









ISBN 978-979-8559-97-6



The 9th International Conference on Educational Technology of Adi Buana

Future Education: Welcoming the Era of Exponential

CONFERENCE **PROCEEDINGS**

Graduate Program University of PGRI Adi Buana Surabaya

Best Western Papilio Hotel Surabaya, Indonesia 26 August 2017











ISBN 978-979-8559-97-6



Future Education: Welcoming the Era of Exponential

CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

Graduate Program University of PGRI Adi Buana Surabaya Best Western Papilio Hotel Surabaya, Indonesia

26 August 2017

The 9th International Conference on Educational Technology of Adi Buana (ICETA-9)

"Future Education: Welcoming the Era of Exponential"

© University of PGRI Adi Buana Surabaya ISBN 978-979-8559-97-6

Editors:

Prof. Dr. I Nyoman Degeng, M.Pd. (State University of Malang, Indonesia)

External Reviewer:

Prof. Dr. Abdul Jalil Othman (University of Malaya, Malaysia)

Prof. Dr. Vikash Kumar (Society for Education and Research Development, India)

Prof. Dr. Mustaji, M.Pd. (State University of Surabaya)

Prof. Dr. Ir. Achmadi Susilo, M.Pd. (University of Wijaya Kusuma, Surabaya)

Dr. Paul Hamadi (SEAMEO-SEAMOLEC, Papua New Guinea Branch)

Dr. Idris Asmaradhani, M.Pd. (IKIP Mataram, Indonesia)

Internal Reviewer:

Irfan Rifai, PhD
Dr. Nurmida Catherine, M.Pd
Dr. Yoso Winarno, M.Kes
University of PGRI Adi Buana Surabaya)
(University of PGRI Adi Buana Surabaya)

GRADUATE PROGRAM

University of PGRI Adi Buana Surabaya, Indonesia Jl. Dukuh Menanggal XII/4 Surabaya 60234,

INDONESIA Telp./Fax: +62 31 8273999

Website:http://www.pps-unipasby.ac.id



UNIVERSITY PRESS UNIPA SURABAYA

Published by:

FOREWORD FROM EDITOR

The 9th International Conference on Educational Technology of Adi Buana (ICETA-9) is the annual International conference held by the Graduate Program of University of PGRI Adi Buana Surabaya. This year's theme is *Future Education: Welcoming the Era of Exponential*. To accommodate the diverse topics, the conference theme is broken down into several sub-themes, namely: a) human performance technology, b) mobile, E-learning and online learning, c) theories and practices of open and distance education, d) diffusion and innovation of teaching in digital learning environment, e) assessment, measurement, and evaluation for learning, f) teacher careers in ICT era.

There is a great focus for this year's conference. First, the quality of the proceedings as a means of publication in this year's edition is improved. It is aimed at maximizing the value of publication as the outcome of the conference. In addition, as international proceedings, it is regulated that the language in the proceedings should use one of the five languages recommended by the United Nation (UN), one of them is English. Hence, in ICETA-9 all papers are written in English.

Second, the committee has applied the system for abstract selection of which the criteria is its consistence with the conference's theme. Reviewers have the right to select papers according to the criteria of the conference's themes. The suggestions to revise abstract are sent to the presenters whose asbtract are identified out of the conference's themes. Revision should be made in accordance with the conference's guidelines.

Third, the coverage of the sub-themes for this year's conference is quite broad. Bearing in mind that the main and solely theme of education is not limited to certain topics. This is aimed at accomodating the diverse research interests of the presenters. There are more than fourty five papers are selected and to be presented in two modes of presentation: parallel and poster presentation. The number of papers presented indicate the stability in the number of presenters and participants. It indicates that ICETA-9 is entrusted by the teachers, lecturers, and practitioners to be an academic forum to share their thoughts, reflections, and academic experiences.

Finally, we would like to deliver great appreciation to the organizers, presenters, writers, and all parties who have been contributing directly and indirectly to the publication of the proceedings.

Surabaya, August 2017

The Editor

Content

| | | Page |
|----------------------------------|---|------|
| Editor | | 1 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Presenters' paper | | 6 |
| Name of Presenter | Title of Paper | |
| Andini D. Arumsari, Bustomi | ENGLISH LEARNING METHOD FOR EARLY CHILD | |
| Arifin, Zulidyana D. Rusnalasari | EDUCATION IN SURABAYA | 6 |
| Asih Nurwahyuningsari, | THE DEVELOPMENT OF LEARNING DEVICES OF | |
| Iskandar Wiryokusumo, Djoko | REALISTIC MATHEMATICS WITH CONCEPT MAP IN | |
| Adi Walujo | TRIGONOMETRIC SUBJECT IN CLASS XI SMK NEGERI 1 | |
| | KEMLAGI ACADEMIC YEAR 2016/2017 | 12 |
| Atti Yudiernawati | THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COOPERATIVE LEARNING | |
| | (STAD) AND COGNITIVE STYLE TO IMPROVE | |
| | LEARNING ACHIEVEMENT OF NURSING CLINICAL | |
| | STUDY | 18 |
| Bernadetta Budi Lestari | DIGGING UP THE STUDENTS' ARTISTIC TALENT OF | |
| | HOME ECONOMICS 2013, MATHEMATICS 2010 AND | |
| | 2011, ENGLISH 2012, INDONESIAN 2012 THROUGH | |
| | BASIC SOCIAL AND CULTURAL SCIENCES COURSE | 26 |
| Demitra | IMPROVED MATHEMATICS CONCEPT MASTERY | |
| D: E :: | THROUGH HANDEP COOPERATIVE LEARNING MODEL | 29 |
| Diana Evawati | REVITALIZING THE ENTREPRENEURIAL LEARNING | |
| | PRODUCTION UNIT WITH THE APPLICATION OF THE | 25 |
| D: D : T : 0.1 | MODEL OF PBE | 35 |
| Dian Puspa Dewi, Tantra Sakre | ANALYSIS OF LEARNING FOR SPECIAL NEEDS | |
| | CHILDREN BASED ON GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR | |
| | INCLUSIVE EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS (ACCORDING TO PERMENDIKNAS NO 70 YEAR 2009) IN INCLUSIVE | |
| | EARLY CHILDHOOD LEVEL SURABAYA | 43 |
| Eko Aries Susanto, Rufi'i, | DEVELOPMENT OF WORKSHEETS FOR GRADE V WITH | 43 |
| Marianus Subandowo | OBJECTS IN THE SURROUNDING ENVIRONMENT | |
| Warianus Subandowo | THEME AND REALISTIC MATHEMATICAL APPROACH | |
| | FOR SDN 1 CERME KIDUL, CERME, GRESIK | 49 |
| Endah Yulia Rahayu | INDONESIAN ENGLISH LECTURERS' PERSPECTIVE | |
| | TOWARD PLAGIARISM | 59 |
| Endah Yulia Rahayu, Nunung | FEEDBACK STRATEGY IN TEACHING TRANSLATION | |
| Nurjati, Joesasono Oediarti | FOR EFL CLASSROOM: A CONCEPTUAL | |
| , | FRAMEWORK | 68 |
| Endah Yuliani, Hadi Suryanto | THE EFFECT OF PROBLEM BASE LEARNING METHODS | |
| | ON IMPROVING THE ACTIVITY AND RESULT OF | |
| | MICRO ECONOMIC | |
| | LEARNING | 74 |
| Fachrudy Asj'ari, Subakir, C.H. | THE ROLE OF SPIRITUAL INTELLIGENCE IN | |
| Menuk, I Made Bagus D. | ADVANCING EDUCATION IN THE CREATIVE | |
| | INDUSTRIES SECTOR | 80 |
| Ahmad Fachrurazi, Dian Puspa | PARENTING EDUCATION TO HELP | |
| Dewi, Ana Rafikayati | PARENTING SKILLS OF DEAF CHILDREN'S PARENTS | 88 |
| Fauridah, Nurmida Catherine | THE DEVELOPMENT OF TEXTBOOKS OF INDONESIAN | |
| Sitompul, Yoso Wiyarno | TEXT-BASED LANGUAGE TO INCREASE LITERACY OF | 02 |
| F D: 4 1 . | EIGHTH GRADE OF SMP AL HIKMAH SURABAYA | 93 |
| Ferra Dian Andanty | THE USE OF MOVIE FOR TEACHING ESSAY WRITING | 00 |
| Communication Communication | FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS | 99 |
| Gempur Santoso | RESCUE TO RESOURCES OF EDUCATIONAL INPUT | 104 |
| Hernawati, Achmad Noor | THE EFFECT OF LEARNING METHOD AND DIFFERENT | |
| Fatirul, I Wayan Arsana | EARLY SKILLS ON STUDENTS' ABILITY IN NUMERACY FOR KINDERGARDEN'S STUDENT | 107 |
| | | 107 |

| Hertiki | CREATIVE WAYS OF TEACHING BAHASA INDONESIA | |
|---|---|------------|
| | IN POLAND | 112 |
| Imas Srinana Wardani, Ida | MISCONCEPTION OF INTEGRATED LEARNING BY | |
| Sulistyawati | STUDENTS OF PGSD OF UNIPA SURABAYA | 119 |
| Imas Srinana Wardani, Triman | QUESTIONING SKILLS OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL | |
| Juniarso | TEACHERS OF CLASS V OF KETABANG STATE | |
| | ELEMENTARY SCHOOL OF SURABAYA | 124 |
| Indayani | ASSESSMENT IN INTERCULTURAL LANGUAGE AND | |
| | LITERATURE LEARNING | 129 |
| Joesasono Oediarti S. | LOCAL WISDOM AS FUNDAMENTAL KNOWLEDGE FOR | |
| | SHAPING STUDENTS' MORAL IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE | |
| | TEACHING TO FACE GLOBALIZATION | |
| | ERA | 135 |
| Muchamad Irvan, Muhammad | EARLY INTERVENTION FOR CHILDREN WITH AUTISM | |
| Nurrohman Jauhari | SPECTRUM DISORDER USING PLANNING | |
| | MATRIX | |
| | | 140 |
| Lutfi Isni Badiah, Cindy Asli | THE IMPORTANCE OF SELF-KNOWLEDGE FOR | |
| Pravesti, Maghfirotul Latifah | CHILDREN WITH VISUAL IMPAIRMENT | 145 |
| Meiti Leatemia | IMPLEMENTATION OF COOPERATIVE INTERGRATED | |
| | READING AND COMPOSITION (CIRC) IN IMPROVING | |
| | READING COMPREHENSION SKILL | 149 |
| Nenik Widhiyanti, Achmad | THE INFLUENCE OF LEARNING METHOD ON | |
| Noor Fatirul, I Wayan Arsana | READING ABILITY OF KINDERGARTEN STUDENTS | |
| | WITH DIFFERENT VERBAL LINGUISTIC ABILITY | 160 |
| Ninies Eryadini, Durrotun | THE EFFECT OF LEARNING STYLES ON CRITICAL | |
| Nafisah | THINKING SKILLS | 168 |
| Nurul Qomariyah | THE DEVELOPMENT OF SAINS GROWTH PLANTS | |
| | LEARNING MATERIAL USING DICK AND CAREY | |
| | MODEL TO THE STUDENTS GROUP B TK DHARMA | 4 = 4 |
| D | WANITA PERSATUAN 03 SOCAH BANGKALAN | 173 |
| Putri Gayatri | PROPOSING ONLINE INSTRUCTION AS PREREQUISITE | |
| | FOR AGRICULTURE STUDENTS, UNIVERSITY OF | |
| | BRAWIJAYA TO TAKE ENGLISH COURSE | 180 |
| Rahayu Pujiastuti, Luluk Isani | DEVELOPMENT OF LESSON PLANNING MATERIALS | |
| Kulup | THROUGH MODELING TO IMPROVE LEARNING | |
| | OUTCOMES OF STUDENTS OF INDONESIAN LANGUANGE AND LITERATURE EDUCATION OF | |
| | | 101 |
| Potro Danu Buomavyati Mada | UNIVERSITY OF PGRI ADI BUANA SURABAYA DEVELOPMENT OF ELECTRONIC LEARNING | 183 189 |
| Retno Danu Rusmawati, Made Duananda Kartika Degeng | DEVELOTIVIENT OF ELECTRONIC LEARNING | 103 |
| Rr. Laili Rizkiyah, Sugito, | PUBLIC LEARNING DEVICE DEVELOPMENT BASED ON | |
| Ki. Lain Kizkiyan, Sugito, | COOPERATIVE LEARNING TO IMPROVE SKILLS OF | |
| Harwanto | SCIENCE PROCESS OF GRADE VIII STUDENTS (A | |
| | STUDY AT SMP ALHIKMAH SURABAYA) | 193 |
| Septiana Agustin | ANALYSIS OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION BASED ON | 1). |
| Septiana Agustin | PERMENDIKNAS NUMBER 70 YEAR 2009 | 200 |
| Setyo Purwoto, Joko Sutrisno | LEARNING ABOUT WATER PURIFICATION USING | 200 |
| Setyo I di woto, joko Satrisno | FILTRATION AND REVERSE OSMOSIS | 205 |
| Suharti | OPTIMIZATION OF MAIN TASKS AND FUNCTION | 200 |
| Sullarti | SUPERVISORY TO INCREASE THE QUALITY OF | |
| | EDUCATION LEARNING IN SMPN 2 GEDANGAN | |
| | SIDOARIO DISTRICT | 212 |
| Suhartono, Atnuri, | IDENTIFICATION OF DIFFICULTIES FACED BY CIVICS | 212 |
| Achamad Busrotun Nufus | TEACHERS OF SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS IN SAWAHAN | |
| Acnamad busrotun Nurus | DISTRICT SURABAYA CITY IN IMPLEMENTING | |
| | INNOVATIVE LEARNING STRATEGY | 219 |
| Supeno | YOUNG CHILDREN AND SMARTPHONES: | -1. |
| | A SERIOUS ISSUE | 223 |
| Titah Kinasih, Siyaswati | LEARNING LANGUAGE CONSTRUCTION IN THE | |
| Timi Rimoni, Olydowau | FAMOUS BRANDS SLOGANS | 232 |
| Via Yustitia | THE MATHEMATICS REASONING ABILITY OF PGSD | _02 |
| | STUDENTS THROUGH REALISTICS MATHEMATICS | |
| | EDUCATION (RME) APPROACH | 238 |
| | | |

| Villyasari Purworini, Nurmida | THE DEVELOPMENT OF ENGLISH INSTRUCTIONAL | |
|-------------------------------|--|-----|
| Catherine Sitompul, Yoso | MATERIAL FOR EIGHTH GRADE OF SMP AL HIKMAH | |
| Wiyarno | SURABAYA | 242 |
| Vony F.S Hartini Hippj | IMPLEMENTATION OF DIRECT INSTRUCTION ON | |
| | MAKING PROPORTIONAL PAES IN INDONESIAN | |
| | BRANCH OF JOGJA | 249 |
| Wahju Bandjarjani, Endang | UNRAVELLING TEACHERS' CONFUSION ABOUT THE | |
| Mastuti Rahayu, Dyah | CHANGING TERMINOLOGIES IN TEACHING - | |
| Rochmawati | LEARNING STEPS | 253 |
| Yayuk Chayatun Machsunah | PROBLEM BASED LEARNING (PBL) ON | |
| | ENTERPRENEURSHIP COURSES OF SOCIAL SCIENCES | |
| | EDUCATION DEPARTMENT OF STKIP PGRI | |
| | LAMONGAN | 259 |
| Yuniar Poerbandini, Nurmida | THE DEVELOPMENT OF CLASSICAL AND | |
| Catherine Sitompul, Yoso | COUNSELING SERVICE BOOK FOR 9TH GRADE YUNIOR | |
| Wiyarno | HIGH SCHOOL | 264 |
| Zainal Arifin | THE EFFECT OF JIGSAW OF COOPERATIVE LEARNING | |
| | METHOD AND QUANTUM LEARNING WITH | |
| | DIFFERENT LEARNING STYLES ON STUDENTS' | |
| | ACHIEVEMENT IN MATHEMATICS FOR VIII GRADERS | |
| | OF SMPN 2 KAMAL | 272 |
| | | |

FEEDBACK STRATEGY IN TEACHING TRANSLATION FOR EFL CLASSROOM: A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Endah Yulia Rahayu

Universitas PGRI Adi Buana Surabaya indahr 99@yahoo.com

Nunung Nurjati

Universitas PGRI Adi Buana Surabaya nunung.nurjati@unipasby.ac.id

Joesasono Oediarti

Universitas PGRI Adi Buana Surabaya joesa os@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Feedback as an evaluation of learning in teaching translation plays important role as the basis for improvement in translation result. From feedback the learners are encouraged to reflect and learn from their current works. Subsequently, the translation result is expected to be better. Feedback according to level, written feedback, and group feedback are various feedback strategies that can be applied in translation classes. This paper aims at explaining conceptual framework each type of feedback strategy implemented in the EFL classrooms which in turn is expected to improve the translation result of learner's pieces of work. This paper also clarifies among the types of feedback strategies that have the effect of improving translation outcomes. To strengthen the elaboration of the concept of feedback strategies, the results of the relevant of previous studies will also be elaborated. At the end, the conclusion of the elaboration of the concept of feedback strategy can serve as the theoretical basis of future research in teaching translation to improve translation result in EFL classrooms.

Key words: feedback strategy, translation result, teaching translation, EFL classroom

INTRODUCTION

Therefore it should be enhanced in ELT classrooms by evaluating the students' works. Feedback in teaching translation should encourage and fasten learning translation in order to improve the quality of translation works. In translation classroom, teachers definitely should do to provide translation tasks and as a response the students should have to do the translation work. As in return the teacher should give their translations feedback for evaluation. As Shore (2001) examines that translation projects are evaluated by the teacher and then given back to students as feedback. This action could be of an obligation for teachers; it sometimes takes place during the teacher's working time (ibid). This is a form of teacher-student communication where the teacher actually gives some feedback, but simply in a written form of varying features and usefulness; consequently a claim could commence that such a procedure actually presents effective and incorporated feedback.

In this paper, some strategies are exposed. These strategies should be applied based on the students' purpose and learning objective designed by translation lecturers. Since there is no best strategy to be applied in the classroom, teachers need to know well the weakness and strength of each of strategy to meet the need of their translation class. This paper gives some insight to them how the latest research of the strategies applied in translation classroom in ELT context. These notions can be the theoretical framework for the next study in teaching translation to produce future translation with high quality.

The importance of feedback strategy in translation classroom

As part of teaching tools, feedback is seen as a strategic way in teaching process. It displays the existence of teacher-students communication. When teachers give the assignments to the students and they hand in the final work of the assignment, it shows that at both ends of the sides the communication has been built then when feedback is given by the teachers it means that both ends have been bridged. In term of communication between teacher and student, it is agreed that feedback bears the important component in teaching. Brookhart (2008: 2) affirms that feedback can function as a formative assessment. Formative assessment gives information to teachers and students about how students are doing relative to classroom learning goals. Other formative assessment includes designing clear learning targets, lessons and assignments that corresponds those targets to students. After giving good feedback, the students learn how to formulate new goals for themselves and action plans that will lead to achievement of those goals.

Feedback can be very useful if it is conducted correctly. The usefulness of formative feedback situated in its two-side purposes, addressing both cognitive and motivational factors at the same time. Good feedback gives students information they need so they can understand where they are in their learning and what to do next; the cognitive factor. Once they feel they understand what to do and why, most students develop a feeling that they have control over their own learning; the motivational factor (ibid, p. 3). Good feedback contains information that a student can use, which means that the student has to be able to hear and understand it. Students can't hear something that's beyond their comprehension; nor can they hear something if they are not listening or are feeling like it would be useless to listen. Good feedback should be part of a classroom assessment environment in which students see constructive criticism as a good thing and understand that learning cannot take place without practice. If the classroom culture values finding and using suggestions for improvement, students will be able to use feedback, plan and execute steps for improvement, and in the long run attain better than they could if they were trapped with assignments on which they could already get a good result without any new learning.

In translation classroom, feedback is used for its role to be part of translation activity. This is meant to give the foreground especially for the beginners to cover up what should be paid attention to the elements in language which should be transferred to the target language (Colina, 2003: 70-71). Those elements such as pragmatic, functional and textual consideration are to guide the students through the translation process rather than presenting them with traditional instruction and to help them to provide the relevant information (Shreve, 1997). Further, feedback can also be conducted as the apparatus of acquiring translation competence (Colina, 2013: 71) in a gradual and slow process through which the students must be guided. As for the teachers, feedback allows the teachers focus on particular aspects of translation competence that have been identified earlier, for example, teachers can give feedback on textual features to bring the students' attention to how this issues bear on translation process (ibid).

Thus, feedback strategy in teaching translation should be encouraged for: 1) the need to emphasize translation as a process: students should get feedback from their teachers to be aware their own fallacy in translation skill, 2) the need to develop the student's self awareness and self concept: the awareness can build professionalism, and 3) the students in translation classroom often face problems in identifying the obstacle and recognizing the weak points in their translations. The possible causes have to do with limits on the processing capabilities. Feedback helps students focus on translation problem that may have gone overlooked due to the lack of translation competence.

Previous studies in feedback strategy in teaching

More recently, scholars have tried to conduct research on feedback that has accumulated over the influencing for many years, what makes some feedback effective and some ineffective (Seguinot,1991; Tedick and Gortari,1998; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Kluger & DeNisi, 1996). Other researchers have concentrated on describing the characteristics of effective feedback (Johnson, 2004; Piertrzak, 2014). Educational theorists no longer explain learning with behaviorist theories about stimulus-response connections. More recent studies recognize the role of the student in the feedback process. They study the kind of feedback given and the context in which it was presented. What we now realize is that the message sent is filtered through the student's perception

(influenced by prior knowledge, experiences, and motivation) as it becomes the message received. The student's job is to make meaning from schoolwork, not to respond to stimuli.

Hattie and Timperley (2007) propose a model of feedback that distinguishes four levels: (1) feedback about the task (such as feedback about whether answers were right or wrong or directions to get more information), (2) feedback about the processing of the task (such as feedback about strategies used or strategies that could be used), (3) feedback about self-regulation (such as feedback about student self-evaluation or self-confidence), and (4) feedback about the student as a person (such as pronouncements that a student is "good" or "smart"). The level at which the feedback is focused influences its effectiveness. Feedback about the qualities of the work and feedback about the process or strategies used to do the work are most helpful. Feedback that draws students' attention to their self-regulation strategies or their abilities as learners can be effective if students hear it in a way that makes them realize they will get the results they want if they expend effort and attention.

Rezaei, S and Derakhshan, A. (2011) share the result of their study on recast and metalinguistic feedback strategy which their study was considered to be useful in methodological issues related to error correction techniques and teacher educators training pre-service or in-service teacher.

Kinds of feedback strategy in EFL classroom

Several authors have offered different kind of feedback strategy in EFL classroom. Those strategies are employed in different situation.

Tedick and Gortari (1998) identified corrective feedback which covers the followings:

- 1. Explicit correction. Clearly indicating that the student's utterance was incorrect, the teacher provides the correct form.
- 2. Recast. Without directly indicating that the student's utterance was incorrect, the teacher implicitly reformulates the student's error, or provides the correction.
- 3. Clarification request. By using phrases like "Excuse me?" or "I don't understand," the teacher indicates that the message has not been understood or that the student's utterance contained some kind of mistake and that a repetition or a reformulation is required.
- 4. Metalinguistic clues. Without providing the correct form, the teacher poses questions or provides comments or information related to the formation of the student's utterance (for example, "Do we say it like that?" "That's not how you say it in French," and "Is it feminine?").
- 5. Elicitation. The teacher directly elicits the correct form from the student by asking questions (e.g., "How do we say that in French?"), by pausing to allow the student to complete the teacher's utterance or by asking students to reformulate the utterance (e.g., "Say that again."). Elicitation questions differ from questions that are defined as metalinguistic clues in that they require more than a yes/no response.
- 6. Repetition. The teacher repeats the student's error and adjusts intonation to draw student's attention to it.

Hattie and Timperley (2007) distinguish four levels of feedback:

- 1. Feedback about the task
- 2. Feedback about the processing of the task
- 3. Feedback about self-regulation
- 4. Feedback about the self as a person

Feedback about the task includes information about errors—whether something is correct or incorrect. Feedback about the task also includes information about the depth or quality of the work, often against criteria that are either explicit (for example, criteria from a scoring rubric) or implicit in the assignment (for example, a written assignment should be well written). Feedback about the task may include a need for more information (for example, "You should include more information about the First Continental Congress in this report"). Feedback about the task can also include information about neatness or format.

Feedback about process gives students information about how they approached the task, information about the relationship between what they did and the quality of their performance, and information about possible alternative strategies that would also be useful. Some successful learners are able to translate feedback about the task into feedback about the process. Feedback about processes shows students the connections between what they did and the results they got. Simple knowledge of test results is task-related feedback. To extend it into feedback about the

learning process, have students figure out the reasons for the error for each item they got wrong. This simple exercise can be done individually. Help students see that careless errors (like marking the wrong choice even though they knew the right choice) imply that being more careful and taking more time might be good strategies for improvement. Errors about facts or concepts imply that studying longer or differently might be helpful. Trying to classify what kinds of facts or concepts were particularly problematic can help students "study smarter, not harder" by focusing on the trouble spots.

Self-regulation is the process students use to monitor and control their own learning. Self-regulation can lead to students seeking, accepting, and acting on feedback information—or not. Effective learners create internal routines that include figuring out when they need more information, or an assessment or suggestions, and strategies for getting this feedback. Less effective learners depend more on external factors, such as whether the teacher decides to give any feedback on this or that assignment, for their information. Students are more willing to expend effort in getting and dealing with feedback if they have confidence in themselves as learners, called self-efficacy, and confidence that the information will be useful and thus worth the effort. Therefore, feedback about self-regulation is effective to the degree that it enhances self-efficacy.

Applying feedback strategy in translation classroom

Translation classroom is actually a form of translation in practice. The kinds of written feedback claimed by Brookhart (2008) are: 1) clarity, 2) specificity, and 3) tone.

Clarity is important; students need to understand the feedback information as you intend it. Students have different vocabularies and different backgrounds and experiences. The criterion for clarity is whether the writing or speech would be clear to the individual student.

Specificity is to make your feedback is a matter of the suited principle: not too narrow, not too broad, but just right. I had given back an extensive paper to a student at the end of one marking period. I had read it with "pen in hand" and had almost absent-mindedly corrected all his mechanical errors. The class had an opportunity to redo these papers for credit, and he did—but all he did was make the editing changes I had marked for him. It annoyed me to give him credit for work that I had done, but he did make changes, and I had not written any other, more substantive things on his work. So I couldn't claim there was anything else I had asked him to do, and for about 10 minutes' worth of correction work, he "revised" a major project. I won't do that again! The feedback I provided was definitely too narrow. The moral of this sad little fable is this: go for conceptual feedback.

Tone refers to the expressive quality of the feedback message, and it affects how the message will be "heard." The tone of a message is conveyed by word choice and style. They communicate underlying assumption about the students. Tone can inspire or discourage. It's important to choose words that imply that students are agents, active learners.

In his attempt to define constructive feedback, Dollerup (1994: 125) distinguishes three components of feedback; these comprise corrections in the translations submitted by the students, an oral discussion in class covering adequate as well as inadequate renditions and finally a feedback form, assessing strengths and weaknesses with each student. Indeed, to ensure that the feedback is effective, it should be individualized, geared towards the student's particular needs; but is oral discussion the best way of analysis and are written comments left by the trainer enough? Should translation teachers' work be based on the belief that those who are left with a short commentary willingly give some consideration to the teacher's annotations? Or that they are conscientious and inquisitive enough to probe more deeply into the issues during the teacher's office hours and indeed get to know what and why they did wrong? Or that, having discussed it during the office hours, they come to fully comprehend the reasons for their mistakes and memorize what to improve and what to avoid next time when they translate?

While Piertrzak (2014) offers: group of feedback and focus group of feedback. Group feedback is therefore a form of translation practice where students not only join forces but are also allowed to react and improve the analysed translations - acting as if they were in a position of a teacher or a client. Therefore, group feedback aims not at assessing and marking but rather at revising and editing, which better represents the actual job context and what the response of a client could be. 1) focus group of feedback practice, 2) organization group of feedback practice The reason to focus on revising and editing skills is a survey undertaken by Mucha (2013) under the author's supervision. It was conducted among three groups of respondents represented by translation students, translation

teachers and translation agencies with a view to investigating how translation competence is seen in the Polish translation market. The results showed that proofreading is understood as a crucial subcompetence of translators since the ability to edit text was valued highly by all the three groups.

Having chosen the area to focus on, the organization of group feedback provision should be resolved. The crucial question that needs to be answered concerns the form and material for such group feedback. First, the problematic fragment of a student's translation as well as the way of presenting it for discussion must be decided on. The fragment can be read aloud by the teacher, spotted by the students, stopped at when a student is reading the whole text, suggested by the students on the basis of the comments written on their assignments (if the teacher decides to hand them out before the discussion), presented to the group by means of a chosen assignment of one or two students xerocopied or displayed to the group, or arranged in other possible manners.

Regardless of how many types of feedback strategies are proposed, there is always a risk that the chosen strategy does not always have the best impact in line with its learning objectives. For example, in his study of student evaluation reports, Kenny (2010: 110) notes that a large number of student comments fall into the so-called 'other' category in the study. The group produced comments that were considered too harsh by the study instructor or left the problem text unchanged. However, it is worth stressing that Kenny investigated the results of group evaluation activities in an online translation training module in which students participated in private discussion conferences set up so that each group could share files and discuss the task. Such problems can be eliminated by the presence of the instructor in the proposed procedure for feedback as they manage the discussion and control whether the specified criteria are followed without problems.

CONCLUSION

The teaching process is presented only as a conduct in classroom; However, after applying this way to propose feedback to students in the translation classrooms, the authors can prove the benefits it provides to students and their appreciation. While it goes beyond the scope of this article to prove the value of such feedback procedures in such an appropriate way, it should be observed that the participation and active contribution of students, the task of translation becomes a more holistic practice. Not only provide a framework for organizing translation classes but also help students practice together. In this way they gain access to 'performance models' (Shreve 2002) and pass with apparatus for quality management. After obtaining various criteria for revision and evaluation to assess their own work, translation students are ready to polish their future translations to perfection so they can manage without commenting their translation teacher and fighting for themselves in their future careers. If possible, then in their skillful performance, they can supply the feedback they demand which is one of the most important translation tools.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The paper is part of the outcome for grant that is funded by Dikti in the scheme for Grant of Young Lecturer. Gratitude should be delivered to Ministry of Research and Technology and Higher and Education. This research can be conducted by its grant with contract number of 055.4.2/LPPM/VII/2017 dated on July, 2017.

REFERENCES

Brookhart, S. (2008) How to Give Effective Feedback to your Students. Alexandria-Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. www.ascd.or/membersbook

Colina, S. (2003). Teaching Translation: From Research to the Classroom. A Handbook for Teachers. Dollerup, C. (1994) "Systematic Feedback in Translation Teaching" in Teaching Translation and Interpreting 2, Cay Dollerup and Anne Lindegaard (eds), Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 21–132.

Kenny, M. A. (2010) "The Impact of Task Design on Small-group Interaction in an Online Translation Exercise Classroom" in Teaching and Testing Interpreting and Translating, Valerie Pellatt, Kate Griffiths and Shao-Chuan Wu, Bern, Peter Lang, 97–114.

Kim, M. (2009) "Meaning-oriented Assessment of Translations: SFL and its Application to Formative Assessment" in Testing and Assessment in Translation and Interpreting Studies,

- Claudia V. Angelelli and Holly E. Jocobson (eds), Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 123–58.
- McAlester, G. (1992) "Teaching Translation into a Foreign Language: Status, Scope and Aims" in Teaching Translation and Interpreting: Training, Talent, and Experience, Cay Dollerup and Anne Lindegaard (eds), Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 291–98.
- Mossop, B. (2001) Revising and Editing for Translators, Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Nida, E. (1964) Towards a Science of Translating, Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Nida, E. and Taber, C. (1982) The Theory and Practice of Translation, Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Rezaei, S and Derakhshan, A. (2011). Investigating Recast and Metalinguistic Feedback in Taskbased Grammar Instruction.
- Savory, T. (1968) The Art of Translation. Boston: The Writer.
- Seguinot, C. (1991) "A Study of Student Translation Strategies" in Empirical Studies in Translation and Intercultural Studies, Sonja Tirkkonen (ed.), Tubingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 79-88.
- Shreve, G. M. (1997) "Cognition and the evolution of translation competence" in Cognitive processes in translation and interpreting, J. H. Danks, G. M. Shreve, S. B. Fountain, and M. K. McBeath (eds.), London/New Delhi: Sage, 120–36.
- Shreve, G. M. (2002) "Knowing Translation: cognitive and experiential aspects of translation expertise from the perspective of expertise studies" in Translation Studies. Perspectives on an Emerging Discipline, Alessandra Riccardi (ed.), Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 150–71.
- Shore, S. (2001) "Teaching Translation" in Exploring Translation and Multilingual Text Production: Beyond Content, Erich Steiner and Collin Yallop (eds), Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 249–76
- Tedick, D. and Gortari, B. (1998). Research on Error Correction and Implications for Classroom Teaching. The Bridge, ACIE Newsletter. Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota, v1. [Online] http://www.carla.umn.edu/immersion/acie/vol1/May1998.pdf
- Toury, G. (1995) Descriptive Translation Studies- and Beyond, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

BIODATA

