



ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK: WHAT DO STUDENTS PREFER AND WHY?

Candra Hadi Asmara, Prativi Khilyatul Auliya, Ribeh Najib Muhammad

*ribeh@umg.ac.id

Universitas Muhammadiyah Gresik, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Corrective feedback is crucial for students to improve their speaking skill. The feedback is as important as the way of delivering it to students. Lecturers need to acknowledge students' preferences on corrective feedback, so it will be useful for students' speaking improvement. This study aims at investigating (1) the amount of corrective feedback that students think most useful and its reason, (2) types of corrective feedback that students think most useful and its reason. This study utilizes mixed method. Both close-ended and open-ended questionnaire are used to gain the data. The result shows that students need the lecturer to mark all their errors during speaking. When lecturer marks all their error, they will remember the correction and will never repeat the same mistake in the future. Furthermore, students also need the lecturer to mark their mistakes every time they make it to avoid them making the same mistake on the other occasion. In this study, most students prefer explicit correction as the useful way that can be done by lecturer to deliver the corrective feedback. Students need lecturer to do that way to give feedback in term of grammar, pronunciation and vocabulary or word choice. Explicit correction is saving time since it does not need further explanation why a certain word's choice, word's pronunciation or grammar is incorrect. It is also efficient because lecturer does not need to wait for students to think about or to guess the right form of certain word's choice, word's pronunciation or grammar.

Keywords: Oral Corrective, Feedback, Students' Preference, Speaking Skill

INTRODUCTION

Speaking is one of productive skills used to convey ones' thought. To express their thought, speakers need to produce understandable and acceptable speech as it is a very essential skill in everyday life (Wörtwein et al., 2015). The speech should be clear on vocabularies, pronunciation, and grammar to avoid misunderstanding. That is why, to improve students' speaking ability in using English, teachers need to pay serious attention to students' speaking performance (Sutarsyah, 2017; Muhammad, 2019).

Since English's role is as a foreign language in Indonesia (EFL), Indonesian students need a lot of practices to be good at speaking. In teaching speaking, it is important for teachers to monitor students' progress and to give corrective feedback on their daily practice. Since it promotes students' interlanguage development and learning, corrective feedback has received a lot of attention in studies on teaching and learning (e.g., Chaudron, 1977; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Lyster & Saito, 2010; Sheen, 2004; Sheen, 2007; Sheen & Ellis, 2011). Due to the fact that this instructional technique fosters both language acquisition and linguistic accuracy, corrective feedback (CF) or error correction plays a crucial part in language teaching and learning (Ellis, 2009). This indicates that CF is viewed as a crucial component to assist pupils in enhancing their learning through self-correction (Sheen & Ellis, 2011).

*Corresponding Author
Ribeh Najib Muhammad
Email: ribeh@umg.ac.id

The term 'corrective feedback' refers to any teacher's reaction that purposely done to show the disapproval, transform, and request for the betterment of learners' utterance while speaking (Chaudron, 1977). According to this point of view, it is the responsibility of the teacher to help students correct their mistakes or provide them feedback on how well they are using the language. The teacher's response to a student's incorrect speech might be implicit, as in the case of confirmation questions, repetitions, recasts, requests for clarification, and even facial expressions, or explicit, as in the case of a grammatical explanation or excessive error correction (Carroll & Swain, 1993; Schachter, 1991). CF is reflected as information provided to learners regarding a linguistic blunder they have committed, in spite of these claims (Loewen, 2012; Sheen, 2007). Yoshida (2008) contrasts this by describing corrective feedback as a teacher correcting a student's incorrect oral performance.

However, it is common for language learners to unintentionally make mistakes (Edge, 1989; Hendrickson, 1978). Lexical, phonological, and syntactic faults are only a few of the several sorts of errors that can occur. When students make mistakes, it is important for them to receive feedback so that they can learn from their mistakes and prevent repeating them in the future. If this is not done, errors could get "fossilized," which would embed them in pupils' minds and prevent them from developing language competence.

Then, it is crucial to understand students' perceptions on corrective feedback. It is because when there is no connection among students' and teachers' perceptions of instructional effectiveness, students possibly suffer from discontent, and creates impaired learning on them (Brown, 2009; Schulz, 2001). However, this research focuses primarily on students' viewpoints, with fewer studies on students' opinions. Previous research has studied teachers' methods of corrective feedback on students' speaking skills. Particularly, the preferences of students for various forms of CF and their justifications for selecting particular forms of corrective feedback have not yet been investigated. In addition to examining students' preferences for various types and amounts of CF, this study also explains why their preferences are for that certain type.

Despite the fact that there are many different opinions on oral corrective feedback, it is generally accepted that it helps pupils improve their erroneous speech. The phrase "oral corrective feedback" refers, for the sake of this study, to any correction strategies used by the teacher to draw attention to or respond to students' incorrect statements by giving them the appropriate form based on their mistakes or giving them hints for self-correction. Six types of corrective feedback were mentioned by Tedick and Gortari (1998) in their study on error correction and its implications for classroom instruction: explicit correction, recast, clarification requests, metalinguistic clues, elicitation, and repetition. As indicated in Table 1, Sheen (2011) divided oral CF techniques into two groups: (1) right form is delivered, and (2) correct form is elicited.

Table 1: Types of Oral CF Strategies
(Based on Sheen, 2011; cited in Mendez & del Rosario Reyes, 2012)

Correct form is provided	Correct form is elicited
Recast	Repetition
Explicit correction	Elicitation
Explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation	Metalinguistic cue
	Clarification request

The details of oral corrective feedback types are described as follows;

1. Recast

Recast is defined as "a reformulation of the learner's incorrect speech that corrects the entire or part of the learner's utterance and is integrated in the ongoing conversation." Sheen (2011), page 2, mentioned in (Mendez & del Rosario Reyes Cruz, 2012: 65). It alludes to a teacher's implied correction of a student's incorrect speech. Without explicitly saying that the

student's statement is inaccurate, the teacher either delivers the remedy or implicitly reformulates the student's error. The recasting example is as follows:

Student (S): "He go to school by motorcycle."

Teacher (T): "Oh, he goes to school by motorcycle."

2. Explicit correction

The term "explicit correction" is used in the phrase "the explicit provision of the right form" (Lyster & Ranta, 1997: 46). It indicates that the teacher thoroughly discusses the student's error before providing the error's correct form. The teacher made it very apparent that the student is making false comments. Here is an illustration of the explicit correction:

S: "He go to school by motorcycle."

T: "It's not "he go" but "he goes."

3. Explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation

In explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation, teacher provides student with the correct form and comments on student's error. Teacher not only indicates and corrects the error but also provides the explanation related to the student's erroneous utterance. Here is the example of explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation:

S: "He go to school by motorcycle."

T: "He goes" not "he go." Because the subject is "he", you have to put the verb in singular form "goes" not "go".

4. Repetition

In repetition, teacher simply repeats the student's error and adjusts intonation to draw student's attention to the error. Here is the example of repetition:

S: "He go to school by motorcycle."

T: "He go?"

S: "He... uhm... He goes."

5. Elicitation

In elicitation, the teacher asks the students questions (such as, "How do we say that in French?"), pauses to let the students finish the teacher's utterance (such as, "It's a..") or asks the students to reformulate the utterance to get the correct form (e.g., "Say that again."). The following is an example of elicitation:

S: "He go to school by motorcycle"

T: "Say that again. He..."

S: "He goes to school by motorcycle"

6. Clarification request

Clarification request can be done by using phrases like "Excuse me?" or "I don't understand", "Excuse me?", "Sorry?", "Pardon me?" and many others. A repetition or reformulation is necessary, the teacher says, indicating that the message has not been understood or that the student's statement includes some sort of error. Here is an illustration of a clarification request:

S: "He go to school by motorcycle"

T: "Pardon?"

S: "He goes to school by motorcycle"

METHODS

This research used mixed-method as its research design. The quantitative method was used to solve the first research question which is related to the amount of corrective feedback. While qualitative method will be used to solve the second research question that deals with the types of corrective feedback.

This study was conducted at English Education Department of Teacher Training and Education Faculty in University of Muhammadiyah Gresik. The subjects of the study were the second semester students from both morning and evening class who are joining Intermediate Speaking class. There are 40 students in total.

Researchers used a written questionnaire to gather the data for this investigation. The purpose of study was to obtain the individuals' perspectives on the value of various types and amounts of CF as well as the factors that influenced their decisions. Closed-ended survey items with Likert scale formats were used to collect quantitative data. Qualitative data was gathered using open-ended questions to learn more about the specific reasons why students favor a particular sort or quantity of feedback. The participants' answers to the open-ended questions are allowed to express their preferences in their own terms. We developed, tested, and gave students access to parallel questionnaires.

An excel spreadsheet was used to record the survey replies. The frequency of replies on the surveys were determined for the quantitative data. The means of the participants' replies to the questionnaire's items with Likert scales were calculated. Explanatory responses from the participants were subjected to a qualitative examination. To do this, the participants' responses to the open-ended questions were compiled and arranged into themes.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Each student has their own preference toward corrective feedback which should be delivered by lecturer. Half of students (50%) stated that they liked best when lecturer marks all their errors while speaking. If lecturer did not mark all of the error, students would never know their mistake. It possibly made them repeat the same mistake without knowing that they produced it. On the other hand, when lecturer delivered feedback to all of their error, they would recognize it and would avoid the same mistake in the future. The more often lecturer gave feedback to students, the easier for students to remember the correct one.

Some other students (32.5%) argued that lecturer should mark most of major errors, but not necessarily all of them. Too much marking students error made them more worried to speak up. When students were worried to speak up because they were afraid of making mistakes, their speaking ability would decrease. That was why lecturer only needed to mark the major error on students such as content and ideas. It meant that content and ideas are two crucial aspects of speaking.

The above statement was supported by the other students (22.5%) who preferred that lecturer marked only the errors that interfere with communicating ideas. While five students (12.5%) liked when lecturer mark no errors and respond only to the ideas and content. The last four students (10%) said that lecturer should mark only a few of major errors. While no students stated that lecturer should mark all major errors but not the minor ones.

Related to the lecturer frequency on giving corrective feedback, most of students (85%) agreed that lecturer needed to do correction every time students made error. Students claimed when lecturer done the correction once, then did not do it again whenever students made the same mistake, it would make students repeat the same mistake for the second, third, and so on. However, when lecturer did correction every time students made mistake, students would be easier in correcting their mistake because it was already as habit. The rest of students (12.5%) were standing at the opposite place where they thought that lecturer no needed to give corrective feedback every time students made mistake because it would waste time.

Related to the grammar, more than half (57.5%) of the students stated that they liked better when lecturer clearly indicated their mistake and then provided the correct form. The

term of this kind of oral corrective feedback was explicit correction. On explicit correction, lecturer clearly indicating that the student's utterance was incorrect, then the lecturer provided the correct form. Take an example when a student said "*He go to school by bike*", then lecturer gave feedback to him by saying "*It's not 'he go' but 'he goes'*". When lecturer provided explicit correction for students, students could directly draw their attention to clear feedback. It was because lecturer not only mentioned the wrong part of speaking but also provided the correct form of it.

While around 17.5% of students indicated that they preferred metalinguistic clue as the corrective feedback from lecturer. In metalinguistic clue, lecturer posed questions or provided comments or information related to the formation of the student's utterance without providing the correct form. Students preferred this kind of corrective feedback because they felt that lecturer did not judge their mistake directly. Moreover, by posing question or comment, lecturer already gave the time for students to rethink about what they already produced. Students could try to find the correct form of a certain incorrect grammar by their selves.

The other 10% of students said that they preferred recast, in which lecturer implicitly reformulated the student's error, or provided the correction without directly indicating that the student's utterance was incorrect. Some students chose this kind of oral corrective feedback since it let them to recognize which part of their utterance that was wrong. It challenged students to compare between what the lecturer said and what they already said.

While three students (7.5%) stated that they preferred repetition in which lecturer repeated student's error and adjusted intonation to draw student's attention. The other 7.5% mentioned that they preferred elicitation. No one chose clarification request since it made students more confuse which part of their utterances that was wrong.

Related to pronunciation mistake, seventeen students (42.5%) agreed if lecturer gave explicit correction to them. By giving explicit correction, students no needed to try finding the correct pronunciation of the mistake. Moreover, students also knew the wrong part of utterances they made. It eased students to notice their mistake and it saved time to make a correction.

While 7 students (17.5%) said that they liked lecturer gave them metalinguistic clues when they produce wrong pronunciation. By given a clue, students would like to guess the right pronunciation. Moreover, students would try to memorize or recall the right pronunciation. By guessing and memorizing, students were easier to make better pronunciation later.

Another 7 students claimed that they preferred elicitation rather than the other kind of oral corrective feedback. It was because when lecturer elicited students to produce the correct pronunciation, students were given a chance to find the correct answer. When lecturer directly gave them the correct pronunciation of a certain word meant that students were not challenged to find the right answer by their selves. It made them easily forgetting on what already corrected by lecturer.

Five students (12.5%) said that they liked lecturer to repeat their mispronounced words in higher intonation. Repetition was really helpful for students to find the correct answer without wasting too much time like explaining. Repetition challenged students to find the correct answer in an easier way since the lecturer directly pointed out the wrong part by raising the tone of speaking. A few students (7.5%) claimed that they preferred recast. And one student preferred clarification request.

Words choice was another important part of speaking that needed attention. Some students (17.5%) needed the lecturer to give them corrective feedback by explaining that their word choice was not relevant to the content and then lecturer provided the best word choice. Most of students preferred this kind of oral corrective feedback because they did not need to make guessing on the appropriate word choice. So, it could save time while speaking.

In the same percentage (17.5%) students stated that they preferred metalinguistic clue in which lecturer provided comment or information without providing correct answer. Lecturer could explain that the word choice used by student was not relevant to the content. So that students could try to find the best word choice for a specific content. This kind of corrective feedback let students think by themselves to find correct answer.

The 10% of students preferred repetition. According to the students, repetition was not a scary thing in doing correction. It was not like the explicit correction in which lecturer directly pointed out the wrong words. Repetition also gave chance for students to think about the best word choice that appropriate in the context they are talking about.

Another 10% students liked clarification request. Some student chose this kind of corrective feedback because it gave chance for them to reformulate the correct form. Moreover, the implicit way in giving correction did not put students into the worst one in the class. While three students (7.5%) chose explicit correction as the way for lecturer to give corrective feedback. The rest of students (2%) preferred elicitation

CONCLUSION

Oral corrective feedback is really needed by students to improve their speaking skill. Students need lecturer to mark all their error during speaking. When lecturer marks all their error, they will remember the correction and will never repeat the same mistake in the future. Furthermore, students also need the lecturer to mark their mistakes every time they make it. Giving corrective feedback once students make mistake is not enough since there is possibility for them to make the same mistake on the other occasion.

Providing best way of delivering corrective feedback is as important as the feedback itself. It should be based on students' preferences. In this study most students prefer explicit correction as the useful way that can be done by lecturer to deliver the corrective feedback. Students need lecturer to do that way to give feedback in term of grammar, pronunciation and vocabulary or word choice. In explicit correction, lecturer clearly indicates the student's error and then provides the correct form of the error. By doing so, students could easily recognize their mistake and notice the correct one. Moreover, explicit correction is saving time since it does not need further explanation why a certain word's choice, word's pronunciation or grammar is incorrect. It also efficient because lecturer no need to wait for students to think about or to guess the right form of certain word's choice, word's pronunciation or grammar

REFERENCES

- Brown (2004). *Language Assessment principles and Classroom Practice*. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Brown. H. Douglas. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching Fifth Edition*. New York: Pears on Education, Inc.
- Brown. A. (2009). Students' and teachers' perceptions of effective foreign language teaching: A comparison of ideals. *Modern Language Journal*, 93, 46-60.
- Carroll, S., & Swain, M. (1993). Explicit and implicit negative feedback: An empirical study of the learning of linguistic generalization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15(3), 357-386.
- Chaudron, C. (1977). A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors. *Language Learning*, 27(1), 29-46.
- Edge, J. (1989). *Mistakes and correction*. New York: Longman.
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1), 3-18.

- Hendrickson, J. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent research and practice. *Modern Language Journal*, 62(8), 387-398.
- Loewen, S. (2012). The role of feedback. In A. Mackey & S. Gass (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp.24-40). Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37-66.
- Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 265-302.
- Mendez, E. H., & del Rosario Reyes Cruz, M. (2012). Teachers' perceptions about oral corrective feedback and their practice in EFL classrooms. *Profile Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 14(2), 63-75.
- Muhammad, R. N. (2019). Increasing Students' Awareness in Speaking Participation. *Journal of English Teaching, Literature, and Applied Linguistics*, 3(1).
- Schachter, J. (1991). Corrective feedback in historical perspective. *Second Language Research*, 7(2), 89-102.
- Schulz, R. A. (2001). Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA-Columbia. *Modern Language Journal*, 85,244-258.
- Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research*, 8(2), 263-300.
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effects of corrective feedback, language aptitude, and learner attitudes on the acquisition of English articles. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversation interaction in second language acquisition: A collection of empirical studies* (pp. 301-322). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sheen, Y. (2011). *Corrective feedback, individual differences and second language learning*. New York: Springer.
- Sheen, Y., & Ellis, R. (2011). Corrective feedback in language teaching. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. 2, pp. 593-610). New York: Routledge.
- Richards, Jack C. and Renandya, Willy A. (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sutarsyah, C. (2017). An analysis of student's speaking anxiety and its effect on speaking performance. *IJELTAL (Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics)*, 1(2), 143-152.
- 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>.

- Wörtwein, T., Chollet, M., Schauerte, B., Morency, L. P., Stiefelhagen, R., & Scherer, S. (2015). Multimodal public speaking performance assessment. In *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM on International Conference on Multimodal Interaction* (pp. 43-50).
- Yoshida, R. (2008). Learners' perceptions of corrective feedback in pair work. *Foreign Language Annals*, 41(3), 525-541.