

## Students' Preferences toward Lecturers' Types in Giving Corrective Feedback on their Speaking

**Silfia Rahmi**

Institut Agama Islam Negeri Batusangkar,  
Sumatera Barat, Indonesia

E-mail: [silfiarahmi@iainbatusangkar.ac.id](mailto:silfiarahmi@iainbatusangkar.ac.id)

**Sirajul Munir\*)**

Institut Agama Islam Negeri Batusangkar,  
Sumatera Barat, Indonesia

E-mail: [sirajulmunir@iainbatusangkar.ac.id](mailto:sirajulmunir@iainbatusangkar.ac.id)

**Abstract:** *The current study aims at investigating the students' preferences toward types of corrective feedback applied by the lecturers on their speaking. This research used a descriptive method. The participants of this research were 151 non English department students who took English subject. The instruments used to collect the data were questionnaire and interview guide. Those were adapted from Hyang (2010), Katayama (2007), together with Smith. They became the guideline on this research. The data gathered from questionnaire were analyzed by using formula suggested by Heaton and Arikunto. Then, the data obtained from interview guide were analyzed by using theory proposed by Miles and Huberman. The research findings indicate that most students preferred to receive explicit corrective feedback using metalinguistic correction. It was caused by lack of language exposure due to limited language knowledge they possess.*

\*) *Corresponding Author*

**Keywords:** *Students' Preferences, Corrective Feedback, Speaking*

### INTRODUCTION

It is a fact that corrective feedback has become the major issue in the context of pedagogical area in recent years. Providing corrective feedback becomes one of the alternative solution for reminding the students on the forms of the standard English (Richard, 1996). It is a part of learning process to avoid the long lasting mistakes as well as to build good communicative competence as a prerequisite in constructing good communication. Corrective feedback distinguishes classroom interaction from interaction outside the classroom (Nunan, 2004). It is really necessary for EFL students since they cannot correct the language by themselves because of lack of exposure. They are totally dependent on lecturers for useful linguistic feedback (Yoshida, 2008). It reveals that they mostly get the correct language form through corrective feedback from the lecturers. It can help the students to

know how to use the language appropriately. Besides, it also assists the students to differentiate between their native and foreign language. Moreover, corrective feedback becomes something positive because it gives the benefit impact for the language development. It effects better achievement for adult learner. Without corrective feedback, the students' mistakes become fossilization. Surely, it will hinder the communication. Especially for Non English department, it becomes advantageous as it is last opportunity for them to learn English for formal condition. Thus, they get the correct language nutrition only from the appropriate corrective feedback.

That condition is dissimilar from ESL students. They possess adequate speech communities for getting communication in English. As a result, they can acquire more English exposure as most of people included them use English for everyday

communication at least for formal situation. As a result, they will be able to correct their mistakes by themselves. For those reasons, corrective feedback becomes compulsory to be applied on EFL students.

In line with the information above, most researches finding disclose that there were many types of corrective feedback identified applied by the lecturers. First is Pavlu (2007). He found that there were five types of corrective feedback for used by the lecturers in correcting students' mistakes in speaking. They are reformulation, echoing, using gesture, denial and question. Then, the research finding of Riza (2007) depicts that recast became the most frequent type in corrective feedback. Moreover, Cascun (2003) also divulged that there were six corrective feedback used by the lecturers in correcting students' speaking. They are recast, elicitation, clarification, request, metalinguistic clues, explicit correction and repetition of error. Among all of them, recast were also the most frequently type applied by the lecturers.

Furthermore, the result of research investigated by Rahmi (2017) on the lecturers who teach at non English department students at IAIN Batusangkar reveal that most of the lecturers applied seven corrective feedback which is like suggested by Sheen (2004) & Lyster (1997). First was recast. The lecturers implicitly tried to expands the mistakes or incomplete sentences, words or phrases (Lyster, R & Panova, 2002). Second type of corrective feedback they used was clarification. It is an elicitation of a reformulation or repetition from the students (Lyster, 1997). It is done by using phrases like *Excuse me? sorry, I don't understand*, and *pardon me*. For instance, when the students express "*How many years do you have?*". Then, the lecturers say "*I am sorry?*". Moreover, it also can be used by using the phrase "*I cannot get your point*". It shows that by using this type, the lecturers repeat what the students said. It is to remind what they said are wrong. Next was elicitation. It is a type of corrective feedback which prompt the

learner to do self corrective feedback". It is to remember the students what they expressed has been wrong. The lecturers do not provide the correct form but invite the other students to inform the right words or phrases. Besides, there are some phrases applied by the lecturers such as, "*how do we say this in English, which one is correct?*" In addition, the lecturers may correct the students' mistakes by asking the students to complete the sentence, or may ask a question such as "what is the (x) form of (y)?", (Sheen, 2004). Moreover, it can also use the expression "It can say x or y?" (Maolida, H, 2014).

Then, metalinguistic also identified they used. On this type, the lecturers give comments, information, or questions regarding the wrong expression that the students produced (Lyster, 1997). The lecturers just provide the clue regarding the incorrect words or phrases. He or she does not tell the right form directly. Moreover, they can also apply the expression such as "*Do we say it like that?*" (Yoshida, 2008). As an Example, the students express : I am here since January. Then, the lecturers respond: well, *okay, but remember we talked about the present perfect tense?* Next type was explicit corrective feedback. There is the correct form provided, (Ting, 2001). It is a corrective feedback type where the lecturers indicate the students' mistakes and give the accurate words or phrases (Lyster, 1997). They do not provide students with the keys or some clues but they directly give the precise form.. Beside, the lecturers apply the word: not X but Y (Sheen, 2004). Moreover, repetition was also identified used by the lecturers. They repeat the incorrect students' utterances (Lyster, 1997). It is usually done with a change intonation (Lyster, R & Panova, 2002). The lecturers do repetition toward the incorrect utterances produced by the students. It is to remind them that the words they said are wrong. For example: when the students say: I am get the winner, then, the lecturer do correction by saying: *I am get?*. Through this example, it can be understood that the lecturers repeat the

sentence “I am get” by putting the rising intonation at the end of sentence. It is hoped that the students will realize that the sentence “I am get” is wrong. Then, the last corrective feedback the lecturers used was Explicit with metalinguistic. On this type, the lecturers provide the corrective feedback by giving the right form and tell why the students are incorrect. Among all of that type, recast becomes the most frequent type used by the lecturers.

However, the result of corrective feedback used by most of English lecturers who teach at non English department students seems not successful yet. It was still found that there were many mistakes that the students made when they spoke whether in pronouncing the word, grammar even in the choice of the words. As example, the students often utter the word “library, now and done” by /librari/, no/, and/don. In addition to this, they also often said “I am like, I am have and I am go” to express I like, I have and I go. Furthermore, the students also often said ‘I am long’ to state I am tall, etc. Those mistakes occur everytime they spoke. It depicts that there was a problem with the type of corrective feedback frequently applied by the lecturers.

Actually, the corrective feedback will be useful and work well if they are applied based on some principles. One of that is corrective feedback should be matched to the students’ preferences (James, 1998). In this case, it can be defined as some choices, alternative, election, option or selection of what the students want regarding types of corrective feedback used by the lecturers on their speaking. It becomes one of the influential factor in influencing the success of corrective feedback (Oxford, 2000)&(Smith, 2010). A mismatch between teachers’ or lecturers’ preferences and the ways the learners prefer to receive corrective feedback which could result in negative effect on learning, (Horwitz, 2008).

Related to the importance of the students’ preferences, it is compulsory for the lecturers to consider it before deciding what type of corrective they are going to use.

However, in fact, most of lecturers more focus on how to provide corrective feedback. Meanwhile the information regarding the students’ preferences especially non English department students toward them tend to be ignored. Moreover, research which discussed about the students’ preferences especially preferences for non English Department students are hardly ever to be concerned.

In line with the explanation above, the researchers are interested in writing this issue to discuss the students’ preferences toward lecturers’ types in giving corrective feedback on their speaking.

## **METHOD**

This belongs to descriptive research. 151 non English department students who took English subject were involved. They were the students from Math, Biology, Shariah Accounting, and Islamic Education Program Department at IAIN Batusangkar. Then, there were two instruments used by the researchers to acquire the data on this research. They were questionnaires and interview guide. Besides, there were two questionnaires used in order to get the data. The first questionnaire was adapted from Hyang-Sook Park (2010) & Katayama (2007). It used five choices of Likert scale. They were strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree and strongly disagree. Then, there were 27 statement provided. Those were compiled in Indonesian language in order that the respondents or the students could answer the items easily.

The second questionnaire was adapted from (Smith, 2010). There were 8 questions containing 4 different options. They were also compiled in Indonesian language in order that the participants could answer the items easily. Then, the students were allowed to choose one of the options. After that, the students were asked to provide their reasons for choosing each options. It was to find out the information why they prefer every options. Then, interview guide was used to gather the information regarding the students’ preferences toward types of

lecturers' corrective feedback on their speaking together with their reasons to receive corrective feedback with that type.

Next, the data obtained from the first questionnaire was analyzed by using the formula from (Heaton, 1990). It is stated as follows:

$$M = \frac{\sum fx}{N}$$

M = Mean Score of the Students' Preferences

$\sum fx$  = Sum of the Students' Score of Each Item.

N = Number of the Students

After calculating the mean score of the students' preferences, the conclusion was interpreted based on Oxford's theory. It is as follow:

**Table 1. Classification of the Students' Preferences**

Quantity	Quality
1-1.5	Strongly disagree
1.51-2.50	Disagree
2.51-3.50	Neutral
3.51-4.50	Agree
4.51-5.00	Strongly agree

(R. Oxford, 1990)

Meanwhile, the data got from the second questionnaire were analyzed by using formula from (Arikunto,2006). It is as follow:  $P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100$

F= Frequency of the Types of Corrective Feedback

N= Total of Data

P= Percentage

Next, the data gathered from interview guide were analyzed by using theory proposed by Miles,M.B.&Huberman, (1992). They are data reduction, data display and conclusion.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Results

After administering the first questionnaire to the participants that administered by the researcher, the result or the scores of the students' preferences will be shown on table 2:

**Table 2. The Students' Preferences toward Lecturers Types In Corrective Feedback on their Speaking**

Indicators	Sub Indicators	Mean	Quality
The Types of Corrective feedback that the students prefer	Recast	2.93	Neutral
	Elicitation	2.64	Neutral
	Explicit Correction With Metalinguistic	4.65	Strongly Agree
	Clarification	2.46	Disagree
	Repetition	2.41	Disagree
	Metalinguistic	3.21	Neutral
	Explicit correction	3.84	Agree

Note :

1-1.5 = Strongly disagree

2.51-3.50 = Neutral

1.51-2.50 = Disagree

3.51-4.50 = Agree

4.51-5.01 = Strongly Agree

The table 2 shows that among seven type of corrective feedback which the lecturers used, explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation becomes the most popular type of corrective feedback which the students preferred to be used by the lecturers. It was found having the highest mean score for students' preferences toward this type. It was 4.65. It indicates that the students strongly agreed their mistakes were rectified by using explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation. In this case, most of them preferred the lecturers give the correct form and state the reasons why they were wrong along with further explanation together with the examples.

Then, in order to get further information concerning the types which preferred by the students, the researchers also distributed the second questionnaire. On this questionnaire, the students were given some options. After that, they should provide their reasons for each of their options. The result of the second questionnaire can be seen on table 3 below.

**Table 3. The Type of Corrective Feedback which the Students Prefer**

No	Type of Corrective Feedback	Number of students	Percentage
1	Recast	7	4,63 %
2	Elicitation	2	1.32%
3	Metalinguistic	4	2.64 %
4	Explicit Correction	6	3.9 %
5	Clarification	1	0,66 %
6	Repetition	1	0.66 %
7	Explicit Correction with metalinguistic	124	82.11 %

The table 3 explicitly explains that there were 124 (82.11%) students chose explicit with metalinguistic explanation to correct their mistakes. Furthermore, there were 7 (4.63%) students chose recast. Then, there were 4 (2.64%) students chose metalinguistic, and 2 (1.32%) students chose elicitation type. Meanwhile, it was only 1 (0.66 %) student chose repetition and clarification type. Last, it was only 6 (3.97%) students chose explicit correction.

According to the data above, it can be seen that explicit with metalinguistic still became the highest type which was chosen by the students. It is similar with the result of the first questionnaire. After analyzing the reasons they wrote on that questionnaire, it shows that most students prefer to receive explicit with metalinguistic correction because of their lack of knowledge. They said that it was easier for them to remind what their lecturers corrected. Most of them said that if their lecturers corrected them by giving the correct form along with some explanation why they were wrong, it made them more understand.

Those finding also supported by the data obtained from interview guide. There are not various answers gotten. The answer of each participant was rather the same. According to those answers, it can be understood that most of students prefer to be corrected through explicit with metalinguistic explanation since they need further explanation related to what their lecturers corrected. Although the materials seem quite simple, however, in fact, some explanation were still needed.

### **Discussion**

This research shows that students prefer to choose explicit corrective feedback using metalinguistic explanation to correct their mistakes. This finding is relevant with what Heift (2002) found that most of students prefer explicit feedback all the time. Moreover, Hyang-Sook Park (2010) also states that most of students need more explicit with metalinguistic. The students' preferences toward explicit with metalinguistic explanation was also in line

with the opinion of Ellis (2009). He explicitly claims that the type of corrective feedback become beneficial and should be provided. Furthermore, Mackey (2012) states that advanced students needed more explicit feedback.

Yoshida (2008) points out that the effective language teaching and learning can only be achieved when the lecturers are aware of preferences in meeting these needs. This ideas is to support what Horwitz (2008) explains that the lecturers need to know what the learners expect regarding language learning. It is to maximize the students' opportunities to acquire the target language accurately. The findings of this research reveal that most of students preferred their mistakes were corrected by using explicit with metalinguistic. They need more explanation and more information why they were wrong.

Then, the finding related to the students' preferences toward explicit with metalinguistic was also in line with what Pyne (2012) believes. He clearly states that in EFL environment in which the learners get just a few hours a week of classroom exposure of English, explicit correction with metalinguistic can significantly expedite the process of language learning by giving direct feedback about the rules and the limits of language use. It signifies that it will be more beneficial for the lecturers to apply correction explicitly by providing some explanation because it will provide them by some language knowledge. Moreover, this finding is also in line with the finding of Choi, S.Y. and Li (2012) which found that the young learner preferred explicit feedback. Moreover, the students' preferences toward explicit with metalinguistic explanation is also in line with the opinions of the experts regarding the appropriate type in giving corrective feedback especially for EFL classroom. Then, Ellis (2009) & Swain (1993) suggests the lecturers to use explicit with metalinguistic explanation type. She believes that it is more effective ways than other types. Then, Doughty et.al in (Hyang-Sook

Park, 2010) also state that explicit correction involved metalinguistic feedback was more effective in increasing awareness of corrected feature in the learners. Otherwise, the findings from the previous research reveal that the lecturers were seldom to use explicit with metalinguistic feedback. They more tended to use recast.

## CONCLUSION

In accordance with the research findings and discussion, it can be concluded that most of EFL students especially Non English department prefer their lecturers use explicit corrective feedback with metalinguistic. It was caused by lack of correct language nutrition or language exposure due to limited language knowledge they have. It implies that providing corrective feedback by using this types is required to be applied. It is to bridge the students to get the forms of the standard English. It is expected that by appealing the types that the students prefer, satisfied result of corrective feedback can be achieved.

The researchers would like to give some recommendation for the next researchers. First, since this research only involved 151 participants (4 departments), it is recommended for other researchers to enlarge the participants. Another recommendation is experimental research design is interesting to conduct in order to know the effectiveness of giving feedback by the lecturers. Finally, it is suggested to investigate corrective feedback in other areas such as writing and reading in the context of EFL class.

## REFERENCES

- Arikunto, S. (2006). *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: PT Rineka Cipta.
- Cascun, A. (2003). *A Classroom Research. On Oral Error Correction*. Abant Izzet Baysel University.
- Choi, S.Y. and Li, S. (2012). Corrective Feedback and learner uptake in a child ESOL classroom. *ESOL Classroom.*, 4(43,331-351).
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development. L2. *Dulib Journal*, 2(3-16.).
- Heaton, J. (1990). *Writing English Language Test: A Practical Guide for Teachers of English as A Second or Foreign Language*. London: Longman Group.
- Heift, G. (2002). When is Corrective Feedback most likely to succeed? *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciencenational Journal of Educational Research*.
- Horwitz, E. (2008). Learner's Perceptions of How Anxiety Interacts with Personal and Instructional Factors to Influence their Achievement in English: A Qualitative Analysis of EFL Learners in China. *Language Learning Journal*, 58(1), 1(58(1), 151-183).
- Hyang-Sook Park. (2010). *Teachers' and Learners' Preferences for Error Correction*. The University of Texas Austin.
- James, C. (1998). *Errors in Language Learning and Use: Exploring Error Analysis*. New York: Longman.
- Katayama, A. (2007). *Learners' Perception Toward Oral Error Correction*. University of Texas Austin.
- Lyster, R & Panova, L. (2002). Pattern of Corrective Feedback and Uptake in an Adult ESL Classroom. *TESOL Quarterly Journal*, 36(36,573-595).
- Lyster, R. (1997). Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition.*, *Language Teaching Research*, 3(20 (3)).
- Mackey, A. (2012). *Input, Interaction, and Corrective Feedback in L2 Learning*. (Oxford Uni).
- Maolida, H, E. (2014). A descriptive Study of Teacher's Oral Feedback in an ESL Young Learner Classroom in Indonesia. *Kata Journal*, 2.
- Miles, M.B. & Huberman, M. A. (1992). *Analisis Data Kualitatif*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia.
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Practical English Language Teaching*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Oxford, A. (2000). *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary*. . London: Longman.
- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. New York: New York.
- Pavlu, L. L. (2007). *Technique in Mistakes Correction*. Masaryk University BRNO.
- Pyne, C. (2012). In the Classroom Cataway? *English Teaching Profesional Journal*, (Issue 80.).
- Rahmi, S. (2017). Types of Corrective Feedback Used by Four Lecturers on Students' Speaking Performance. *Innovis Journal*, 2(2).
- Richard, J. C. L. (1996). *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Riza, A. (2007). *Lecturers Techniques in Giving Corrective Feedback in Classroom A Case Study of Graduate Lecturer's Practice*. State University of Padang.
- Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake in Communicative Classroom Across Instructional Setting. *Language Teaching Research*, 8(3).
- Smith, H. (2010). *Correct Me If I am Wrong : Investigates the Preferences in Error Correction among Adult English learner*. University of Central Florida. Retrieved from <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/4379>.
- Swain, M. (1993). Problems in Output and the Cognitive Processes they Generate: A Step towards Second Language Learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 16.
- Ting, D. (2001). The Comparative Effectiveness of Recast and Prompts in Second Language Classroom. *Journal of Cambridge Studies*, 7(2).
- Yoshida, R. (2008). Teachers Choice and Learners' Preferences of Corrective Feedback Types. *Language Awareness*.