

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN EFL CLASSROOM

Shohiyah Shobaha

English Language Teaching Study Program
Postgraduate School, University of Islam Malang, Indonesia
Email: shohishoba@gmail.com

Abstract

Many studies related to corrective feedback in diverse contexts and settings have been conducted. Most of those previous studies only focused on the particular issue of corrective feedback study like the types of corrective feedback used or students' perception of corrective feedback. Peculiarly, this current study investigates the wider issues of corrective feedback implemented in EFL's non formal classroom. By using mixed-method research design, this study investigates the implementation of oral corrective feedback in term of; the corrector of error, the time of correction, kinds of errors corrected, types and distribution of corrective feedback types, error ignorance, the reasons of error ignorance, and completed by the students' perception to the oral corrective feedback. The findings showed that corrective feedback was dominantly corrected by the teacher. The students' errors were corrected immediately when the errors happened. The most corrected errors were the errors that related to the grammatical materials taught in the classroom and the errors that infect the understanding of communication called "global error". The type of corrective feedback that was mostly engaged was "recast". However, many students' errors were still ignored because the errors consisted of grammatical materials that have not been taught by the teacher when errors happened. Those corrective feedback implementations have different findings in the view of students' perception for some terms.

Keywords: oral corrective feedback, grammar, speaking

INTRODUCTION

Error analysis (EA) was on the hill since contrastive analysis (CA) was under serious attack in 1970. By the time goes, the researchers are more attentive in studying how to correct the error rather than investigating what the error is. Corrective feedback, which is defined as the forms of responses that follow the

students' erroneous/utterances (Ellis, 2009), has so much interests to be investigated by the researchers. Since Hendrickson (1978) tells five arguable points of corrective feedback about whether the students' errors should be corrected or not, who should correct the students' errors, when the students' errors should be corrected, what types of errors should be corrected, many studies have been conducted to investigate each of those points specifically in many contexts and settings. Fan (2019) specifically investigated the corrective feedback types used in listening and speaking class of ESL's formal school while Fadilah, Anugerahwati, and Prayogo (2017) conducted the study about the students' preferences of corrective feedback in different anxiety levels in term of the time to give correction, the type of errors corrected, the strategies to give correction and the corrector of errors in speaking classes of EFL's formal classroom. This current study intended to investigate the whole and wider aspects of corrective feedback's controversial issues both in the implementation of corrective feedback and in the view of students' perception toward corrective feedback implemented. In order to obtain the whole description of those points, the problems of study are determined into (1) how the implementation of oral corrective feedback in grammar for speaking class in the term of; who does the correcting in grammar for speaking class, when the learners' errors are corrected, what kinds of errors are corrected, types and distribution of corrective feedback type, (2) whether any students' error is ignored or not, if it is found, what the reasons of ignorance, and (3) how the students' perception to the oral corrective feedback. This study was conducted in speaking class that specifically focuses on improving grammatical accuracy in non formal classroom to result variety and dissimilarity from previous studies.

METHOD

This study used mixed methods. The data of corrective feedback implementation, error ignorance, the reason of error ignorance, and the students' perception of the oral corrective feedback implemented were described qualitatively through the frequency and distribution of each datum that presented quantitatively. The subjects of study were the English teacher and 21 students of grammar for speaking class, the speaking class that focuses on improving grammatical accuracy, in Global English Course located in Kampung Inggris, Pare, Kediri. The students of grammar for speaking class were the students of intermediate level. This study used video recorder as the tools of documentation to get the complete and detail data about the implementation of oral corrective feedback and error ignorance, interview for the teacher to get the data about the reasons of error ignorance, and

questionnaire to get data about the students' perception to the oral corrective feedback implemented.

The researcher firstly listened the data from video-recorder very carefully then typed all the errors made by the students. After all students' errors were found, the researcher repeated to listen the recordings in order to classify and analyze the students' errors based on who corrected the students' errors, when the students' errors were corrected, what kinds of errors were corrected, what types of corrective feedback used, and the errors that ignored by the teacher. Those classifications were presented into the table of frequency before leading to the conclusion. After the ignored errors of students found, the interview to get data about the reasons why those errors were ignored, it is conducted by showing the completed data of errors' ignorance in written text then asked the teacher to give reasons why each of those errors was ignored. Questionnaire was also spread to all students in the last meeting to get the data about their perception toward the corrective feedback implemented during they join in grammar for speaking class.

RESULTS

From recordings of teaching and learning activity which was recorded for 810 minutes, the data related to the implementation of oral corrective feedback in grammar for speaking class as follows;

Table 1 - Results of Who Did Correcting in Grammar for Speaking Class

The Students' Corrected Errors	Corrected by Teacher	Corrected by Student Who Made the Error (Self-Correct)	Corrected by other Students
124	103	20	1

Data shows that there were 124 students' errors which have been corrected during teaching and learning process. The teacher was the one who was the most dominant in doing correction, it is proven by the number of errors that were corrected by the teacher reaches 103 errors.

Table 2 - Results of When Students' Errors Were Corrected in Grammar for Speaking Class

The Students' Corrected Errors	Immediate Corrections	Delayed Corrections	Immediate + Delayed Correction
124	80	35	9

The data on the table above present that from the totals of students' errors which have been corrected, there were 80 errors involving in immediate corrections. It can be revealed that correction of students' errors in grammar for speaking class was mostly done immediately when the errors happened in line with the goal of the class which trains the students to speak accurately and grammatically.

Table 3 - Results of What Kinds Of Errors Were Corrected Based on Focused and Unfocused Correction

No	Grammatical Targets of Grammar for Speaking Class		Grammatical Errors	
			Corrected	Ignored
1.	5 Basic of Tenses	Simple present	4	17
		Present Continuous	1	-
		Present Perfect	2	-
		Past Simple	74	55
		Simple Future	2	-
2.	Modals	Could	4	1
		Must	5	-
3.	Passive Forms	Simple present	1	-
		Present Perfect	1	-
		Past Simple	-	1
		Must	1	-
4.	Adjective Clause		1	1
5.	Noun Clause		1	2
	TOTAL		97	77
	Other Errors Out of The Materials		27	62

The data above shows that “the focused corrective feedback” was done widely. The data tells that most of the errors which have been corrected are the errors related to the grammatical targets of grammar for speaking class which have been taught by the teacher. The total of errors made by the students related to the materials which they learnt in the class is 174 errors. The number of 174 errors shows that there are 97 errors being corrected while the errors which were ignored just reach 77 errors during teaching and learning process while the result of corrected errors related to the materials that were not taught by the teacher in the class. The errors of students that have no relation with the materials of grammar for speaking were mostly ignored. The data shows that from 89 students’ errors which have no relation with the materials of grammar for speaking, there were 62 errors being ignored.

Table 4 - Results of What Kinds Of Errors Were Corrected Based on Global and Local errors

The Students’ Errors	Grammatical Errors			
	Global Errors		Local Errors	
	Corrected	Ignored	Corrected	Ignored
263	85	64	39	75

The data above reveals that the correction in grammar for speaking class was generally focused on the global errors. The frequency of global errors which were corrected was quite higher than the frequency of local errors which were corrected. The corrected global errors get to 85 errors while the corrected local errors just get to 39 errors. It means the students’ errors which infect the understanding of communication are mostly considered to get the corrective feedback.

Table 5 - Results of Types and Distribution of Corrective Feedback Types

Type of Corrective Feedback Used	Frequencies
Metalinguistic Feedback	38
Recast	58
Elicitation	7
Repetition	3
Paralinguistic Signal	1
Recast + Metalinguistic Feedback	5
Elicitation + Metalinguistic Feedback	4

Repetition + Metalinguistic Feedback	1
Elicitation + Recast	3
Paralinguistic Signal + Recast + Metalinguistic Feedback	1
Elicitation + Paralinguistic Signal + Recast	1
Elicitation + Paralinguistic Signal + Repetition	1
Elicitation + Paralinguistic Signal + Recast + Metalinguistic Feedback	1
Total	124

The categorization of corrective feedback types used in grammar for speaking class above tells that the corrective feedback in grammar for speaking class did not always engage single particular type of corrective feedback but sometimes the mixed corrective feedback types were engaged to succeed in doing correction. However, the mixed corrective feedback types were engaged in grammar for speaking class, the data shows that "recast" dominated the usage of corrective feedback in grammar for speaking class.

Table 6 - Results of Percentage of Error Correction and Percentage of Error Ignorance

Students' Errors	Error Correction	Percentage of Error Correction (%)	Error Ignorance	Percentage of Error Ignorance (%)
263	124	47.5	139	52.5

The data above shows that there were many students' errors being ignored. Based on the interview done with the teacher of class, it was got the data about the reasons why those errors were ignored. The whole data of interview conducted with the teacher of grammar for speaking class was classified as follows;

Table 7 - The Result of Reasons Why Some Errors Were Ignored

The Reasons to Ignore Some Errors	Frequency
1. The errors consist of grammatical material that have not been taught when errors happened	48
2. The corrective feedback just focused on one particular usage of grammatical feature on that day	34
3. The teacher did not want to interrupt the students' speaking activity	38
4. The errors were ignored due to limitation time	19
Total	139

Based on the classification above, it is revealed that most of errors were ignored because the errors consist of grammatical materials that have not been taught when errors happened.

From the questionnaires spread, the data related to the students' perception toward the implementation of oral corrective feedback in grammar for speaking class as follows;

Table 8 - The Result of the Students' Perception about Whether Students' Errors Should Be Corrected or Not

No	Statement	Answer	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	Errors Should Be Corrected	a. Yes	21	100
		b. No	0	0

The data above tells that 100% students in grammar for speaking class are willing to get corrective feedback as the response to their erroneous utterances. The students surely prefer if the errors they made are corrected rather than being left without any correction because the students who joined in grammar for speaking absolutely need feedback in order to improve their grammatical accuracy of speaking.

Table 9 - The Result of the Students' Perception about Who Should Do the Correcting in Grammar for Speaking Class

No	Statement	Answer	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	Corrected by Teacher	a. Yes	18	85.5
		b. No	3	14.5
2.	Students' Self-Correct	a. Yes	16	76.5
		b. No	5	23.5
3.	Corrected by Other Students	a. Yes	12	57.5
		b. No	9	42.5

Result of questionnaire above reveals that the highest percentage, 85, 5% students, prefers to get error correction from the teacher. Most of students have perception that the one who should correct their errors is the teacher of grammar for speaking class while there were 76, 5% students still willing to get encouragement to do self-correct. The correction of other students in the classroom reached the lowest preferences.

Table 10 - The Result of the Students' Perception about When the Learners' Errors Should Be Corrected

No	Statement	Answer	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	Immediate correction	a. Yes	10	47.5
		b. No	11	52.5
2.	Delayed correction	a. Yes	1	4.5
		b. No	20	95.5
3.	Immediate correction + Delayed correction	a. Yes	10	47.5
		b. No	11	52.5

According to the table above, the result of students' preference about when to correct students' errors reveals that there is tendency of the same result between students who prefer to get immediate correction when errors happened and the students who prefer both immediate correction and delayed correction. It means that most of the students of grammar of speaking class have perception to welcome the corrective feedback anytime no matter it was delivered immediately or it was delayed in the last of speaking activity.

Table 11- The Result of the Students' Perception about What Kinds of Errors Should Be Corrected

No	Statement	Answer	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	Focused Error Correction	a. Yes	14	66.5
		b. No	7	33.5
2.	Unfocused Error Correction	a. Yes	14	66.5
		b. No	7	33.5
3.	Global Error	a. Yes	8	38.5
		b. No	13	61.5
4.	Local Error	a. Yes	1	4.5
		b. No	20	95.5
5.	Global Error + Local Error	a. Yes	12	57.5
		b. No	9	42.5

From the view of "focused and unfocused error correction", the students prefer to have both focused and unfocused error correction. The students of grammar for speaking class do not mind to get correction as the responses to both the errors which have relation with the grammatical materials that they have learnt in the class and other errors happened which has no relation with grammatical materials that they have learnt in grammar for speaking class.

The similar result also found in the term of "global errors and local errors", it is known that 57,5% students have no matter to get corrections to both the errors that infects the understanding of communication called "global errors" and the error that do not infect the understanding of communication called "local errors".

Table 12- The Result of the Students' Perception about What Types of Corrective Feedback Should Be Used

No	Statement	Answer	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	Recast	a. Yes	8	38.5
		b. No	13	61.5
2.	Repetition	a. Yes	10	47.5
		b. No	11	52.5
3.	Explicit Correction	a. Yes	20	95.5
		b. No	1	4.5

4.	Clarification Request	a. Yes	13	61.5
		b. No	8	38.5
5.	Metalinguistic Feedback	a. Yes	17	80.5
		b. No	4	19.5
6.	Elicitation	a. Yes	19	90.5
		b. No	2	9.5
7.	Paralinguistic Signal	a. Yes	11	52.5
		b. No	10	47.5

The data above tells that the most dominant type of corrective feedback which was preferred by the students of grammar for speaking is "explicit corrective feedback". The students tend to avoid the ambiguous feedback and prefer to get feedback that delivered explicitly.

DISCUSSION

Research Findings Compared to the Theory of Corrective Feedback

The Implementation of Corrective Feedback

Based on these research findings, the one who was dominant in doing error correction in grammar for speaking class was the teacher. That finding is contradicted with the suggestion of Doughty and Varela (1998) which said that the teacher should encourage the students to do self-correct by stressing the part of error as sign for the students that they are making an error. If that way is not successful, the teacher can take part in providing any corrections by reorganizing the erroneous part. While Ellis (2009) argued the suggestion of students' self correct above by telling that the process of teacher's correction which is done after the failure of students to do self-correct is potentially disturbing the activity of student because to do that correction is really wasting the time. He also said that students' self-correct cannot work maximally if the students do not have enough knowledge. He supported teacher's correction to be employed.

The data related to the time in giving error correction resulted that correction of students' errors in grammar for speaking class was mostly done immediately when the errors happened. The finding of this upcoming study that conducted in speaking class that focuses on improving grammatical accuracy strengthens what Scrivener said. Scrivener (2005) said that an immediate correction is more appropriate to be engaged in the accuracy activity while delayed correction is suggested to do in fluency activity.

The finding of the study shows that errors which were mostly corrected in grammar for speaking class are the errors that related to the materials which have been taught by the teacher in grammar for speaking class. The errors that have no relation with the grammatical materials taught tend to be ignored. That finding is supported by Ellis (2009) who said that it is necessary to do "the focused corrective feedback". "The focused corrective feedback" means corrective feedback that focuses on particular different target every day. Those connections between theory and finding of this current study are contradicted with teacher guides. According to the view of cognitive-code learning method, all errors made by students should be corrected to avoid the repetition of errors in the upcoming time. (Ur: 1996)

In the term of "global and local error", the results proved that "global errors" were mostly corrected during learning and teaching process of grammar for speaking class. That result strengthens what Burt said. Burt (1975) encouraged to correct "global error" rather than "local error". Beyond that, Ellis (2013) argued determination of "global and local errors" by saying that it is hard to decide which one the global error is and which one the local error is at the time of giving correction.

This current study shows that "recast" was the type of corrective feedback which was dominantly used. That current result is supported by result of the previous study conducted by Mifka-Profozic (2012) which concluded that "recast" is more effective to improve the students' grammatical accuracy compared with clarification request.

Related to the error ignorance, there were 139 students' errors were ignored from 263 errors happened. The result of error correction done selectively in this current study is affirmed by Ur (1996) who said that doing correction has to be done selectively in order to avoid the missing of learning value. Katayama (2007) also strengthens by saying that selecting error is very beneficial to keep the students excitement in learning. While the reason of error ignorance found was mostly because the grammatical errors made by the students consist of grammatical materials that have not been taught by the teacher when the errors happened. It is surely supported by Ellis (2009) who suggested doing "focused and unfocused feedback" to make the correction work maximally on improving one particular grammatical target.

The Students' Perception to the Implementation of Corrective Feedback

The finding of students' perception about whether students' errors should be corrected or not shows that 100% students prefer to get error correction. It is absolutely appropriate with the theory of Allwright and Bailey. Allwright and Bailey (1991) said that the improvement of students' language will be influenced negatively if the students' errors are ignored. The students really welcome to get any error correction.

The result of students' perception about who should do the correcting in grammar for speaking class shows that the majority of students prefer to get error correction from "the teacher". That result of students' perception is in line with the result of corrective feedback implementation got in the previous discussion. The corrective feedback in grammar for speaking class was mostly implemented by the teacher and the students of grammar for speaking class are prefer to get correction from the teacher of class too. Both results found surely strengthen the result of previous study conducted by Fadilah, Anugerahwati, and Prayogo (2017) who conducted the research about the students' perception of corrective feedback toward the freshman students and sophomore students reveals that teacher is most preferred corrector of errors.

In term of the students' perception about when the learners' errors should be corrected, the result shows that students prefer to get both immediate and delayed correction. It is contradicted with the previous study conducted by Fadilah, Anugerahwati, and Prayogo (2017) which revealed that the students prefer to get delayed correction rather than immediate correction.

In the case of "focused and unfocused feedback" related to the students' perception about what kinds of errors should be corrected, the students welcome to get corrections for all kinds of errors they made no matter whether they got correction related to the grammatical materials that they have learnt in the class or not. It is contrastive with the suggestion of Ellis. Ellis (2009) encourages the teacher to set the specific target to correct students' errors called "focused feedback". While in the term of "global and local error", the students do not mind to get correction to both errors that infect the understanding of communication and errors that do not infect the understanding of communication. That students' perception is clearly contradicted with the suggestion of Burt. Burt (1975) suggests correcting "the global error" rather than "the local error".

The students' perception about what types of corrective feedback should be used which resulted "explicit feedback" as the most preferred feedback type used. The students prefer to get correction explicitly rather than the implicit and ambiguous correction like recast. Ammar and Spada (2006) state that recast is considered as ambiguous feedback type because the learner sometimes can not notice the corrective intent of recasts.

CONCLUSION

Based on data that were collected by using instruments determined in the previous chapters, it is drawn some conclusions as follows;

1. The implementation of oral corrective feedback in grammar for speaking class in the term of;

(a) Who does the correcting in grammar for speaking class

According to the classification of data frequency got from documentation, it can be concluded that the teacher of grammar for speaking class is the one who is dominant in giving correction to the students' erroneous utterances.

(b) When the learners' errors are corrected

Related to the time of giving corrective feedback, it is drawn that most of students' errors were corrected immediately when the errors happened. Immediate correction was mostly engaged in order to achieve grammatical accuracy based on the main goal of grammar for speaking class.

(c) What kinds of errors are corrected

According to the classifications done on the theories determined in the previous chapter, the result of study shows the tendency that the errors which were dominantly corrected in grammar for speaking class is the errors which have relation with the target of grammatical materials that have been set by the teacher of grammar for speaking class, it is called as "focused feedback". While in term of "global and local error", the errors which infect the understanding of communication called "global error" were mostly corrected rather than the "local errors".

(d) Types and distribution of corrective feedback types

From 7 types of corrective feedback, it is concluded that recast is widely used to correct the students' grammatical errors in grammar for speaking class. Recast was considered as simple corrective feedback type.

2. Whether any students' error is ignored or not, if it is found, what the reasons of ignorance

The result of this study shows that from 263 students' errors during teaching and learning process in grammar for speaking class, there are 139 students' errors were ignored. Based on the result of interview conducted with the teacher of grammar for speaking class, it is known that there four reasons why some of students' errors were ignored; those are because (1) the errors consist of grammatical material that have not been taught when errors happened, (2) the corrective feedback just focused on one particular usage of grammatical feature on that day, (4) the teacher did not want to interrupt the students' speaking activity, and (5) the errors were ignored due to limitation time.

From those four reasons, it is concluded that most of the students' errors were ignored because the errors consist of grammatical materials that have not been taught by the teacher when errors happened.

3. The students' perception to the oral corrective feedback in grammar for speaking class in term of;

(a) Whether students' error should be corrected or not

The students' perception shows the tendency that they look forward to getting corrective feedback as the treatment to the errors they make. All students of grammar for speaking class even disagree if their errors were left without any correction.

(b) Who should correct the students' errors in grammar for speaking class

Based on the data of questionnaires, it is concluded that the students of grammar for speaking class prefer to get correction from the teacher. The students tend to consider that the one who should mainly correct their errors is the teacher of grammar speaking class who has enough knowledge to do correction.

(c) When the learners' errors should be corrected

The students of grammar for speaking class show the tendency of the same result between students who prefer to get immediate correction when errors happened and the students who prefer to get both immediate correction and delayed correction.

(d) What kinds of errors should be corrected

If the result of implementation of oral corrective feedback in term of errors that were corrected in grammar for speaking class shows that "focused error correction" was mostly engaged, in the term of students perception shows different result. The students really welcomed to receive both focused and unfocused feedback no matter whether their corrected errors are connected with the grammatical materials they have learnt in the class or not. The students prefer to get correction to any kinds of errors they made. While in the term of global and local errors, the students' perception shows the similar result. Students of grammar for speaking class do not mind to get corrections to both the errors that infect the understanding of communication called "global errors" and the error that do not infect the understanding of communication called "local errors".

(e) Types of corrective feedback should be used to correct students' errors

The result of implementation of oral corrective feedback in term of corrective feedback type that was used to correct students' errors in grammar for speaking class has been concluded that "recast" was dominantly used to correct students' errors but in the students' perception, students of grammar for speaking class prefer to get correction by using "explicit feedback type". The students are more interested in receiving correction which is delivered explicitly rather than implicitly.

REFERENCES

- Allwright, D. & Bailey, K.M. 1991. *Focus on The Language Classroom: An Introduction to Classroom Research for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Ammar, A. & Spada, N. 2006. One Size Fits All?: Recast, Prompts, and L2 Learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28: 543-74
- Ellis, R. 2009. Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1): 3-8
- Ellis, R. 2013. Corrective Feedback in Teacher Guides and SLA. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 1(3): 1-18
- Fadilah. A. E., Anugerahwati, M. & Prayogo, A. P. 2017. EFL Students' Preferences for Oral Corrective Feedback in Speaking Instruction. *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora*, 5(2): 76-87
- Fan, N. 2019. An Investigation of Oral Corrective Feedback in an ESL Listening and Speaking Class. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 10(1): 197-203
- Hendrickson, J. M. 1978. Error Correction in Foreign Language Teaching: Recent Theory, Research, and Practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, 62(8): 387-398
- Mifka-Profozic, N. 2012. *Corrective Feedback, Individual Differences and the L2 Acquisition of French Preterite and Imperfect Tenses*. Unpublished Ph.D thesis. Auckland: University of Auckland
- Scrivener, J. 2005. *Learning Teaching: A Guidebook for English Language Teachers*. Oxford: MacMillan Education
- Ur, P. 1996. *A Course in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.