JELE The Eyes of Experts

OPEN ACCESS

Article

Teacher's Use and Students' Perception on Oral Corrective Feedback in English Morning Program (EMO)

https://doi.org/10.31004/jele.v9i5.546

*Moh. Nawawi Ivan[1], Lukman Hakim[2]

Universitas Islam Zainul Hasan Genggong[1], Universitas KH. Bahaudin Mudhary Madura[2]

Corresponding Author: ivan.kazimakikenzei@gmail.com

A B S T R A C T

Speaking is a crucial skill for effective communication, especially for learners using a non-native language. In this study, we investigate the types of oral corrective feedback (OCF) used by English teachers and students' perceptions of when this feedback should be given. The research employs a descriptive qualitative design, focusing on 2 English teachers and 35 students from seven majors at SMK Bhakti Mulia Pare, Kediri, specifically in the English Morning Program (EMO). Data were collected through observations, interviews, and questionnaires. The questionnaire, comprising 15 items, used a Likert Scale to gauge students' feelings about OCF, their perceptions of it, and how they believe it should be delivered. The study reveals that while Teacher A primarily used recasts, and Teacher B combined recasts with repetition, over 68.1% of students agreed with the feedback provided by their teachers. The findings suggest that oral corrective feedback is beneficial and can enhance students' speaking competence.

Keywords: Oral Corrective Feedback, Types of OCF, Students' Perceptions, Speaking Competence.

Check for updates

INTRODUCTION

The significance of English communication is evident in the objectives of teaching speaking skills in Indonesian high schools, particularly for senior and vocational students. Vocational high school students, who will enter the job market immediately after graduation, need to master speaking skills to communicate effectively in English. Proficiency in English can enhance their ability to participate appropriately in various communication settings. However, mastering English speaking is challenging. When teachers ask students to present topics, explain procedures, or give speeches in front of the class, the complexity of speaking skills becomes apparent. A study by Laeli and Slamet found that English language education lecturers commonly use recasts, repetitions, and clarification requests in speaking classes (source: https://journal.unismuh.ac.id/index.php/exposure)(Laeli & Setiawan, 2019). This indicates that oral corrective feedback is frequently employed and preferred by teachers. Understanding how students perceive this feedback is crucial for improving teaching methods and enhancing speaking skills.

There are six types of oral corrective feedback: explicit, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition(Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Effective oral feedback should positively impact students' learning achievements; however, not all types of

feedback are beneficial. In some cases, feedback can lead to frustration and diminish students' motivation. Therefore, teachers must carefully consider how they provide feedback and correct errors to maintain student motivation, especially in speaking skills. Teachers need to be attentive to several factors: which errors to correct, when to correct them, who should correct them, and how to correct them(Elis R & Sheen Y, 2011). Being sensitive to these aspects ensures that feedback is constructive and supports students' learning effectively.

Speaking is a crucial component of effective communication, as it allows individuals to express ideas and share information (Jack C. Richards, n.d.). Mastering speaking skills is essential for students to enhance their oral communication, particularly in English(Alhadad et al., n.d.). However, teaching English in schools can often be less engaging, with many teachers relying on traditional lecture methods, which can hinder students' mastery of the language. Research on junior high school students indicates that teachers use various oral corrective feedback strategies to improve performance (Widia et al., 2018). Despite these efforts, students frequently face challenges such as pronunciation issues, grammatical errors, limited vocabulary, and fluency problems when learning to speak English. In the educational context, addressing these difficulties is vital to support effective language learning and communication.

Oral corrective feedback is a direct indication or clue given when there is an error that a student has produced when using the English language. In other words we can say that oral corrective feedback is considered as corrective feedback in which the teacher gives response directly when the students produce erroneous utterances. By giving oral corrective feedback, the students will know their errors and how to correct it as quick as possible. Therefore, oral corrective feeback can also improve their speaking performance. In addition, oral corrective feedback of teachers' verbal feedback on mistakes in students' speaking performance is often useful for pronunciation, vocabulary and language patterns, communication skills, ideas, and organization (Annie, 2011) in other word, oral corrective feedback is the process through which verbal correction of students speech errors is given by teachers and students.

This present study is conducted in Vocational high school which focuses in English morning program. English morning program (EMO) is extracuricullar of SMK Bhakti Mulia Pare which is designed for preparing students for better English communication by facilitating the learning of knowledge and skill in each specific majors. The majors involve pharmacy, nursing, accounting, multimedia, software engineeering, banking, and office administration. What is extraordinary from this program is that teachers should be able to teach English for specific purposes in all those 7 majors. In this research, the researcher interviews two English teachers based on the recommendation from the headmaster. These teachers have a good reputation and good English academic teaching competence.

The reasons for providing oral corrective feedback vary among teachers. Teachers may use different types of oral corrective feedback based on their objectives. There are four main reasons for giving oral corrective feedback: First, it offers learners guidance on learning and helps them acquire new vocabulary and structures in context. Second, it provides learners with information on how to correct their errors. Third, it serves as a motivational tool that encourages learners to study and strive for improvement. Fourth, it fosters self-reliance by helping learners begin to identify their own mistakes (Lewis, 2002). Additionally, oral corrective feedback functions as a tool for message correction and learning enhancement (Rusma, 2013)

Several experts express their opinions about providing oral corrective feedback in classroom, some state that from four teachers being studied, all of them agreed that errors by students in using target language should be corrected (Kassa, 2011). The use of oral corrective feedback in junior and senior high school in Banda Aceh were the students appreciated their teacher's frequent feedback, considering that it had a positive impact on developing their speaking skills, but they also believed that their teachers should then allow them to self-correct such errors and she also state that teachers need to be highly sensitive when it comes to addressing student's errors in order to avoid negative outcomes (Septiana et al., 2016).

Speaking is a vital component of English language learning, especially for non-native speakers. Mastering English speaking skills is crucial for effective communication with native speakers and global interactions (Boonkit, 2010). Effective speaking involves articulating ideas, conveying meaning, utilizing a broad vocabulary, and interacting fluently in various contexts.

Research highlights the importance of oral corrective feedback in improving speaking skills. Studies show that learners generally respond positively to immediate feedback, appreciating when teachers correct errors and provide the correct forms (Azad, 2016). Additionally, both male and female EFL learners prefer receiving feedback after completing their speaking tasks, finding this timing most effective (Papangkorn, 2015). Corrective feedback has been shown to enhance students' speaking competence (Solikhah & Surakarta, n.d.).

This study focuses on English teaching in vocational high schools, particularly the English Morning Program. It aims to describe the oral corrective feedback strategies employed by teachers, their preferences for these strategies, and the reasons behind them. Additionally, it explores students' perceptions of the feedback they receive. The goal is to identify effective methods for error correction and to provide guidance for teachers, instructors, and lecturers on how to motivate students and improve their learning experience.

METHOD

The research utilized a qualitative design with a descriptive approach. This method involves investigating contemporary phenomena within their real-life context, particularly when the boundaries between phenomena are not clearly defined (Yin, 2016). The study aimed to provide a detailed description of the case, using descriptive quantification to show the number and percentage of oral corrective feedback types used, teachers' preferences, and students' perceptions of this feedback.

The qualitative approach was chosen to explore the motivations of both teachers and students, allowing for an in-depth understanding of their perspectives and interpretations. The research was conducted with teachers and students from SMK Bhakti Mulia Pare, Kediri. The subject of this study are the teachers and students of SMK Bhakti Mulia Pare. Further, the study involves the tenth grade students of SMK in which followed an extracurricular program namely English Morning Program (EMP). However, the tenth grade students from seven majors was selected and involved in the study based on teacher's recomendation. The class had around 30 – 40 students in each majors. 5 students were selected as the representative of each majors and become the participants of this study. The seven majors were choosen because the student's representative were considered potential to produce the most valuable data.

Data were collected through observations, interviews, and questionnaires. Observations focused on classroom conditions and situations during lessons. Interviews provided insights into teachers' preferences and students' perceptions of oral corrective feedback. Questionnaires were distributed to students to gather information on their views about the feedback they received.

Data analysis involved processing and describing the data from observations, interviews, and questionnaires, using triangulation to ensure accuracy. The analysis followed Miles and Huberman's framework, which includes data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing (Miles et al., 2014).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Types of oral corrective feedback used to correct students' oral errors in the teaching and learning

Table 1. Result of Questionnaire

NO	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
1	17	68	9	6	0
2	17	54	20	9	0
3	23	60	14	3	0
4	40	49	11	0	0
5	23	37	26	14	0
6	34	46	20	0	0
7	3	28	40	29	0
8	43	48	9	0	0
9	40	57	3	0	0
10	29	60	11	0	0
11	3	23	40	34	0
12	11	54	26	6	3
13	17	3	23	57	0
14	3	54	26	6	11
15	9	46	14	0	0
TOTAL	23,00%	45,10%	19,10%	10,19%	0,6%

The survey results reveal that students' responses regarding their motivation after receiving feedback were evenly distributed between agreement and strong agreement, reflecting that nearly half of the respondents felt highly motivated. Very few students reported being either less motivated or not motivated at all by the teachers' corrections, and no students disagreed with the idea that the feedback enhanced their motivation. Over fifty percent of students indicated that corrective feedback significantly boosted their confidence in speaking, although some remained unsure of its impact. A small minority felt that they did not experience an immediate positive effect on their confidence.

Most students acknowledged the benefits of oral corrective feedback. More than fifty percent expressed a preference for receiving feedback in this format, with one-third of them specifically favoring oral feedback. However, 5 out of 35 students were neutral about their preference. Less than 10% of students disliked oral corrective feedback.

According to the questionnaire results, over 68.1% of students agreed with the feedback provided by their teachers. Teachers consistently deliver oral feedback upon identifying errors in students' speaking, which proves effective in making students aware of their mistakes and enabling immediate correction. Continuous feedback helps students

prepare thoroughly before speaking. Thus, oral corrective feedback is essential and beneficial for improving students' speaking competence.

Result of Interview

Interviews revealed that both teachers valued providing feedback to learners. Mrs. I emphasized that feedback helps students improve their language productivity by using accurate utterances, while Mr. L believed that feedback enhances students' accuracy in speaking. However, they differed in their approaches: Mr. L preferred implicit feedback to activate long-term memory, whereas Mrs. I focused on helping learners understand the assessment. Both teachers frequently used recast and repetition to draw attention to errors by adjusting their intonation, which aligns with Lewis's view that this approach promotes self-reliance as students begin to detect their own mistakes.

Overall, the findings indicate that in the English Morning Program (EMO) at SMK Bhakti Mulia Pare, the teachers predominantly used recast and repetition as forms of oral corrective feedback. According to Lyster and Ranta's theory, recast involves the teacher incorporating the content of the incorrect utterance and correcting it without explicitly pointing out the error. The teachers did not use phrases like "you mean" or "you should say," but focused on word and grammatical modifications. Repetition involved the teacher repeating the student's utterance with emphatic stress to highlight the error. The researcher also found the teachers used recast and repetition in correcting student utterance. Teacher A used recast and teacher B used two types of teacher oral corrective feedback, there is recast and repetition used by teacher B when student dialogue performance and have the incorrect utterance.

Previous studies align with these findings. Solikhah found that while corrective feedback enhances speaking competence, it should not be administered during speaking practice (Solikhah & Surakarta, n.d.). Papangkom observed that both male and female EFL learners preferred oral corrective feedback after completing their speaking tasks(Papangkorn, 2015). Katayama revealed that Japanese EFL students desired feedback on all speaking errors but recognized the challenges posed by large class sizes, appreciating corrections from both teachers and peers (Katayama, 2007).

In summary, teachers should consistently provide oral feedback to address students' speaking errors. This approach effectively helps students recognize and correct their mistakes promptly. The research supports the notion that oral corrective feedback is crucial for enhancing students' speaking skills and suggests that its continued use by teachers is beneficial for improving students' overall speaking competence.

CONCLUSIONS

The study highlights that Teacher A predominantly employed recasts, a technique where the teacher integrates the content of a student's incorrect utterance into a corrected version, while Teacher B utilized a combination of recasts and repetition. This approach reflects a difference in corrective feedback strategies between the two teachers. Furthermore, the questionnaire results show that over 68.1% of students agreed with the feedback they received from their teachers, suggesting a general acceptance and effectiveness of these methods in the classroom.

REFERENCES

Alhadad, M. A., Mustofa, M., & Karimullah, I. W. (n.d.). *Exploring the Benefits of English Entertainment Exposure as Language Acquisition*.

Annie, T. S. Y. (2011). *Exploring Students' Perception of and Reaction to Feedback in School–based Assessment. 7*.

Azad, A. K. (2016). *Bangladeshi EFL Learners' Perceptions and Preferences for Oral Corrective Feedback. 10*(2).

Boonkit, K. (2010). Enhancing the development of speaking skills for non-native speakers of English. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *2*(2), 1305–1309. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.191

Elis R, & Sheen Y. (2011). *Corrective Feedback Language Teacing*. Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning.

Jack C. Richards. (n.d.). Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice. *New York: Cambridge University Press*.

Kassa, A. A. (2011). *Oral Corrective Feedback: An Exploratory Case Study of the Interplay Between Teachers' Beliefs, Classroom Practices, and Rationales*.

Katayama, A. (2007). A. Katayama 2007.pdf. *Asian EFL Journal (Conference Proceedings Volume English as an International Language: Setting the Standards)*, *9*(No. 4).

Laeli, A. F., & Setiawan, S. (2019). Oral Corrective Feedback in Speaking Class: Its Frequency, Students' Perceptions and Preference. *EXPOSURE : JURNAL PENDIDIKAN BAHASA INGGRIS*, *8*(2), 257–269. https://doi.org/10.26618/exposure.v8i2.2785

Lewis, M. (2002). *Giving Feedback In Language Classes*. Seameo Regional Language Center.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake: Negotiation of Form Incommunicative Classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *19*(1), 37–66. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (Edition 3). Sage.

Papangkorn, P. (2015). SSRUIC Students' Attitude and Preference Toward Error Corrections. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *197*, 1841–1846. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.244

Rusma. (2013). *Computer-Based Learning and Learning to Develop 21st Century Professionalism*. Alfabeta.

Septiana, Y., Bukhari, D., & Heriansyah, H. (2016). Students' Perceptions on Teacher's Oral Feedback. *Research in English and Education (READ)*, *1*.

Solikhah, I., & Surakarta, I. (n.d.). *Oral Corrective Feedback in a Speaking Class*.

Widia, S., Mukhaiyar, & Ratmanida. (2018). Engglis Theachers' Strategies Giving Oral Corrative Feedback On Students' Speaking Performance. *Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on English Language and Teaching (ICOELT-6)*.

Yin, R. K. (2016). *Qualitative research from start to finish* (Second edition). The Guilford Press.