



## TEACHER'S AND STUDENT'S PERCEPTIONS OF CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN TEACHING SPEAKING

Herman Khunaivi<sup>✉</sup>, Rudi Hartono

Postgraduate Program, Semarang State University, Indonesia

### Article Info

*Article History:*

Accepted October 2015

Approved October 2015

Published November

2015

*Keywords:*

*Perception, Corrective Feedback, Adult Learners, Speaking Skill*

### Abstract

The purposes of this study were to find out the types of the spoken errors commonly made by the students in speaking, knowing the reasons do the students make same errors, describing how English teachers use corrective feedback to refine students' errors, exploring the types of corrective feedback do the students mostly like, explaining the teachers' and students' perceptions towards corrective feedback. The types of this study was descriptive qualitative study. The findings indicated that errors mostly made by the students were pronunciation error, grammatical error and lexical error, why did they make same errors because the students got fossilization, corrcetive feedbacks were used to refine students speaking were explicit correction, repetition and reformulation, corrective feedbacks that the students mostly like were explicit correction, repetition and pronunciation, the teachers perceptions towards corrective feedback were corrective feedback was to know the lacks of the students speaking, the teachers could give the students feedbacks in order not to be fossilized. by giving feedback appropraitely it was believed the students would not be fossilized. The students' perceptions on corrective feedback were they had very good responses about corrective feedback that were given by the teachers in the classroom.

©2015 Semarang State University

<sup>✉</sup> Correspondence Address:

Unnes Bendan Ngisor Campus, Semarang, 50233

E-mail: [lionelyakin@gmail.com](mailto:lionelyakin@gmail.com)

ISSN 2087-0108

## INTRODUCTION

In Indonesia, English belongs to a foreign language in which it is used for academic purposes, job vacancies' requirement, and traveling overseas. Learning English as foreign language cannot be separated from the foreign language acquisition. According to Ellis (1994:11-12), foreign language acquisition takes place in settings where the language plays no major role in the community and is primarily learned only in the classroom. In this case, English teachers take an important role in teaching and learning processes.

Instead of delivering the materials, they need to give feedback to their students. Therefore, the students will be able to improve their English proficiencies. The English proficiencies of students include four aspects that cover speaking, listening, reading, and writing. In the scope of English as International Language, speaking skill takes an essential position since it is used mostly as a communication mean.

Speaking is one of compulsory subject at university especially in English Education Department. Speaking becomes easier if it allows students to speak every time in many opportunities. The more students participate, activate and use English as a spoken language in the class; the various elements of the language they have stored in their brains. As a result, students gradually become autonomous language users (Harmer, 2007:123). Indeed, spoken English is one of the most important things which help students because it will be useful to them in order to communicate.

In speaking people do not only focus on getting things done but also creating a warm relationship in our society. The government has drawn up English in this country as a foreign language that should be mastered by students. English has different characteristics from the exact sciences or social sciences, which places in the function of language that is as a tool of communication. It identifies that learning English does not only learn vocabulary and grammar in the sense of knowledge, but also it should be everyday used as a means of

communication. It means that for those who are studying English, they should be able to use words and phrases very smoothly without much conscious thought. Good speaking activities can and should be extremely engaging for the students (Harmer, 2007:123).

In a speaking class, specifically English Education Department, the students are forced to speak in English even outside of the classroom. Sometimes, it makes them brave to do so, but it can make them not to be brave to do conversation at the outside of the classroom, because they need to have some comprehensible inputs and feedbacks from their teachers even from their friends. As well as teaching speaking in the classroom, the teacher always gives the students comprehensible inputs and also correction for those making errors while speaking.

There are some points that should be emphasized in teaching speaking. There are five principles that have to be considered in teaching speaking. The principles are 1) second language and foreign language learning context, 2) providing opportunities to talk, 3) fluency and accuracy, 4) planning for speaking tasks, and 5) classroom activities design (Nunan, 2003). Harmer (2003:102) states that there are six principles of teaching speaking, they are 1) helping students overcome their initial reluctance to speak, be encouraging, provide opportunity, start from something simple, 2) asking students to talk about what they want to talk about, 3) asking students to talk about what they are able to talk about, 4) incorporating the teaching of speech acts in teaching speaking, 5) combining speaking with listening and reading, 6) and providing appropriate feedback.

Furthermore, students often evaluate their success in language learning as well as the effectiveness of their English course on the basis of how much they feel they have improved in their spoken language proficiency (Richards and Rodgers, 2008:19). It cannot be avoided that feedback is needed to be given to the students,

since it gives positive effects to the students. Henderson and Karr-Kidwell (1998) wrote that using feedback to evaluate and to improve student work is a natural outgrowth of the movement toward more corrective assessments in teaching and learning process.

Ellis (1994:584) who warned that correction is both useless for acquisition and dangerous in that it may lead to a negative affective response. It is not encouraging evidence about the effects of grammar feedback on students development is a waste of teacher energy and deflects attention from more important issues. On the contrary, Krashen (1983:117) says when the goal is learning, errors should indeed be corrected (but not all the times, not all the rules, even is the goal is learning). He was apparently agreed to corrective feedback if the goal is learning, not acquisition, and should be under certain requirements. Chenoweth et. al. (1983) as cited in Ellis (1994:584) found that learners like to be corrected not only during form-focus activities, but also when they were conversing with native speaker.

According to Harmer and Naghizadeh (2003 :62-63) a correction helps students to clarify their understanding of the meaning and construction of language. It is a vital part of the teacher's role. The matter of when, how and who must correct errors has been a controversial issue and has no simple answer.

Students need to be corrected in order not to be fossilized to make errors. Moreover, students produce error in the process of learning. It is believed that teacher's corrective feedbacks can be regarded as input for the students to improve in learning English either English as a Second language or Foreign language. They are significant to motivate the students in the English as a Foreign learning. It is a vital part of the teacher's role to point out students' errors and provide corrective feedbacks. Corrective feedback will help students clarify their understanding of meaning and construction of the language.

There are several studies related to this study that conducted by many researchers. Among those studies, the first study was conducted by Chu (2011) with the entitled was

effects of teacher's corrective feedback on accuracy in the oral English of English-majors college students. Her study tried to solve the following questions: 1. Whether corrective feedback have a positive effect on improving oral English accuracy? 2. Two types of corrective feedback, which types have a better effect on English accuracy? 3. If corrective can improve oral English accuracy, but for the high or medium and low group of students, does it have the same improving effectiveness?. The results were Corrective feedback had a positive effect on improving oral English accuracy. Corrective feedback did make great effects on oral accuracy, but the effectiveness for different level of learner was different. For medium and low group learners, the effectiveness was better, because there was enough space for them to be improved. For high group learners, their oral accuracy was better, what they needed to do was improve their oral fluency and complexity.

The second study was organized by Razavi and Naghizadeh (2014), the title was corrective feedback in speaking in relation to error types in iranian EFLclassrooms. The aim of their study was to investigate the relationship between corrective feedback in speaking in relation todifferent error types in Iranian EFL classrooms. The research design was an experimental design.The result was that recast type of feedback and grammatical errors were the most frequent types in the posttest. These findings implicated the importance of using implicit types of feedback regarding to different errors.

The third was finished by Eini et al. (2013), their title wasThe effect of corrective feedback modalities on secondlanguage post- speaking activities among iranian preintermediateEFL learners.This project reported on the study regarding the effect of teacher and peer feedback in post-speakingactivities among 120 second-grade Iranian students selected from three different classes in Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz branch, through random judgment sampling. The result of the study indicated that the class with teacher corrective feedback outperformed the peer corrective feedback and control groups ( $p < .001$ ).

The fourth study was conducted by Lange (2009) her title was *Corrective Feedback during communicative activities: A study of recasts as a feedback method to correct spoken English*. The purpose of her study was to investigate the amount of feedback given in language-focused exchanges and communicative exchanges. She also investigated if recasting was the feedback method most frequently used in communicative activities. She observed three different classes, at different levels of the Swedish school system, and also interviewed the teachers. It was shown that feedback was more frequently provided during the language-focused exchanges. It was also shown that two of the teachers were very reluctant to provide their students corrective feedback during communicative activities. All three teachers agreed that recasting was the best method to use for correcting the students' speech because it did not interrupt the communication and did not inhibit the students.

The fifth study was conducted by Soenoewati (2010), her title was *teachers' corrective feedback in the English as a foreign language (EFL) speaking class at sekolah Indonesia Bangkok (SIB), Thailand*. The aim of the study was to investigate how the English teachers of SIB provide corrective feedbacks during the EFL speaking class, what types of the spoken errors commonly used by Junior High School students in SIB, and find out whether or not corrective feedbacks are significant in the EFL speaking class in SIB. The findings indicated that teachers used clarification request (31%) of all corrective feedback types. Students made all error types, particularly content error (25%). The results of the study also showed that corrective feedback, particularly clarification request, could generate repair uptake, particularly self-repair (36%).

The sixth study was done by Safari (2013) with the entitled was a descriptive study on corrective feedback and learners' uptake during interactions in a communicative *EFL* class. The aim of his study was to investigate, describe, and analyze the discourse patterns of corrective feedback utilized by an Iranian teacher and also their relationship to the learner's uptake and the

repair of those errors. Transcripts totaling 16 hours of classroom interaction included 181 episodes, each containing a trigger (error) produced by the learner, a CF move from the teacher and a learner's subsequent uptake in response to the CF. The findings obtained from such context reveal the ratio and distribution of the six different feedback types as well as those of different kinds of learner's uptake and immediate repair of errors. According to problems proposed in this study can be formulated as follows:

1. What types of spoken errors do the students of speaking class at the fourth semester of English Department at Private Islamic University *Sultan Agung* commonly make?
2. Why do the students make same errors in speaking class?
3. How do English teachers use corrective feedback to refine students' errors in speaking class?
4. What types of corrective feedback do the students mostly like?
5. What are the teachers' and students' perceptions towards the use of corrective feedback in speaking class?

## METHOD

This is a case study with a descriptive qualitative approach which was going to be developed into a quantitative approach. The qualitative approach aimed to take a close look at the terminology used in this study and describe the fact in the field of the study, the quantitative approach would give detailed results of the data acquired. The participants of this study were seventy four students and two lecturers.

Data collections were needed in some kinds of studies to come on the results of the study. In collecting the data, the study needed to use device called instruments. In doing this study, observation and recording, in-depth interview, questionnaires, documentation as the instruments and lastly will be transcribing and coding.

Observation and recording were used to know the conditions and the atmosphere in the classroom. In doing observation, it led deeper

understanding and it would give knowledge of the context in which events occurred. Triangulation was used in observation in order to avoid bias data. I used the data from observation to know the real condition in teaching speaking and observed the students' speaking utterances in speaking class combined with coding of the students' utterances.

Recording was used to record the activity happening in the class. In conducting recording, I asked other friend to help me in collecting the data. Then, in-depth interview, I focused on the teachers, aiming to find out personal reason why certain teacher used certain strategy to provide certain error and corrective feedback. This in-depth interview was also very beneficial in completing the data gained from the observation and recording.

Questionnaire was given to discover particular information related to the study. Documentation would be done as the real document I did while in the classroom, and lastly it was transcribed and made coding of the students' speaking and also teacher corrective feedback while giving feedback in the speaking class. Transcribing the data from recording would be the core data in analysing the students' errors and teachers' corrective feedback. After getting the data from transcription I asked other friends to check the data acquired whether the data was suitable with the main observation or not.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Based on the data, it could be stated the total number of error in speaking class were phonological error was 40%, grammatical error was 35%, lexical error was 11%, gambits was 4%, stress was 6% and intonation was 4%. Mostly error was made by the students were pronunciation and grammatical error, because in Indonesia English is as a foreign language. In that case the students made many errors in speaking activity even in speaking class.

The reason why the students made same errors in speaking class is because the students got fossilization, both of the teachers stated the students made some errors eventhough the teachers had

already reminded them. Because of the fossilization, some of students got fossilization. By delivering appropriate feedback and drilling them were the best choice for teachers to solve students in making the same errors.

The way of English teachers used corrective feedback to refine students' errors in speaking class that were by using types of corrective feedback such as clarification request, explicit correction and elicitation. The teachers used these corrective feedbacks to refine the students' error. After delivering corrective feedback to the students, the students got inputs when they made some errors. In that case by using those types of feedback, it was believed that the students' speaking skill would be better.

The types of corrective feedback do the students mostly like were clarification request, explicit correction and repetition. When the students made error in speaking then the teachers reminded them and corrected them, the students' responses were very well, sometimes they also laughed when teachers gave them feedbacks and corrected them. Mostly, the students laughed when they got corrective feedback from the teachers.

Teachers' and students' perceptions on corrective feedback in speaking class were the teachers thought corrective feedback was to know the lacks of the students, after knowing the students' lacks, the teachers could give the students feedbacks in order not to be fossilized. In one hand, the biggest think the students faced was getting fossilization. In the other hand, some of them got fossilization, by giving feedback appropriately it was believed that the students would not be fossilized. The students respond when they got corrective feedbacks from the teachers were very well, they accepted all the corrective feedbacks were given by the teachers. The students respond the correct feedback was given by the teachers or other students, they incorporate the feedback provided by the teachers into any longer utterance, but sometimes, it could be forgotten by them, they also supply self correction, some of their friends remind each other and peer feedback could correct their friends' error. By reminding each other, it could correct their friends' error.

In giving corrective feedbacks, the teachers said there were also the benefits of giving corrective feedback, those were; they don't worry of their own performance, They feel of self-esteem of their capability, they did not feel afraid of making errors, lacks of nervous, more comfortable or self confidence of their capability, peer-assessment and self-assessment.

For the next level of students, the teachers would give feedbacks to the students all the time. Even though, the students were in lower level, intermediate or advanced level. Feedbacks were very important for the teachers, to correct them in accordance with knowing the students' mistakes and errors.

Students' perceptions on corrective feedback in speaking class were they had very good responses to corrective feedback. They hoped all the teachers were giving feedbacks every meeting in the classroom.

The discussion of study finding, based on the results of findings in this study, it could be discussed the total number of error in speaking class were made by the students were phonological error was (40%). The teachers used corrective feedback to refine students' errors in speaking class that were by using types of corrective feedback such as clarification request, explicit correction and elicitation. It was contrary with the previous finding that was done by Soenowati (2010), the findings indicated that the students made all error types, particularly content error (25%). Teachers used clarification request of all corrective feedback types. The results of the study also showed that corrective feedback, particularly clarification request.

On the one hand, Razavi (2014) found that, the result was that recast type of feedback and grammatical errors were the most frequent types in the posttest. These findings implicated the importance of using implicit types of feedback regarding to different errors.

On the other hand, Lange (2009), all three teachers agreed that recasting was the best method to use for correcting the students' speech because it did not interrupt the communication and did not inhibit the students.

## CONCLUSION

The teachers' and students' perception on corrective feedback in speaking class were the teachers thought corrective feedback was to know the lacks of the students, after knowing the students' lacks, the teachers could give the students feedbacks in order not to be fossilized. In one hand, the biggest think the students faced was getting fossilization. In the other hand, some of them got fossilization, by giving feedback appropriately it was believed that the students would not be fossilized. The students respond when they got corrective feedbacks from the teachers were very well, they accepted all the corrective feedbacks were given by the teachers. The students respond the correct feedback was given by the teachers or other students, they incorporate the feedback provided by the teachers into any longer utterance, but sometimes, it could be forgotten by them, they also supply self correction, some of their friends remind each other and peer feedback could correct their friends' error. By reminding each other, it could correct their friends' error.

In giving corrective feedbacks, the teachers said there were also the benefits of giving corrective feedback, those were; they don't worry of their own performance, They feel of self-esteem of their capability, they did not feel afraid of making errors, lacks of nervous, more comfortable or self confidence of their capability, peer-assessment and self-assessment.

For the next level of students, the teachers would give feedbacks to the students all the time. Even though, the students were in lower level, intermediate or advanced level. Feedbacks were very important for the teachers, to correct them in accordance with knowing the students' mistakes and errors.

The students' perceptions on corrective feedback in speaking class were they had very good responses about corrective feedback. They were given by the teachers feedbacks in the classroom. This data answer the last research question that is what are the teachers' and students' perceptions towards the use of corrective feedback in speaking class.

## REFERENCES

- Chu, Ruili. 2011. Effects of Teacher's Corrective Feedback on Accuracy in the Oral English of English-Majors College Students. *Journals of Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 5, pp. 454-459.
- Eini, Massoume; Gorjian, Bahman and Pazhakh, Abdolreza. 2013. The Effect of Corrective Feedback Modalities on Second Language Post-Speaking Activities Among Iranian Pre-Intermediate EFL Learners. *Journals of Advances in Asian Social Science (AASS) 810*. Vol. 4, No. 2.
- Ellis, Rod. 1994. *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Harmer, Jeremy. 2003. *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.). Edinburgh: Longman.
- Harmer, Jeremy. 2007. *How to Teach English*. Oxford: Pearson Education Limited.
- Henderson and Karr-Kidwell. 1998. *Corrective Assessment: An Extensive Literary Review and Recommendations for Administrators*. Texas: Texas Woman's University.
- Krashen, SD. 1983. *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Nunan, David. 2003. *Practical English Language Teaching*. New York: The McGraw-Hill.
- Lange, Camilla Ferm. 2009. *Corrective Feedback during communicative activities A study of recasts as a feedback method to correct spoken English*.
- Razavi, Arezou and Naghizadeh, Mohammad. 2014. Corrective Feedback in Speaking in Relation to Error Types in Iranian EFL Classrooms. *International Journal of Emerging Investigations in Applied and Basic Sciences*. Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 148-160.
- Richards, J. C. and Rodgers, T. S. 2008. *Teaching Listening and Speaking from Theory to Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Safari, Parvin. 2013. A Descriptive Study on Corrective Feedback and Learners' Uptake during Interactions in a Communicative EFL Class. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 7, pp. 1165-1175.
- Soenoewati, Does Ichnatun. 2010. Teachers' Corrective Feedback in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Speaking Class at Sekolah Indonesia Bangkok (SIB), Thailand in the Academic of 2009/2010. Unpublished Thesis. Semarang: Program Pascasarjana Unnes.