

CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK AS PERCEIVED BY AN EFL TEACHER AND STUDENTS IN SPEAKING CLASSROOM

Yustika Nur Fajriah
Institut Pendidikan Indonesia, Garut
yustikanurfajri@gmail.com

Abstract

Given the prominence of corrective feedback, particularly in educational context, has been reported by related studies in SLA (White, 1987; Lyster & Ranta, 1997). However, many teachers failed to develop second language acquisition through corrective feedback since they didn't meet the effective ways in giving error correction (Hendrickson, 1976 as cited in Krashen, 1982). Given to these concerns, this study aims to investigate corrective feedback used as perceived by both EFL teacher as well as students in speaking classroom. To collect the data, this study employed open ended questionnaire, and structured interview. The findings reveal that the teacher and students perceived positively toward the importance of corrective feedback used in their speaking performance. Additionally, the explicit feedback given at the end of the students' speaking applied by the teacher is also considered as an effective way to correct errors as perceived by students.

Keywords: Corrective feedback, an EFL teacher and students, speaking

INTRODUCTION

Corrective feedback has been claimed as an important aspect in second language learning. It is supported by some hypotheses which gaze theoretical claim from Krashen (1982) about unprofitable as well as destructive effects of corrective feedback in SLA since error correction will obstruct the stages of acquiring the comprehensible input. It is in line with White (1987) that corrective feedback has been a prominence particularly in L2 learning context based on the hypotheses that learners need corrective feedback in order to distinguish the inter-language form with the second language learnt). Swain (1985) with output hypothesis also emphasizes that the input only is not sufficient to develop second language as shown by the studies on French immersion that learners still were far from the native like performance though they got much comprehensible input. It is also supported by Schachter (1998) as cited in Tomczyk (2013) that the lack of corrective feedback will let learners stay in incorrect hypothesis which automatically obstruct the process of language acquisition. In accordance with that, it is inferred that corrective feedback has been taken into account as a prominent aspect in second language acquisition particularly in L2 education context.

Hendrickson (1976) as in Krashen (1982) claim that many teachers failed to develop students' language acquisition through negative feedback in learning process since they did not meet the condition as the four main things concerned in giving the

error correction; they are, error correction is limited to the learnable and take-away rules, the correction enables Monitor to work, the negative feedback is concerned with the time which enables learners to use conscious knowledge, and the subject given in the correction is under the monitor- user by means students have been familiar with the knowledge of subjects corrected.

Moreover, teachers have the important roles in second language learners' learning. It is in relation to Krashen & Terrel (1983) as cited in Bot, Lowie, and Verspoor (2005) that learning is the product of formal teaching resulting the conscious knowledge in language. It is also supported by Schmidt (1999) as cited in Bot, Lowie, and Verspoor (2005) that there is an evidence that conscious understanding resulted from language learning gives positive influence towards the language acquisition though the issue of implicit learning is hard to be firmed.

Regarding corrective feedback in second language acquisition resulted in learning process, it is necessary to uncover teachers' perceptions on the use of corrective feedback in second language learning. It is also important to discover students' perceptions toward corrective feedback used to know whether or not they perceive the error correction given positively.

Numerous studies concerning corrective feedback in SLA have been conducted. Panova and Lyster (2002) investigated the patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom by using observation in a Montreal school board in Canada. The result is recast and translation are mostly used in corrective feedback; whereas, the uptake as the advance step is rarely conducted in the classroom. Another related study undertaken by Agudo (2012) aims to investigate Spanish EFL students' beliefs and preferences regarding the effectiveness of corrective feedback which was conducted in two bilingual schools taking two classes in each site. The instrument used is likert- scale instrument and resulted the findings that corrective feedback may discourage L2 learning since the students believe that it made them often feel embarrassed during the error correction in front of their friends. This study suggests other following studies to analyze the time of correction properly chosen in language learning. Tomczyk (2013) conducted the study which aims at investigating teachers' as well as students' perceptions on oral corrective feedback which involved 43 English teachers as well as 250 students from secondary schools and technical colleges which English is taught as foreign language. The instrument used in this study was questionnaires in forms of both close- ended and open ended questions. The result shows that teachers and students believe that corrective feedback is important to be undertaken in classroom. Furthermore, students expect teachers to correct the errors as well as to reintroduce the rules of the utterances.

This study particularly adopted types of oral corrective feedback based on Lyster & Ranta's (1997) which involve recast, explicit correction, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, clarification request, and repetition. Besides, paralinguistic strategy is also added by Ellis (2009). Recast is the strategy to rearticulate learners' erroneous utterances without altering the original meaning. Doughty (2001) as cited in

Ellis (2009) states that recasts enable learners to rehearse what they have accessed on their inter-language. Explicit correction is defined as an attempt to supply the clear indication of what is being corrected; for example, the teacher says “it should be..., the correct one is..., or you mean...” Elicitation is also meant as a way to evoke the correct forms without giving the proper utterances. Besides, clarification request is a technique which indicate the students’ utterances that cannot be understood or ill formed such as by saying “Pardon? What do you mean? Sorry?” Repetition is also used in the corrective feedback in which teachers try to repeat the errors made by students in order to make students are aware of the errors made. The last one is paralinguistic signal; teachers’ attempt to use of gesture or facial expression which indicate the errors have emerged. Therefore, types of corrective feedback discussed in this study involve recast, explicit correction, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, clarification request, and repetition

To avoid misinterpretation of the terms, it is necessary to clarify particular terms discussed in this research; corrective feedback and perceptions. Corrective feedback in this study concerns on the error correction given by recast, explicit correction, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, clarification request, and repetition by the teacher in second language learning particularly in speaking activity (Gass & Selinker, 2008). Whereas, perceptions from psychologists’ perspective are defined as knowledge, beliefs, and/ or expectation resulted from cognitive process by involving experiences (Schlack & Albright, 2007; Zhaoping & Guyader, 2007 as cited in King, 2007). Therefore, this study portrayed teacher’s perceptions in terms of understanding and belief in using corrective feedback; meanwhile, students’ perceptions will concern on their belief as well as expectation about the error correction given.

METHODOLOGY

This present study undertaken qualitatively in case study design which was in accordance with the intention to get understanding in depth as well as the information in details concerning the corrective feedback used as perceived by EFL teacher as well as. It is in line Mc.Millan and Schumacher (1989) that case study is undertaken to analyze one phenomenon in order to understand in depth regardless of the number of sites, participants, or documents for a study. This research also applies a descriptive study which tends to describe the existing phenomenon without making the hypothesis in the prior stage (Grimes & Schulz, 2002). In other words, this study was conducted through the principles of the qualitative approach as well as the descriptive study.

In data collection, one of state vocational schools in Bandung was chosen as the research site. This school actually has implemented 2013 curriculum as the pilot project of the government in the period of 2013-2014. The accessibility and also permission were also taken into account in considering the site. A female English teacher served as a respondent. She teaches English in ESP (English for Specific Purpose) program in tourism as well as office administration major. She was chosen based on the consideration that she is experienced teacher who has high educational

background in English teaching. Even, she is continuing her study for master degree in English education major which support the assumption that she is familiar with the topic discussed in this research. Moreover, the other observed participants are five students in one of tourism classes taught by the observed teacher. They were taken purposively on basis of willingness, interest and the representativeness. It means that students exactly proposed themselves to be observed as well as the teacher's help to select students based on their achievement; high, medium and low achievers from speaking test result. In other words, the sampling technique used was purposive sampling.

Moreover, triangulation of the method applied in this study which is shown by the use of two types of instruments; questionnaires as well as interviews. It is in accordance with Mc.Millan and Schumacher (1989), there is a multiple method which can be conducted in a qualitative data collection. Open-ended questionnaire type was chosen to uncover the overall responses of students' on the corrective feedback used by the teacher in speaking classroom. Open-ended semi-structured interviews were also undertaken to both the teacher and selected students.

This study was analyzed inductively as in line with McMillan and Schumacher (1989) that in inductive analysis, the category of data analysis come out rather than enforced prior in data collection. Dealing with that, the data were analyzed through the process of coding, identifying, and interpreting the data. In the first step, the data were segmented and labeled which is in accordance with Creswell (2010) that the coding process involves segmenting and labeling the data. In other words, the transcripts of both the questionnaire and the interview were coded based on the focus of the study. Afterwards, the data were identified based on resulted codes, aimed at uniting the ideas which were needed to answer the research questions. At last, the data were interpreted in details as the points in the findings. The findings were also discussed then by relating with the theoretical foundation used in this study before getting the conclusion.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

This section will cover the findings as well as discussions to answer research questions posed in this study;” What are EFL teacher's perceptions on corrective feedback used in speaking class? “What are students' perceptions on the corrective feedback yielded by the teacher in speaking class? Direct quotations are also cited in this part to be analyzed and discussed in details by relating the data gained by the theoretical foundations used.

The Perceptions on the necessary to use corrective feedback

Given at the results of questionnaires as well as students' interview, all students expect the corrective feedback from the teacher as it will help them to acquire the second language well particularly in speaking. Almost of them stated that speaking is quite complex, they have to understand the grammar, pronunciation as well the

selection of vocabulary items. Therefore, the possibility to make errors in speaking is high so that they claim that corrective feedback is a way to help them speak English properly. Even one of students (In) interviewed explained that

“One day, kita kan kerja ya bu di bidang pariwisata pasti kita ketemu bule, jadi koreksi dari guru sangatlah diharapkan biar kita nanti gak salah salah ngomong bu, apalagi dalam speaking, itu kan buat komunikasi ya bu, ya jadi sangatlah penting. Kalo kita ga dikoreksi, kita pasti sering salah ngomong dan itu memalukan”.

To conclude, students expect getting corrective feedback from the teacher particularly in speaking activity aimed at measuring as well as encouraging their ability in speaking. Even, one of students as her statements mentioned above the corrective feedback will be used to the real communication when she comes to job field which need her to speak English properly.

Furthermore, the teacher also has the same perspective with her students that giving correction is one of important parts in teaching and learning process, including language teaching as she said:

“Koreksi itu tentu sangat penting, terutama ini kan belajar bahasa asing, soalnya di kelas itu kan diumpamakan sebagai laboratorium bahasa anak anak, tempat mereka belajar dan bereksperimen. Biasanya dengan adanya kesalahan dan diberikan koreksi, mereka jadi inget, oh iya lupa itu teh salah, minggu kemarinjadi mereka dapat menyadari kesalahan terutama saat speaking sehingga dalam proses akuisisi, mereka ga akan mengulangi kesalahan dalam pengucapan, yang harusnya f jadi p, atau yang harusnya grammarnya past tense ini pakai verb one..dan lainnya”

In other words, the teacher believes that giving corrective feedback is important to be a part of language learning since it will contribute to the development of students' second language acquisition. Of course, it is in relation to Schachter (1998) as cited in Tomczyk (2013) that the lack of corrective feedback will let learners keep incorrect hypothesis which automatically obstruct the process of language acquisition.

Types of corrective feedback used in speaking course

Regarding the data from questionnaires, all five students claim that the teacher is accustomed to correct students' errors in speaking by fixing the utterances to be the proper ones without giving students coded feedback as a chance to fix by themselves. One of them wrote *“Guru biasanya mengoreksi langsung kesalahan. Misal : kita salah mengucapkan 50 (fifty) jadi 15 (fifteen) dikoreksi sama ibu langsung.”* Another student also answered *“mengoreksi langsung saya ingat pada saat saya mengucapkan cousin tetapi melafalkannya dalam bahasa Prancis.”* In other words, the type of corrective feedback used by the teacher is explicit correction which indicate the attempts to give the clear indication of the errors to be corrected (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

Moreover, based on the interview results, two of students perceived that what has been conducted by the teacher in giving the corrective feedback is appropriate since they will automatically know what errors they have made as well as what the correct utterances are as a student (De) said *“langsung dikasih tau, soalnya kalau dikasi kode kita teh da asa bener jadi susah.. kalau to the point mah ohh salah..”* Besides, it can be concluded that students need the explicit corrective feedback to indicate the gap between aberrant interlanguage forms and the L2. (Gass, 1997, 2003; VanPatten, 2003; Long, 2007 as cited in Agudo, 2012), it is also stated by (Eu) that it is better to get the correction explicitly without trying to catch the code. However, another student prefer getting some codes or signals when they make errors particularly in their speaking since it will be a challenge for them to fix the errors first so that it trains them to carefully concern on their utterances. In contrast, the other one (Mu) state that she needs both explicit feedback and implicit feedback as she said *“Kalau aku ada 2, kalau kata kata nya susah lebih baik langsung dikasi tau apa yang benarnya kalo kata katanya gampang yaa mending guru ngasi kode biar akunya pun berusaha mikir sendiri.”*

The interview of the teacher was also conducted. She stated that she uses explicit feedback giving students opportunity to fix by themselves previously; by giving some signals, gestures, clues, and many more. She stated *“saya biasanya mengoreksinya langsung, karena kalau dengan kode, atau misal dengan gesture, ekspresi, ataupun pengulangan kata dengan stress yang beda, anak malah suka bilang miss, sebelah mana emang salahnya. Jadi anak anak susah untuk menangkap maknanya maksudnya kemana”*.

In other words, the strategy to use explicit feedback is to avoid misunderstanding of students in catching the intentions of the teacher which can obstruct the process of acquiring the second language. Even, the teacher also said that she has tried to give coded feedback but those techniques did not help students to be aware of the errors made and automatically could not guide students to try correct errors by themselves. In other words, the teacher prefers using explicit feedback after trying some techniques of the implicit feedback, such as the recast, clarification request, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, even paralinguistic signal.

To conclude, the teacher uses explicit corrective by which she clearly indicates that what learners have said is incorrect (Lyster & Ranta: 1997) as a way to overcome students' errors particularly in speaking based on the perception as well as experiences that students will get confused if they are demanded to identify the errors as well as to try correcting by themselves. Moreover, the teacher also avoids the mismatching of her intention and students' interpretation when giving the corrective feedback. It is in line with Agudo (2012) that one of issues on the corrective feedback in SLA is the mismatches between teachers' intentions with students' interpretation. Besides, most of students perceive positively to the choice of the teacher in using explicit feedback in their second language acquisition particularly in speaking activity.

The regulating of corrective feedback applied by the teacher

In this discussion, the regulating of corrective feedback is defined as the timing considered appropriate to give the error correction during speaking activity. Students stated that the teacher tends to give the correction in the final session after all students perform rather than interrupting them in the middle of speaking. They stated that the teacher has conducted the interruption when the errors appear in speaking but it rarely happens. Three of them perceived that correction in the final phase is proper to be conducted since the interruption always obstruct their concentration in the performance, like a student (Mu) said *“aku senang dikoreksi beres speaking, kesalahannya dimana aja, soalnya kalau ditengah tengah diinterupsi suka, aduhh poho! Soalnya jadi ngeblank.”* In addition, she said that the corrective feedback in the last session stated that it will have longer time to do correction. The similar statement is also uttered by another student (De) who claims that she will get nervous if the teacher interrupts her incidentally during she speaks so that she believes that giving correction in the final stage is the proper choice. However, (Ri) claimed that he likes to get feedback in the middle of speaking since he will be easily remember the error if it is directly corrected. Moreover, the other students (In & Eu) claim that the interruption in the middle of speaking is not problem. It helps them to remember easily the errors they made so that they will not do the same errors later. Moreover, a student explained that interruption is not obstructive if the correction is about pronunciation, as a student (Eu) said

“Mau diinterupsi ataupun setelah beres speaking itu ga masalah. tetapi interupsi nya cuma soal kesalahan pronunciation karena pasti langsung inget kalo dikoreksi pas itu juga.. Kalau soal grammar atau salah kata mending di akhir soalnya koreksinya butuh waktu lama terus susah buat lanjutannya karena jadi blank harus ati ati mikirin grammar sama vocab selanjutnya.”

It means that the student believes that the pronunciation errors should be corrected directly; whereas, the grammar accuracy and the diction are better corrected after the session of speaking finishes.

Giving these concerns, the teacher is expected to understand the types of corrective feedback in relation to the types of errors as well as the timing of giving the error correction. It is in line with Hendrickson (1976) as in Krashen (2009) that the error correction must be under condition of the learnability, the portability and the properness of time.

The statements from students were also confirmed by the teacher through the interview. She stated that the time to give corrective feedback is based on the situation and the types of errors occur as she uttered

“Ada yang direct juga yang indirect. Misalnya ada yang langsung on the spot kalau fatal, seperti apa ya.. contohnya kemarin itu misalnya di pronunciation. Kalau grammar accuracy sama lexicalnya atau pemilihan kata biasanya di akhir.”

Therefore, the teacher focuses on pronunciation errors to be corrected directly (by interruption); whereas, the corrective feedback will be portrayed in the post-teaching activity to the errors of grammar accuracy and the lexical choices. Besides, the teacher also added her statement that she also concerns students' psychological condition in which she never mentions the name of students who have made the errors in the process of correcting as she said

“Koreksi biasanya diberikan setelah semua siswa perform, tentunya tidak menyebutkan nama, jadi secara umum, misal ada beberapa koreksi.....atau tadi saya lupa siapa ya yang jelas koreksinya adalah..... tapi kadang anak-anak juga nyadar sendiri suka tiba tiba bilang iya ya miss itu aku,, atau mereka senyum senyum sendiri.”

In other words, the teacher carefully considers the timing of corrective feedback as well as the psychology of students in giving the corrective feedback. Of course, it is in relation to Hendrickson (1976) as in Krashen (2009) that it is necessary for teachers to concern the time as well as the condition in giving the corrective feedback in SLA. It is also reported by Agudo (2012) that his research shows that corrective feedback may distract the process of learning which also automatically obstruct the acquisition since students often complain towards the time of corrective feedback used; direct interruption during speaking activity, since they feel so embarrassed to be suddenly paused then corrected in front of the class.

CONCLUSION

To conclude, both the English teacher and students perceive positively towards the use of corrective feedback in speaking on the basis of their perspectives that error correction helps students to improve their speaking proficiency. Besides, students perceived the type of corrective feedback used by the teacher; explicit feedback, is effective to do in tackling the errors made in speaking class. The choice of giving correction after speaking performance finished rather than interrupting students in the middle of speaking practices is also considered as right timing as perceived by both the teacher and students.

REFERENCE

- Agudo, J. (2012). *Investigating Spanish EFL students' belief and Preferences Regarding the Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback*. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 9, 121-130.
- Creswell, J.W. (2010). *Educational Research*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall
- De Bot, K., Lowie, W., Vespoor, M. (2005). *Second Language Acquisition : An advance resource book*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Ellis, R. (2009). *Implicit and Explicit Knowledge in Second Language Learning, Testing, and Teaching. Corrective feedback and teacher development*. *L2 Journal*, 1(1):3-18

- Gass, S.M & Selinker, L. (2008). *Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Routledge
- Grimes, D. A., & Schulz, K. F. (2002). *Descriptive Studies: what they can and cannot do*. Lancet vol.359. [online] Retrieved on <http://www.lancet.com> [08/08/12]
- King, L. (2010). *The Science of Psychology: An Appreciative View*. Colombia: Mc Graw Hill, Marswendy. Jakarta: 222-238
- Krashen, S.D (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S.D. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: issue and implication*. Newyork: Longman
- Lyster,R.,& Ranta.L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation form in communicative classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 37-66.
- Mc.Millan & Schumacher. (1989). *Research in Education*. London: Harpler Collins Publishers
- Panova & Lyster (2012). *Patterns of Corrective Feedback and Uptake in a Adult ESL Classroom*. TESOL Quarterly, 36, 537-595.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S.M Gass & C. Madden (Eds), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp.235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Tomczyk, Wlzbietta. (2013). *Perceptions of Oral Errors and Their Corrective Feedback: Teachers vs. Students*. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 5, 924-931.
- White, L. (1987). *Against comprehensible input: The input hypothesis and the development of L2 competence*. *Applied Linguistics*, 8/1, 95-110.