

Preferences of Oral Corrective Feedback among Students with Different Anxiety Levels

Nuramalia

University of Islam Malang

E-mail address: amalialia314@gmail.com

Abstract

Find out high anxiety and low anxiety students' preference for oral corrective feedback practice in the English classroom activity was the aim of this study. This research was conducted in SMA Muhammadiyah Kediri, 103 students participated in this study. The researcher used two different questionnaires; language anxiety questionnaire and oral corrective feedback preferences questionnaire. The obtained data of questionnaire responses then converted into percentages. The result revealed that high anxiety and low anxiety students wanted to receive oral corrective feedback when they made spoken errors. They also preferred to be orally corrected after they speak. Furthermore, explicit corrective feedback was the most favored types of corrective feedback among high anxiety and low anxiety students. Both groups also share the same opinion that serious spoken errors as errors which are needed to be always corrected and they valued corrective feedback from their teacher more than the other sources. In short, High anxiety and low anxiety students of SMA Muhammadiyah Kediri had similar preferences of oral corrective feedback practice in the English classroom activity. It seems that students aware of the purpose of the oral corrective feedback, so their anxiety levels do not give impact to their oral corrective feedback preferences.

Keywords: preferences, oral corrective feedback, anxiety

Corrective feedback is in form of a response to a learner's utterance containing a linguistic error (Ellis, 2009, p. 03). Oral corrective feedback cannot be apart from the English teaching and learning activity especially in Indonesia where English taught as a foreign language which means the possibility for students to make errors are greater. The fact that students learning English which is literally very different from Indonesian language, it cannot be denied that students will feel anxiety. Language Anxiety itself arises in the language learning situations, students feel worry, nervous and panic when learning a language, especially foreign language. (Sahin, 2016, p. 13).

Mufidah (2017) found that oral corrective feedback has a different impact on each language anxiety groups. Students from the anxious group have a negative reaction to oral corrective feedback, meanwhile, students in relax group felt so happy and satisfied with the

teacher correct their utterance because they argued that they could learn through their mistake. Every student has a different level of anxiety and what should be born in teachers' mind is that students are not likely to benefit from the teachers' corrective feedback if it causes their anxiety getting worst.

Dealing with students' errors or mistakes and correct them is one of the most important job for the teachers because there are a lot of things that teachers must consider when they provide the corrective feedback, such as students' preferences and students anxiety levels as Amrhein and Naseji (2010, p. 116) stated that if the type or amount of feedback provided for the students do not match what they prefer and expect, it may not be useful to them. Although language anxiety is a psychological symptom that every student experienced it and cannot be erased, it is still possible to reduce its effects on students' performance with choosing the suitable corrective feedback strategies with students' preference.

Some researcher has examined the different believes about corrective feedback of students with high-anxiety and low-anxiety students (Zhang & Rahimi, 2014; Martin & Valdivia, 2017). Based on the result of the studies, there was no significant difference believes in corrective feedback between high-anxiety and low-anxiety students. Both groups had the same opinion about the necessity of error correction. However, a significant different believes found regarding the frequency of corrective feedback, Zhang and Rahimi (2014) said that both of the students' group want their error to be always corrected, meanwhile Martin and Valdivia (2017) found that students not to like too much of corrective feedback.

Abedi, Mahdavi, and Hassakhah (2016) also investigate the opinions of Iranian EFL learners' about the practice of oral corrective feedback in their classroom, the students' opinions regarding their level of anxiety. In contrast with Zhang and Rahimi (2014) Martin and Valdivia

(2017) findings where there were no significant different preference of corrective feedback between students with high-anxiety and low-anxiety, Abedi, Mahdavi, and Hassakhah (2016) found that there was significant difference between students with high anxiety and students with low anxiety regarding the necessity of error correction, frequency of receiving corrective feedback and types of errors that should be corrected.

In Indonesia context, there also a study related to the relationship of EFL learners preference of corrective feedback and their foreign language anxiety. Fadilah, Anugerahwati, and Prayogo (2017), the subjects of their study were undergraduate students of English department in State University of Malang. The result revealed that regarding the types of errors that the students want to be corrected, the timing of correction and types of corrective feedback there was no different preference between the groups of the students. Students difference opinion only shown in the case of the order of preference of corrective feedback in grammatical errors and phonological errors. From the previous studies of students with high-anxiety and low-anxiety preference for corrective feedback the results are mixed and not lead to a clear conclusion.

The reason why this study still worth to conduct is all of the participants of the previous studies are university levels and based to the researcher best knowledge, this kind of study that focused on the students of senior high school levels is rare and seems very difficult to find it. Additionally, senior high school levels, English classroom learning activity more focuses on developing students accuracy or grammar rules of English language, it is different from university levels where English learning activity more focus to develop students fluency. In this case, the frequency of corrective feedback practice on senior high school is greater.

Furthermore, it can be critical information for senior high school teachers when delivering the corrective feedback in the English language activities, it will give teachers clues

about how their students want the oral corrective feedback to be done and can help the teacher provide a friendly, encouraging and motivating classroom environment.

Methods

The objectives of this current research is to find out high anxiety and low anxiety students' preferences for oral corrective feedback practice, Survey research design considered to be an appropriate approach for this study as Ary, Jacobs, Sorensen, and Razaviah (2002: 372) stated that in survey research the researcher asks questions about peoples' beliefs, opinions, characteristics, and behavior.

The participants of this current research were one hundred and three students of SMA Muhammadiyah Kediri. There is no special criterion in choosing to sample; it is based on the principal of Muhammadiyah Kediri permission and the willingness of the room teacher. Both male and female students from those classes participated in this study with the ages ranged from 15-18 years old.

The researcher used two different questionnaires. The first questionnaire is language anxiety questionnaire in order to elicit students' self-report of anxiety during English learning activities in the classroom and the second one is a questionnaire for students' oral corrective feedback preferences. Both of the questionnaires are designed based on a five-point Likert-chart.

Result

Necessity and Frequency of Oral Corrective Feedback

As could be seen in table 4.1, eighty-nine percent of high anxiety students and eighty-seventh percent of low anxiety students gave the response "strongly agree" or "agree" to the first question of the questionnaire. It can be indicated that students from both groups wanted their errors to be corrected to ensure whether they have produced correct utterances. In brief, regardless of the

students' level of anxiety in English learning classroom, they had strong opinions about the importance of oral corrective feedback.

Table 4.2 provides students from both groups responded to the frequency of oral corrective feedback, it can be seen that most of the students from both groups; seventy percent from high anxiety group and fifty-three percent from low anxiety group wanted their teacher to always or usually give oral corrective feedback when they make a spoken error. In other word, students aware of their spoken errors and the majority of students regardless of their anxiety level wanted to be corrected by their teachers most of the time.

Table 4.1 High/Low Anxiety Group Preference on the Necessity of OCF

Groups	Strongly Agree/Agree	Neutral	Disagree/Strongly Disagree
HA (n=56)	89	6	6
LA (n=47)	87	11	0

Table 4.2 High/Low Anxiety Group Preference on the Frequency of OCF

Groups	Always/Usually	Sometimes	Occasionally/Never
HA (n=56)	70	18	13
LA (n=47)	53	28	19

The timing of Oral Corrective Feedback

There are three items in the questionnaire about when students errors should be treated, these are correction “as soon as students made errors” (Item Number 3), the correction provide “after students finish their speaking activity” (Item Number 4), and “at the end of the English classroom activity” (Item Number 5).

From table 4.3, it shows that out of the three timing of correction choices, the biggest percentage; fifty-four percent of high anxiety group and sixty percent of low anxiety group “strongly agreed” or “agree” to get feedback after they finish the speaking activity. it implies that the students do not want to be interrupted in the middle of their speaking activity. the preferences-order of both anxiety groups for the appropriate time to corrected their errors as follow; first is after “they finish their speaking”, then “as soon as students made spoken errors”, and the last “at the end of the classroom activities”.

Table 4.3 High/Low Anxiety Group Preference on the Timing of OCF (%)

Timing of Treatment	Groups	Strongly Agree/Agree	Neutral	Disagree/Strongly Disagree
As soon as errors are made	HA	52	32	16
	LA	36	49	15
After I finish speaking	HA	54	46	0
	LA	64	34	2
At the end of class	HA	50	30	20
	LA	34	34	32

Types of Errors that Need to be Corrected

In this study, the types of errors are divided into five types, these are serious spoken errors that may cause the listener’s understanding (Item Number 6), less serious spoken errors that do not affected to the listener’s understanding (Item Number 7), spoken errors that students made frequently (Item Number 8), infrequent spoken errors (Item Number 9), and the individual errors (spoken errors that make by certain student that the other students may not make) (Item Number 10).

Table 4.4 shows forty-six percent of high anxiety and thirty-four percent of low anxiety groups preferred their serious spoken errors to be “always” or “usually” treated. It seems that

regardless of students' anxiety levels they share same preference about the spoken errors that need to be treated. Serious spoken errors gained the highest percentage from both groups, the second is frequent errors, the third is less serious spoken errors, and then infrequent errors, meanwhile individual spoken errors gain the lowest percentage. It can be interpreted from the findings that students regardless of their anxiety level were aware of the importance of being understandable when they are said something in English by the listeners.

Table 4.4 High/Low Anxiety Group Preference on the Types of Errors that Need to be Corrected (%)

Types of Errors	Always/Usually		Sometimes		Occasionally/Never	
	HA	LA	HA	LA	HA	LA
Serious	46	34	41	43	13	23
Less Serious	34	26	30	55	36	19
Frequent	39	32	30	30	30	38
Infrequent	20	15	43	47	38	38
Individual	16	4	34	34	50	62

Types of Oral Corrective Feedback

In this current study, the method of oral corrective feedback divided into “clarification request” (Item Number 11), “repetition” (Item Number 12), “recast” (Item Number 13), “explicit feedback” (Item Number 14), “elicitation” (Item Number 15), “metalinguistic” (Item Number 16), and “no corrective feedback” (Item Number 17).

As seen in table 4.5, students from both groups' percentage responses not really different. Both of the groups were chosen explicit feedback as the most effective method, seventy-nine percent of high anxiety students and seventy percent of low anxiety students. In brief, high anxiety students' preferences for oral corrective feedback method as the following order; explicit, elicitation, recast, clarification request, repetition, metalinguistic and then no corrective feedback. While low anxiety students as the following order; explicit, recast, elicitation,

clarification request, repetition, metalinguistic and no corrective feedback. Both of groups have different preference on second and third most favorite of oral corrective feedback, it seems that high anxiety students want to do self-correction before teacher give them correction, while low anxiety students want their teacher correct their errors right away.

Table 4.5 High/Low Anxiety Group Preference on the Types of OCF (%)

Types of OCF	Groups	Very Effective/ Effective	Neutral	Ineffective/ Very Ineffective
Clarification Request	HA	64	34	2
	LA	47	38	17
Repetition	HA	52	34	14
	LA	45	38	17
Recast	HA	70	21	9
	LA	66	32	2
Explicit Feedback	HA	79	18	4
	LA	70	23	6
Elicitation	HA	73	25	2
	LA	53	34	13
No Corrective Feedback	HA	27	30	43
	LA	17	28	55
Metalinguistic Feedback	HA	45	46	9
	LA	40	36	23

Sources of Oral Corrective Feedback

In this study there are three sources of oral corrective feedback, they are “teacher” (Item Number 18), “classmates” (Item Number 19), and “student themselves” (Item Number 20).

It can be seen at table 4.6 that ninety-one percent of high anxiety students and eighty-seven percent of low anxiety students thought that oral corrective feedback from the teacher was very effective. The result indicated that students regardless their anxiety level value that correction from their teacher as the most effective one, it might be because students have the assumption that teacher is more competent and make teachers oral corrective feedback more valid and reliable.

Table 4.6 High/Low Anxiety Group Preference on the Sources of OCF (%)

Source of OCF	Groups	Very Effective/ Effective	Neutral	Ineffective/ Very Ineffective
Classmates	HA	59	32	9
	LA	43	49	9
Teachers	HA	91	5	4
	LA	87	9	4
Students	HA	48	27	25
Themselves	LA	49	38	13

Discussion

Regarding the students' opinions about necessity and frequency of oral corrective feedback, most of the students from high anxiety and low anxiety groups wanted to receive oral corrective feedback when they make spoken errors in the English learning activities. This result indicates that all of the students regardless of their anxiety level consider oral corrective feedback as an important part of English learning activities and believe that oral corrective feedback on their errors or mistakes can facilitate to improve their English skill. This finding in line with Fadilah, Anugerahwati, and Prayogo (2017) and also Atma and Widiati (2015) that found in their study was none of the sophomore and freshmen students did not want to receive oral corrective feedback.

In addition, more than half students of high anxiety and low anxiety students wanted to be corrected by their teacher most of the time. This result in keeping with Zhang and Rahimi (2014) who stated that both high anxiety and low anxiety students trusted that when their errors frequently corrected their learning was more effective. It is important to make students aware of their errors; so that in the future they do not repeatedly does the same errors (Tomzyck, 2013). Regarding students' preference about the timing of oral corrective feedback, both of the groups share the same preference about the most favorite time they want to get oral corrective feedback

which is after they finish what they want to convey, Tomczyk (2013) states that delay correction let students finish their utterance, without teacher interruption in order to correct the occurred errors.

Most of the students from both groups rated serious spoken errors as errors which are needed to be always treated by the teacher. It seems that both high anxiety and low anxiety students aware of the importance of being understandable by the listeners when they say something in English. This result is in line with Martin and Valdivia (2017) who find that high anxiety students and low anxiety students agree that serious errors are a priority to be always correct.

Both of the groups regardless of their anxiety levels rated explicit feedback as the most effective corrective feedback, this in line with Fadilah, Anugerahwati, and Prayogo (2017) result that two groups of students; high anxiety and low anxiety, preferred to be corrected using explicit feedback no matter what type of their error is. Both of high anxiety students and low anxiety students were conscious about the accuracy but because their grammar proficiency still lack they regard recast as effective corrective feedback and grammatical explanation do not help students from both groups to make their utterances right.

Regarding the source of oral corrective feedback, both of the high anxiety and low anxiety students preferred teachers as the source of the oral corrective feedback. This finding is similar with Fadilah, Anugerahwati and Prayogo (2017) where students want to be corrected by their teacher, it might be because students have an assumption that teacher is more competent and make teachers oral corrective feedback more valid and reliable. Furthermore, students' have believed that teacher as a specialist whose role is to provide feedback and explain knowledge (Farahani and Salajegheh, 2015).

Conclusion

From the result it can be concluded that regardless of the students' anxiety level, most of the students from both high anxiety and low anxiety groups want to receive oral corrective feedback and they want to be corrected by their teacher most of the time, students want preferred to be orally corrected after they finish saying what they want to convey and they choose serious spoken errors as errors which are needed to be always treated. Explicit corrective feedback was the most favored types of corrective feedback among students and they preferred the teacher as the source of the oral corrective feedback.

In short, the result of this current study revealed that high anxiety and low anxiety students of SMA Muhammadiyah Kediri had similar preferences of oral corrective feedback practice in the English classroom activity. Students seem aware of the purpose of the oral corrective feedback, so their anxiety levels seem not to give impact to their oral corrective feedback preferences. In addition, in senior high school level teacher have the dominant role in the teaching and learning activity meanwhile students still have low proficiency of English language, as a consequence students relay to their teachers and believe that their teacher's oral corrective feedback can facilitate their English language learning.

Suggestion

Referring to the conclusion above, some suggestions are proposed for English teachers in particular and the future researcher in general. For the teachers, it is better to consider students' preferences when giving oral corrective feedback so students can feel comfortable and motivate to practice their English skill in the classroom. For the other researcher, hopefully, they can conduct this kind of study with the larger participants in order to obtain a more reliable result and

may have possibilities to get a richer understanding about the relationship between students anxiety and oral corrective feedback.

REFERENCES

- Amrehin, H, R. & Nassaji, H. 2010. Written Corrective Feedback What Do Students and Teachers Prefer and Why?. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 13: 95-127.
- Abedi, D., Mahdafi, Z, A., & Hassaskhah, J. 2016. Iranian EFL Learners' Preferred Oral Corrective Feedback: High Anxious Learners vs. Low Anxious Learners. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*. 5(2): 75-86.
- Ary, D., Cheser, L., Lucy, R., Asgar., & Sorensen, C,. 2002. *An introduction to research in education (6th ed.)*. Belmonth: Wadsworth Thomson Learning.
- Ellis, R. 2009. Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1): 3-18.
- Fadilah, A, E., Anugerahwati, M., & Prayogo, J, A. 2017. EFL Students' Preferences for Oral Correction Feedback in Speaking Instruction. *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora*. 5(2):76-87.
- Mufidah, Z, M. 2017. The Impact of Oral Corrective Feedback On the Level of Language Anxiety. Advance in Social Science. *Educational and Humanities Research*. 145: 219-227.
- Martin, S., & Valdivia, M, A. 2017. Students' Feedback Beliefs and Anxiety in Online Foreign Language Oral Tasks. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*. 14-18
- Sahin, D. 2016. *Secondary and High School Students' Speaking Anxiety: A Comparative Study*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Eastern Mediterranean University.
- Zhang, L, J., & Rahimi, M. 2014. EFL Learner's Anxiety Level and Their Beliefs About Corrective Feedback in Oral Communication Classes. *System*. 42: 429-439.