

EFL Students' Responses on Oral Corrective Feedbacks and Uptakes in Speaking Class

Gunawan Suryoputro

English Education Department
Universitas Muhammadiyah Prof. Dr. HAMKA
Indonesia

Aam Amaliah

LP3I College Banten
Indonesia

Abstract

The study aims to find out the responses of Oral Corrective Feedback and Students' Uptake on EFL students' learning process in speaking class and to identify the most frequent type of oral corrective feedback and uptakes by one non-native teacher and EFL students. To find out the responses and the types, the classroom observation and interview were done. The results revealed that explicit correction is the most frequent type of oral corrective feedback used by the teacher and self-repair as the most frequent type of students' uptakes. Regarding the responses of giving oral corrective feedback, the student admitted that 1) they became aware of their own errors; 2) they were motivated to improve their speaking skill; 3) their pronunciation and grammar input improved; and, 4) their vocabulary enriched. In spite of the positive responses of the students on the explicit correction, a further study should be done with a different level of English proficiency in order to obtain comprehensive contributions to the importance of feedbacks and uptakes in the learning process.

Key Words:EFL, oral corrective feedback, students' uptakes, explicit correction

Introduction

In the past decade or so, oral corrective feedback and student uptakes have been investigated by many researchers. Even though there are still controversial issues on corrective feedback and student uptake, Ellis(2000)strongly argued that "oral CF should take a place in L2 learning process because of fostering students' motivation and ensuring linguistic accuracy"(p. 3).By contrast, Argudo (2013) suggested that "teachers have to avoid corrective feedback because it likely has harmful impacts on students' affective domain"(p. 124).A similar argument is put forward by Elsaghayer (2014) who states, "feedback should always be personal, and never directed at person's personality"(p. 76).Thus, pros and cons over the essential corrective feedback and student uptake remain questionable and a further study is needed in order to provide a significant contribution to EFL teaching and learning.

Oral Corrective Feedback

There are some similar notions of oral corrective feedback put forwarded by different experts. Lightbown and Spada(as citedin Karbalaei and Karimian, 2014), define "corrective feedback as any indication to the learners that their use of the target language is incorrect"(p. 967).In this case, the feedback can be conveyed explicitly and implicitly that include metalinguistic information. According to Calsiyao (2015). "oral corrective feedback is a means of offering modified input to students which could consequently lead to modified output by the students" (p. 395).Likewise, Chaudron (as citedin Mendez and Cruz, 2012), defined "oral corrective feedback as any reaction of the teacher which clearly transforms, disapprovingly refers to, or demands improvement of the learner utterance" (p. 64).In short, oral corrective feedback is the process of giving correction toward student's error in oral production which can be conveyed by teachers and students.

Students' Uptakes

Student uptake refers to “utterance that immediately follows the teacher’s feedback and that constitutes a reaction in some ways to the teacher’s intention to draw attention to some aspects of a student’s initial utterance,” (Lyster and Ranta 1997, p. 49). Lyster and Llinares (2014) stated “uptake defined as a discourse move and not as an instance of acquisition, although some researchers have suggested that uptake may be ‘related to learners’ perceptions about feedback at the time of feedback” (p. 182). Similarly, Afitska (2012) argued that student uptake refers to “student ability to pay attention on negative form that was provided by the teacher in the classroom” (p. 5). These notions may suggest student uptakes actually refer to students’ verbal reaction or responses towards a given feedback. Student uptakes usually occur immediately after teacher’s feedback as long as there will be opportunity for them in responding their teacher’s feedback. Therefore, student uptakes are absolutely observable as long as a teacher pays a full attention to every single response by students.

Methods

Research Design

This study was designed to elicit the EFL Indonesian students’ responses on the use of oral corrective feedbacks and uptakes in speaking performance. They were EFL students of college non English department in the Province of Banten, Indonesia. It was believed that the oral corrective feedback and the uptakes had significant impacts on the development of students speaking skill.

Participants

The participants were one non-native English teacher (Indonesia) and eighteen EFL students of diploma program. The participants took the TOEIC test as the requirement to take the course which focuses on English for Occupation Purposes (EOP) since they were expected to be ready to work after graduation.

Instruments

This study used two types of instruments: video recording and interview. The video recording was used to identify the most frequent types of oral corrective feedback and students’ uptakes that were applied by the teacher and the students during their speaking performances. The data was taken during six meetings in which each meeting lasted 200 minutes. Thus, the total duration of videotape recordings was 1,200 minutes or 20 hours. The interview was used to find out the students’ responses on the usefulness of oral corrective feedback. Due to the limited time allotment, the researchers conducted the interview with nine out of eighteen students.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was carried out through the following steps. First, on the basis of Lyster and Ranta (1997) classification, the oral corrective feedbacks and students’ uptakes which were videotaped were coded, categorized, and analyzed using error treatment sequences. Next, the data were analyzed and calculated into percentages in order to find out their frequent uses and types. Finally, the distribution of types and frequencies of oral corrective feedback toward students’ speaking performance were transcribed and discussed in order to reveal to what extent the oral corrective feedback and students’ uptakes were responded positively by the students and had significant impacts on learning process.

Results

Types of Oral Corrective Feedback

Referring to the classification of oral corrective feedback defined by Lyster and Ranta (1997) and Ellis (2009), the data were grouped into seven types: *recast*, *explicit correction*, *elicitation*, *metalinguistic feedback*, *clarification request*, *repetition*, and *paralinguistic signal*. The followings are the types of oral corrective feedback and the examples from the participants (the teacher and the students of LP3i):

- a) **Recast.** The student (S) mistranslated their Indonesian utterances into English, and the teacher (T) corrected the error.

Example 1

S1 : "I am going to buy medicine because *stomach sick*." (Indonesian translation into English)

T : "Yes, you are *stomach ache*." (*Corrected utterances in English*)

S1 : "I am asking about medicine to the shopkeeper."

(Continued to the next *topic*)

b) **Explicit correction** occurs when the teacher identifies the student's error and tries to correct it immediately.

Example 2:

S2 : "Tips for controlling your *nervous* (*Phonological and grammatical error*)

T : "*Nervousness*."

S2 : "*Nervousness*." (*In corrected pronunciation and grammar*)

c) **Elicitation** necessitates the teacher to repeat the erroneous utterances directly to a student to make her aware of the feedback and repair it directly.

Example 3:

S3 : "Hope to see *you're* soon."

T : "*Your?*"

S3 : "*You*."

d) **Metalinguistic feedback** invites the teacher to give the correction by asking a student to complete the sentence with the appropriate linguistic signal.

Example 4:

S4 : "There are *4 bedrooms*."

T : "You need Plural."

S4 : "Yes."

e) **Clarification request** occurs when the teacher asks clarification from a student about incorrect sentence.

Example 5:

S5 : "I would like to share you about *how is applying job*."

T : "*Pardon?*"

S5 : "I would like to share you about *how to apply the job*." (*note: the correct one is "...share with you...apply for..."*)

f) **Repetition** means that the teacher repeats the erroneous utterances to guide a student to be aware of the mistake.

Example 6:

S6 : "Because she *doesn't have* a room."

T : "Because she *DOESN'T have* a room."

S6 : "*Doesn't have*."

g) **Paralinguistic signal** takes place when the teacher prefers to giving his body language in guiding a student to know his errors.

Example 7:

S7 : "I *am* really *missing* you."

T : (*Shake a head*)

S7 : "I *miss* you so much."

2. The Most Frequent Use of Oral Corrective Feedback Types

In the classroom, the students had to speak about a particular topic that had already been chosen by the teacher based on their textbook in front of the classroom. During the performance, the teacher and their peers were allowed to give oral corrective feedback if there were any errors in grammar, lexical, phonological aspects of languages. By using the categorization of oral corrective feedback, the seven types are presented in the following table:

Table 1: Seven types of oral corrective feedback

Meeting	R	EC	E	MF	CR	R	PS	
1	1	11	2	2	3	1	2	
2	3	10	3	0	2	1	2	
3	3	2	1	0	2	0	0	
4	0	5	1	1	0	0	0	
5	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	
6	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	
Total	8	30	10	3	8	2	5	n = 66
Percentage	12.1%	45.5%	15.2%	4.5%	12.1%	3%	7.6%	100%

Note: R= recast, EC= explicit correction, E= elicitation, MF= metalinguistic feedback, CR = clarification request, R= repetition, PS = paralinguistic signal

The analysis of seven different oral corrective feedbacks showed that *explicit correction* was the most frequently used type of feedback by the teacher and the students, accounting for 45.5% of all feedback moves, followed by *elicitation* (15.2%), *recast* (12.1%), *clarification request* (12.1%), *paralinguistic signal* (7.6%), *metalinguistic feedback* (4.5%), and *repetition* (3%). Since the *explicit correction* is the most frequent types, it can be inferred that the *explicit correction* is the most effective way in giving feedback because the teacher can immediately determine the errors and provide the feedback to the students in appropriate way.

3. Types of the Students' Uptakes

Referring to the categories by Lyster and Ranta (1997), the study classifies the students' uptakes into two main categories: *Repair* and *Need-Repair*. Within the repair categories, there are five types—*repetition*, *incorporation*, *self-repair*, *peer-repair*, and *acknowledgement*. In the need-repair, there are two types—*same error* and *different error*. The followings are the explanations and examples of the data.

Table 2: Students' uptakes of LP3i

No	Categories	Types	Explanations and examples
1	Repair	Repetition	<p>Repetition occurs after a certain feedback has already been conveyed, and students responded the feedback by repeating it.</p> <p>Student 1 : "Breakfast" Teacher : <i>Correct the pronunciation</i> Student 1 : "Breakfast" (<i>Repeat the corrected pronunciation</i>)</p>
		Incorporation	<p>Incorporation holds the students repetition of the correct form given by the teacher. Here is an example of incorporation found in the present data:</p> <p>Student 2: "Interview must be faced." (<i>Incorrect pronunciation</i>) Teacher : "Faced." (<i>Corrected pronunciation</i>) Student 2: "Interview must be faced." (<i>In corrected pronunciation</i>)</p>
		Self- repair	<p>Self-repair occurs when the student corrects his error himself after a feedback type does not retreat the correction. Instances of self- repair can be seen as follows:</p> <p>Student 3 : "Wood cutting." Teacher : "Wood cutting?" Student 3 : "Wood cutter."</p>
		Peer- repair	<p>Peer-repair means that the error is corrected by a student other than the one who made the error.</p> <p>Student 4 : "Give me a French juice." Teacher : "A soft drink, may be?" Student 5 : "Yes, soft drink."</p>
		Acknowledgement	<p>Acknowledgement occurs when the student responses to feedback simply by saying "Yes" or "No". Illustration of acknowledgement can be seen in the following example:</p> <p>Student 6 : "Do you want to try this 'salak'?" Teacher : "A bark fruit." (note: salak = sanke fruit) Student 6 : "Yes."</p>
2	Need-repair	The same error	<p>The same error refers to the student repeating the original error after the feedback.</p> <p>Student 7 : "I climbed mountain last week." Teacher : "Climbed." Student 7 : "Climbed." (<i>Still in the wrong pronunciation</i>)</p>
		The different error	<p>The different error occurs when the student response to the feedback but he still makes an error which is different from the original one.</p> <p>The following example shows an occurrence of different error:</p> <p>Student 8 : "This is a shoes pocket." Teacher : (<i>shaking a head</i>) Student 8 : "Shoes place." Teacher : "Shoes shelf." Student 8 : "Shoes shelf."</p>

4. The Most Frequent Types of the Students' Uptakes

The data revealed that the highest types of students' uptakes was *self-repair* (22.7%), followed by *repetition* (21.2%), *no uptake* (15.5%), *incorporation* (10.6%), *acknowledgement* (9%), *the same error* (9%), and *the different error* (1.5%). As long as self-repair is the most frequent type of students' uptake, it can be inferred that students became aware of their errors and highly motivated to correct their own errors.

These results suggest that oral corrective feedback help students to improve their speaking performance by promoting the students to realize their mistakes and dare to correct them.

5. Responses and Impacts of Oral Corrective Feedbacks

The study revealed that the students had positive responses on corrective feedbacks provided by their teacher and peers. The students admitted that, based on the analysis of the interview and video recording, oral corrective feedback could develop their speaking performance because:

- 1) Oral Corrective Feedback made them aware of their errors.
- 2) Oral Corrective Feedback madethemaccustomedto listen to other's suggestion.
- 3) Oral Corrective Feedback helped them to improve their language elements, like pronunciation and the use of grammar.
- 4) Oral Corrective Feedback helped them to avoid the same error and enrich their vocabulary which leads to improve their speaking performance.

Discussion

1. The most Frequent Types of Oral Corrective Feedback

The most types of oral corrective feedback used by the teacher and the students in this study are *explicit correction* (45.5%). This finding is likely different from some previous studies carried out by Lyster and Ranta (1997), Taipale (2012), and Maolida (2013), who found that the most frequent type of oral corrective feedback by teachers was *recast*. There is plausible reason why recast was mostly used by the teacher. It may due to the background of the students. For example, Taipale made the study with the young learners and Lyster and Ranta with immersion class, in which recast was more appropriate oral corrective feedback strategy compared to the explicit correction. By using recast, the young learners would not be discouraged to join the learning process.

More importantly, in this study the teacher tends to provide oral corrective feedback explicitly due to some reasons. First, most of students still produced incorrect pronunciation which automatically forced the teacher to correct immediately. Second, very often the students did not understand when the teacher provided them with another types of oral corrective feedback, like metalinguistic feedback and clarification request. Third, because of their fossilization of their first language, they tended to repeat the same errors after being corrected by teacher.

The most interesting finding in the current study is that most students preferred to obtain the feedback immediately after they found the error rather than in the end of performance. As Mendez and Cruz (2012) argued that oral corrective feedback can be delivered directly after a teacher found the errors or mistakes, on one condition that the teacher has to deliver oral corrective feedback as appropriate as possible in order to avoid students affective domain, like discourage motives (Elsaghayar, 2014).

2. The Most Frequent Types of Students' Uptakes

There are different and similar findings between current study and previous studies. The different result is regarded to the most frequent types of oral corrective feedback that was followed by students' uptakes. The current study found that explicit correction as the most type wasequal to elicitation and paralinguistic signal. However, Lyster&Ranta (1997) and Maolida (2013) found that elicitation was the most frequent type, and Taipale's (2012) found the clarification request. The other different result is that self- repair was the most types of students' uptake; whereas the previous studies indicated that need- repair belongs to acknowledgement and the same error.

There are, however, similar findings between the current study and the study conducted by Maolida (2013). The two findings showed that recast had the highest percentage for no uptake. It maybe due to that fact that the teacher did not repeat the feedback, and they kept on delivering their speech, meaning that recast may not make students aware of their own errors.

3. Responses and Impacts of Oral Corrective Feedbacks

The results of the interview analysis indicate that there are some positive responses which have impacts on EFL students' speaking performance.

First, oral corrective feedback made the students aware of their errors because the teacher provided them with a variety of oral corrective feedback. For example, one student said,

- (1) “Setelahpraktekbicara di depankelasakutahukesalahannyahabisdapat feedback.” (Aa)
(I become aware and know my errors after I practice my English in front of the class.)

Second, oral corrective feedback made them accustomed to listen to other’s suggestion and made them improve their speaking skill, as seen in the following example,

- (2) “Kita gamarahkalaudikoreksisama Pak Rokiatauteman-temankarenaitubisamembantukitalebihbaiklagi speaking kita.” (Mei)
(We are not angry when our mistakes are corrected by Mr. Roki and friends because their correction can help us improve our speaking.)

This finding endorsed Ellis’ idea (2009), but it opposed Argudo’s argument (2013). During the interview, all of the students in this study admitted that they were not resent after being corrected by both of their teacher or peers; instead, it motivated them to improve their speaking in the next performance. Obviously, the students’ affective domain in receiving oral corrective feedback must be considered to identify whether feedback takes place or not. The same argument was advocated by Tuan and Mai (2015) who stated that students’ speaking performance was actually based on the feedback given by the teacher. The more appropriate way of delivery is, the more motivated students can be to improve their speaking performances.

Third, oral corrective feedback helped them to improve their linguistic aspects, like pronunciation and the use of correct grammar. For example, one student said,

- (3) “Kalo pas ngomongdidepanseringngaktahuucapandan grammar benar. Kalodikoreksioleh guru jadilangsungbisabetulin.” (Ra)
(When practicing English in front of the class I am very often not sure whether my pronunciation and grammar correct. Hence I can improve my pronunciation and grammar directly when the corrective feedback is given.)

The current study showed that phonological elements and grammar as the two frequent error were produced by the students. Through oral corrective feedback, the students were accustomed to listening to the corrected pronunciation. Thus, they can be considered as the successful students in learning target language when they produced the English words appropriately and speak it in the right structure. As stated by Honig et al., in Sarwar (2014), someone who succeeds in learning target language is usually seen from the way he talks—the more accurate his speaking is, the more visible his successful can be.

Next, oral corrective feedback helped them to avoid the same error and enrich their vocabulary. Two students stated that,

- (4) “Kalodikoreksi, vocab sayajadibertambah” (In)
(I can enrich my vocabulary if my English is corrected)
- (5) “Denganseringnyasayadikoreksi, sayajaditahukesalahanmana yang harusdihindari biargangulangkesalahan yang sama.” (Bi)
(If I am given the correction and feedbacks, I become aware of my errors and I can avoid having the same mistakes.)

By correcting all the time from the teacher as well as their friends when they speak English, they become familiar with the error types, the use of appropriate vocabulary, and avoidance of the same error in their next practices. As stated by Kosar and Bedir (2014), students would be able to decide what strategy they will use in order to avoid the same error and choose kind of words for their next speaking performance.

At last, oral corrective feedback improved their speaking. It could be confirmed by the answer from all of students who agreed that they became more confident in delivering their thought and enjoying their speaking performance in front of the class. They admitted that the teacher gave the feedback in an appropriate way; as a result, they became highly motivated to improve their speaking performance to be better than before. For example one student said,

- (6) “Saatngomong di depankelas, koreksiantuhbisamemotivasikita, Bu.” (Nit)
(When the teacher gave corrections our speaking performance in of the class, it could motivate us.)

Shumin (2010) suggested that speaking performance can be affected by affective factors, and motivation is one kind of affective factors affecting students' speaking performance. Based on the students' responses during interview, it could be concluded that they were happy to be corrected and they felt confident enough to deliver their idea.

Conclusion

The study showed all of seven types of oral corrective feedback took place in diploma students setting in which the *explicit correction* was the most frequent type of oral corrective feedback. Regarding the types of students' uptake, both repair and need- repair were done by the students during speaking performance in the class. However, the findings seem different from the previous studies since there are only three (acknowledgement, same error, and different error) from six types (acknowledgement, same error, different error, hesitation, off target, and partial error) of need- repair, and there was only self- repair as the most frequent type of students' uptakes occurred. Moreover, the study reveals that oral corrective feedback has positive responses from EFL students, and it has significant impacts on the students' learning process in the class. For example, oral corrective feedback could improve the students' speaking performance by making them aware of their errors, and it also makes them accustomed to listen to other's suggestion. More importantly and specifically, the study suggests that the explicit correction does not discourage the EFL students to learn English. Though there are positive responses to the explicit correction, a further study is still needed with a different level of English proficiency in order to obtain comprehensive contributions to the importance of feedbacks and uptakes in EFL speaking class.

References

- Argudo, Juan de Dios Martinez. (2013). 'An Investigation Into How EFL Learners Emotionally Respond to Teachers' Oral Corrective Feedback.' *Applied Linguistic Journal*, 15/2: 124.
- Afitska, Oksana. (2012). 'Role of Focus-on-form Instruction, Corrective Feedback and Uptake in Second Language Classrooms: Some Insights from Recent Second Language Acquisition Research.' *The Language Learning Journal*, 1(1).
- Calsiyao, Irene S. (2015). 'Corrective Feedback in Classroom Oral Errors among Kalinga- Apayao State College Students.' *International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research*, 3/1: 135
- Ellis, Rod. (2009). 'Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development.' *L2 Journal*, 1/1: 3- 9.
- Elsaghayer, Mohamed. (2014). 'Affective Damage to Oral Corrective Feedback among Students in Libyan Secondary Schools.' *IQSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IQSR- JRME)*, 4/6:76.
- Kosar, Gulden and Hasan Bedir. (2014). 'Strategies- Based Instruction: A means of Improving Adult EFL Learners' Speaking Skills.' *International Journal of Language Academy*, 2/3: 16- 17.
- Karbalaei, Alireza and Abdolkarim Karimian. (2014). 'On the Effect of Type of Teacher Corrective Feedback on Iranian EFL Learners' Writing Performance'. *Indian Journal. Sci. Res*, 7(1).
- Lyster, Roy and Ana Llinares. (2014). 'The Influence of Context on Patterns of Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake: a Comparison of CLIL and Immersion Classrooms.' *The Language Learning Journal*, 42(2).
- _____ and Leila Ranta. (1997). 'Oral Corrective Feedback and Student Uptake; Negotiation of Form in Communicative Classrooms.' *SSLA*. pp. 44- 55.
- Maolida, Ellis Homsini. (2013). Oral Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake for Young Learners. (Unpublished Thesis. Bandung: UPI), pp. 1- 157.
- Mendez, Edith Hernandez and Maria del Rosario Reyes Cruz. (2012). 'Teachers' Perceptions About Oral Corrective Feedback and Their Practice in EFL Classrooms.' *ELT Journal*, 14/2: 64.
- Sarwar, Muhammad, Muhammad Alam, Ashfaque Ahmad Shah, and Mehlah Jabeen. (2014). 'Assessing English Speaking Skills of Prospective Teachers at Entry and Graduation Level in Teacher.' *Language Testing in Asia; A Springer Open Journal*, 4/5: 1.
- Shumin, Kang. (2010). In Jack Richards and Willy A. Renandya (Ed.), *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 205- 206.
- Taipale, Paivi. (2012). *Oral Errors, Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake in an EFL Setting*. (Finland: University of Jyväskylä), pp. 3- 46.
- Tuan, Nguyen Hoang and Tran Ngoc Mai. (2015). Factors Affecting Students' Speaking Performance At Le Thanh Hien High School. *Multidisciplinary Journals*, 3/2: 9.