he angry. He always he always a. say to his a (...)
 247 what is this? A. to his a. he say him as a dog (.) that dog, killed them all.
 248 L: *Okay. So, he is.*

In Extract 6, Mrs. Dona was discussing with the students a movie they have just watched, and she posed a question about a male character in the movie (lines 244–245). In lines 246–247, a student responded by explaining the characterization of the man. After getting the response, Mrs. Dona said, "Okay. So, he is." This indicated that she agreed and accepted the answer (line 248). In the same vein, in his literary criticism lecture, Mr. Steven also used this strategy, as shown in Extract 7.

EXTRACT 7 (LE-2):

- 126 L: ... Anyone want to share (/) ok Bhakti (/)
 127 S: Literature for me is a place for everyone to share their mind about life and their experience, and then
 128 to reach other people ((inaudible)) Also from literature we can change people mind from our
 129 ((inaudible))
 130 L: *Yeah, literature, literary work can move people, right, can change the way their thinking, that is true*

In the beginning of his lecture, Mr. Steven was talking about literature, especially its impact on human life. In line 126, he invited a student named Bhakti to talk. Then, the student shared his idea, explaining that literature was a platform for everyone to share anything about life and experience. He also mentioned that literature could also influence other people's mind (lines 127–128). Next, in lines 130, Mr. Steven accepted the student's response by saying "yeah," "right," and "that is true." Similar to Mrs. Dona and Mr. Steven, Mr. David also accepted a student's response in his prose lecture, as shown in Extract 8.

EXTRACT 8 (LE-3):

776 L: Speech (/)
 777 S: Ya. The speech, the boy said my father is going to come and fix your window very soon. *Nah*, it means the
 778 boy is liar because the man is not his father.
 779 L: *Okay. Next. Others?*

In his prose lecture, Mr. David discussed the five methods of characterization: STEAL (speech, thought, effect on others, action, and look). In line 776, he asked the students to identify the characterization by looking at the speech aspect. Then, in lines 777–778, a student gave his idea by explaining that the boy character was a liar, seeing from his utterance, which said that his father was going to come and fix the window in the story. Considering the response was correct, Mr. David accepted the response by saying "Okay." Then, he continued to ask other students (line 779).

Appreciate and Praise Student's Response

Besides accepting students' response, the findings also indicated that all lecturers appreciated and praised students' response to value their ideas, to foster engagement, and to create a positive learning atmosphere. Extract 9 shows how Mrs. Dona appreciated a student for his response in the lecture.

EXTRACT 9 (LE-1):

253 L: How about the action? His action in the movie (/) Joffrey I mean
 254 S: His action
 255 L: It described it's a. what is it? Bad temper
 256 S: Yes. A(...) when he a(...) when he hit Sansa (.) He always hit Sansa, then he always mock to her (.)
 257 That's the action of Joffrey
 268 L: *Thank you*

In Extract 9, Mrs. Dona discussed the characterization of a character. In lines 253, she posed a question about the characterization of Joffrey based on his action in the movie. After that, a student confirmed the point of question by saying "his action" (line 254). Then, she clarified her intention by using a rhetorical question stating that the character named Joffrey had a bad temper (line 255). In lines 256–257, the student explained his opinion about the reason why Joffrey was a bad-tempered character by looking at what he says and acts. Mrs. Dona appreciated the student's response by saying "thank you" (line 268). In Extract 10, Mrs. Dona also accepted and praised her students after responding to a series of questions during her lecture.

EXTRACT 10 (LE-1):

545 L: Ok, when you see the pictures, there are four pictures here, when you see white shirt like that, the
 546 cold like that.
 547 S: Ehem
 548 L: It's symbolic of what?
 549 Ss: Doctors
 550 L: And what else?
 551 Ss: Laboratory
 552 L: How about students? Student of what?
 553 Ss: Science Science.
 554 L: Scientist (.) and the second the picture similar like what?
 555 Ss: Weedy
 556 L: What else?
 557 S: Loyal
 558 L: Loyalty. He is. *Okay, that's great (.)*

In lines 545–546, Mrs. Dona was explaining about symbols in a literary work and what they represented, followed by displaying four pictures. She started showing the first picture, which was a white shirt that might symbolize coldness as an example. Then, she asked the floor for other possible symbols that could be represented by the white shirt (line

548). In line 549, the students responded in chorus, saying “doctors.” Next, the lecturer demanded more answers (line 550), and the students said, “Laboratory” (line 551). In lines 552, the lecturer wanted the students to relate it with something else, and they responded by saying “science.” Right after that, in line 554, the lecturer moved to the second picture. The students directly gave their choir answers “weedy” and “loyal” (lines 555 and 557, respectively). After getting such responses, in line 558, the lecturer accepted and praised the students’ response by saying “Okay, that’s great.” Meanwhile, Mr. Steven also appreciated and praised his student’s response, as shown in Extract 11.

EXTRACT 11 (LE-2):

- 346 L: Approach and theory, what makes them different especially in literary criticism? yes(/) feel free,
347 speak your mind, yes Rani (/)
348 S: As I read the some some sources, literary theory is the prelude the relation between author and the
349 work, and in some approaches, there are sociological criticism which focus on the cultural, economy,
350 and political context and so on and so forth and then the deconstructionist criticism focuses on the
351 languages that author use in this work
352 L: *Ok thank you very much, very good Rani about the approaches, theory, thank you*

Extract 11 shows that Mr. Steven was discussing approaches and theories for literary work analysis. At the end of his explanation, he gave the entire class an opportunity to share their ideas; then, he nominated a female student named Rani who seemed excited to express her thought (lines 346–347). In lines 348–351, she explained the difference between *approach* and *theory*. After that, in lines 352, Mr. Steven expressed his appreciation and said, “Ok, thank you very much.” This was followed by a compliment, “very good.” Furthermore, Mr. Steven praised the student for her response by giving a compliment and a round of applause.

EXTRACT 12 (LE-2):

- 1121 L: Yes. Not Winy and Rizka anymore, ok. M.H. Abram critical orientation or you explain two, we leave
1122 this room, yes? Ya Evi (/)
1123 S: Ok, actually, M.H. Abram critical approach to literature. There are four categories, the first is mimetic
1124 theories. It explains the correlation between the text, audience, and also the author, and the papers.
1125 And the second is about the expressive theory, that concern with the text with the relationship
1126 between the text and the author, and the third is about pragmatic theory that concerned with between
1127 the text and also the audience but for the objective theory for the last, it is the most recent
1128 classification which is focus on the analysis of the text, for example, for the, we can see only the text, it
1129 is about the, maybe about the aesthetic of literature itself can be from structural or other perspective
1130 in the literature itself without correlate between the outside of text itself.
1131 L *Okay, good, very good explanation, can we give applause?*
1132 Ss ((applause))

In the lecture, Mr. Steven was discussing M.H. Abram’s critical approach, and he wanted more students to speak up (lines 1121–1122). After that, he nominated a female student named Evi. Next, the student shared her thought, explaining four categories of M.H. Abram’s critical approach to literature, which consisted of the mimetic, expressive, pragmatic, and objective theories (lines 1123–1130). After listening to her explanation, Mr. Steven praised the student by saying “Okay, good, very good explanation.” He also asked the entire class to give the student a round of applause as a form of appreciation (lines 1131). In line 1132, all students applauded. Correspondingly, in a different lecture, Mr. David appreciated his student for her response, as shown in Extract 13.

EXTRACT 13 (LE-3):

- 793 L: Action and thought. What about thought?
794 S: Thought is his fast thinking and also he is smart but he is still lying.
796 L: *Ok, thank you very much, Uning. That’s about the boy. I said that he is liar. Mmm Uning said that he is*
797 *fast thinker–fast thinking or fast thinker (.) he is also smart and liar.*

In his lecture, Mr. David was discussing character and characterization and the STEAL method. In line 793, he focused on the action and thought aspects and asked the students’ idea about the thought aspect. A female student named Uning initiated a response by giving an example, arguing that the boy was intelligent as he could think fast, even though he was also a liar (lines 794). In lines 796–797, Mr. David thanked the student and summarized her answer.

Repeat Student’s Response

The findings also discovered that all lecturers repeated students' response. This strategy was utilized to signal that the lecturers approved students' responses as well as to show interest in the content of their responses. Extract 14 shows how Mrs. Dona used this strategy in her lecture.

EXTRACT 14 (LE-1):

- 336 L Who have a strong connection the character in the story? why?
 337 S *Because we feel the emotion*
 338 L *Because we feel the emotion.*Ok. What else?
 339 S Miss miss (.) Well sometimes we feel that we we. E... we sometimes *imagine when I'm a (...) I'm eh (...)*
 340 *I'm as the main character in that.*
 341 L *Sometimes you imagine that you are the main character*

During the lecture, Mrs. Dona wanted to know whether the students had ever experienced a connection with a story (lines 336). A male student responded and said that he could feel the emotion of a story (line 337). In line 338, Mrs. Dona repeated his response, indicating her approval, and then she demanded more response. In lines 339–340, a female student shared her thought by saying that sometimes she could imagine herself as the main character in a story. Again, Mrs. Dona repeated her response (line 341), showing her acceptance. In the same pattern, Mr. Steven also repeated a student's response, as shown in Extract 15.

EXTRACT 15 (LE-2):

- 120 L: If you analyze literary work, it develops your critical thinking, ok you are questioning why literature is
 121 matter? it makes you critical and ee Rulita also previously explain that it can be medium of?
 122 S: *Express our ideas and thought*
 123 L: *Expression, to express ideas and though (.) ok*

In Extract 15, Mr. Steven was discussing why literature did matter to people's life. In lines 120–121, he explained that a literary work could develop the critical-thinking skills of the students. Then, he wanted to hear more from his students about the importance of literature (line 121). In line 122, a student responded that it could be a medium to express ideas and thoughts. Mr. Steven repeated the student's point, which indicated that he approved the response (line 123). Similar to Mrs. Dona and Mr. Steven, Mr. David also repeated his students' responses during the lecture.

EXTRACT 16 (LE-3):

- 305 L: Alright. Next, based on the character's functions, protagonist and antagonist. (.) Keanu, what is
 306 protagonist?
 307 S: Character that is being given *sympathy and empathy*.
 308 L: *Sympathy and empathy*. Usually, it shows–he or she shows good deed to the reader, will see very–has a
 309 good symphaty and emphaty, protagonist. Antagonist? ((looking at the slide))
 310 Ss: *Character that causes conflict*.
 311 L: *Character that causes conflict*.

In the lecture, Mr. David was discussing the types of character and their functions: protagonist and antagonist (line 305-306). Following that, he nominated a male student named Keanu to answer his question about a protagonist character (line 306). The student gave his answer by saying that a protagonist was a type of character who had sympathy and empathy (lines 307). In line 308, Mr. David repeated the student's response by emphasizing the main points: sympathy and empathy. Next, he asked the entire class about the antagonist character (line 309). In line 310, the floor responded in chorus, stating that an antagonist was a character who caused conflict within a story. Again, Mr. David repeated the response, which indicated that it was accepted (line 311).

Answer Student's Questions

This study also found that answering students' response was utilized by the lecturers as one of feedback strategies to increase students' comprehension toward the materials at hand. Extract 17 shows that Mrs. Dona answered a student's question during her drama lecture.

EXTRACT 17 (LE-1):

- 463 L: Question (/)
 464 S: As for the major or minor how can we call that?
 465 L: *For major actually the one who is the main character in the story (.) It means the one who is always shown*
 466 *in the story. The focus of the sentence of the story. We can say that. But the minor it doesn't mean that the*
 467 *person the character of aaa the minor character actually could be shown in the story but not always.*

In her lecture, Mrs. Dona just finished explaining major and minor characters, and she offered the entire class to ask questions (line 463). Right after that, a student initiated a question about the definition of major and minor characters (lines 464). In lines 465–467, Mrs. Dona answered the student’s question by explaining the differences between major and minor characters as seen from their contribution to the story. Meanwhile, in Extract 18, Mr. Steven answered question from his student during the lecture as well.

EXTRACT 18 (LE-2):

- 452 L: Yes, Dian (/) question (/) ((staring at a female student))
 453 S: In the literature, there are so many approaches, I want to know, what’s the best approach to study
 454 literature and why? Thank you
 455 L: *Ok, thank you very much, ee very good questions, in analyzing a literary work, then for example, if this*
 456 *is, say this is a novel, there are many ways to analyze this, there are many approaches and theory can*
 457 *be used to analyze this, ok, which one is the best? how you will deal with, ok, then, if you want to cover*
 458 *all, it will be impossible, because one novel can be analyze I mean ee it depends on our interest, ok, it*
 459 *depends on what problem we are going to criticize, ok, Dian(/)*

In the middle of the lecture, Mr. Steven was discussing approaches in analyzing literary works, and in line 452, he nominated a student named Dian who looked excited to ask a question. Then, the student immediately posed a question, asking the best approach to study literature and the reason (lines 453–454). In lines 455–459, Mr. Steven thanked and praised her for the question, followed by an explanation that in analyzing literary works, the students could not use all approaches; instead, he selected the relevant ones, depending on their interests and the issues. In the same vein, Mr. David answered a student’s question in his lecture, as shown in Extract 19.

EXTRACT 19 (LE-3):

- 375 S: Sir (/)
 376 L: Yes (/)
 377 S: What is the difference between static and flat character?
 378 L: *Static? It is only based on the criteria, but when the—in the real application it is quite the same, static*
 379 *means you know not grow changing, flat means there is no changing so still the same, but the criteria*
 380 *is different, one is based on the character’s development, ok,*

Extract 19 shows that Mr. David was discussing the types of characters, and a student initiated a question (line 375). In line 376, Mr. David gave him a chance to speak. Following that, the student posed a question about the difference between static and flat characters (line 377). After receiving the question, Mr. David explained that it could be seen from the character’s development (lines 378–380).

Discussion

This study was aimed at investigating the use of feedback strategies by lecturers in English literature lectures in a higher learning institution in Indonesia. The findings revealed that all lecturers employed two types of feedback strategies, negative and positive. In manifesting the negative feedback, the lecturers criticized students’ responses owing to the sense of dissatisfaction on their literary knowledge and linguistic errors such as inaccurate pronunciation and grammar while delivering their ideas and responding questions. In addition, the lecturers addressed the students’ poor reading habit. Rido (2018) and Rido et al. (2014) stated that the lecturers used evaluative and corrective inputs, which were actually done to show students’ mistakes or irrelevant responses and fix them and were not intended to make students feel wrong. Here, students might be aware of the difference between what they said and what they were supposed to say, and they might also perceive that they could not express what they wished to express. Thus, they paid attention to new vocabularies or language structures and content knowledge of the lectures, which could create engagement and more outputs in a productive way. Gormally et al. (2014) and Dabiri (2018) believed that this strategy was beneficial to let students know how to repair their responses and improve their learning performance during the lecture so that the learning objectives could be achieved.

The findings also revealed that the lecturers employed positive feedback. In manifesting the positive feedback, they accepted students’ responses as well as appreciated and praised them for their correct responses in both verbal and nonverbal ways. They said “okay,” “yeah,” “right,” “that’s true,” “thank you,” “thank you very much,” “that’s great,” and “very good” and then gave a round of applause. In addition, they repeated students’ responses and answered their questions comprehensively. Rido et al. (2014) claimed that accepting students’ response was done to build self-confidence and create interest in the lectures. Besides that, this strategy could foster participation as they felt acknowledged by the lecturers. Meanwhile, appreciating and praising student responses were another attempt to motivate students as their efforts and ideas were valued and respected. Burnett and Mandel (2010) asserted that this strategy could make students feel happy and proud, so they wanted to try harder. Next, repeating students’ response indicated the lecturers’ approval as well as emphasized that the students’ responses and standpoint were correct and good. This could also boost their confidence in expressing their thoughts. This was supported by Tabatabaei and

Banitalebi (2011) and Dabiri (2018), who claimed that repetition, was one of the most successful techniques to make students actively participate and improve their understanding. Moreover, it was also indicated that answering students' question helped the lecturers give more explanation and encourage them to initiate more questions during the lectures. According to Rahmat and Munir (2018), answering the questions from students helped the lecturers clarify and explain further something that was still unclear. To some extent, the findings of this study were relevant with Tabatabaei and Banitalebi (2011), Dabiri (2018), Shi (2013), and Rahmat and Munir (2018).

Conclusion

To conclude, all lecturers used negative and positive feedback during the lectures. These strategies were manifested by criticizing, accepting, appreciating, praising, and repeating students' responses and answering their questions. The use of feedback strategies during the lectures improves the students' language competence and literary knowledge, encourage them to actively engage during the lectures, and build the students' confidence in expressing their thoughts. Interestingly, most forms of feedback in this study consisted of the act of accepting, appreciating, praising, and repeating and not followed by the act of commenting on concepts or facts related to the students' responses. Thus, this study suggested that lecturers give additional comments that could keep learning longer than those with only accepting, appreciating, praising, and repeating.

Recommendation

This study has two implications, particularly for lecturers and students. First, the feedback strategies become essential and effective tools in the process of teaching and learning, especially in improving students' language competence, literary knowledge, and participation. Second, applying more positive feedback followed by additional comments during lectures could engage student's motivation and keep learning longer. Following the implications as stated, it is recommended that future researchers study feedback strategies that involve more lecturers from various disciplines such as science and engineering in the university context in different countries to get richer data from different perspectives.

Limitations

This study has some limitations; the researchers only used video recordings and involved three lecturers from one university in Indonesia. Thus, this study cannot be overgeneralized. Other researchers may follow up this study by triangulating results of video recordings, questionnaires, and interviews to get more holistic results.

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our highest gratitude to The National Research and Innovation Agency (BRIN) Republic of Indonesia and Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia for supporting this research. We would also like to extend our appreciation to all lecturers for allowing us to access their lectures and complete this research.

Funding

This research was supported by a grant from The National Research and Innovation Agency (BRIN) Republic of Indonesia and Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia.

Authorship Contribution Statement

Rido: Conceptualization, design, analysis/ interpretation, and writing. Prakoso: Conceptualization, editing/ reviewing, supervision, and securing funding. Kuswoyo: Admin, editing/ reviewing and supervision.

References

- Akbulut, H., & Vural, R. A. (2017). Drama in education as one of the opportunities of cross -cultural pedagogy. *Drama Research: International Journal of Drama in Education*, 8(1), 1–20. <https://bit.ly/3zg2qD5>
- Akpinar, M. (2018). Feedback strategies which social sciences teachers give to their students. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 6(6), 1317–1327. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2018.060623>
- Al-Bashir, M., Kabir, R., & Rahman, I. (2016). The value and effectiveness of feedback in improving students' learning and professionalizing teaching in higher education. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(16), 38–41. <https://bit.ly/3GJPqHk>
- Angelianawati, L. (2019). Using drama in EFL classroom. *Journal of English Teaching*, 5(2), 125. <https://doi.org/10.33541/jet.v5i2.1066>
- Brouillette, L. (2012). Advancing the speaking and listening skills of K-2 English language learners through creative drama. *TESOL Journal*, 3(1), 138–145. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.8>

- Burnett, P. C., & Mandel, V. (2010). Praise and feedback in the primary classroom: Teachers' and students' perspectives. *Australian Journal of Educational and Developmental Psychology*, 10, 145–154. <https://bit.ly/3mbVLLw>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Dabiri, A. (2018). A critical discourse analysis on teachers' verbal feedback patterns in EFL CLT classrooms. *Journal of English Educators Society*, 3(2), 129–140. <https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v3i2.1262>
- Dahal, B. (2016). Teachers' feedback strategies in students' mathematical activities and their achievement. In R. Koul & Y. Rahmawati (Eds.), *The Eighth International Conference on Science, Mathematics, Engineering and Technology Education* (pp. 47–54). Universitas Negeri Jakarta.
- DuFon, M. A. (2002). Video recording in ethnographic SLA research: Some issues of validity in data collection. *Language Learning and Technology*, 6(1), 40–59. <https://bit.ly/3xnpheF>
- Fard, S. F. (2016). A Short introduction to literary criticism. *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies*, 3, 328–337. <https://bit.ly/3NQnu71>
- Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2007). Input, interaction, and output in second language acquisition. In B. VanPatten & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction* (pp. 175–199). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gormally, C., Evans, M., & Brickman, P. (2014). Feedback about teaching in higher ed: Neglected opportunities to promote change. *CBE Life Sciences Education*, 13(2), 187–199. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.13-12-0235>
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
- Heyward, P. (2010). Emotional engagement through drama: Strategies to assist learning through role-play. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 22(2), 197–203. <https://bit.ly/3U4QsmF>
- Ibrahim Almohizea, N. (2018). An investigation of oral interaction in English as a foreign language classroom. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 6(3), 51–60. <https://doi.org/10.11648/jijll.20180603.11>
- Ilyas, H. P. (2016). Drama in the EFL classroom: Critical review of the literature. *Journal of ELT Research*, 1(2), 200–205. https://doi.org/10.22236/jer_Vol1Issue2
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31). John Benjamin. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.125.02jef>
- Kuswoyo, H., Sujatna, E. T. S., Indrayani, L. M., & Rido, A. (2020). Schematic structure and lexico-grammatical features of aerospace engineering English lectures: A systemic functional linguistic approach. *Asian EFL Journal*, 27(46), 171–203. <https://bit.ly/3MfRPLc>
- Kuswoyo, H., Sujatna, E. T. S., Indrayani, L. M., Rido, A., & Macdonald, D. (2021). 'Let's take a look...': An investigation of directives as negotiating interpersonal meaning in engineering lectures. *Pertanika Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 29(1), 47–69. <https://doi.org/10.47836/pjssh.29.1.03>
- Kuswoyo, H., Sujatna, E. T. S., Rido, A., & Indrayani, L. M. (2020). Theme choice and thematic progression of discussion section in engineering English lectures. *ACM International Conference Proceeding Series*, 50, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3452144.3452194>
- Mackey, A. (1999). Input, interaction, and second language development: An empirical study of question formation in ESL. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 21(4), 557–587. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263199004027>
- Maison, Hidayat, M., Kurniawan, D. A., Yolviansyah, F., Sandra, R. O., & Iqbal, M. (2022). How critical thinking skills influence misconception in electric field. *International Journal of Educational Methodology*, 8(2), 377–390. <https://doi.org/10.12973/ijem.8.2.377>
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. Jossey-Bass.
- Muhsin, A. (2016). The effectiveness of positive feedback in teaching speaking skill. *Lingua Cultura*, 10(1), 25–30. <https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v10i1.873>
- Nguyen, N. H. T., & Luu, N. T. T. (2022). Difficulties in listening of English-majored sophomores at Tay Do University in Vietnam. *European Journal of English Language Studies*, 2(1), 17–33. <https://doi.org/10.12973/ejels.2.1.17>
- Noor, N. M., Aman, I., Mustaffa, R., & Seong, T. K. (2010). Teacher's verbal feedback on students' response: A Malaysian ESL classroom discourse analysis. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 7(2), 398–405. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.10.054>

- Rahmat, A., & Munir, U. M. (2018). Teacher's verbal feedback in the classroom interaction. *Metathesis: Journal of English Language, Literature, and Teaching*, 2(1), 122. <https://doi.org/10.31002/metathesis.v2i1.632>
- Razavi, A., & Naghizadeh, M. (2014). Corrective feedback in speaking in relation to error types in Iranian EFL classrooms. *International Journal of Educational Investigations*, 1(1), 148–160. <https://bit.ly/3GKOW3E>
- Rido, A. (2017). What do you see here from this picture?: Questioning strategies of master teachers in Indonesian vocational English classrooms. *TEFLIN Journal*, 28(2), 193–211. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v28i2/193-211>
- Rido, A. (2018). Focus on teacher: Classroom interaction from different perspectives. In A. Rido, A. Y. Wahyudin, & I. Gulö (Eds.), *An overview of current issues in literature, linguistics, and language teaching* (pp. 1–12). Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia.
- Rido, A., Ibrahim, N., & Nambiar, R. M. K. (2014). Investigating EFL master teacher's classroom interaction strategies: A case study in Indonesian secondary vocational school. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 118, 420–424. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.02.057>
- Rido, A., Kuswoyo, H., & Ayu, R. (2020). Interaction management strategies in English literature lectures in Indonesian university setting. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics*, 5(2), 315–337. <https://doi.org/10.21462/ijefl.v5i2.286>
- Rido, A., Kuswoyo, H., & Nuansa, S. (2020). Questioning strategies in English literature lectures in an Indonesian university. *Lingua Cultura*, 14(2), 241–253. <https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v14i2.6834>
- Rido, A., Kuswoyo, H., Suryaningsih, A. S., Nuansa, S., Ayu, R., & Arivia, R. P. (2021). Repair strategies in English literature lectures in a university in Indonesia, Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia. *Teknosastik*, 19(1), 14–23. <https://doi.org/10.33365/ts.v19i1>
- Shi, D. (2013). Teacher-student interaction in novel and poetry classrooms in the Hong Kong tertiary setting. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(11), 1975–1982. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.3.11.1975-1982>
- Simpson, R., Lee, D., & Leicher, S. (2002). *MICASE manual: The Michigan corpus of academic spoken English*. English Language Institute, The University of Michigan. <https://cutt.ly/gNNmDUY>
- Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse*. University Press.
- Supakorn, S. (2020). A conversation analytic study of classroom interactional competence. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network Journal*, 13(2), 15–40.
- Tabatabaei, O., & Banitalebi, A. (2011). Feedback strategies in foreign language reading classes. *Asian Culture and History*, 3(2), 59–70. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ach.v3n2p59>
- Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203827826>
- Xuerong, F. (2012). Excellent English teachers' classroom strategies: A case study of three college English teachers in China. *Higher Education of Social Science*, 2(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/jm3s>