Exposure

by Anita 3

ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN SPEAKING CLASS: ITS FREQUENCY, STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS, AND PREFERENCE

Anita Fatimatul Laeli[1], **Slamet Setiawan**[2]

[1]Universitas Muhammadiyah Jember, Indonesia
[2]Pascasarjana Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia
anitafatimatul@unmuhjember.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The objective of this quantitative study is to investigate kinds of corrective feedback used by the English lecturer in speaking class at the English Department in one of the private University in Jember. Further, this research also investigates how the students' perception and preference lying on their speaking proficiency toward the corrective feedback which is dominantly used by the lecturer. Based on the analysis taken from a questionnaire given to 30 students of the English Language Education department, it was found that (1) recast, repetition and clarification requests are commonly used in the class. In addition (2) according to the students' perceptions, repetition is the effective feedback that engages the students to improve their speaking skills. Last (3) the students prefer to get repetition and explicit correction as the feedback in the speaking class.

Keywords: *Oral Corrective Feedback, its frequency, Students' perception, Students' Preference*

INTRODUCTION

Promoting the students in developing oral proficiency skills in speaking class has always become the main concern in learning and teaching English as either a Foreign or second language classroom setting. Commonly, the activities design in speaking class mostly requires students to speak in front of the class. According to Harmer (1998), there are 3 key factors to ask the students to produce the language (speaking task) in the classroom, a) activities in speaking class mostly designed to practice real-life communication in the classroom; b) practicing speaking in the classroom will lead to get feedback from the teacher; c) the opportunities that lead the students to *implement* all different component in learning a language, will engage them to be more fluently in producing the language. In a classroom setting, it is very common for the students to make errors while practicing their oral productive skill. Teachers, instructor or lectures provide various methods or strategies to cope with the students' difficulties in speaking

class. One of them is by giving feedback on the students' incorrect utterance, grammatical errors, inappropriate vocabulary, etc.

According to Wiggins (2002) feedback occurs after a fact, and consists of the information we receive about how we are doing in the effort made to reach a certain goal. In addition, Neals (2015) states kinds of feedback are; oral feedback and written feedback; evaluative and descriptive feedback; informal and formal feedback; and peer and self-feedback. Commonly, teachers, instructors or lecturers provide oral feedback in speaking class. There different kinds of oral feedback, they are corrective feedback (R Lyster & Ranta, 1997) evaluative feedback (Gattalo, 2000) and descriptive feedback (Askew, 2000). commonly, teacher/lecturer use oral feedback in speaking class (Roy Lyster, Saito, & Sato, 2013).

Lightbown & Spada (2004) state there are two ways in conducting the corrective feedback in speaking class: (1) explicit corrective and (2) Implicit corrective. Explicit feedback is language teachers interrupt students' utterance by giving a metalinguistic explanation, on the contrary, Implicit corrective feedback is language teachers interrupt students' utterance by giving some language input with no metalinguistic explanation. According to Ellis (2009) implicit corrective feedback including *Recast, Repetition, and Clarification Request*. Beside, explicit corrective feedback is including *Explicit correction, Elicitation, and Paralinguistic signal*.

In brief, implementing oral corrective feedback in a speaking class can be done in various strategies. Reformulating the incorrect utterance into the correct one *(Recast)*, repeating the incorrect utterance by stressing the intonation to inform the incorrect one *(Repetition)*, asking clarification on the incorrect utterance *(Clarification Request)*, Explicitly correcting the incorrect utterance and provide the correct utterance *(Explicit Correction)*, repeating the part of the learner's correct sentence and ask them to continue the utterance by asking them to do self-correction, *(Elicitation)*, and giving signal using gesture to produce the correct utterance *(Paralinguistic Signal)*. The following are examples of various strategies of oral corrective feedback.

Recast:	*Std*	*: She goes to the cinema last night.*
	T	*: She **went** to the cinema last night*
	Std	*: She **went** to the cinema last night*
Repetition:	*Std*	*: We will washed the dish*
	T	*: we will **washed** the dish (giving strong intonation in the word washed)*
	Std	*: We will wash the dish*
Clarification Request:	*Std*	*: I am study in University*
	T	*: Pardon?*
	Std	*: I am a university students*
Explicit correction:	*Std*	*: On July*
	T	*: No, it's not on July. We use "in" before mentioning the month, we say "in July".*
	Std	*: in July*
Elicitation:	*Std*	*: My father is like fishing*
	T	*: My father is ....?*
	Std	*: My father likes fishing*
Paralinguistics Signal:	*Std*	*: Last week I visited my grandmother*
	T	*: (give a signal with gesture by moving the right hand over left side to indicate past*

Research in providing oral corrective feedback in speaking class still becomes an interesting issue to be investigated. A study on teachers' belief in defining oral corrective feedback was done by Kamiya (2018). Investigation on the students respond (uptake) of different gender toward oral corrective feedback used by lecturer (Amalia, Fauziati, & Marmanto, 2019). An investigation on oral corrective feedback used in different instructional setting (listening and speaking class) (Fan, 2019). Teacher attitude toward oral corrective feedback which integrates cognitive, affective and conative component in implementing different kinds of corrective feedback (Argüelles, Méndez, & Escudero, 2019). However, these previous studies have not cope with the issue of the students' perception and preferences in receiving oral corrective feedback by the lecturer. According to Hattie & Timperley (2007) feedback is will be more effective when it does not bring "high threats to self – esteem". Therefore, this study is proposed to

investigate kinds of oral corrective feedback frequently used by the lecturer and how the students' perception and preference toward the oral corrective feedback used frequently in the speaking class.

According to Hornby (2010), perception is an idea, a belief or an image you have as a result of how you see or understand something. Students' perception in this research is the students' opinion on the effectiveness of the application of the types of oral corrective feedback that the teacher/lecturer used in the speaking class. Hornby (2010) defines preference is a greater interest in or desire for something than something else. The focus of this present study is to know which type of feedback that the student likes to receive. It is important to know in order it can give beneficial information for the teacher so that the teacher can provide effective feedback for the students in the class. And further, the selected feedback helps the students to improve their speaking skills (Fan, 2019).

Generally, feedback that is given to the students must have a positive effect on the students' learning achievement. However, not all types of feedback affect the students positively; sometimes it is frustrating them and burden them in the learning process. As it supported by Spiller (2009) states that students might criticize that feedback on assessment is unhelpful or unclear and even sometimes distressing. Additionally, sometime students declare that the guidance on how to use feedback to improve following performance is not given to them.

Therefore, this present study assumes that it's important to investigate a) *types of oral corrective feedback* that frequently used by the lecturer; b) the *students' perception* toward how effective *oral corrective feedback* used by the lecturers; and c) *the students' preferences* in receiving *oral corrective feedback*.

METHOD

Kind of this research was qualitative research. Qualitative research was a form of social inquiry that focused on the way people interpreted and make sense of their experiences and the world in which they live (Atkinson, Coffey, & Delamont, 2001). Further, the qualitative design used in this research was a case study. A case study was an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon (the 'case') within its real-life context, especially when the

boundaries between phenomenon and context might not be evident (K.Yin, 2016). Participants of this research were 30 students of English Department Teacher Training and Education Faculty. They were from the 3rd semester and 5th semester. All the participants were taking speaking subjects; Responsive speaking for 3rd semester and argumentative speaking for the 5th semester.

Data for this research were collected through a questionnaire. The questionnaire was distributed to the students after they were taken midterm test. The participants were asked to answer some questions in their own words in the written form which was provided by the researcher (Heigham & Croker, 2009).

The data in this research were analyzed in the following steps; coding, analyzing and interpreting the data (Creswell, 2014). The types of Oral Corrective Feedback (*Recast, explicit correction, repetition, clarification request, elicitation, paralinguistic signal*) were coded to see which types of feedback frequently used by the lecturer. In the next step, the types of Corrective feedback used by the lecturer were analyzed to identify which types were effective based on the students' perception and which types of feedback the students prefer to receive during the speaking class. The last steps the data were interpreted by using theories and previous studies about the use of Oral corrective Feedback in speaking class.

RESULT

Frequency of oral Corrective Feedback

To get the first data in answering the research question number 1 (which types of Oral Corrective Feedback frequently used by the lecturer), the researcher used *the Likert scale*. In the item of the questionnaire, the students must select the frequency of the usage of each type of corrective feedback based on their experience. The frequency of usage is categorized into: 1 = never, 2= seldom, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, 5 = always (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2000).

Table 1. Recapitulation Frequency of Oral Corrective feedback

Category	Types of Corrective Feedback
Never	paralinguistic Signal
Seldom	Elicitation
Sometimes	Explicit Correction
Often	- Recast - Clarification Request
Always	Repetition

The result of the data shows paralinguistic signal never used in the class. Elicitation is the type that categorized seldom used by the lecturer. The students informed that explicit correction sometimes uses in the class. Then *types of oral corrective feedback* often use by the lecturer are recast and clarification requests. Then repetition is the type of oral corrective feedback that always use by the lecturer in the speaking class. Thus, oral corrective feedback that frequently uses (often and always) in the speaking class by the lecturer are recast, clarification request and repetition.

Students' Perceptions About How Effective The Types Of The Corrective Feedback Used By The Lecturer?

The second data was about the students' perceptions on which types of corrective feedback do they think it is effective to be used and help them in improving their speaking skill. The students were asked to select one type of oral corrective feedback out of the sixth types. Then they were asked to write their reason in selecting the types. From the data analysis, 11 students choose repetition, 7 students choose explicit correction, 6 students choose clarification request, 3 students choose recast and the other 3 students choose elicitation. In brief, most of the students choose repetition as effective oral corrective feedback that can help them.

Table 2. Recapitulation of Effective Oral Corrective Feedback Based on The students' Perception

No	Type of Corrective Feedback strategies	Person
1	Recast	3
2	Repetition	11
3	Clarification Request	6
4	Explicit Correction	7
5	Elicitation	3
6	Paralinguistic Signal	0

Regarding their reason in selecting repetition as the effective types in giving oral corrective feedback, the following are the students' reason:
1. The students think that they are given a chance to analyze and correct the incorrect utterance by themselves
2. It can help the students to have more attention to grammatical error
3. It can help them in analyzing their mistakes, especially grammar mistakes.
4. Students aware of the mistake and can directly correct the mistakes.
5. When the teacher repeats the students' incorrect utterance and put high intonation on the error, the students can analyze what is the correct utterance, word, or form.

Students' Preference in Receiving Types of Oral Corrective Feedback in Speaking Class

In this step, the students are asked to select one of the types of oral corrective feedback that according to the students preference. The result will be arranged from the smallest number to the largest choice.

Table 3. Students' Preference for Types of Oral Corrective Feedback

No	Type of Corrective Feedback strategies	Person
1	Paralinguistic Signal	0
2	Clarification Request	4
3	Recast	5
4	Elicitation	6
5	Repetition	8
6	Explicit Correction	8

Based on the table, it can be concluded that most of the students prefer repetition and explicit correction. Here are their reasons:
   a. Repetition

1. It can motivate them to remember what they have learned about speaking.
2. It can help them to do self - correction.
3. It built their confidence
4. It provides an opportunity to analyze the mistake and how to correct it.

b. Explicit correction
1. It helps the students to know the correct thing directly.
2. When the teacher helps the students to correct their mistakes directly, it helps them to remember what their mistake is and what the correct one is. So that they can easily remember for future performance.
3. The teacher gives more explanations on the mistakes.
4. It did not make them feel nervous.
5. The students think it is easier to be understood and motivate them to learn more to improve their speaking skills.

DISCUSSION

Three main issues are investigated in this research. The first is to know which *types of Oral Corrective Feedback* that commonly used by the lecturer to correct the students' mistakes in speaking class. It is known by analyzing the frequency of usage during the meeting in one semester according to the students' experience in the class. The oral corrective feedback that is investigated in this research are recast, Repetition, Clarification Request, Explicit Correction, Elicitation, and Paralinguistic Signal.

Based on the analysis, it was found that recast, repetition and clarification Request that are commonly used by the lecturer of English language Education for speaking class. According to Lyster & Ranta (1997) Recast is when teacher implicitly reformulates all or part of the student's; repetition: teacher repeats the student's ill-formed utterance, adjusting intonation to highlight the error; clarification request: teacher's request for further information from a student about a previous utterance. Besides, according to Ellis (2009) says that Recast is included to(implicit) input - providing, repetition is (implicit) output – prompting and clarification Request is (implicit) input – providing. Further, (Roy Lyster, Saito, & Sato (2013) conclude that recast is categorized as a reformulation strategy. Reformulation means the teacher supply the learners with the target non – target output. Then, repetition and clarification request is classified as a prompt

strategy. Prompt means a variety of signals other reformulation that push learners to self-repair.

In short, the lecturers tend to use implicit corrective feedback rather than explicit feedback. However, the advantages and disadvantages of the use of implicit feedback. The advantages are including this type does not disrupt the flow of the students' communication. Moreover, it does not invite the students' anxiety in practicing their speaking skills in the class. Besides, in applying implicit input, the teacher needs to carefully select the clues that can be easily understood by the students to be aware of their mistake and repair it by themselves. In addition, the lecturers consider the students' proficiency level because it related to their language proficiency to notice that they have made mistakes.

The second issue investigated in this research is to know the students' perceptions toward the corrective feedback used by the lecturer that is possible to engage them to improve their speaking skills. For the 6 types mention before, the students argue that repetition is an effective strategy that helps them to improve their speaking skills. In repetition, the lecturer repeats the students' utterances by giving high intonation to indicate the error made by the students. Also, this type provides an opportunity to make self-correction, in which they can analyze what was the error and find the correct utterance for the error. it is supported by Chu (2011) repetition is one type of feedback that can facilitate peer and self-repair. Further, he states that repetition helps second language learners by providing the students' opportunities to re-analyze their incorrect utterances.

The third issue investigated in this research is what types of feedback that the students prefer to receive out of the six types of corrective feedback in the speaking class. Based on the students' preference, repetition and explicit correction are mostly chosen by the student. If we analyze more, it could be a good combination to be chosen by the lecturer in giving oral feedback on students' oral performance, wherein repetition students are given some opportunities to make self-repair based on their knowledge about speaking. However, sometimes it will waste the time if the learners do not give fast responses and they are not aware of what the incorrect utterance is. So that, explicit correction can help them to directly know what is the correct utterance because in an explicit correction the

lecturer provides direct information what is the incorrect utterance and rephrase the correct utterance (Chu, 2011). Besides, an explicit correction will lead to uptake repair in which will lead the students to actively engage in the class (Amalia et al., 2019). Since the students that are involved in this research are heterogeneous from the high proficiency level and low proficiency level. Therefore, the lecturer must consider the students' language proficiency in selecting the types of corrective feedback. It has a high possibility to apply different types of corrective feedback in one class.

Above all, in determining feedback that will be used, it is important to consider the students' characteristics, the assignment that is given, and the classroom atmosphere, since there is no single solution for all students, all of the time (Fonsec, Carvalho, Conboy, Valente, & Gama, 2015). In addition, Hattie & Timperly (2007) feedback has the potential to have a significant effect on students' learning achievement. Further, they said that feedback is more effective when addresses achievable goals and when it does not carry "high threats to self – esteem". Therefore, it is important to know students' preferences for the types of feedback that will be given to them.

CONCLUSION

The result shows that there are three types of feedback that are commonly used by the teacher in speaking class, they are Recast, Repetition and Clarification request; in which repetition was dominant. According to the students' opinion, repetition is the effective feedback that can help them to improve their speaking. Most of the students prefer to have repetition and explicit correction than the other 4 types of oral corrective feedback.

SUGGESTION

In selecting the oral corrective feedback that will be given to the students, it is better to know the students' characteristics and the students' input knowledge in order for the feedback that is used to help the students to improve their speaking rather than burden them.

There are some limitations to this study. The researcher only takes the information based on the students' view, the researcher has not seen from the teachers' view. Then, this researcher still not analyze the students' opinion based on their level of proficiency, in which it is affected by the students' opinions given in this research. Moreover, this researcher is not categorized into specific types of classes for speaking subjects. In the English Language Education Department, there are four integrated subjects for speaking; they are guided speaking, responsive speaking, argumentative and productive speaking. In which, each subject has a different course learning outcome that relies on a different level of competencies, from elementary to advance. In addition, different lecturers teach those subjects. So, it is suggested to have the same research by focusing on students' level of proficiency and the lecturers' point of view in selecting the oral corrective feedback use in the class.

REFERENCES

Amalia, Z. D. H., Fauziati, E., & Marmanto, S. (2019). Male and female students' uptake in responding to oral corrective feedback. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, *9*(1), 107. https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v9i1.1047

Argüelles, L. G., Méndez, E. H., & Escudero, M. D. P. (2019). EFL teachers' attitudes towards oral corrective feedback: A case study. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, *21*(1), 107–120. https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v21n1.69508

Askew, S. (2000). *Feedback for Learning*. New York: Taylor and Francis Group.

Atkinson, P., Coffey, A., & Delamont, S. (2001). *Qualitative Research*. *1*(1), 5–21.

Chu, R. (2011). Effect of Teacher's Corrective Feedback on Accuracy in The Oral English of English- Major College Students. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *1*(5), 455–459.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research Methods in Education* (Fifth). London: Routledge Falmer.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Method Research Design* (Fourth). United States of America: Sage.

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development. *Journal for*

Foreign and Second Language Educators.

Fan, N. (2019). An Investigation of Oral Corrective Feedback in an ESL Listening and Speaking Class. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *10*(1), 197. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1001.22

Fonsec, J., Carvalho, C., Conboy, J., Valente, M., & Gama, A. (2015). Changing Teacher Teachers' Feedback Practices: A Workshop Challenge. *Australian Journal Teacher Education*, *40*(8).

Gattalo, F. (2000). Formative Assessment in ELT primary (Elementary) Classroom: An Italian Case Study. *Language Testing*, *17*(2), 278–288.

Harmer, J. (1998). *How To Teach English*. London: Wesley Longman Limited.

Hattie, J. ., & Timperley, H. (2007). The Power of Feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, (77), 81–112.

Heigham, J., & Croker, R. A. (2009). *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics; A Practical Introduction*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hornby, A. . (2010). *Oxford advanced Learners' Dictionary*. Oxford: University Press Ltd.

K.Yin, R. (2016). *Qualitative Research from Start to Finish* (Second). New York: The Guilford Press.

Kamiya, N. (2018). An analysis of the meaning of "natural" concerning oral corrective feedback. *Tesl-Ej*, *22*(1), 1–13.

Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (2004). *How Language Are Learned* (Second Edi). New York: Oxford University Press.

Lyster, R, & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake: Negotiation of Form in Communicative Classrooms. *Studied in Second Langauge Acquisition*, *19*, 37–66.

Lyster, Roy, Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral Corrective Feedback in Second Langauge Classroom. *Jounal Cambridge LAnguage Teaching*, *46*(1), 1–40.

Neals. (2015). *Types of Feedback*. State of Newsouth Wales: Department of Education and Communities.

Spiller, D. (2009). Assessment: Feedback to Promote Student Learning. *Teaching Development*.

Wiggins, G. (2002). *Assessment as Feedback*. New Horizons For Learning.

How to Cite (APA style):

Laeli, A. F., & Setiawan, S. (2019, November). Oral Corrective Feedback in Speaking Class: Its Frequency, Students' Perceptions, and Preference. *Exposure: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris,* *8*(2), 257. Retrieved from https://journal.unismuh.ac.id/index.php/exposure/issue/view/437

Exposure

Student Paper

<1%

10   studylib.es
      Internet Source

<1%

11   Submitted to Universitas Muhammadiyah Sinjai
      Student Paper

<1%

12   Submitted to Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University
      Student Paper

<1%

13   Seyyed Reza Mousavi Moghaddam, Fatemeh
      Behjat. "Overt-correction vs. Recasts and
      Grammar Performance of Iranian Male Learners
      of English", Journal of Language Teaching and
      Research, 2014
      Publication

<1%

14   Submitted to Leeds Beckett University
      Student Paper

<1%

15   sinta3.ristekdikti.go.id
      Internet Source

<1%

16   dergipark.org.tr
      Internet Source

<1%

17   digilib.uinsgd.ac.id
      Internet Source

<1%

18   www.wjeis.org
      Internet Source

<1%

19 repository.uin-suska.ac.id
Internet Source
<1%

20 Arief Eko Priyo Atmojo, Arif Nugroho. "EFL Classes Must Go Online! Teaching Activities and Challenges during COVID-19 Pandemic in Indonesia", Register Journal, 2020
Publication
<1%

21 doc.utwente.nl
Internet Source
<1%

22 revistas.uptc.edu.co
Internet Source
<1%

23 Nada H. Gamlo. "EFL Learners' Preferences of Corrective Feedback in Speaking Activities", World Journal of English Language, 2019
Publication
<1%

24 Submitted to Universitas Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa
Student Paper
<1%

25 Submitted to University of Southampton
Student Paper
<1%

26 e-journal.iain-palangkaraya.ac.id
Internet Source
<1%

27 repositorio.unab.cl
Internet Source
<1%

Saeideh Ahangari, Somayeh Amirzadeh.

28   "Exploring the Teachers' Use of Spoken Corrective Feedback in Teaching Iranian EFL Learners at Different Levels of Proficiency", Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2011

Publication

<1 %

Exclude quotes   Off   Exclude matches   Off
Exclude bibliography   Off