HOW ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IS PERCEIVED BY EFL BILINGUAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHER

Novia Mustika Dewi[1], Ainun Putri Nurdiya[2], Mitha Mediana Sukandar[3], & Lucky Rahayu Nurjamin[4]

Institut Pendidikan Indonesia, Garut Indonesia
Email:
dewimustikanov@gmail.com

Abstract.
Oral corrective feedback (OCF) is one of the important teaching methods because it can aid the students in the learning process. The EFL teacher in bilingual primary schools was studied for this research because they are still in under research. This study tries to find out how oral corrective feedback (OCF) is perceived by EFL bilingual primary school teachers. This study used case study. The data were collected using semi-structured interview with one of the teacher. The findings of this research, there are four kinds of oral corrective feedback (OCF) that used often by the teacher in the learning process that are, recast, repetition, elicitation and paralinguistic signals and the mechanism used bases on the situations individually or group correction. The second findings of this research is from the teacher perspective giving oral corrective feedback (OCF) can be easier for students to remember the correction from the teacher

Keywords: Bilingual Primary School, EFL Teacher, Elicitation, Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF)

INTRODUCTION

Oral corrective feedback is a very a crucial component of speaking classes, because students' faults will be corrected in this class by the teacher. This is accordance with the assertion of (Ellis., 2017) Corrective feedback (CF) is an aspect of language pedagogy that is important for both teachers and second language acquisition (SLA) researchers. According to (Muslem, Zulfikar, Astila, Heiansyah, & Marhaban, 2021). A non-native English student often produces errors in using the target language. According to (Maolida, 2009), corrective feedback from teachers is essential for young learners' interlanguage development. She does, however, emphasize the importance of teachers providing clear corrective feedback in order to facilitate students' knowledge of proper target language usage. In other words, the teacher has the right to correct student mistakes, the corrections given must be appropriate, clear and wise. This is line with (Rahimi, & Zhang, 2015) the teacher has the responsibility to provide corrective feedback,

because students hope that the teacher can give the correct form of the students' language errors so that they are able to improve their language.

The present study focuses on oral CF. Earlier research (e.g., (Lyster, R., & Ranta, L, 1997) have developed taxonomies of Oral Corrective Feedback types that teachers used in their practice and explored: 1) teachers' rationale for CF (Fanselow, 1977), 2) attitude towards CF (Njuk, 1983), 3) awareness, 4) beliefs, and 5) perception about CF (Long, 1997), and 6) their reasoning for providing different types of CF (Chaudron, 2018). A number of experimental studies have examined the differential impact of various forms of CF on learners' CF uptake, production, and learning (e.g., Zhang & Rahimi, 2013; Nassaji, 2013; Shegar, Zhang, & Low, 2013; Rassaei, 2017). As the present study focuses on oral corrective feedback (OCF) and types of CF, it is useful to introduce the concept, which has been defined in relatively similar ways by various scholars through the years. Oral feedback, as its name implies, is feedback that is provided orally and frequently in interaction with other people.

In addition, there are some disadvantages of oral corrective feedback according to (Alsolami, 2019) Ineffective use of oral corrective feedback in language classes leads to issues such as inconsistency, ambiguity, and teacher ineffectiveness. Oral corrective feedback becomes unfavorable for students as well. According to (Zhao, Y., Yi, Z., Gentekaki, E., Zhan, A., Al-Farraj, S. A., & Song, W, 2016) The increased awareness of learners contributed to improved recognition and more accurate written production of the targeted form, such feedback can be deceptive because it does not focus on providing the learner with appropriate language skills. According to (Rahimi, 2010) and (Agudo, 2005), oral corrective feedback should be avoided because it might be "harmful, time consuming, and ineffective." Moreover, (Krashen, 1982) and (Truscott, 2007) agree that oral corrective feedback is useless and harmful. In addition, 'overcorrection' towards the errors will damage the students' self-confidence because the students will be embarrassed when the teachers give the feedback in front of others (Elsaghayer, 2014).

The study that examine the use of Oral Corrective Feedback at the elementary school especially bilingual schools, are still under research. The focus previously has been more to the EFL college students and senior high school students. Thus, it is essential to focus on the use of oral correlative feedback in elementary school and find out more about the perceived by the teacher on the EFL bilingual elementary school. In addition, this particular study will reveal the situation of the use of oral corrective feedback in the EFL bilingual elementary school, bringing forward important insights for teachers' and also researchers.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Oral corrective feedback (OCF)
Oral corrective feedback (OCF) refers to responses to learners' incorrect L2 productions in oral and written modes. According to (Ellis, 2009) oral corrective feedback has 6 types, Recast; Repetition; Clarification request; Explicit correction; Elicitation; and Paralinguistic signal. The researchers found that corrective feedback provides many advantages for second language learners. According to (Ellis, 2009) CF makes the student to construct a form-meaning mapping, which is essential for true acquisition. This will make it easier for students to learn second language.

Based on the researchers, almost all students responded positively to the feedback used by the teacher in correcting errors made by them during oral activities. Students feel that they learn more if their teacher corrects them all the time. This is line with (Ellis, 2009) Positive feedback affirms that a learner response to an activity is correct, in positive pedagogical theory feedback is seen as important because it provides affective support to learners and foster motivation to continue learning. According to (Muhsin, 2016), the most common sort of feedback utilized in speaking is corrective feedback since it directly displays errors, increasing the possibility of modifications and accelerating learning. Immediate feedback pinpoints errors, which enhance learning. So, it's no wonder why students are so excited and give positive responses when their teachers use oral corrective feedback.

METHODOLOGY

This study employs a case study. This study was carried out in bilingual elementary school. The school was chosen because their used oral corrective feedback strategies in the learning process, which are consistent with the research objectives. One bilingual elementary school teacher was chosen for this study. The participants were chosen by the researchers because the teacher used oral corrective feedback in the learning process.

The researcher used interview as a research instrument. The researchers used this instrument because interview is a flexible method. The purpose of the researchers to use this instrument because during the interview, the researcher can add or reduce the questions that have been prepared according to the needs of the researcher. This study's data was analyzed using the inductive analysis theory. According to (Creswell, 2016). The inductive approach to research begins with specific observations and measures and then moves on to detecting themes and patterns in the data. This enables the researcher to develop an early tentative hypothesis that can be tested. The exploration's findings may eventually lead to broad conclusions or theories. After recording and noting the data collection process, the researchers transcribed the results of the interview.

Researchers look for schools that fits with the research criteria, and once found, researchers obtain informed consent as a form of research approval. The researcher visited the school and explained the goals and objectives of the research. The researcher and the school determined the time of the research after obtaining approval in accordance with what was agreed upon. The researchers then returned to collect data through semi-structured interviews with the teacher.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This section contains the findings of the study in which the results and discussion are not done separation. The hope in this discussion the author examines the findings and cross-references with the study of theoretical and empirical studies.

Results

A. Experience

Based on the data, there were 4 types of OCF usually employed by the respondents.

1. Recast. The teacher said that this OCF used to fix the grammar. For example,

The teacher: where did u go at the weekend?
The students: I go to bla bla bla
The teacher: oh, so you went to your grandmother's house.

From that example, it is clear that the recast used to fix student's grammar mistake. It used when the morning assembly.

2. Repetition. The use of repetition is usually done during discussions or question and answer sessions which require students to make their own sentences directly. For example,
The teacher: How many animals are in the picture?
The student: There are 5 animal (without the letter 's')
The teacher: So, there are 5 animals?

3. Elicitation. Carried out both during discussions in class and outside of class hours (breaks time).

4. Paralinguistic signals, it is done when helping students work on worksheets. For example, if there is an error in spelling or using the article, just point your hand or shake your head a little, then the student understands what needs to be corrected.

Oral corrective feedback was also employed to help students aware of grammar mistakes, and able to pre-filter the words/sentences to be spoken/written, so that they are grammatically more organized. 'Made a mistake. Learn from them'.

Regarding the mechanism, the teacher gave oral corrective feedback based on the situation. The teacher used to give the OCF in general and also individually. The teacher said "*Biasanya sih depend on the situation ya, OCF nya itu bisa in general ke semua murid ke semua siswa atau secara individu personal, ocus secara general itu siswa cenderung kurang bisa menangkap apa yang disampaikan oleh teacher jadi harus mengulang Kembali nantinya, jadi better dikasih OCF secara personal dari awal, dan lebih sering dikasih personal sih atau individu.*" (Usually it depends on the situation, yes, the OCF can be in general to all students or individually, if in general students tend to be less able to understand what the teacher is saying so they have to repeat it later, so it's better to give OCF separately personal from the start, and more often given personally or individually).
It means that it is better to give the OCF individually so students can understand the feedback clearly, and it's shown that most of the mechanisms used by teachers is giving the OCF individually to their students. The repetition of giving OCF to the students depends on their condition and whether they are able to quickly understand the feedback given or not. The teacher said
"As I mentioned before*, kalo untuk yang berulang itu biasanya ocus saya kasih OCF secara general, kalo untuk secara ocusua tau personal biasanya tergantung kondisi siswanya apakah dia mampu menangkap dengan cepat feedback yang diberikan maksud dari feedback yang diberikan atau dia masih kayak confused masih bingung baru dikasih pengulangan, seperti itu sih.*"

(As I mentioned before, for repetitive ones it's usually when I give OCF in general, for individuals or personally it usually depends on the condition of the student whether he is able to quickly grasp the feedback given the meaning of the feedback given or he is still confused as if he is still confused just now repeated, like that anyway). So, teacher need to observed students' performance for receiving OCF. The factor that influences students to be less able to understand the feedback given in general is the distraction from their friends or themselves.

The teacher said

> "*Menurut saya hal-hal atau ocus-faktor yang mempengaruhi itu adanya distraksi, baik itu distraksi dari temannya ataupun distraksi dari diri dia sendiri yang hilang ocus disaat teacher nya sedang berbicara sedang memberikan feedback in general sebab Ketika memberikan feedback in general, teacher gak bisa keep eye contact to one student, keep eye keeping her eye on one student to one student, gak bisa kaya gitu jadinya siswa cenderung kurang, kurang mendengarkan dan cenderung cuek juga seperti itu. Berbeda halnya kalu memberikan feedback secara individual atau personal siswa bisa eye contact langsung dengan teacher dan itu berhasil membuat dia lebih mendengarkan.*"

(In my opinion, the things or factors that influence it are distractions, whether it's distraction from friends or distraction from himself who loses focus when the teacher is talking while giving feedback in general because when giving feedback in general, the teacher can't keep eye contact to one student, keep eye keeping her eye on one student to one student, it can't be like that so students tend to be less, don't listen and tend to be ignorant too like that. It's different if you give feedback individually or in person, students can make eye contact directly with the teacher and it succeeds in making them listen more).

While giving feedback in general, the teacher cannot keep eye contact with all of the students, which can cause the students to not listen carefully and tend to be ignorant. It is different when the teacher gives the OCF individually; the teacher can make eye contact with their student directly, which can lead students to be more focused on what the teacher said for their feedback.

B. Opinion

From the interviews conducted, there are benefits from OCF, the teacher said

> "*Alasan saya menggunakan metode Ocf didalam pembelajaran ini, sebab Ketika pemberian feedback secara oral lebih mudah nempel atau mudah diingat oleh siswanya, dan saya bisa melihat perubahannya secara significant dibanding dengan feedback secara written atau tertulis*"

(The reason I use the OCF method in this lesson is because giving oral feedback is easier for students to stick to or easy to remember, and I can see a significant change compared to written or written feedback). Including the fact that it makes it simpler for students to learn when provided feedback orally, because it is easier for students to recall, and teachers perceive significant changes when compared to written feedback.

According to the teacher's opinion

> "*Menurut saya pemberian OCF ini ada dampaknya dalam kelancaran berbicara siswa, sebab siswa ini meniru dan melihat habit di kelasnya apa yang dilakukan oleh gurunya seperti yang sudah saya sebutkan tasdi adanya diskusi anatara*

teacher dan siswa, sehingga hal tersebut membiasakan siswa untuk terus berbicara baik dengan teman sebayanya atua dengan guru sehingga berpengaruh dalam kelancaran berbicaranya"

(In my opinion, giving OCF has an impact on students' speaking fluency, because these students imitate and see what habits their teacher does in class, as I have mentioned earlier, there are discussions between the teacher and students, so this gets students used to continuing to speak well with peers or with teachers so that it affects the fluency of speaking), fluency in students' speaking is caused because students often imitate and see habits in class and what their teachers do, such as discussions between teachers and students, so that this gets students used to continuing to talk either with their peers or with the teacher, and things it can affect the fluency of speaking.

Based on the teacher's experiences, the students' responses when given oral corrective feedback were well received. By providing oral corrective feedback, it can create space for discussion and encourage students' critical thinking. The teacher said that based on their experience in giving oral corrective feedback, students preferred the type of repetition oral corrective feedback

"Menurut saya hal-hal atau ocus-faktor yang mempengaruhi itu adanya distraksi, baik itu distraksi dari temannya ataupun distraksi dari diri dia sendiri yang hilang ocus disaat teacher nya sedang berbicara sedang memberikan feedback in general sebab Ketika memberikan feedback in general, teacher gak bisa keep eye contact to one student, keep eye keeping her eye on one student to one student, gak bisa kaya gitu jadinya siswa cenderung kurang, kurang mendengarkan dan cenderung cuek juga seperti itu. Berbeda halnya kalu memberikan feedback secara individual atau personal siswa bisa eye contact langsung dengan teacher dan itu berhasil membuat dia lebih mendengarkan"

(In my opinion, the things or factors that influence it are distractions, whether it's distraction from friends or distraction from himself who loses focus when the teacher is talking while giving feedback in general because the teacher can't keep eye contact to one student, keep eye keeping her eye on one student to one student, it can't be like that so students tend not to listen, and tend to be ignorant too like that. It's different when giving feedback individually or in person students can make eye contact directly with the teacher and it worked to make him listen more), because they could realize their mistakes at that moment and tend not to repeat them.

Experience

This part discusses the teacher experiences and opinion about the use of oral corrective feedback in the EFL bilingual primary school with the theory by the expert. The teacher found that there are four types of oral corrective feedback that are most often used in class, namely recast, repetition, elicitation and paralinguistic signals. This is slightly different from research conducted by (Siska, Mukhaiyar, & Ratmanida, 2018)which states that there are two types of oral corrective feedback that are most often used by teachers in class, namely recast and explicit correction. This study states that based on data identification, all teachers use the recast strategy. Recast is the highest percentage of verbal corrective feedback strategies used by English teachers where the total number of teachers using this strategy is 174 people times (60.2%). In using recast, the teacher does not say that what the students say is wrong, but directly change the student's

mistake with the correct one and for explicit corrections are used by all English teachers. The total use of explicit corrections was 83 times (28, 7%).

Relating the mechanism, the teacher gave oral corrective feedback based with two different types based on the situation. There are two mechanism that teacher used for give oral corrective feedback, giving OCF in general and individually, teacher prefer to give OCF individually because it can lead students to be more focused on what the teacher said for their feedback. In line with (McMilan, 2010) that states effective feedback pinpoints the gap between students' current task performance and the desired learning outcomes. It helps students understand the inadequacies in their work and encourages them to bridge the gap. It is communicated in a constructive way to help students self-regulate and improve, rather than in a negative way that puts students down. Effective feedback treats mistakes as important opportunities to learn. It stimulates students to try alternative strategies and to seek out additional resources to develop their knowledge, understanding, and skills. Considering the ability of the students are really helpful for students and teachers in understanding the meaning of the OCF given so that the results obtained will be maximized and have a good impact on students' abilities.

Opinion
This part discusses the teacher opinion about students' preferences towards oral corrective feedback regarding by the expert theory.

According to students' preferences for student feedback in speaking, when they receive verbal feedback from their teacher, they are more likely to retain and grasp what their teacher says, allowing them to imitate and repeat what their teacher says.

Based to the interviews, there are positives to OCF, including the fact that it makes it simpler for students to learn when provided feedback orally, because it is easier for students to recall, and teachers perceive significant changes when compared to written feedback. According to the teacher's opinion, fluency in students' speaking is caused because students often imitate and see habits in class and what their teachers do, such as discussions between teachers and students, so that this gets students used to continuing to talk either with their peers or with the teacher, and things it can affect the fluency of speaking.

Based on the teacher's experiences, the students' responses when given oral corrective feedback were well received. By providing oral corrective feedback, it can create space for discussion and encourage students' critical thinking. The teacher said that based on their experience in giving oral corrective feedback, students preferred the type of repetition oral corrective feedback because they could realize their mistakes at that moment and tend not to repeat them.

CONCLUSIONS
The study showed four types of oral corrective feedback (OCF) were frequently used by the teacher in teaching students' in bilingual primary school (Recast, Repetition, Paralinguistic, Elicitation). Teacher must be sure for deciding the types to use because it can be affected to the students' understanding about the feedback. Moreover, the individually mechanism must be optimizing rather than group feedback, because it's really giving more positive benefits both for the teacher and also students. Aside from

that there are still other types that can be used in the classroom (Explicit, Correction, Clarification Request) every type of oral corrective feedback (OCF) has their own purpose for their used. The teacher must know the positive and also the negative impacts from each of the types.

REFERENCES

Agudo, J. d. (2005). Teaching and Learning English through ICT. *UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing*, 1-7.

Alsolami, R. (2019). Effect of Oral Corrective Feedback on Language Skills. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 672-677.

Cauley, K. M. (2010). Formative Assessment Tecniques to Support Student Motivation and Achivment. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas, 83(1)*, 1-6.

Chaudron, C. (2018). Teachers' priorities in correcting learners' errors in French immersion classes. *Angewandte Chemie International Edition 6(11), 951-952., 3(1), 10-27*, 64 - 84.

Creswell, J. W. (2016). Educational Research. *In Library of Congress Cataloging (Vol. 4, Issue August)*.

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal 1(1)*, 2-18.

Ellis., R. (2017). Oral corrective feedback in L2 classrooms: What we know so far. In H. Nassaji & E. Kartchava (Eds.), Corrective Feedback in Second Language Teaching and Learning: Research, theory, applications, implications.

Elsaghayer, M. (2014). 'Affective Damage to Oral Corrective Feedback among Students in Libyan Secondary Schools.'. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSRJRME), 4(6)*, 74-82.

Fanselow, J. (1977). The treatment of error in oral work. Foreign Language Annals. 583-593.

Felix, S. W. (1978). Languagee Aqcuisition and Language Learning. *In System (Vol 6, Issue 2)*.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). Acquiring a second language. *World Englishes*, 97-101.

Long, M. H. (1997). Teacher feedback on learner error: Mapping cognition. *In D. H. Brown, C. C. A. Yorio, & T. R. Crymes (Eds.), vol. 77. On TESOL*, 278 - 294.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective Feedback and Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language acquisition, 19(01)*, 37-66.

Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral Corrective Feedback in Second Language Classroom. *Language Teaching, 46*, 1-40.

Maolida, E. H. (2009). Oral Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake In A Young Learner EFL Classroom (A Case Study In AnEnglish Course In Bandung). *Univesitas Pendidikan Indonesia I repository.upi.edu I perpestakaan.upi.edu*, 1- 6.

McMilan, K. M. (2010). Formative Assessment Techniques to Support Student Motivation and Achievement. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 1-6.

Muhsin, A. (2016). The Effectiveness of Positive Feedback in Teaching Speaking Skill. *Lingua Cultura, 10(1), 25*, 25-30.

Muslem, A., Zulfikar, T., Astila, I., Heiansyah, H., & Marhaban, S. (2021). Students' Perception Toward Oral Corrective Feedback in Speaking Classes. 244-256.

Nassaji, H. (2013). Participation Structure and Incidental Focus on Form in Adult ESL Classrooms. *Language Learning Volume 63, Issue 4*, 835-869.

Nystrom njuk. (1983). Teacher-student interaction in bilingual classrooms: Four approaches to error correction. *In H. W. Seliger, & M. H. Long (Eds.), Classroom-oriented research in second language acquisition*, 169 - 189.

Rahimi, M. (2010). Iranian EFL Students' Perception and Preferences for Teachers' Written Feedback: Do Students' Ideas Reflect Teachers' Practice? *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS)*, 75 – 98.

Rahimi, M., & Zhang, L. J. (2015). Exploring non-native English-speaking teachers' cognitions about corrective feedback in teaching English oral communication . *System,55*, 111-122.

Rassaei, E. (2017). Effects of three forms of reading-based output activity on L2 vocabulary learning. *Language Teaching Research*, 76-95.

Shegar, C., Zhang, L. J., & Low, E. L. (2013). Effects of an input–output mapping practice task on EFL learners' acquisition of two grammatical structures. *System 41*, 443-461.

Siska, W., Mukhaiyar., & Ratmanida. (2018). English teachers' strategies in giving oral corrective feedback on students' speaking performance. *Proceedings of the sixth International Conference on English Language and Teaching (ICOELT-6)*, 158-168.

Truscott, J. (2007). The Effect of Error Correction on Learners' Ability to Write Accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16(4)*, 255-272.

Zhang & Rahimi. (2013). EFL learners' anxiety level and their beliefs about corrective feedback in oral communication classes.

Zhao, Y., Yi, Z., Gentekaki, E., Zhan, A., Al-Farraj, S. A., & Song, W. (2016). Utility of combining morphological characters, nuclear and mitochondrial genes: An attempt to resolve the conflicts of species identification for ciliated protists. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution, 94(February)*, 718-729.