

The Urgency of Oral Corrective Feedback in English Language Teaching: Students and Teachers' Perception

Eulis Rahmawati
UIN SMH Banten
eulis.rahmawati@uinbanten.ac.id

Abstract

Oral corrective feedback plays a significant role that cannot be ignored in second and foreign language learning. The objectives of the research is to reveal the urgency of oral corrective feedback in the English instruction. It further aims at providing guidance toward English instruction practice at secondary school. This research provides a clear description of feedback on English language teaching, especially how teachers give feedback and how students perceive and interpret the feedback given. The research was conducted in one of secondary schools in Kota Serang. In relation to this, the respondents of the research are English teachers and students at the second grade of secondary school. The data were collected through observation, interview, and questionnaire. It was found that the teacher gave oral corrective feedback immediately and delayed depend on the situation, focus on certain topics and collaboratively. The results revealed that students generally have good perception of oral corrective feedback. They like to be corrected when they made a mistake

Keywords: English Language Teaching, Teaching and learning process, Corrective feedback.

A. Introduction

In learning a foreign language, making error is an indispensable part of learning process. Error is typically produced by learner who do not yet fully command some institutionalized language system. But Zhu views errors as evidence of the learner's positive contribution to foreign language learning rather than as a sign of learner's inability to master the new language as many teachers view this. It is a common thing that errors occur regularly, especially among younger learners.

What common in the process of English teaching and learning is that many students make mistake and error when they learn foreign language in the classroom or outside the classroom. Thus, students need feedback to help them noticing their mistake and error (Cohen, 1999; Dunsford, 2006).. Most common name for this feedback is corrective feedback.

Oral corrective feedback plays a significant role that cannot be ignored in second and foreign language learning. In the school, teacher as an educator in classroom takes crucial role to

help students by giving suitable and appropriate feedback. Mollestam and Hu in their study stated that corrective feedback helps students to improve their learning but if corrective feedback is inappropriate, it may cause low motivation and some students could lose motivation (Santrock, 2011; Cardelle&Corno 1981). However, to most language teachers, giving feedback to students is one of the most difficult job for them to fulfill, especially there are a lot things one has to keep in mind while correcting. As a result teachers decide by themselves the way of feedback is provided (Ellis, 2009).

In 1997, Lyster and Ranta developed a model of an observational scheme which allow researcher to observe different types of feedback that teachers give on errors and also examine student's uptake. The observational scheme by Lyster and Ranta (1997) was developed by combining some categories from Part B of the COLT (Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching) scheme and some additional categories. From this study, they identified six different types of corrective feedback. Thus, teacher can respond to student's erroneous utterance 'She has car' by: reformulating it (recast): 'A car'; warning the learner to the error and providing the correct form (explicit correction): 'No, you should say "a car"'; asking for clarification (clarification request): 'Sorry?'; making a metalinguistic comment (metalinguistic feedback): 'You need an indefinite article'; eliciting the correct form (elicitation): 'She has ...?'; or repeating the wrong sentence (repetition): 'She has car?'

During two decades following their research, Lyster and Ranta's model of observational scheme has encouraged many researchers to investigate the issue of corrective feedback in various contexts of teaching and learning interaction by using Lyster and Ranta's (1997) model (cf. Lyster, 1998; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Sheen, 2004). Some others were concerned with corrective feedback patterns and students' uptake in classrooms with various learners' age, proficiency, the purpose of learning the target language, and focus of instructions (cf. Suzuki, 2004; Lyster & Mori, 2006; Dewi, 2013). . However, no prior research, particularly in the Indonesian context, yet observes the possible patterns of corrective feedback in the interactions of EFL classrooms which adopt Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach.

Related to the above explanation, the researcher is interested in investigating the urgency of oral corrective feedback in English teaching process viewed from students and teachers' perception. This research provides a clear description of feedback on English language teaching,

especially how teachers give feedback and how students perceive and interpret the feedback given. When knowing the result of this research, it is expected that the process of English instructions is getting better in terms of teachers feedback can more effectively improve the students' skill in English Language (Amri, 2017; Askew, 2000). Based on the background above, the problems are specified into the followings: (1) How is the implementation of oral corrective feedback provided by teachers in the English instruction? (2) What are students' perception of corrective feedback in English learning process?. The objectives of the research is to reveal the urgency of oral corrective feedback in the English instruction. It further aims at providing guidance toward English instruction practice at secondary school.

B. Research Methodology

The researcher used qualitative study. The researcher built a complex, holistic picture, analyzes words, reports detailed views of informants, and conducts the study in a natural setting (Sugiyono. 2008; Yusuf, 2014). Qualitative research was considered as the most appropriate one in exploring students' perception of oral corrective feedback in English language teaching. The perception itself needed to be presented comprehensively in order to get deep explanations of the real condition. The other consideration in using qualitative research was the problems of this research were not definite, holistic, and dynamic.

The research was conducted in one of secondary schools in Kota Serang. In relation to this, the respondents of the research are English teachers and students at the second grade of secondary school. For the efficiency of the study, the researcher only takes one teacher and 10 students from the school.

Since the research was qualitative in nature, the data were collected through observation, interview, and questionnaire (Creswell, 2007). . The observation was conducted in order to get the picture of how teachers gave corrective feedback during the English classroom. While the interview was for both validating and clarifying the unclear data from observation. Questionnaire was to get the data about teachers and students' perception on corrective feedback in English instruction. This would finally go to clear description about how urgent corrective feedback is in relation with English competence improvement. There are several steps taken in analyzing the

data that have been described by Miles and Huberman: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification.

C. Results and Discussion

1. The Implementation of Oral Corrective Feedback in English Language Teaching

Oral corrective feedback is one of the most important areas of language learning and teaching. it is useful technique that help learners and teachers to focus on the important areas in language learning that need improvement and correction. Feedback is provide important information and helping students become effective and efficient learners.

To get data about the implementation of oral corrective feedback in English language teaching, the researcher did observation. The researcher used an observation form which researcher adapted from Brookhart. The purpose of using it is to ease the researcher in observing the teacher by having some list or items that represent the implementation of oral corrective feedback in English language teaching.

For observation, the researcher took one class in the second grade students of MAN 2 Kota Serang, exactly at XI Bahasa. Beside doing observation, the researcher also collecting data by interviewing students. The purpose of this interview was to get more information about the implementation of oral corrective feedback based on students' perception.

Here is the data of observation which was taken from class XI Bahasa at MAN 2 Kota Serang.

No	Components	Aspects	Answer	
			Yes	No
1.	Timing	a. Teacher gives oral corrective feedback immediately after students made mistake or error.	√	
		b. Teacher gives oral corrective feedback at the end after students finished their utterance (delayed).	√	
2.	Frequency /	a. correct all of the mistake		√

<i>The</i>		amount	made by students.		
			b. correct on certain topic.	√	
	3.	Audience	a. giving correction to individual.	√	
			b. giving correction colaboratively.	√	
	4.	Mode	a. Explicit correction	√	
			b. Recast	√	
			c. Clarification Request	√	
			d. Metalinguistic Clue	√	
			e. Elicitation		√
			f. Repetition		√

Implementation of Oral Corrective Feedback in English Language Teaching

Based on the form, the researcher divided focus area into 4 parts, here is the result based on the observation and students’ interview:

1. Timing

Timing is pointed out as one of the focuses of the teacher in oral corrective feedback. Timing indicates when feedback is given. Feedback would be effective, if it gives in proper time. It is tricky when to give feedback. Usually, when teacher catch the student say something incorrectly, they would hold themselves to correct the students because afraid it will down their motivation, interrupt them or make them feel embarrassed in front of others. In order to prevent it, the teacher should be wise about timing of giving feedback. Feedback can be immediately given or delayed.

Based on the observation, the researcher found that both immediate and delayed feedback was used by the teacher. The teacher provided immediate feedback when the student made a simple error like mispronounce or grammar while answer question. For example in short sentence; “*I sing a song from Beyonce last week.*” Then, right after that the teacher would give feedback, “*I sang not sing, because it is past.*” The teacher immediately gave corrective feedback right after the learner has made the mistake, As it is reflected in a students’ opinion from interview : ‘[He] usually corrected right away. When we made a mistake [he] immediately corrected and told us the correct form;. If the teacher delays it, students might forgot or even would result to ambiguity.

Delayed feedback provided at the end after the students finish their utterance. Because the material of the class that researcher observe was about song, so there are some students who sing in front of the class. The teacher delayed the correction to keep the flow of students' performance. Later at the end of performance, he would give the correction to the student upon the mistakes that he remember. Sometimes he even let them to make many mistake just to make sure that they would keep sing. If the teacher interrupted it, student might would be shy or even forgot the lyrics.

2. Frequency / Amount

Every teacher has a tendency to correct every mistake and error made by students. However, there is a considerable problem that has to be solved; How to correct if there are many mistakes are made by student?. Making decision about the how much the correction to be given is the complex thing to do. managing the frequency of feedback will determine the successful of teaching learning. On observation form, there are two items for frequency observation: correcting every mistake and error and correcting the small part of the topic.

Based on the observation, the researcher saw that the teacher did not correct all the mistake made by his students. He was corrected the mistake which are commonly repeated and important ones. It means teacher gave feedback focus on certain topic. Brookhart stated teacher feedback should be right only on the target of the learning points. There are many students in the class, if the teacher corrected all of the mistake it will waste time and disturb the flow of teaching learning. May be it is one of the reason the data from interview revealed that six of twenty students did not get corrective feedback from the teacher. It is not because the teacher did not give corrective feedback, but because they did not aware about it.

3. Audience

Based on its audience, the students are divided into two; individual and collective. During the observation, the teacher dominated his class with collective oral correction feedback. He just did individual once. It was approved by the result of the interview, most of the students stated that their teacher usually gave them oral corrective feedback in front of the classroom which means the teacher give oral corrective feedback collectively. Teacher did collective frequently by its advantage as one correction for all and it is effective for teaching in large class. Beside it,

giving corrective feedback collectively was to save the time and to minimal mistake that would make by other students over the same material given.

4. Mode

The main activity of corrective feedback is centered to the mode or the way of how it is delivered. As mention before that it can be written and oral. but in this research, the researcher focus in oral corrective feedback. Based on the observation form, there are four types of oral corrective feedback used by teacher; explicit correction, recast, clarification request and repetition.

During classroom observation, the researcher found that explicit correction was the most widely feedback used by English teacher in the classroom. It is used when the teacher was clearly indicated that the student was incorrect utterance then the teacher provided the correct form. The second most frequently used type by English teacher was recast. Recast frequently occurred when the teacher just repeat the correct form directly when the students made a mistake or an error. For clarification request and metalinguistic clue rarely used by the teacher.

Elicitation and repetition were found never used by English teacher. Both elicitation and repetition are implicit forms of feedback. They require a considerable amount of time as students are strategically guided towards identification of their errors and they need to come up with the correct forms themselves. Given the limited amount of class time, it is not suprising that teachers did not use these types of feedback. The result of the interview also revealed that most of the student stated explicit correction and recast was the most frequently used by the teacher in delivering oral corrective feedback.

2. **Students' Perception of Oral Corrective Feedback in English Language Teaching**

McGoldrick and Caffrey stated students' perception can be understood as the students' ability to justify their own opinions and distinguish it from research being presented in the class (Akande, 2009). Students' perception of teaching and learning is absolutely dependent on the fact that they have been taught in the class and how they experience it. As Alagbau in Adediwura & Tayo. (2007) stated that perception follows factors, as past experiences, present experiences, personality and motivation, as crucial to undertanding how people perceive events.

To get data about students' perception of oral corrective feedback in English language teaching, the researcher distributed questionnaires and did interview with 10 students. There were 30 students at second grade of MAN 2 of Kota Serang as the respondents. To be detailed, the results from questionnaire and interview presented below.

The Frequency of Teachers' Oral Corrective Feedback

Statements	Frequency	Percentage
Always	8	26,67%
Often	16	53,33%
Never	6	20%
Total	30	100%

The table shows 26,67% (F=8) respondents state they always get teachers' oral corrective feedback, 53,33% (F=16) often get teachers' oral corrective feedback, and 20% (F=6) never get teachers' oral corrective feedback.

It means that students often get oral corrective feedback by their teacher in English language teaching, it proved by students interview that when students made error or mistake in English classroom, they generally agree that they got oral corrective feedback by their teacher. Teacher sometimes corrected it immediately and delayed. Though most students assumed that they often get teachers' oral corrective feedback, some students state that they never get it. It was because they didn't aware toward it.

Students feeling towards Oral Corrective Feedback

Statements	Frequency	Percentage
Like	30	100%
Dislike	0	-
Total	30	100%

The above table shows 100% (F=30) respondents state they like to get teachers' oral corrective feedback, and no one student state dislike toward it. This findings accordance with the results from interview that the students said they like when the teacher gave oral corrective feedback in English language teaching. It indicated that they want to get oral corrective feedback when they made a mistake.

The Importance of Oral Corrective Feedback

Statements	Frequency	Percentage
------------	-----------	------------

Important	30	100%
Unimportant	0	-
Total	30	100%

The table shows 100% (F=30) respondents state oral corrective feedback is important, and no one student state oral corrective feedback is unimportant. It means that the use of oral corrective feedback in English language teaching is really important. From the interview, some students said that from oral coral corrective they can know what their error and it prevented them to make a same mistake anymore in the future.

The Types of Oral Corrective Feedback

Statements	Frequency	Percentage
Explicit Correction	15	50%
Recast	6	20%
Clarification Request	3	10%
Metalinguistic Clue	1	3,3%
Elicitation	1	3,3%
Repetition	4	13,4%
Total	30	100%

The table shows 50% (F=15) respondents state they prefer explicit correction, 20% (F=19) state they they prefer recast, 10% (F=3) they prefer clarification request, 3,3% (F=1) they prefer metalinguistic clue, 3,3% (F=1) they prefer elicitation, and 13,4% (F=4) they prefer repetition.

For types of oral corrective feedback, explicit correction was the most favorable by the students. They explained that they would like to know when they say something wrong in order to notice the inaccurate expression. These students described further that this helps them to remember the error and enabled them to learn the right expression. Some of them explained that the teacher needed to explain what specifically was wrong with their oral language and provide the examples of what one could say instead.

D. Conclusion

Based on the observation and interview, in the implementation of oral corrective feedback in English language teaching it was found that the teacher gave oral corrective feedback

immediately and delayed depend on the situation, focus on certain topics and collaboratively. Oral corrective feedback, explicit correction and recast was the most frequently used in English language teaching.

The results revealed that students generally have good perception of oral corrective feedback. They like to be corrected when they made a mistake. Oral corrective feedback help them to know what their error, avoid the same mistake, improve their English and increase their knowledge about English. However, students believe that not all the mistakes need to be corrected. Further, students expect to get delayed corrective feedback and explicit correction as type of oral corrective feedback in English language teaching.

References

- Adediwura, A. A., & Tayo. B. (2007). Perception of teachers' knowledge, attitude and teaching skills as predictor of academic performance in Nigerian secondary schools. *Educational Research and Review*, 2(7), 165-171. <https://academicjournals.org/journal/ERR/article-full-text-pdf/EC377823498/>
- Akande, S. O. (2009). Knowledge, perception, and attitudes of library personnel towards preservasion of information resources in nigerian federal university libraries. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*, 303, 1-8. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/17209427.pdf>
- Amri, W. (2017). "Teachers' oral corrective feedback strategy in English language classroom". Banda Aceh: Ar-rainy state Islamic Universty Darussalam, 2016. Unpublish thesis. <http://repository.ar-rainy.ac.id>
- Askew, S. (2000). *Feedback for learning*. London: Routledge Farmer.
- Brookhart, S. M. (2008). *How to give effective feedback to your students*. USA: ASCD.
- Cardelle, M., & Corno, L. (1981). Effects on second language learning of variations in written feedback on homework assignments. *TESOL Quarterly*, 15(3), 251-261. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586751>
- Cohen, A. (1999). *Language learning: Insights for learners, teachers, and researchers*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & Research design choosing among five approaches*. USA: USA Publication Data.
- Dewi, P. W. (2013). *Students' perception towards teachers' written feedback among 11th grade students at SMA N 1 Wedi Klaten*. Yogyakarta: Yogyakarta State University. Unpublish thesis. <http://eprints.uny.ac.id>
- Dunsford, D. W. (2006). Feedback follow up: the influence of teacher comment on student writing assignments. *NACTA Journal*. 50(2), 12-18. <https://agris.fao.org/agris-search/search.do?recordID=US201301089861>
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1, 3-18. <https://doi.org/10.5070/12.v1i1.9054>
- Santrock, J. (2011). *Life span development, 13th Edition*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Sugiyono. (2008). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif-kualitatif dan R & D (Quantitative-qualitative research methods and R & D)*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Yusuf, A. M. (2014). *Metode penelitian kualitatif, kuantitatif, dan penelitian gabungan (Qualitative research methods, quantitative, and combined research)*. Jakarta: PT Fajar Interpratama Mandiri.
- Zhu, H. (2010). An analysis of college students' attitudes towards error correction in EFL context. *English Language Teaching*. 3(4), 127-131. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1081995.pdf>