STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS TOWARDS ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN A SPEAKING CLASS

Sri Mulyani[1], Nurfajri Ningsih[2], Nurul Istiqamah Setyaningrum As.[3]
[1,2,3]*Institut Parahikma Indonesia*
Corresponding E-mail: srymulyani@parahikma.ac.id

ABSTRACT This research aimed to find out students' perceptions towards oral corrective feedback in a speaking class and the types of oral corrective feedback used by the lecturer. This study applied a qualitative research design. Thirteen students had contributed to this research as the respondents. The data were collected by using open-ended questionnaire and interview. The collected data were analyzed by applying thematic analysis. This study of this study covered three main themes, namely (1) the benefits of oral corrective feedback include increasing students' knowledge, being a helpful way to improve students' speaking ability, and giving positive impacts on students' learning; (2) the drawbacks of oral corrective feedback include causing nervousness, causing unappreciated feeling, and causing embarrassed and traumatic feeling; and (3) students' expectations of oral corrective feedback include motivating, encouraging and constructive oral corrective feedback, and appropriate timing in giving oral corrective feedback. In addition, this research also discovered the types of corrective feedback used by the lecturer in the speaking class were recast, elicitation, and explicit correction. Based on the findings of this research, it is highly recommended for the lecturers to consider students' perceptions in the use of oral corrective feedback especially in terms of the content, types and timing in giving oral corrective feedback.

Keywords: students' perception, oral corrective feedback

A. INTRODUCTION

Speaking skill is one of the most important skills to develop in learning English as a foreign language. It is generally accepted that students' communicative competence relatively becomes an indication of their success in language learning. However, learning speaking is never an easy task to do. Students frequently encounter unexpected difficulties to communicate using the target language, since it requires sufficient knowledge of many language components. The main objective of English language teaching is to enable learners to use English language effectively and accurately in communication (Leong et al., 2017). In other words, it is implicitly argued that accuracy is an indispensable aspect to create meaningful interaction in oral communication. In classroom interaction, teachers or instructors usually utilize various strategies to improve accuracy in their speaking activities. One of the strategies is providing oral corrective feedback during the formal speaking class.

Oral corrective feedback refers to teacher oral responses to learners' erroneous target language production. Khunaivi, H., & Hartono (2013) stated that corrective feedback provided by the teachers is aimed to minimize the possibility of students making errors in the speaking classroom. Some previous studies on oral corrective feedback were attributed to investigate its

pedagogical and theoretical significance (Li, 2014). Meanwhile, many practitioners are interested in whether, when, and how to incorporate corrective feedback in classroom instruction (Li, 2014). Nevertheless, some language experts and theories debated over whether corrective feedback (both oral and written) is necessary in second or foreign language development, considering the negative sides of its use. Recent experimental studies have revealed that oral corrective feedback can facilitate second or foreign development but that its effects may be constrained by contextual factors and individual learner differences (Li, 2010; Lyster & Saito, 2010). Fungula (2013) mentioned that corrective feedback will affect students' motivation and self-confidence which will drive them into anxiety and embarrassment. Conversely, Lyster, R., et al., 2013)stated that lecturers who correct students' errors are better than those who ignore them.

Students need to receive corrective feedback to make them aware of their errors then prevent them from making similar errors. In speaking class, the importance of oral corrective feedback is subtle to improve students' speaking skill and to avoid fossilizations. The use of oral corrective feedback plays an essential role in facilitating students' oral performance in ESL and EFL classes. Furthermore, the uses of appropriate oral corrective feedback based on the differential oral proficiency levels of students in a speaking class are needed to improve students' speaking ability (Fan, 2019).

Considering the significance of the oral corrective feedback, students' perceptions towards oral corrective feedback has been the main concern for some lecturers and researchers. Some research suggests that the lecturer should not ignore students' perceptions because the lecturer will possibly provide inappropriate feedback in correcting students' errors. Preferences of learners are important because they can influence learning behaviors and inform instructors about learners' perspectives and subsequently may help teaching practices on oral corrective feedback more effectively (Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, 2013). In addition, knowing students' perception will lead the lecturers to have insights about preferred methods of correction and timing of corrections that essentially contribute to the students' target language development. Grounding from the aforementioned issues, this current research is objected to investigates students' perceptions toward oral corrective feedback in a speaking class and the types of oral corrective feedback used by the lecturer.

B. LITERATURE REVIEW

Corrective feedback is defined simply as 'responses to learner utterances containing an error and also but also as a 'complex phenomenon with several functions' (Lyster, R., et al.

2013). The complex phenomenon reflects its negative and positive impacts on learners' language growth. corrective feedback as an approach which is commonly used by second language lecturers to assess and reduce students' such errors (Zao, 2015). Alsolami (2019) also added, corrective feedback was usually used by the lecturer to specify as the verbal reaction which is done by the students to highlight the erroneous pronunciation.

Theoretical perspectives suggest that corrective feedback is not only beneficial but may also be necessary for moving learners forward in their second language development. Skill acquisition theory acknowledges a pivotal role of corrective feedback, specifically in terms of interaction that leads learners from effortful to more automatic second language user (Lyster, R., et. al. (2013). Sociocultural theorists, on the other hand, believe that corrective feedback assists learners to negotiate dialogically as they shift other regulations to self-regulation (Nassaji & Swain, 2000; Sato & Ballinger, 2012; Lyster, R., et al., 2013). Corrective feedback is classified into written and oral corrective feedback. Written corrective feedback is teachers' responses to learners' erroneous production in written form, while oral corrective feedback is attributed to teachers' responses in oral form. Ranta and Lyster (2007) classified oral corrective feedback into six categories, they are recast, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, explicit correction, repetition, and clarification request.

a. *Recast*. Recast is the feedback which is given by the teacher or lecturer to provide students' corrections in such a way that communication is not obstructed. The lecturer reformulates students' question forms during the treatment. For example:

   Student: "What is she drinks?"

   Lecturer: "what does she drink?"

b. *Metalinguistic Feedback*. It is used by the teacher or lecturer as provision of students' grammatical explanations based on target structure (Gringo, 2017). The lecturer provides information about students' grammatical errors related to students' utterance. For example:

   Student: "my father is there last night"

   Lecturer : "*my father is there last night?*. It should be "my father **was** there last night".
Because there is an adverb time past, so the auxiliary verb must be in past form also.

c. *Elicitation*. (Solikhah, 2016) describes elicitation as repeating the correct part of student utterance without the erroneous and rising intonation as a signal to the students to correct errors and complete the sentence. As an example:

   Student: "the black cat wants I to feed her"

   Lecturer : "the black cat wants…?"

   Student: "me to feed her"

d. *Explicit Correction*. Explicit correction is clear information of students erroneous and the lecturer will provide the correct form. Anggoro (2013) describes that explicit correction is indicating students incorrectly clearly while providing the correct form. This type of corrective feedback will drive students into a clear explanation about their mistakes. As an example:

> Student: "on April"
>
> Lecturer : "No. it is 'In April'".

e. *Repetition*. Repetition is repeating students' mistakes and adjusting intonation to attract students' attention to their errors. For example:

> Student: "I goes to school everyday"
>
> Lecturer : "I goes to school everyday?"

f. *Clarification Request*. clarification requests is operationalized by the lecturer to show that he could not understand the utterances because of either the meaning or the linguistic forms. The lecturer ask for clarification from what students had said before. As an example:

> Student: "she flies by herself"
>
> Lecturer : "pardon?"

Corrective feedback in general, and oral corrective feedback (OCF) in particular, has been of interest to both language teachers and researchers in second language acquisition (Hanh & Tho, 2018). The growing number of research on this area yields its pivotal roles in promoting learners' second or foreign language development. Research on students' perceptions towards' oral corrective feedback in the Indonesian context reported interesting and almost the same results. (Mastang, 2019) conducted descriptive research to examined ninth-grade students' perception towards lecturers' oral corrective feedback. From thirty students, seventeen students have strongly positive perceptions of lecturers' oral corrective feedback in their class. Students also considered corrective feedback as a helpful way for them to learn more. Moreover, students also confirmed that oral corrective feedback was the important strategy that lecturers should employ in running English class activities.

Using mixed-method, Muslem, A. et al. (2017) carried out a study to investigate students' perception of oral corrective feedback in speaking class of fourth-semester students in thr department of English Language Education. The majority of the students agreed that oral corrective feedback was an important way in improving students' speaking ability. They perceived that oral corrective feedback was very helpful in increasing their English proficiency. (Giantika, 2019) investigated students' preferences toward oral corrective feedback in speaking

class. The study found students' positive attitude toward oral corrective feedback. Additionally, Students in this research preferred metalinguistic feedback. They stated that this type was clear and easy to understand, it was also more effective to improve their knowledge than other types.

Involving 64 students, Muyashoha, A.B. & Sugianto (2019) also conducted a quantitative study on this topic. The study revealed students' positive perspectives toward oral corrective feedback. They also agreed that oral corrective feedback was beneficial to improve students' speaking ability and to make more meaningful learning. (Yanggara, 2020) research suggested that most of the lecturer focused on students' pronunciation, vocabulary, communication skills, ideas and organization in their oral corrective feedback.

C. METHOD

Respondents

The respondents of this research were the fifth-semester students of English Education Department at Institut Parahikma Indonesia. Thirteen (13) students had participated in this study. All of the students had recently been active in a speaking class. This research was conducted in the even semester of 2019/2020 academic year.

Instruments

This research used questionnaires and interview as data collection methods. An open-ended questionnaire in form of google form was distributed to all participants. Krosnick (2018) defined that open-ended question was permitting respondent to answer by their own words. The second method was an interview. Adhabi & Anozie (2017) described interview as authenticity of methods of collecting data. Semi-structured interview was used by the researcher. The researcher interviewed 5 participants to clarify the result of questionnaires and to explore more information related to their perception of oral corrective feedback.

Data Analysis

In analyzing the data of this study, the researcher used thematic analysis. Clarke, V., & Braun, (2014) stated that thematic analysis allowed the researcher to share meaning and experiences by focusing on meaning across a data set. This analysis covered six steps: (1) familiarizing with the data, (2) generating initial codes, (3) searching for themes, (3) Reviewing potential themes, (3) Defining and naming the themes, and (6) Producing the report.

D. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Students' Perceptions Towards Oral Corrective Feedback

This study found students' perceptions that covered three main themes, namely the benefits of oral corrective feedback, the drawbacks of oral corrective feedback, and students' expectations of oral corrective feedback.

The Benefits of Oral Corrective Feedback

There were ten out of thirteen participants who agreed with providing oral corrective feedback in speaking class. From the result of qualitative questionnaire and interview, students mentioned three benefits of oral corrective feedback. The first, corrective feedback Increases students' knowledge. Most of participants argued that applying oral corrective feedback would effectively increase students' knowledge because the feedback shared information about students' erroneous utterances. Besides, the feedback also could avoid fossilization of learners' errors. It could be seen in every speaking class activities, students often made pronunciation and grammatical errors without realizing it. Once the teacher corrected their mistakes on the spot, they would realize their mistakes. The corrections indirectly improve students' English language knowledge.

The second, corrective feedback is a helpful way to improve students' speaking skills. Students stated that oral corrective feedback provided information about their errors that will increase their knowledge about the language they learn. Moreover, by correcting students' error, students become aware of the errors they made. It will prevent them from making the same errors in the future. Therefore, corrective feedback will gradually improve their speaking skill in the long run. The third benefit of corrective feedback is giving positive impacts on students' learning. Some students stated that after receiving corrective feedback, they felt more motivated to learn as they felt that the teacher paid attention on what they said and really appreciated their effort in learning. They also mentioned that the feedback made them more proficient in using English in the future, since they know their mistakes and will never do the same mistakes.

This findings are in line with many previous research such as Asnawi et al. (2017), Ananda, D. et al. (2017), Muslem, A. et al. (2017) and Mastang (2019) who conducted the same research on students' preferences towards oral corrective feedback in speaking classes. the participants of those studies also had positive attitude towards oral corrective feedback and regarded oral corrective feedback as an essential aspect to improve students' speaking ability.

The Drawbacks of Oral Corrective Feedback

The drawbacks of oral corrective feedback expressed by the respondents were divided into three points; (1) causing nervousness. Some students argued that oral corrective feedback triggered their nervousness and made them reluctant to speak because they are afraid of making errors. Furthermore, the students argued that even though oral corrective feedback was very

important in a speaking class, it could be detrimental if the teacher or the lecturer do not consider the time and the condition of the students. (2) causing unappreciated feeling. Frequently, unpreferred feedback can drive students into unappreciated feeling. Speaking in a foreign language is never easy for some students. They have to steeling themselves to come up with English words that seem to hard for them to pronounce. It also need high concentration to remember the vocabulary and the right grammatical rules in the same time. They mentioned they felt unappreciated because after all of the efforts, the teacher directly correct their mistake in front of their friends that make them lose the prepared idea. (3) causing embarrassed and traumatic feelings. Some students also mentioned that another negative side of oral corrective feedback was embarrassed and traumatic feelings especially when the lecturer give the correction without considering the appropriate timing. Some students admitted that sometimes they felt embarrassed and traumatic when the teacher interrupted their speaking activities to correct their mistakes in front of the class. They felt that it was embarrassing since some of their friends were laugh at them. A half of participants clarified that oral corrective feedback is a daunting assessment because some of lecturer gave the correction at the wrong time.

This findings supported Mahmoud's (2018) study that found that oral corrective feedback was negatively affected students' performance and motivation. This findings also confirmed the statement of Elsaghayer (2014) who argued that oral corrective feedback could affect students' motivation and attitudes negatively. In addition, Şakiroğlu (2020)on his research about oral corrective feedback preferences of university students in English communication classes suggested that each lecturer had to be aware with the students' attitude towards oral corrective feedback since it can provoke negative feeling such as nervous and embarrassed that negatively interfere with students' speaking skill.

Students' Expectations of Oral Corrective Feedback

This study also revealed students' expectation of oral corrective feedback. There are two themes related to students' expectations of oral corrective feedback, namely; (a) motivated and encouraging corrective feedback, (b) appropriate timing in giving oral corrective feedback.

Students expected that their lecturer gave corrective feedback that can motivate and encourage them in learning English. It inferred that the feedback should be conveyed in a positive and a good manner. In addition, the students also highlighted the time in giving corrective feedback in speaking class. They preferred corrective feedback which was given after the speaking activities as it will not interrupt their speaking activities. They added that preferred corrective feedback was given in the end of the class without pointing out the name of students who made errors.

The Types of Oral Corrective Feedback Used by the Lecturer in Speaking Class

The second research question is aimed to find out the types of oral corrective feedback which used by the lecturer in speaking class by employing in-depth interview. The result found that there are three types of oral corrective feedback which commonly used as the way lecturer corrects students' error. The types are Recast, Elicitation, and Repetition. The participants highlighted recast as one of types of oral corrective feedback which usually used by the lecturer in speaking class. Recast operationalized as lecturers' form to reformulate students' errors.

Elicitation was also mentioned as one of the types used by the lecturer in speaking class. Elicitation is repeating the correct part of students' utterance without the erroneous and rising intonation as a signal to the students to correct error and complete the sentence. The participants described that this method of correction giving the time to the students to think where exactly the error is. The next type used by the lecturer was explicit correction. This type is one of the common types which is usually used by the lecturer in correcting students' error. Explicit correction gives clear information of students' error and the teacher will provide the correct form. This type is indicating students incorrectly while providing the correct form. It would drive students into a clear explanation about their error.

It is in line with a study of Muhsin (2016) which confirmed that explicit correction and elicitation was the most popular types of oral corrective feedbacks in speaking class. The research finding also suggested that those typed were effective to detect students' mispronunciation and low accuracy and fluency. In addition, Halenci, N., & Zainil (2020) in their study of teacher's corrective feedback on spoken error and students' perception also revealed that explicit and recast were the most frequently methods used by the lecturer in correcting students' error.

E. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings and discussion, students perceptions are classified into three main themes, they are 1) the benefits of oral corrective feedback that include increasing students' knowledge, a helpful way to improve students' speaking ability, and giving good impact on students' learning; 2) the drawbacks of oral corrective feedback that include causing nervousness, causing unappreciated feeling, and causing embarrassed and traumatic feeling; 3) students expectation of oral corrective feedback which had been divided into two points such as motivating, encouraging and constructive oral corrective feedback and appropriate timing in giving oral corrective feedback. This research also found three types of oral corrective feedback which commonly used by the lecturer in speaking class includes recast, elicitation and explicit correction.

Based on the findings of this research, it is highly recommended for the lecturers to consider students' perceptions in the use of oral corrective feedback especially in terms of the content, types and timing in giving oral corrective feedback. Without considering those aspects, corrective feedback can be detrimental for the development of students' learning. Furthermore, lecturers also need to enrich themselves with sufficient knowledge on how to apply appropriate and motivating corrective feedback to improve students' speaking skill.

REFERENCES

Adhabi, E. A. R., & Anozie, C. B. L. (2017). Literature Review for the Type of Interview in Qualitative Research. *International Journal of Education*, *9*(3), 86. https://doi.org/10.5296/ije.v9i3.11483

Alsolami, R. (2019). Effect of oral corrective feedback on language skills. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *9*(6), 672–677. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0906.09

Ananda, D. R., Yamin, M., & Mu'in, F. (2017). Students' preferences toward oral corrective feedback in speaking class at English department of Lambung Mangkurat university academic year 2015/2016. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *7*(03).

Anggoro, I. (2013). *Corrective Feedback Found in Speaking Class at the English Department of Muhammadiyah University Of Surakarta*. Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta.

Asnawi; Zulfikar, T.; Astila, I. (2017). Students' pe3rception of oral corrective feedback in speaking classes. *english education journal (EEJ)*, *8*(3), 275–291.

Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2014). Thematic Analysis. In *encyclopedia of critical psychology* (pp. 1947–1952). Springer.

Davies, P., & Pearse, E. (2000). *Success in English Teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Elsaghayer, M. (2014). Affective damage to oral corrective feedback among students in Libyan secondary schools. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)*, *4*(6), 74–82.

Fan, N. (2019). *An Investigation of Oral Corrective Feedback in an ESL Listening and Speaking Class* □ . *10*(1), 197–203.

Fungula, B. N. (2013). Oral Corrective Feedback in the Chinese EFL Classroom. *Degree Project). Karlstad: Karlstads Universitet. Retrieved on November*, *6*, 2015.

Giantika, S. (2019). *Corrective Feedback Found in Speaking Class at the English Department of Muhammadiyah University Of Surakarta*. Islamic Institute of Kediri.

Gringo Magbanua, J. (2017). *Effects of focused direct and metalinguistic corrective feedback on L2 learners' writing/Gringo Magbanua Jusa*. University of Malaya.

Halenci, N., & Zainil, Y. (2020). Teacher's Corrective Feedback on Spoken Error and Students' Perception. *Eighth International Conference on Languages and Arts (ICLA-2019)*, 325–328.

Hanh, P. T., & Tho, P. X. (2018). *Oral corrective feedback in efl / esl classrooms : classification oral*

corrective feedback in efl / esl classrooms : classification models. October. https://doi.org/10.25073/2525-2445/vnufs.4301

Khunaivi, H., & Hartono, R. (2013). Lecturer 's and student's perceptions of corrective feedback in teaching speaking. *English Education Journal*, *5*(2).

Krosnick, J. A. (2018). Questionnaire design. In *The Palgrave handbook of survey research* (pp. 439–455). Palgrave Macmillan.

Leong, L., Inglés, S. A.-D. de investigación en educación en, & 2017, U. (2017). An Analysis of Factors Influencing Learners' English Speaking Skill. *International Journal of Research in English Education*, *2*(1), 34–41. http://ijreeonline.com/files/site1/user_files_68bcd6/sma1357-A-10-26-1-fefa0eb.pdf

Li, S. (2010). The Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback in SLA: A Meta-Analysis. *Language Learning*, *60*(2). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00561.x

Li, S. (2014). *Oral corrective feedback. 68*(April), 196–198. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cct076

Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). ral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching*, *46*(1), 1–40. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000365

Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. In *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* (Vol. 32, Issue 2). https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990520

Mahmoud, G. H. A. A. (. (2018). Effects of corrective feedback on learners of english as a second language (ESL). *International Journal of Education (IJE)*, *6*(4).

Mastang. (2019). *Oral corrective feedback in speaking class of english department.* unismuh.

Muhsin, A. (2016). The effectiveness of positive feedback in teaching speaking skill. *Lingua Cultura*, *10*(1), 25–30.

Muslem, A., Zulfikar, T., Astila, I., Usman, B., & Syamaun, A. (2017). Lecturerrs' oral corrective feedback in speaking class: Students' perceptions. *Proceedings of AICS-Social Sciences*, 643.

Muyashoha, A.B. & Sugianto, A. (2019). The students' perception towards oral corrective feedback in speaking class. *International Conference on English Language Teaching.*

Nassaji, H., & Swain, M. (2000). A vygotskian perspective on corrective feedback in l2: the effect of random versus negotiated help on the learning of english articles. *Language Awareness*, *9*(1), 34–51. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658410008667135

Şakiroğlu, H. Ü. (2020). *Oral Corrective Feedback Preferences of Students in English To cite this article : Unsal Sakiroglu , H . (2020). Oral corrective feedback preferences of university students in Oral Corrective Feedback Preferences of University Students in English Communication Classes.*

Sato, M., & Ballinger, S. (2012). Raising language awareness in peer interaction: A cross-context, cross-methodology examination. *Language Awareness*, *21*(1–2), 157–179. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2011.639884

Solikhah, I. (2016). Oral corrective feedback in speaking class of english department. *Lingua*, *13*(1), 87–102.

Yanggara, R. (2020). *The perception on lecturerr oral corrective feedback during students' presentation at IAIN Palangka Raya.* IAIN Palangkaraya.

Zao, W. (2015). *Learners' preferences for oral corrective feedback and their effects on second language noticing and learning motivation.* McGill University (Canada).