Exploring Oral Corrective Feedback in the Context of Teaching Speaking in an Indonesian Senior High School

[1]Anisyah Pratiwi, [2]Budi Setyono, [3]Siti Sundari
(Corresponding author)
[1,2,3]*Universitas Jember, Jember, Indonesia*
Jl. Kalimantan X, Krajan Timur, Sumbersari, Jember, East Java 68121, Indonesia

Abstract: This paper explores how the English teacher in an Indonesian senior high school provides oral corrective feedback (OCF) to the students in the context of teaching speaking. The English teacher at Islamic Senior High School was recruited in the study. The data were collected through virtual observation and face-to-face observation (by using Zoom software and visiting the classroom) and interview with the English teacher. The results revealed that the English teacher used four types of OCF, explicit correction, recast, clarification request, and elicitation. While the rest, metalinguistic and repetition were not given as oral feedback. The most frequent use of OCF was explicit correction (52%), while the least frequent use of OCF was clarification request (2%). The English teacher'sreasons in providing OCF were various. This study highlights the provision of the English teacher in providing OCF as corrective feedback.
Keywords: oral corrective feedback, English teacher, teaching speaking

I. Introduction

With the emergence of communicative English Language Teaching, a teacher isrequired to be able to provide feedback on students' works or students' performance. The feedback process engages students regarding their works for improvement purposes (Carless & Winstone, 2020). Moreover, the feedback process highlights the need for students to seek, understand and use and even recognize feedback, while for teachers to support in conducting or designing the feedback process effectively.In the context of teaching speaking to senior high school students, for example, the English teacher needs to determine the type of instructional method, the speaking activities, the assessment activities, as well as the forms of feedback given to students. In relation to oral corrective feedback (OCF) in the teaching of speaking, the teacher can focus on some aspects of speaking, such as pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, contents, and the whole performance. Through the provision of oral corrective feedback, it is expected that students learning to speak English in English class can be facilitated optimally.

In the process of learning to speak English as a foreign language, OCF plays a major role for the development of accuracy and fluency. Gentrup et al. (2020) posit that teachers' feedback can help students locate the types of errors they make and try to use them as the basis for improving their speaking performance. In line with this, Brookhart (2008) sees that teachers' corrections, suggestions, and guidance potentially enhance students' performance. In the same vein, Sepehrinia et al. (2017) argue that giving oral corrective feedback is believed to assist students to eradicate errors and improve their language performance.

Since 2014, a great many of the previous studies on the issue of oral corrective focused on teacher beliefs, practices and attitudes (e.g. Kamiya, 2014; Ozturk, 2016; Roothooft and Breeze, 2016; Sepehrinia and Mehdizadeh, 2018; and Zhu and Wang, 2019). The findings revealed that the teachers' beliefs and attitudes were positive towards oral corrective feedback. Moreover, 'recast' was used frequently by teachers and became teachers' favorite strategies. Some other studies on teachers' and students' perceptions and preferences (e.g., Tasdemir and Arslan, 2018; Van Der Klaij and Adie, 2020) reported that most of the students felt that providing feedback was important in the learning process. Inwriting, 'elicitation' and 'explicit' feedback were frequently used by teachers (Atai and Shafiee, 2017;Schuldt, 2019), whereas in oral presentation, the teacher gave feedback on the aspects of pronunciation, voice suppression, and intonation (Wang et al.,2016).

Concerningto the importance of feedback in the teaching of speaking in the context of teaching English in senior high school, this study explores how the English teacher in senior high school provides oral corrective feedback to the students in the context of teaching speaking. From reviewing previous studies, it was revealed that oral corrective feedback was carried out in various contexts and with different results. In Indonesia, little is known about how senior high school English teachers give oral corrective feedback in the teaching of speaking. To fill the gap, this study tries to explore what types of oral corrective feedback provided by a senior high school English teacher, which types of oral corrective feedback most and least frequently used, and for what reasons the English teachers provide particular forms of feedback.

II. Literature Review

A. Oral Corrective Feedback in ELT

Oral corrective feedback (OCF) is a form of feedback that is given orally and targeted to the students' utterances individually, in a group, or to the whole class (Brookhart, 2008). Oral corrective feedback is an important part of learning to speak because, without the teacher's feedback, EFL students will not realize their areas of strengths and weaknesses. In the context of teaching speaking, some areas that need teachers' corrective feedback may range from content, organization, pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary.

Sakiroglu (2020) argues that in foreign language teaching classes, fluency is not the only component of learning, accuracy is also one of the components needed for oral communication. Therefore, she states that one way to improve accuracy in oral communication is to provide oral corrective feedback during second or foreign language teaching. Moreover, in the behavioral and cognitive theory of language learning, the feedback provided is an important element in language learning. Winstone and Boud (2020) argue that feedback is not only a justification but also insightful information that can help students further develop their work. In line with this, Sepehrinia and Mehdizadeh (2018) ensure that the use of particular feedback strategies may influence how students perceive the feedback.

Lyster and Ranta (1997) classify corrective feedback into six types, namely explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic, elicitation, and repetition. (1) Explicit correction refers to the teacher to correct students'utterances or pronunciationsthat are incorrect. The teacher provides the correct forms and shows them. (e.g., "Oh, you mean," "You have to say,"). (2) Recastrefers to the teacher reformulations and provides the correction where students make an error without pointing out. (3) Clarification request refers to the teacher that he or she does not understand what the student just said. The teacher uses several request phrases to get even clearer intentions, (e.g. "Sorry", "I'm sorry", "Excuse me", "What"). (4) Metalinguisticrefers to the teacher asks a question or provides comments to the students' utterances without giving the correct form. Metalinguistic is a grammatical explanation of any particular language use. (5) Elicitationrefers to the teacher's technique for getting students' utterances, for example, by pausing students' utterances to fill in the blanks or by repeating students' erroneous. (6) Repetition refers to the teacher's repetition of students' erroneous utterance.

The following is an example of how the English teacher can give feedback to students' erroneous utterance "*she eat spaghetti bolognese*".To this erroneous utterance, the English teacher may: (1) remind and provide the correct form "*it's not "she eat," but you have to say "she eats."*"; (2) reformulate the sentences "*she eats spaghetti bolognese*"; (3) ask clarification "*excuse me ?*";(4) give metalinguistic comment, "*you need the correct one of the present tense*"; (5) elicit the students' utterances, "*she ... .*"; (6)repeatthe wrong sentence "*she eat spaghetti bolognese?*".Based on the six types of oral corrective feedback, in the present study, I explored the most frequently and rarely used of oral corrective feedback by the teacher in natural phenomena.

Brookhart (2008) recommends that the teacher can give feedback when students are ready and willing to hear what the teacher will say. For example, when a student is giving a speech in front of the class, and after the student has finished delivering his or her speech, the teacher can immediately provide oral corrective feedback, whether it is in terms of pronunciation, vocabulary, or grammar and whether it is in individuals or groups. Brookhart (2008) in her statement, mentions that there are several ways to convey or give oral corrective feedback to individual students, such as quietly, at your desk (call his or her name to come to your desk), and at a specially scheduled out of class time (after at the end of class). Thus, it is more effectively given to individual students than in groups. In giving oral corrective feedback individually, students will be better able to grab and understand the corrections that have been given by the teacher.

B. Oral Corrective Feedback in Teaching Speaking

Rassaei (2013) stated that one way to develop L2 is to provide corrective feedback that can help students identify their erroneous utterance. There are some aspects of speaking skills, such as pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, etc. Oral corrective feedback is defined as the teachers' verbal response in correcting students' linguistic errors (Lee and Lyster, 2015; Gooch et al., 2016) and improve interlanguage performance (Sepehrinia et al., 2017; and Wang et al., 2018). Moreover, Gooch et al. (2016) assumed that the existence of corrective feedback would increase the students' proficiency. On the other hand, providing oral corrective feedback can be effective for learners in phonetic terms (one scope of pronunciation). In terms of pedagogy, it can also be assumed that teachers may need to use different strategies, for example, recasts or prompts to help Korean learners acquire aspects of English / r / production. Recasts are thought to be more helpful in increasing the controlled production of / r / in giving feedback in terms of pronunciation.

Couper (2019) tested teachers' beliefs, perceptions, and practices of corrective feedback on students' pronunciation. He showed in the research results, teachers had a belief in corrective feedback which can help correct students' pronunciation in classroom practice. Most of the teachers assumed that recasts are the most frequently used in students' pronunciation feedback.

In terms of grammar and structure, oral corrective feedback can be used to review the target items and grammatical subsystems of students by encouraging communicative interactions (Lyster et al., 2013). Sheen (2010) compared between (a) oral and (b) written corrective feedback, (a) recast versus metalinguistic, and (b) direct correction versus written metalinguistic which focused on indefinite article *a* and definite article *the*. The results and discussions, written direct correction is a more effective strategy than oral recast. She argued that direct correction is clearer in providing feedback. Besides, metalinguistic is just as effective as written metalinguistic in facilitating feedback of English articles. Both of these corrective feedback provide the correct form and explanation of errors made by students. From the finding and discussion above it can be concluded that in oral corrective feedback, metalinguistic is a type that is considered effective in the English articles.

Likewise, Haifaa and Emma (2014) compared between recast and metalinguistic on learning of English modals. Based on the results of the timed grammaticality judgment test (TGJT), metalinguistic in its role is more beneficial in English modals. However, most of the students prefer to recast in English modals.

About the results of previous studies, it can be stated that givingoral corrective feedback in the learning process can be used to teach students, especially in the teaching of speaking, whether in pronunciation, grammar, or vocabulary aspects. Besides, this study will focus on oral corrective feedback typesproposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997), they are explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic, elicitation, and repetition.

III. Method

In line with the purpose of this study is to reveal the phenomena that occur in the learning process, focused on oral corrective feedback (OCF) in the context of teaching speaking, this study employed a qualitative case study design. The English teacher of an Islamic Senior High School in Banyuwangi took a role as the participant in this study.

In collecting the data, virtual and face-to-face observation as well as interview were done with the English teacher. Virtual observations were conducted for three times by using *Zoom*software while face-to-face observation was conducted once by visiting the classroom. Virtual and face-to-face observation were conducted more than 30-minutes in four English classes. While the interview was conducted for about 20-minutes with the English teacher by following the Covid-19 health protocol. With the permission of the English teacher, the audio record placed on the desk between the researcher and the participant to record the process of the interview.

The data from virtual and face-to-face observation (the types of OCF) were analyzed descriptively using descriptive statistics, while the data collected from interview (teachers' reasons for giving OCF) were analyzed using thematic analysis (Creswell, 2012).

IV. Findings

The findings of this research included the types of oral corrective feedback given by the English teacher in the English teaching in the class. There were some types that will be explained in detail in the following parts.

A. Types of Oral Corrective Feedback Given by the English Teacher

Table 1. Types of OCF Given by the English Teacher

No.	Types of Oral Corrective Feedback	Percentage (%)
1.	Explicit correction	52%
2.	Recast	38%
3.	Clarification request	2%
4.	Elicitation	8%
5.	Metalinguistic	0%
6.	Repetition	0%
	Total	100%

As shown in table 1, out of the sixth different types of oral corrective feedback (OCF) proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997), there were four types of OCF (i.e., explicit correction, recast, clarification request and elicitation) given by the English teacher in the context of teaching speaking at Islamic Senior High School in Banyuwangi. While the rest, metalinguistic and repetition were not found during classroom observation. The highest percentage types of OCF was the explicit correction (52%), followed by recast (38%), elicitation (8%) and clarification request (2%).

1. Explicit Correction

Explicit correction refers to the English teacher's oral corrective feedback which indicated an error and provided a correct form, it included phrases such as, "*oh you mean*, *you have to say, no it's not ...*" then the English teacher provided the correct form. Based on observation, almost in every meeting, the English teacher provided explicit correction type as oral feedback to correct the students' erroneous utterances. The English teacher identified the error and provided the correct form to the students' erroneous utterance. The English teacher's explicit correction obtained during the observations at the 1st meeting (E1) and 4th meeting (E4) can be reported as follows:

Meeting	Teacher's OCF
E1	**T.60** Hallo, T. Are you ready?
	S2.61 Yes, mam.
	T.62 Okay please.
	S2.63 "School Holiday"
	In order to welcome (/welkom/) the coming of new semester school will dismiss learning activities. Monday, June 19 2020 until Saturday (/saturde/), July 1 2020.
	S2.64 Done, mam.
	T.65 Okay, Thank you. T, it's not /welkom/ but the correct one is /welkəm/. And then, /sadərdeɪ/ not /saturde/. Please another students.
E4	**S8.134** I have done to cook since I was 10 years old.
	T.136 ... so the use of "done" is not quite right, you can use the word "learned" ...

Note: T (Teacher), S2 (the 2nd student), S8 (the 8th student)

2. Recast

Recast refers to the English teacher's response to reformulate the students' utterances, moreover, in this type, the English teacher did not include phrases such as " *oh you mean*, *you have to say, no it's not ...*" but the English teacher provided the correct form without pointing out the error. Based on my observation, in tune with explicit correction type, recast type were also found at most meetings. The English teacher's recast obtained during the observations at the 2nd meeting (E2) and the 4th meeting (E4) can be reported as follows:

Meeting	Teacher's OCF
E2	**S10.129** My name is AYAS, I'm from X Religion 1, my number is 3. She is beautiful enough (/inoj/) to dancing.
	T.130 Okay, she is beautiful enough (/ɪnʌf/) to dance. Okay very good, thank you. This sentence is good also your pronunciation.
E4	**MS.166** Cook cooked cooked (/kuk/ /kukəd/ /kukəd/)
	T.167 Okay you are still learning, so repeat after me. **Deh deh deh**.
	MS.168 Deh deh deh
	T.169 Cook cooked cooked (/kuk/ /kukd/ /kukd/)

Note: T (Teacher), S10 (the 10th student), MS (Most Student)

3. Clarification Request

Clarification request addressed to the English teacher in giving oral corrective feedback which indicated that the students' utterance was not understood or there was mispronunciation or misspellings so the student was asked to reformulate it. The English teacher used several request phrases to get even clearer intentions, (e.g. "*Sorry*", "*Excuse me*", "*What*"). Based on my observation, clarification request type was only found at the 2nd meeting (E2) while at the 1st meeting (E1), the 3rd meeting (E3) and the 4th meeting (E4), it was not found as oral corrective feedback. The English teacher's clarification request was obtained during the observation at the 2nd meeting (E2) can be reported as follows:

Meeting	Teacher's OCF
E2	**S1.56** He is too old (/old/) to play with us.
	T.57 What? He is? ...

Note: T (Teacher), S1 (the 1st student)

4. Elicitation

Elicitation refers to the English teacher in pausing the utterance of the students with the aim of getting the correct answer from the student (self-correct) so that they could correct their word or phrase. Based on observation, elicitation type was found at the 3rd meeting (E3) and the 4th meeting (E4), in contrast to the 1st meeting (E1) and the 2nd meeting (E2), elicitation type was not found as oral corrective feedback. The English teacher's elicitation obtained during the observation at the 3rd meeting (E3) and 4th meeting (E4) can be reported as follows:

Meeting	Teacher's OCF
E3	**T.175** On what page did you study? Say in English together.
	T.176 How do we say 136 in English?
E4	**MS.176** Read read ... (/ri:d/ /ri:d/)
	T.177 Okay, listen it. This word reads the same as "red" in English, so how to read it?
	AS.178 Read read read (/ri:d/ /red/ /red/)
	T.179 Very good. Read read read (/ri:d/ /red/ /red/) one two three ...
	MS.180 (/ri:d/ /red/ /red/)

Note: T (Teacher), MS (Most Student), AS (Another Student)

B. Types of OCF Most Frequently Used by the English Teacher

Table 2. Types of OCF Most Frequently Used by the English Teacher

No.	Types of OCF	Frequency (f) and Percentage (%)								Total	
		Meeting 1		Meeting 2		Meeting 3		Meeting 4		Meeting 1-4	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1.	Explicit correction	9	81.8	1	10	12	66.6	4	36.3	26	52
2.	Recast	2	18.1	8	80	5	27.7	4	36.3	19	38
3.	Clarification request	0	0	1	10	0	0	0	0	1	2
4.	Elicitation	0	0	0	0	1	5.5	3	27.2	4	8
5.	Metalinguistic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6.	Repetition	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	11	99.9	10	100	18	99.8	11	99.8	50	100

According to the data presented in Table 3, overall, the English teacher provided 50 oral corrections. Table 2 showed that, by a significant margin, explicit correction was the most frequently used by the English teacher (52%, f= 26), followed by recast (38%, f = 19), elicitation (8%, f= 8) and clarification request (2%, f= 1). Explicit correction was most often given at the 3rd meeting (66.6%, f= 12) while the English teacher focused on correcting the students' mispronunciation. Table 3 showed the provision of explicit correction at each meeting (E1-E4). The English teacher inclined to correct the students' mispronunciation. Besides, the English teacher corrected the use of the students' vocabulary and grammar.

Table 3. Explicit Correction Type in Observations

Class	Teacher's OCF
E1	1) **T.65** it's not /welkom/ but the correct one is /welkəm/. And then, /sadərdeɪ/ not /saturde/.
	2) **T.75** "school" how is it pronounced? It's not /səkul/, but /sku:l/.
	3) **T.85** /ɪŋlɪʃ/ not /engles/.
	4) **T.98** /fə:də/ not /furdər/.
	5) **T.107** "dictionary" is not read /diktionari/, /dɪkʃənərɪ/.
	6) **T.113** Then /mʌst/ not /must/. /səksesful/ not /suksesful/.
	7) **T.129** If you mention your name, you should say, "my name is", not "my name". There must be "is". /ɪlektrɒnɪk/ not /elektronik/.
	8) **T.144** IPS in English is "social". So if you want to speak please use "social" (/souʃəl/).
	9) **T.150** /mɪnɪts/ not /minuts/. And then, /treɪn/ not /traɪn/.
E2	1) **T.73** too /leɪt/ not /let/.
E3	1) **T.139** /ædvərtaɪzmənt/ not /edvirtismən/.
	2) **T.141** /pɪktʃər/ not /piktur/.
	3) **T.147** It's not /tris/, /tris/ means trees (pepohonan), students. The correct is /traɪs/.
	4) **T.149** It's not /persuade/ but /pərsweɪd/. It's not /piupəl/ but /pi:pəl/.
	5) **T.151** It's not /bui/ but /baɪ/

International Journal of Latest Research in Humanities and Social Science (IJLRHSS)
Volume 06 - Issue 01, 2023
www.ijlrhss.com || PP. 104-113

	6) **T.153**It's not /produk/ but /prɑːdʌkt/
	7) **T.155**It's not /ivən/ but /ɪvent/.
	8) **T.159**Next, there is one word that mispronounced /komonli/, the correct is /kɒmənlɪ/
	9) **T.163**It's not /suk/ /es/ but /sʌtʃ/ /əz/
	10) **T.165**It's not /njauspepər/ but /njuːzpeɪpər/
	11) **T.167**It's not /usuleli/ but /juːʒuəli/
	12) **T.180**10 (ten) is not read /tin/ but /ten/
E4	1) **T.49**You put simple past tense so here verb 2. But here is verb 3, because the pattern is Subject+have/has+V3+O.
	2) **T.136**... so the use of "done" is not quite right, you can use the word "learn" ...
	3) **T.150**It's not /saɪns/, /sɪns/.
	4) **T.160**/don/ means fall. So here is /dʌn/.

C. Types of OCF Least Frequently Used by the English Teacher

Table 4. Types of OCF Least Frequent Used by the English Teacher

No.	Types of OCF	Frequency (f) and Percentage (%)								Total	
		Meeting 1		Meeting 2		Meeting 3		Meeting 4		Meeting 1-4	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
3.	Clarification request	0	0	1	10	0	0	0	0	1	2

As mentioned in Table 4, the data showed that clarification request was the rarely used by the English teacher (2%, f = 1) in giving oral corrective feedback (OCF) in the context of teaching speaking. Clarification request was only found at the 2nd meeting (10%, f = 1) where the English teacher provided a request phrase "*What*" to get a clear intention of students' utterance (see Table 5).

Table 5. Clarification Request Type in Observations

Class	Teacher's OCF
E2	1) **T.57** What? He is? ...

D. Reasons for Using Particular Forms Oral Corrective Feedback

To know the English teacher's reasons in providing particular forms of oral corrective feedback (OCF) in the context of teaching speaking, the researcher did the interview using English with the English teacher, but in some parts the English teacher used Bahasa Indonesia, therefore, the researcher translated into English. Then, the results of the interview were transcribed based on Widodo's (2014) step. Below were the teacher's reasons for giving particular forms of OCF.

1. Explicit Correction

Based on the interview, the English teacher emphasized the specific correction in providing explicit correction, so it was known that the English teacher corrected the students' erroneous utterance by indicating the error, then provided the correct form. By specific correction, the students can recognized their errors and understood to speak correctly, whether in terms of vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation. The English teacher preferred to provide feedback at the end of the material in the form of a conclusion and targeted to the whole class. Besides, seeing and understanding the atmosphere or situations and conditions in the classroom is an important point in providing oral corrections. The following quote was taken from the result of interview with the English teacher concerning the reasons to provide explicit correction of OCF.

For this correction, it is very good for students to understand speaking correctly, so I always give them feedback at specific correction, sometimes after the students finished speaking, sometimes after when 3 or 4 students finished speaking, sometimes at the last meeting I give them feedback. So it depends on the classroom, when the class needs me to give feedback at the last maybe the classroom is very good.

The English teacher also added that giving oral corrective feedback at the end of the material could shorten the time and the target was given in a more comprehensive coverage. Moreover, she also emphasized the important point of the class situation and conditions.

In my view, actually at the last meeting because it is not spend enough time. It is kind of the conclusion of the material and also give it feedback at the last. But it depends on the classroom, when the classroom is good, everything run well and I give it at the last meeting.

From the English teacher's reason, it was revealed that providing explicit correction in the teaching learning process, especially in the context of teaching speaking could help the students better recognize their erroneous utterances by providing specific corrections.

2. Clarification Request

In contrast to explicit correction which was the frequently type of OCF that the English teacher used, clarification request was only found once in giving oral correction. Based on the interview, the English teacher gave a clarification request if the student still did not understand the material and gave oral corrections to the students' erroneous utterances. Moreover, giving clarification request could provoke or test students whether the student understood or not where the location of the error was. The English teacher used the request phrase "*What*" to get a clearer meaning or intention of what the students said. The English teacher reason's in providing clarification request as the rarely type of OCF could be seen below.

> *So for the specific reasons for giving clarification request to students, based on the material given, sometimes some students very good in this session, sometimes some students do not understand about the material. So sometimes I focused on students who still do not understand or maybe some students make an error in her/his speaking. So I asked them to find out whether the student understand or not where their mistake.*

The English teacher also gave a statement that in providing clarification request it was better given after the students finished their speaking.

> *In my view, after the students speaking. It is kind of motivation for another students who still do not understand about the material. Sometimes I call the students who are very good in English to speak the correct word, not to test, so it is kind to motivate other students who have English error.*

From the statement of the English teacher above, giving feedback was not only done by the English teacher but also by peers (peer correction). It was also one of the motivation for the students who still did not understand how to pronounce the words properly.

3. Recast

The English teacher's in providing recast in correcting the students erroneous utterance was because this OCF type had a less time rather than other types, therefore, the English teacher could provide further material. Moreover, the English teacher also stated that in giving recast, she adjusted for the students' errors, whether in terms of grammatical errors, phonological errors or mispronunciation. The following quote was taken from the result of interview with the English teacher in giving recast type to the students.

> *Because when I emphasize my teaching learning in grammar, I will correct the grammar first. When I emphasize my teaching learning in pronunciation, I will correct the pronunciation. And I think this correction didn't take a long time. And for the best time, of course at the end of material.*

The English teacher also added that she prefers to provide corrective feedback recast at the end of material (delayed feedback).

4. Elicitation

Based on the interview, the English teacher in providing elicitation as oral feedback was because she felt the need to give students the opportunity to think ahead before she gave the correct form. Furthemore, the English teacher expected to the students to find out the correct form from any sources (e.g. friends, books, experiences), hence, the students' ciritical thinking worked to find the correct form to the students' errors. The English teacher reason's in providing elicitation could be seen below.

> *I teach in Senior High School. So I give them (students) the opportunity to think first, not immediately giving "this is the correct form". So let them to find the correct one, maybe for their friends, books, or experiences. So it tends to provide opportunities for students to think critically. I actually cut (pause) it in the middle because I already knew the error. Sometimes I know he/she got it, then I go elsewhere whether he/she pronounces it correct or not.*

The English teacher emphasized that she already knew the students went wrong and tried to test the students at different spot whether the students focus or not. Continuously, the English teacher preferred gave elicitation after the students finished their speaking (immediate feedback).

> *... and the best time for this (elicitation) feedback after the students finished their speaking. So, immediately aimed at the student.*

V. Discussion

In answering the research questions, in this discussion part the researcher discussed the results of the English teacher's oral corrective feedback (OCF) types that were used in the context of teaching speaking in

Senior High School, the frequently and rarely of OCF types that the English teacher used as well as the English teacher's reason frequently and rarely used in providing OCF types. The findings of the research showed that the English teacher at Islamic Senior High School Banyuwangi used oral corrective feedback (OCF) types proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997). They were explicit correction, recast, clarification request and elicitation. Meanwhile, metalinguistic and repetition were not found during the classroom observation. Based on the classroom observation and interview with the English teacher, the patterns and the reasons of four OCF types were found.

The first discussion is about explicit correction type, the frequently used by the English teacher in correcting the students' erroneous utterances in teaching speaking (52%, f= 26). The English teacher gave an explicit correction type by indicating the students' erroneous utterances in various phrases, the observation results, the English teacher often gave the phrase "*no it's not ...*" then gave the correct form, how this word should be pronounced or the use of this vocabulary was more appropiate with the sentence. Contrary to the previous studies found discrepancies that recast type was the type of oral corrections that was most often used and the most favored by the teachers or instructors in correcting the students' utterances (e.g. Kamiya, 2014; Ozturk, 2016; Sepehrinia and Mehdizadeh, 2018). The present study's findings were more compatible with the previous studies that revealed explicit correction type was the most widely used by teachers (e.g. Roothooft and Breeze, 2016; Tasdemir and Arslan, 2018; Schuldt, 2019). The English teacher's reason in providing explicit correction because this type of OCF was given specifically so that the students could recognize their errors and understood to speak correctly, with the scope of the use vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation. It was in line with Roothooft and Breeze (2016) and Sakiroglu (2020) who found that explicit correction more positively promoted the students' accuracy. The English teacher's preferences in providing explicit correction at the end of the material, this seemed inconsistent with the results of the first and second observations where the English teacher gave explicit correction immediately after the students finished speaking. Besides, the English teacher also emphasized the situations and conditions in the classroom as an important point in providing oral correction. It is compatible with the studies that teachers' concerns and assumptions about their treatment of errors could focused on some factors, one of them was classroom atmosphere (Lyster, Saito and Sato, 2013; Sepehrinia and Mehdizadeh, 2018).

The next most frequently used type was recast (38%, f = 19) which occupied in the second place after explicit correction. The English teacher, gave recast by reformulating the whole or part of the students' erroneous utterances, then providing the correct form without pointing out the error. Inversely, the previous studies found that recast had high significant value (67%) in providing corrective feedback, followed by explicit correction (21%) (Sepehrinia and Mehdizadeh, 2018). Lyster and Ranta (1997) also found that recast was the single largest category in distributing corrective feedback (55%), followed by explicit correction (7%). The English teacher's reason in providing recast because the English teacher felt that recast did not spend a long time in giving feedback, so the English teacher could provide further material, considering that she had more than one hundred students. The English teacher also stated that recast was one of the types suitable for the teachers who had limited time. This finding regarding the reason in providing recast was in line with Sepehrinia and Mehdizadeh (2018) based on teacher's view that recast type took less time and did not cut off the interaction. The English teacher's preferences in providing recast at the end of the material, this was in line with the third and fourth observations. Meanwhile, at the first and second observations, the English teacher gave recast immediately after the students finished speaking. This findings inversely with the previous studies that found most teachers provided recast with immediate feedback (Lyster and Ranta, 1997; Ozturk, 2016) because the teachers considered giving immediate feedback could help learners deepen their understanding rather than delayed feedback.

The next type of OCF with the percentage 8% (f = 4) was elicitation that the English teacher used by pausing the students' erroneous utterance and giving a clue for eliciting student self-correction. This evidence was supported by Ozturk (2016) who stated in her findings that teachers who provided elicitation made it easier for the students to recognize their errors and make students independently in correcting their errors. This finding was also in line with other previous studies (Sepehrinia and Mehdizadeh, 2018) who stated that elicitation took a role which could help student more involvement in thinking. The English teacher's reason in providing elicitation because she wanted to give the students the opportunity to think in correcting their errors whether the students could self-correct or not and used references such as books and even friends in correcting their errors. Based on the classroom observation, most students were able to solve their own errors by the teacher's clues. This evidence seemed to correlate with the findings of Lyster and Ranta (1997) who stated that the most successful techniques for eliciting the correct form from the students (self-correct) was elicitation. The English teacher's preferences in providing elicitation after the students finished speaking (immediate feedback), this was in line with the results at the third and fourth observations, there was no elicitation at the first and second observations.

International Journal of Latest Research in Humanities and Social Science (IJLRHSS)
Volume 06 - Issue 01, 2023
www.ijlrhss.com || PP. 104-113

The last type was clarification request with the percentage 2% (f = 1) that was found at the 2nd observation, the English teacher used request phrase (i.e. *What*) to get clearer intentions from the students' utterances. Contrary on the previous studies (Tasdemir and Arslan, 2018) the result found that clarification request was the most favored type of OCF (83.6%), followed by elicitation (75.3%). The present study's finding was consistent with similar other studies in literature (Ozturk, 2016), reported that clarification request was only found by 3 teachers from 8 teachers and the use of this type was the least among those three teachers. The English teacher's reason in providing clarification request because she knew the location of the students' erroneous utterances and tried to get the correct answer from the students. Moreover, clarification request could provoke or test the students whether they understood or not the location of the error. The English teacher also added by giving clarification request, could know the students' awareness of their mispronunciation. The English teacher's preferences in providing clarification request after the students finished speaking (immediate feedback), this was in line with the results at the second observation, there was no clarification request at the first, third and fourth observations.

However, none of metalinguistic and repetition was found in the classroom observations. Conversely on the previous studies (e.g. Ozturk, 2016; Roothooft and Breeze, 2016) metalinguistic took the attention's of the students and the teachers. Other previous studies (Sepehrinia and Mehdizadeh, 2018) found that metalinguistic was rarely used in classroom observations because of time-consuming and cut off the flow of interaction between the teacher and the students. Meanwhile, repetition became candidate type reliable by Chinese EFL learners in receiving oral corrections (Zhu and Wang, 2019). This present study's was more consistent with Sepehrinia and Mehdizadeh (2018) that reported repetition was not found in observed class in 7 teachers because they thought the teacher's repetition did not guarantee that the students could correct their errors. The English teacher's reason for not providing metalinguistic and repetition as oral correction because she did not have enough time to give feedback and considering she had more than one hundred students. To solve those problems, she expressed that she always wrote the students' erroneous utterances in her notebook and for the next meeting, she will discuss about the matters.

VI. Conclusion

This study was conducted in an Indonesian senior high school, exploring the types of oral corrective feedback (OCF), the most and least frequent use of OCF and some reasons in providing particular forms of feedback that the English teacher used. Based on the results of data analysis and discussion above, the results revealed that the English teacher used four types of OCF in her teaching and learning process in the context of teaching speaking. Those four types of OCF were explicit correction (52%), recast (38%), clarification request (2%) and elicitation (8%). The types of metalinguistic and repetition were not found in the teaching and learning process. The most frequently OCF types that the English teacher used was explicit correction with the highest percentage (52%), which corrected the students' erroneous utterances by indicating the errors and provided the correct forms. Conversely, the least frequently OCF types that the English teacher used was clarification request with the lowest percentage (2%), which corrected the students' erroneous utterances by using request phrase to get clearer for the students' intentions (i.e. *What*).

This study also highlighted why the English teacher at the senior high school used particular forms of oral corrective feedback. For explicit correction, the English teacher gave specific corrections so that the students could recognize their errors and understood to speak correctly. For recast, the English teacher felt that recast did not take much time in giving feedback so that the English teacher could provide further material. For elicitation, the English teacher wanted to give the students the opportunity to think and wanted to know how the students' critical thinking in correcting their own errors. For clarification request, the English teacher assumed that clarification request could provoke or tested the students whether the students understood or not the location of the error. For metalinguistic and repetition, the type was not used by the English teacher, because the English teacher did not have enough time to give feedback since she had more than one hundred students.

VII. Suggestions

The suggestions are addressed to the English teachers who want to provide OCF in their language classroom, particularly in the context of teaching speaking. It is suggested that they shouldbe more attentive to the numerous types of OCF that can be provided in the teaching and learning process of speaking. Moreover, the English teachers have to know the characteristics of students' erroneous utterances in their performance. By recognizing the numerous types of OCF and identifying the students' erroneous utterances, the English teachers can know better the OCF that should be given in teaching learning process of speaking. Roundly, by providing corrective feedback, particularly OCF will help students in recognizing where their location of errors, helping students to improve the accuracy and fluency of their language, beside helping students to think critically.

References

[1]. Atai, M. R., & Shafiee, Z. (2017). Pedagogical knowledge base underlying EFL teachers' provision of oral corrective feedback in grammar instruction. *Teacher Development*, *21*(4), 1-17.

[2]. Brookhart, S. M. (2008). *How To Give Effective Feedback To Your Students*. United States of America: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASDC).

[3]. Carless, D., & Winstone, N. (2020). Teacher feedback literacy and its interplay with student feedback literacy (published online). *Teaching in Higher Education*, 1-14.

[4]. Couper, G. (2019). Teachers' cognitions of corrective feedback on pronunciation: Their beliefs, perceptions and practices. *System, 84*, 41-52.

[5]. Gentrup, S., Lorenz, G., Kristen, C., & Kogan, I. (2020). Self-fulfilling prophecies in the classroom: Teacher expectations, teacher feedback and student achievement. *Learning and Instruction, 66*, 1-17.

[6]. Gooch, R., Saito, K., & Lyster, R. (2016). Effects of recasts and prompts on L2 pronunciation development: Teaching English /ɹ/ to Korean adult ELF learners. *System, 60*, 117-127.

[7]. Haifaa, F., & Emma, M. (2014). Oral corrective feedback and learning of English modals. *Procedia – Social and behavioral Sciences, 136*, 322-329.

[8]. Kamiya, N. (2014). The relationship between stated beliefs and classroom practices of oral corrective feedback. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 10*(3), 1-14.

[9]. Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19*(1), 37-66.

[10]. Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching, 46*(1), 1-40.

[11]. Lee, A. H., & Lyster, R. (2015). The effects of corrective feedback on instructed L2 speech perception. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 38*(1), 1-30.

[12]. Ozturk, E. O. (2016). Beliefs and practices of turkish EFL teachers regarding oral corrective feedback: A small-scale classroom research study. *The Language Learning Journal, 47*(2), 1-10.

[13]. Rassaei, E. (2013). The effects of foreign language anxiety on EFL learners' perceptions of oral corrective feedback. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 9*(2), 87-101.

[14]. Roothooft, H., & Breeze, R. (2016). A comparison of EFL teachers' and students' attitudes to oral corrective feedback. *Language Awareness, 25*(4), 318-335.

[15]. Sakiroglu, H. U. (2020). Oral corrective feedback preferences of univeristy students in English communication classes. *International Journal of Research in Eduaction and Science, 6*(1), 172-178.

[16]. Schuldt, L. C. (2019). Feedback in action: Examining teachers' oral feedback to elementary writers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 83*, 64-76.

[17]. Sepehrinia, S., Nemati, M., & Farahani, A. A. K. (2017). Studies on oral error correction: Do they provide counterevidence against nativist arguments?.*The Language Learning Journal, 47*(3), 1-17.

[18]. Sepehrinia, S., & Mehdizadeh, M. (2018). Oral corrective feedback: Teachers' concerns and researchers' orientation. *The Language Learning Journal, 46*(4), 483-500.

[19]. Sheen, Y. (2010). Differential effects of oral and written corrective feedback in the ESL classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32*(2), 203-234.

[20]. Tasdemir, M. S., & Arslan, F. C. (2019). Feedback preferences of EFL learners with respect to their learning styles. *Cogent Education, 5*, 1-17.

[21]. Van Der Klaij, F., & Adie, L. (2020). Towards effective feedback: An investigation of teachers' and students' perceptions of oral feedback in classroom practice. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 27*(3), 1-19.

[22]. Wang, B., Teo, T., &Yu, S. (2016). Teacher feedback to student oral presentations in EFL classrooms: a case study. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 43*(2), 262-264.

[23]. Winstone, N. E., & Boud, D. (2020). The need to disentangle assessment and feedback in higher education (published online). *Studies in Higher Education*, 1-12.

[24]. Zhu, Y., & Wang, B. (2019). Investigating english language learners' beliefs about oral corrective feedback at chinese universities: a large-scale survey. *Language Awareness, 28*(2), 139-161.