

# ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK: ERROR TYPES, AND STUDENTS' UPTAKE IN EFL CLASSROOM

Lailatus Sa'adah

Universitas Kapuas Sintang, Jalan Oevang Oeray No.92 Sintang

**Abstract:** *Corrective feedback has become a big issue among second and foreign language researchers. Its effectiveness while being implemented in the class is still the subject of debate. Moreover, its impact on second and foreign language learners' performance is also a topic of discussion. Most researches claimed that corrective feedback has a positive effect on EFL learners. Therefore, this paper seeks information about the implementation of corrective feedback, the error types and students' uptake found in the class. For this purpose, interviews and observations were used to collect data from a teacher and tenth grade students of senior high school in one of city in central java. The findings showed that there are three types of oral corrective feedback found in the class, they are; explicit correction, metalinguistic, and clarification request. Moreover, the students are frequently do a phonological error and semantic error while speaking. In regard to the students' uptake, acknowledgement, repetition, off-target, and peer-repair are mostly found from the teacher and students interaction.*

**Keywords:** Corrective Feedback, Error Types, Students' Uptake

## INTRODUCTION

Learning English as foreign language in Indonesian context is undoubtedly difficult for some people. This statement is supported by Yule (2006), who believes that for most people, the experience with target language is fundamentally different from their first language and it is hardly conducive to acquisition (p. 163). Indonesia also obliges elementary school until university students to learn English for a few hours a week. In particular, this time allotment is not enough as the fact shows that their English skill is still far away to reach native speaker's competence. The way they use English still needs a lot of exposures from English teachers or native speakers of English.

In regard to learn English, when it comes to the opportunity to speak the target language, some students prefer to speak and express themselves, whereas others choose to remain silent (Riasati, 2012, p. 1287; Macintyre, 2007, p. 564). Indeed, in some English classes, the outstanding students will always be active in speaking, while, the rest just keep silent and are afraid to speak. In contrary, this phenomenon different from the goal of learning English which is encourages the students to communicate in

the target language (Dornyei & Ryan, 2016, p. 180; Brown, 2007). In other words, by learning English, students are expected not only to be able to understand English but also use it as a tool for communication. It can be assumed that the significant factor which contributes to the successfulness of learning English is producing the target language.

In general, many English language teachers have experiences in encouraging their students to produce English in both spoken and written forms. Teachers implement several strategies and methods which lead to fun and enjoyable activities. As a result, students become familiar with the situation and are able to produce English, especially in classroom communication. However, the fact shows that most students still experience anxiety about making mistakes while speaking English in front of others. This situation is understandable and acceptable for non-native speakers of English.

The natural step of learning a second or foreign language is that making an errors (Eini, Gorjian, & Pazhakh, 2013, p.811). When a student makes an error while learning to speak or write English in the class, occasionally, their teacher would

provide a comment related to their mistakes or errors. The teacher's response or comment toward the students in this situation is that what we called it feedback. Hattie & Timperley (2007, p. 81) defined feedback as "information provided by agent (e.g., teacher, peer, book, parent, self, experience) regarding aspects of one's performance or understanding". Feedback also can be described as a consequence of performance (Hattie & Timperley, 2007, p.81).

Traditionally, English foreign language teacher gives a strict attention on correcting a student's or learner's errors, while nowadays, the focus is change. A teacher gives a feedback based on the student's or learner's reaction toward the provided feedback, which is done in order to solve the problem had by the students in conveying a message (Zadkhasht & Farahian, 2017, p.30). However, an active and continues feedback sometimes do not need to be provided, in a way to prevent negative affective responses such as anger, embarrassment, and inhibition (Truscott, 1999, cited in Roothoof, 2014, p.66). On the other hand, if the teacher do not give enough feedback toward the students' errors, their accuracy would not improve (Ebadi, Saad, & Abedalaziz, 2014, p.10).

Apart from the discussion below, it is widely believed that feedbacks during the course of learning are constantly happens in every English foreign language classes. Therefore, giving a feedback toward the students' mistakes and errors while learning is pivotal. Because "without feedback, one cannot know how good he/she is performing towards a goal" (Kampkuiper, 2015, p.2). "Feedback not only helps to correct students' mistakes over a long-term, but it can also shore up knowledge held with low confidence" (Butler & Roediger, 2008, cited in Finn, Thomas, & Rawson, 2017, p.1).

Realizing the fact that there is still few research studied about the focus of teacher in giving corrective feedback and types of students' response or uptake toward the

feedback, therefore, the following research questions were proposed:

1. What are the types of error found in the class?
2. What are the types of students' uptake were found toward teacher' corrective feedback?

## LITERATURE REVIEW

It is widely known that oral and written feedback are closely related in term of giving opportunities for teachers to find learners' strength and giving useful advice in the areas which need improvement. Oral feedback, on the contrary, 'is one type of feedback that is given orally and often in interaction with people. It can be given to an individual, to a group or to the whole class (Brookhart, 2008, pp. 47-54). Grombczewska (2010) said it is information concerning the comprehension and reception of the Speaker's message given by the listener.

Additionally, oral corrective feedback is given to what has done right and what to improve directly after the performance. Also, it gives someone an opportunity to ask a question related the feedback they receive, justify or even argue it. Hence, the student will be more motivated to listen to the feedback and still remember how the task and the performance were like. Clarke et al (2003, p.17) mentions one of the requirements of oral feedback is should focus on the aim of learning, so it will be effective and worthwhile.

On the other hand, Lyster, Saito, and Sato (2013) explained that oral corrective feedback concerns on teacher's direct response to learner's incorrect utterances. Corrective feedback is considered as oral corrective feedback as it is not only given feedback on learners' written work but also given in orally whether learner produces an incorrect utterance. Russell and Spada (2006, p. 134) observed that "the term corrective feedback, refers to any feedback provided to a learner, from any source, that contains evidence of learner of language form." It indicates that there are many ways

of using corrective feedback in classrooms (as cited in Mahdi & Saadany, 2013, p.9). In general, oral corrective feedback focuses on students' speech. Conversely, corrective

feedback indicates only correction of errors (Fungula, 2013, p.3). Therefore, oral corrective feedback plays an essential role to improve the of student's speech accuracy.

**Table 1.** Example of the Six Types of Oral Corrective Feedback

Classification of Oral CF	Example
Explicit correction	St: He take the bus to go to school. T : oh, you should say he takes. He takes the bus to go to school.
Recasts	St: He take the bus to go to school T : He take the bus to go to school
Elicitation	St: He take the bus to go to school T : He ....? T : how do we form the third person singular form in English? T : can you correct that?
Metalinguistic feedback	St: He take the bus to go to school T : do we say he take? T : how do we say when it forms the third person form in English?
Clarification requests	St: He take the bus to go to school T : pardon ?
Repetition	St: He take the bus to go to school T : He take?

*Adopted from Chu (2011, p. 455)*

Research on corrective feedback reveals that teachers have wide variety of strategies available for the treatment of students' error. The one that will be used in this research is six types of oral corrective feedback strategies proposed by Lyster and Ranta in 1997. However, as the teacher we are not always give students correction in their error. Therefore, knowing the students' types of error is also essential for teacher. It is in line with Mendez & Cruz (2012, p. 68) who state that when correcting, it is paramount to identify the type of error the learners make because it is not always the case teachers want or need to correct everything.

Errors have been categorized by Mackey, Gass, & McDonough (2000) and Nishita (2004) as cited by Mendez and Cruz (2012) into as follows: 1. Morphosyntactic error: learner incorrectly use word order,

tense, conjunction, and articles. 2. Phonological error: learners mispronounce words. 3. Lexical error: learners use vocabulary inappropriately or they code-switch to their first language because of their lack of lexical knowledge. 4. Semantic and pragmatic error: the misunderstanding of a learner's utterance, even if there are no grammatical, lexical or phonological errors.

Corrective feedback is usually followed by uptake (Ellis, 2012, p.178). Ellis (2012, p. 178) states that uptake is a term that has been used to refer to a discourse move, where learners respond to information they have received about some linguistic problems they have experienced. In other words, uptake is students' respond toward the corrective feedback given by teacher. Students' uptake can be in form of body movement or the other types of uptake move. According to Lyster & Ranta (1997,

cited in Ellis, 2012, p. 179), there are two kinds of uptake move. They are: Repair and Needs repair. Repair refers to the accurate reformulation of the error produced by the student. In other words, the student is able to

correct the error by using the information in the feedback given by the teacher (Taipale, 2012, p. 44). On the other hand, needs repair refers to the situation where the students still need of repair.

Table 2. Kinds of Uptake

Repair		Needs Repair	
Types	Example	Types	Example
Repetition	The student repeats the teacher's feedback.	Acknowledgement	The student says 'yes' or 'no'.
Incorporation	The student incorporates repetition of the correct form in a longer utterances.	Same error	The student produces the same error again.
Self-repair	The student corrects the error in response to teacher feedback that did not supply the correct form.	Different error	The student fails to correct the original error and in addition produces a different error.
Peer-repair	Student other than the student who produced the error corrects it in response to teacher feedback.	Off-target	The student responds by circumventing the teacher's linguistic focus.
		Hesitation	The student hesitates in response to the teacher's feedback.
		Partial repair	The student partly corrects initial error

## RESEARCH METHOD

The participants of this study were a teacher and 35 senior high school students. They were selected through purposive sampling. Moreover, in order to investigate teachers' oral corrective feedback, error types, and students' uptake found in the EFL classroom, this research used descriptive qualitative as its research method. A semi-structure interview and classroom observation were used as the instrument of collecting the data. Moreover, in analyzing qualitative data, the researcher used 3 steps, those are: organizing and familiarizing, coding and reducing, and interpreting and representing (Ary et al, 2010:481).

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### Types of Error Found in the Conversation Class

In the class, students are sometimes making some errors while speaking. Apparently, their errors in speaking vary from one students to another. In this study, the researcher found several types of errors which always occur in the conversation class.

The first error deals with phonological errors. Phonological errors refers to errors in pronunciation. These errors are commonly caused by the differences between two languages and their sound systems (Taipale, 2012, p. 33). The conversation between teacher and students in the 1<sup>st</sup> observation

below shows an instance of a phonological error:

Example 1

Teacher : Go clean up yourself  
 Students : Go clean up yourself (phonological error)  
 Teacher : So, clean and up is should be clean-up, don't say go clean up yourself, but clean-up yourself. Oke once more. (Explicit correction)  
 Students : Go clean-up yourself. (repetition)

In Example 1, the teacher asks the students to read aloud about some expressions used in daily life. They are asked to follow the teacher utterances. However, some students still mispronounce the expression of *go clean up yourself*. The students utter it with weak stress, so that, the teacher corrected their utterances because she found it inappropriate. The teacher then provides feedback by saying what the students said is incorrect and gives the correct pronunciation along with some brief explanation.

Another type of error found is L2-L1 translation errors. This type of error is not included into the types of errors proposed by Mackey, Gass, & McDonough (2000) and Nishita (2004). This type of error cannot be categorized into morphosyntactic, phonological, lexical, semantic and pragmatic error. Therefore, Taipale (2012) who analyzed oral errors in EFL setting made a category of its own and classified there as L2-L1 translation error. The decision of using this category is based on the findings obtained in the field. L2-L1 translation errors to refer to the inaccurate translation of the English words made by the students. Example 2 is an instance where the students do a translation error:

Example 2

Teacher : what is the meaning of go clean up yourself?

Student A : segera bersihkan dirimu (L2-L1 translation error)  
 Student B : Bersihkan dirimu (L2-L1 translation error)  
 Teacher : No one right here, oke, if you write "segera bersihkan dirimu", it can be "go, tidy up yourself", but go clean up your self means "cepatlah mandi sana" (metalinguistic feedback)  
 Students : ooooooo (acknowledgement)

The first error deals with the misinterpretation about the meaning of *go clean up yourself* in Indonesian. While the teacher and students are having a conversation class, the students are asked to find the meaning of *go clean up yourself*. The students translate the sentence in difficult ways which convey difficult meaning: *segera bersihkan dirimu*; *cepat bersihkan dirimu*; and so forth. No one gives the right answer expected by the teacher. After a long discussion, then, the teacher gave both explanation and answer to the students.

**Types of Students' Uptakes Found in Conversation Class**

When the teacher gives the corrective feedback to the students, sometimes it leads the students to response or react to the feedback in different ways, which is called students' uptake. In this research, the researcher investigated the kind of uptake found in conversation class. As it as already proposed in the previous chapter that students' uptakes are vary, such as; repetition, incorporation, self-repair, peer-repair, acknowledgement, same error, different error, off-target, hesitation, and partial repair.

The data taken from the classroom observation showed that there are four types of students' uptake found in conversation class. The most dominant students' uptake found is acknowledgement. This type of

students' uptake is relates to the students' acceptance or rejection of the feedback given by the teacher. Illustration of acknowledgement can be found in the example 2 and 3.

The second type of students' uptake is repetition. The teacher provides a feedback which contains the correct form of students' ill-formed message and then repeated by the students. In this research, the researcher found repetition in some pronunciation errors. The example is the conversation between teacher and students which can be found in example 1.

In addition, off-target type also occurs in the conversation class. In this type, the students respond by circumventing the teacher's linguistic focus. Somehow, the students ask for further explanation related to the teacher feedback because the students assumed that what they said is correct. The example is the conversation between teacher and students in the class:

Example 3

Teacher	: No one right here, oke, if you write "segera bersihkan dirimu", it can be "go, tidy up yourself", but go clean up yourself means "cepatlah mandi sana".
Students	: oooooooooo (acknowledgement)
Student B	: Kok cepetan mandi? (off-target)

In this situation, the class is talking about the translation of some expressions used in daily life. The teacher asked the students to translate "*go clean up yourself*" into Indonesian. A student replies by writing *segera bersihkan dirimu*, which according to the teacher does not imply the correct meaning of "*go clean up yourself*". As a result, she gives the correct translation and explained the situation to the students. Most students understand the teacher answer and assumed that the teacher feedback is correct. On the contrary, one of the students, still cannot get what the teacher means.

The last type of students' uptake which is found is peer-repair. In this case, the students other who do not produce the error, corrected the error in response to teacher feedback. This happens because of the inequality of students' understanding of the material given. The example is the conversation between teacher and students in the class:

Example 4

Teacher	: save it or change it?
Student A	: apa miss? Save it or chicit?
Teacher	: change it
Student A	: ....
Student B	: change it change it

In this situation, the teacher and the students have been talking about the task. The students are asked to translate some expression in English into Indonesian. The teacher then asks the students whether they agree with the answer or want to change the answer. Therefore, the teacher said "*save it or change it*". However, one of the students misheard the word change. Although the teacher has already given the feedback. Student A still cannot catch the word. So that, the student B tries to give the oral feedback also to the student A.

In summary, the findings showed that the students frequently made phonological and semantic errors. This result partly echoes the studies of Eini, Gorjian, and Pazhakh (2013) who said that the students showed lack of improvement in the content and structure of their speech in their study. Moreover, Dilans (2015) found that feedback was mainly provided in response to morphological, lexical, and phonological errors. However, in better context, Yang (2016) stated that explicit correction and recast were endorsed for phonological, lexical and grammatical errors.

In terms of the students' uptake, there are three types of students' uptake found in this research, they are; acknowledgement, repetition, and off-target. However, the data obtained from students' interview stated that hesitation also frequently happened. Slightly different from the actual situation, students

are more definite about what they really want to utter. Hesitation, a sort of uptake, was not found in the data. In Taipale's study (2012, pp. 43-47), most of the types of uptake were found, such as; repetition, incorporation, self-repair, peer-repair, acknowledgement, same error, different error, partial repair, and hesitation. However, off target is the only uptake type which could not be found in his study.

### CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Regarding to the explanation above, it can be inferred that oral corrective feedback is necessary to be implemented in the class. It is not only useful for the students' linguistic development but also their second language acquisition. If the students' mistakes or errors are not perfectly addressed by the teacher, those errors will lead to fossilization which can cause damages for future language learning development. Although oral corrective feedback is used generously by the teacher, the students' preference was not being investigated here. Therefore, potential researchers should also take this into account, whether or not to put students' preference as their part of study. This is because knowing the students' preference will ease the teaching learning activity, so that the teacher will give the feedback appropriate with their students' preference.

As an English teacher, noticing students' errors while speaking is the teacher's responsibility. Moreover, giving an appropriate type of oral feedback is also a significant matter in this case. Therefore, giving feedback based on the students' preference is also important. Meanwhile, the students who may have problems with errors in speaking should discuss their problems and try to find good solution with the teacher. They do not only discussing about the students' problems while speaking but also the feedback that the students prefer from the teacher. This way the teaching and learning activity becomes more meaningful, efficient, and clear. Besides, further potential researchers are suggested to

investigate other gaps in oral corrective feedback that are not yet studied by other researchers. Therefore, this study might have a significant role as a reference..

### REFERENCES

- Ary, et al. (2010). *Introduction to Research in Education*. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Brown, D. H. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New York: Pearson Education Inc.
- Brookhart, S. M. (2008). *How to Give Effective Feedback to Your Students*. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Clarke, S., Timperley, H., & Hattie, J. A. (2003). *Assessing formative assessment*. Auckland, New Zealand: Hodder Moa Beckett
- Chu, R. (2011). Effects of Teacher's Corrective Feedback on Accuracy in the Oral English of English-Majors College Students. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1 (5). Retrieved from [www.academypublication.com/issues/past/tpls/vol01/05/03.pdf](http://www.academypublication.com/issues/past/tpls/vol01/05/03.pdf).
- Dilans, G. (2015). Corrective feedback in L2 Latvian classrooms: Teacher perceptions versus the observed actualities practice. *Language Teaching Research*, 1-19. DOI: 10.1177/1362168815584454
- Dornyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). *The Psychology of the Language Learner Revisited*. New York: Routledge.
- Ebadi, M.R., Saad, M.R., & Abdelaziz, N. (2014). Corrective Feedback and Second Language Acquisition: Differential Contributions of Implicit and Explicit Knowledge. *The Malaysian Online Journal of Education Science*, 2 (2). Retrieved from [www.moj-es.com](http://www.moj-es.com).
- Eini, M., Gorjian, B., & Pazhakh, A. (2013). The Effect of Corrective Feedback Modalities on Second Language Post-Speaking Activities among Iranian Pre-intermediate EFL Learners. *Advance in*

- Asian Social Science*, 4 (2). Retrieved from [www.worldsciencepublisher.org](http://www.worldsciencepublisher.org).
- Ellis, R. (2012). *Language Teaching Research and Language Pedagogy*. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Finn, B., Thomas, R., & Rawson, K, A. (2017). Learning more from Feedback: Elaborating Feedback with Example Enhances Concept Learning. *Learning and Instruction*, xxx (2017), 1-10. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2017.08.007>
- Fungula, B. N. (2013). *Oral Corrective Feedback in the Chinese EFL Classroom*. Karlstads University.
- Grombczewska, M. (2011). The Relationship between Teacher's Feedback and Students' Motivation. *Humanising Language Teaching*, 3. Retrieved from <http://www.hltmag.co.uk/jun11/stud.htm>.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The Power of Feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 1 (77), 81-112. DOI: 10.3102/003465430298487.
- Kampkuiper, J. (2015). The Effect of Positive and Negative Feedback on Self-Efficacy, Cognitive Trust and Affective Trust. *5<sup>th</sup> IBA Bachelor Thesis Conference*, July 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2015, Enschede, The Netherlands.
- Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral Corrective Feedback in Second Language Classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 46, 1-40. Retrieved from <https://www.cambridge.org>
- Mahdi, D., & Saadany, N. E. (2013). *Oral feedback in the EFL classroom*. Malmö Högskola, 63, 11-27.
- Yule, G. (2006). *The Study of Language (3<sup>rd</sup> ed)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Riasati, M. J. (2012). EFL Learners' Perception of Factors Influencing Willingness to Speak English in Language Classroom: A Qualitative Study. *World applied sciences journal*, 17 (10), 1287-1297. Retrieved from [u.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.390.1430&rep=rep1&type=pdf](http://u.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.390.1430&rep=rep1&type=pdf).
- Roothoof, H. (2014). The Relationship between Adult EFL Teachers' Oral Feedback Practices and their Beliefs. *System*, 46 (2014), 65-79. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.07.012>
- Russel, J., & Spada, N. (2006). The Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback for the Acquisition of L2 Grammar. *Language Learning & Language Teaching*, 13. Pp. 134-164. <https://doi.org/10.1075/llt.13.09val>
- Taipale, P. (2012). Oral Errors, Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake in an EFL Setting. Published Thesis. University of Jyväskylä. Retrieved from [https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/bitstream/handle/123456789/37544/URN\\_NBN\\_fi\\_jyu-201203121409.pdf;sequence=4](https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/bitstream/handle/123456789/37544/URN_NBN_fi_jyu-201203121409.pdf;sequence=4).
- Macintyre, P. D. (2007). Willingness to Communicate in the Second Language: Understanding the Decision to Speak as A Volitional Process. *The modern language journal*, 91 (4), 564-576. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00623.x
- Mendez, E., & Cruz, M. (2012). Teachers' Perception about Oral Corrective Feedback and Their Practice in EFL Classrooms. *PROFILE*, 14 (2).
- Zadkhast, M., & Farahian, M. (2017). The Impact of Immediate and Delayed Corrective Feedback on Iranian EFL Learners' Willingness to Communicate. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature* 6 (6). DOI: 10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.6n.6p.28.