PREFERENCES FOR THE ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK TYPES IN SPEAKING CLASSROOM: VOICES FROM MALE AND FEMALE UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Zaky Dzulhiza Hawin Amalia[1*], Endang Fauziati[2], Sri Marmanto[3]

[1] Sebelas Maret University of Surakarta, Indonesia
[2] Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta, Indonesia
[3] Sebelas Maret University of Surakarta, Indonesia

*corresponding e-mail: zaky.dzulhiza@gmail.com

Abstract: Oral Corrective Feedback (OFC) in language classrooms has received considerable attention for the last few decades. However, most of the studies focus on teachers' practices, and how learners perceive these practices still needs investigation. Based on this, the current studyaims atinvestigating the male and female students' preferences on thesix types of oral corrective feedback as proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997), and revealing their underlying reasonbased on their preferences. This study was qualitative study. A set of questionnaires wasdistributed to a random sample of thefirst-year university students (15 males and 15 females), and interview was providedas the follow-up activity from the result of questionnaires. The result from the survey indicates that most of the male students have a higherpreference to explicit correction and most of the female students have a higher preference to metalinguistic feedbackcompared to other types of OCF. Furthermore, there are some reasons behind their choice of OCF types.They perceived that clarification request is the most ambiguous type to be comprehended,whereasexplicit correction and metalinguistic feedback are the easiest way to be recognized. Theresult of this studyaims to improve the practice of oral correctivefeedback in speaking classroom.

Keywords: *Language Learning, Oral Corrective Feedback, Preferences, Speaking Classroom,Male and Female Students*

INTRODUCTION

In the process of learning a new language, error can occur in every level of students. Producing errors when learning a new language such English is unavoidable. An error, according toYule (2010, p. 191), is not something that hinders a student's progress, but is probably a clueto the active learning process being made by a student as he or she tries out ways ofcommunicating in the new language. The challenge for a language teacher isbeing able to turn these natural errors into learning opportunities, without discouragingthe student. In order to do this, some form of corrective feedback may be necessary.

Russell & Spada (2006, p. 134) defined corrective feedbackas any feedback provided to learners, from any source, that contains evidence of learner error of languageform. It may be oral or written. Lyster, Saito, and Sato (2013) share their opinion that the oral corrective feedback focuses on teacher's immediate response of learner's erroneous utterances. When providing feedback to students, teachers are essentially giving information about the students' performance or understanding (Hattie &Timperlay, 2007). They use feedback to reduce the gap between the student's understanding and actual performance andhow the teacher wants him to perform or develop (Hattie, 2009)**.** Thus,the underlying assumption for giving corrective feedback is that it supposes to help students notice their errors and, subsequently, to produce the correct forms.

The framework developed by Lyster and Ranta (1997) has been the baseline of many studies in the literature, and numerous studies have been carried out to identify the uses of these types of oral corrective feedback in a classroom atmosphere. In this model, there are six types of oral corrective feedback such as explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation,

and repetition. The table below provides an example and explanation for each OCF type (Lyster and Ranta, 1997).

Table 1. Types of Oral Corrective Feedback

Types of OCF	Definition	Example
Explicit Correction	Indicates an error clearly and provides the correction	S: He go to school regularly. T: It's not "he go", you should say "he goes".
Recast	Reformulates all or part of the incorrect word or phrase to show the correct form without explicitly identifying the error	S: I went there two times. T: You've been there twice as a group?
Clarification Request	Indicates that the student's utterance was not understood and asks the student to reformulate it	S : Can I lend your book? T : Pardon me?
Metalinguistic Feedback	Gives technical linguistic information about the error without explicitly providing the correct answer.	S :It's about two day. T : You need plural!
Elicitation	Prompts the student to self-correct by pausing, so the student can fill in the blank by the correct word or phrase	S : Last year I go to New York. T : Last year I ….....?"
Repetition	Repeats the student's error while highlighting the error by means of emphatic stress	S : I will showed you. T : I will SHOWED you.

Normally, most students may expect to be given feedback and prefer their errors to be corrected as they will be expected to be the source of language for their students. However, according to Hattie and Timperley (2007, p. 17), "feedback is one of the powerful influences on learning and achievement, but this impact can either positive or negative". To reduce the negative emotional experience to the students and gain the complete benefits of oral corrective feedback, teachers should be aware of their students' needs. Nunan (1995, p.140) proposes that teachers should find out what their students think and feel about what and how they want to learn. The teacher, then, should give more attention to choose the appropriate corrective feedback that meets with students' preferences. The fact is that such preferences should not be idealized as the suggestion from James (1998, p.253), he says that students' preferences for certain types of correction cannot be ignored of course. When teachers know what their students want to be taught and what they want to learn in teaching and learning process, they can prepare to choose the appropriate technique of feedback in teaching.

For the students, an appropriate type of feedback may develop students' motivation and effort (Harward et al., 2014). It is one way to make them closer to language they learnt and finally acquire it as their second language. It will help students understand the subject which they learnt in the classroom. The opposite of it, inappropriate correction or feedback from teachers might influence students' anxiety, which means it might cause fossilization (Brown, 2004) and it can cause student blanking on to say something in the target language (Ortega, 2009). Therefore, giving correction to students' errors should meet their expectation (Katayama, 2007), so that, they still can repair their errors and improve their language, in way of correction that they can accept.

There are some factors that influence the choice of corrective feedback. One of these factors is gender that will be examined in this study. Khorshidi and Rassaei (2013) state that gender is one of the aspects of psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic mechanisms. When considering about students' gender, there were differences on the preferences of corrective feedback. Different gender between

male and female students may have different preferences. They will accept and response the teachers' corrective feedback in different ways. In this sense, Havnes et al. (2012) argue that individual and situational characteristics can have a potential effecton how students prefer on the teachers' corrective feedback. In fact, there are only few studies about males' and females' preferences fordifferent types of corrective feedback. Different researches focus on student-studentand teacher-student interactions in the classroom. Gender can influencethese interactions. So, the role of gender in choosing the preferences is so importantthat has become an important variable in this study.

As highlighted by the explenation mentioned above, investigating thepreferences of male and female students with respect to OCF is as important as teachers' practices since their preferences are influential in the learning process, and as Nunan (1989) stated, if there happen to be certain discrepancies between teacher behaviors and students' perceptions of those behaviors, these discrepancies might affect the learning in a negative way. For this reason, a comprehensible study that focuses on the male and female students' preferences of OCF is needed in SLA literature. Thus, this study aims to investigate the male and female students' preferences regarding the types of oral corrective feedback and the underlying reasons for these preferences.

METHODOLOGY

This study used qualitativeas a research design.According to Creswell (2014, 32), Qualitative researchis an approach for exploring and understanding the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem. This research also seeks to understand about people view or give meaning toward event or situation faced by them.

The participants of the study include 30 university students for both 15 males and 15 females. They were enrolled in the first-year student of English Education Department. Data were collected through questionnaire and interview. The researcher listed a set of written declarations and the respondents answered the declarations using the answer provided by the researcher. The questionnaire was used in order to reveal the male and female students' preferences towards the oral corrective feedback given in speaking class. The interview wasprovided as the follow-up activity from the result of questionnaires.It was used in order to reveal why the male and female students prefer to have particular types of corrective feedback, so that the researcher knew how the underlying reason fortheirpreferences.

In order to establish the whole pictures of the findings, the data were analyzed qualitatively by using Interactive Model proposed by Miles and Huberman (Miles and Huberman, 1984). This type of data analysis is divided into four parts, namely data collection, data reduction, data displays and drawing conclusion and verification. In data collection, the data are collected and gathered by using techniques of collecting data, such as questionnaire and interview. After that is data reduction, it refers to the process of selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting and transforming the raw data that appear in written-up field notes.After the data is shorted in data reduction, the data is displayed as an organized assembly of information leading the conclusion drawing and action taking. The last stage of data analysis is drawing conclusion and doing verification. In drawing conclusion, the researchers will verify the data to the theory and previous researches.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Questionnaire Result

This part shows the male and female students' answer of their preferences toward the types of oral error corrective feedback. On thequestionnaire, the students are given the explanation and example of six types of oral error corrective feedbackdescribed by Lyster and Ranta (1997) in the form of Likert scale. They need to choose between Strongly Agree, Agree,Neutral,Disagree, and Strongly disagree. The following table shows the result of the questionnaire.

Table 2.Male and Female Students' Preferences towards the OFC Types

Types of OFC	MALE					FEMALE				
	SA	A	N	D	SD	SA	A	N	D	SD
Explicit Correction	8 44%	7 46%	-	-	-	4 26%	6 40%	1 6%	2 13%	2 13%
Recast	1 6%	7 46%	6 40%	1 6%	-	4 26%	6 40%	5 33%	-	-
Clarification Request	1 6%	2 13%	7 46%	4 26%	1 6%	-	2 13%	4 26%	7 46%	2 13%
Metalinguistic Feedback	-	7 46%	5 33%	3 20%	-	2 13%	10 67%	1 6%	2 13%	-
Elicitation	3 20%	6 40%	3 20%	2 13%	1 6%	1 6%	6 40%	4 26%	2 13%	2 13%
Repetition	1 6%	5 33%	4 26%	4 26%	1 6%	-	6 40%	1 6%	6 40%	2 13%

The left side of Table 2 shows the percentage of male students' preferences for the oralcorrective feedback types. On the data which has been collected, it has some results which show male students' preferences toward the types of oralcorrective feedback, such as 100% agree to Explicit Correction, 60% agree to Elicitation, 52% agree to Recasts,46% agree to Metalinguistic Feedback, 39% agree to Repetition, and 46% neutral to Clarification Request. Based on the results we can find that Explicit Correction gets the first rank of the most prefer type of oral errorcorrective feedback and it follows by Elicitation and Recast in the second and third rank, Metalinguistic Feedback in the fourth rank, Repetition in the fifth rank and Clarification Request in the last rank.

The right side of Table 2shows the percentage of female students' preferences for the oralcorrective feedback types. On the data which has been collected, it has some results which show female students' preferences toward the types of oralcorrective feedback, such as 80% agree to Metalinguistic Feedback, 66% agree to both Explicit Correction and Recasts, 46% agree to Elicitation,43% disagree to Repetition, and 59% disagree to Clarification Request. Based on the results we can find that Metalinguistic Feedback gets the first rank of the most prefer type of oral errorcorrective feedback and it follows by Explicit Correction and Recast in the second rank, Elicitation in the fourth rank, Repetition in the fifth rank, and Clarification Request in the last rank.

Interview Result

This part shows the underlying reasons of the OCF types by the male and female students. The students were asked about their reasons for choosing those types of OCF. The following table shows the result of the interview from the males.

Table 3.Reasons for Preferring the OCF Types by the Male Students

Types of OCF	Strongly Agree / Agree	Strongly Disagree / Disagree
Explicit Correction	The whole class will know the error clearly and correction exactly. It is easier to be understood and recognized. It doesn't take a longer time.	-
Recast	It helps the studentto correct the error. It can help students to knowanother formulation of the sentence.	The student didn't know where is the part of the error. It needs a longer time to think.
Clarification Request	It helps the studentsrealizetheir error. It sounds comfortable enough to be heard.	It makes the student confused and nervous. Studentsdidn't know the error part.

		The student didn't understand what the lecturer's mean.
Metalinguistic Feedback	The student can correct it easilyunder the lecturer's clue.	The studentwill not be confident again to speak more. It makes the student confused.
Elicitation	The studentwill know the errorpart. It is effective type to elicit the student to think critically.	The student will be confused if he/she wasnot given the correctiondirectly. Wasting the time.
Repetition	The student will know the part of error that needsto be corrected. It helps the student to correct the error by his/herself.	It seems like the lecturer is not patient to teach. Not all students will understand what the lecturer's mean. It feels like the lecturer is patronizing the students.

From the data obtained, **all male students preferred to have explicit correction** because they will know the error and the correction clearly. Male student 3 said, *"I will know the error and correction exactly. Moreover, both error and correction will be heard by the whole students in the class"*. Explicit correction was also preferred because it is something to the point so that it doesn't take a longer time to be understood.Male student 1 said, *"This type of correction doesn't take a longer time and I will be easy to understand"*.

Another highest preferred by the male student was **Elicitation (60%).** They said that they like to be asked to think deeply under the lecturer's guidance, so they will be easy to correct the error. It also elicits them to think critically. For instance, male student 3 said, "*I think, this type is effective enough because the lecturer gives the student opportunity to think critically about the correct form rather than to provide the correct form immediately after the student's error"*.

The two last preferred types by the male student were **Clarification Request and Repetition (32% disagree).** One of them said that Clarification Request will make them confused about what part should be corrected and how to correct the error, and also not all of the students will understand about what the lecturer's mean. They also think that clarification request will take a longer time because it makes the students think for the second time. It can also make the student nervous, uncomfortable, and afraid to speak more. Male student 2 said, *"This type is wasting the time. 80% of the students will feel uncomfortable talking in front of the class for a longer time. It will make the students think for a second time and they will get so nervous and afraid to speak more if he/she produced a different error"*.

For **Repetition**, they said that they will be confused to understand what the lecturer's mean by emphasizing the word. Male student 4 said that emphasizing the word or changing the intonation feels like the lecturer is not patient to teach. Another male student also thinks that to be corrected by using repetition feels like the lecturer is patronizing the students and he doesn't like being overly patronized in learning process.For instance, male student 5 said, *"It feels like the lecturer is patronizing the students and I don't like it"*.

Aside from the male students' reasons,the following table will show the result of the interview from the females about their preferences towords the oral corrective feedback types.

Table 4.Reasons for Preferring the OCF Types by the Female Students

Types of OCF	Strongly Agree / Agree	Strongly Disagree / Disagree
Explicit Correction	The students will know the error and correction exactly. The error and correctionwill be understood andremembered easily.	Some students will feel intimidated. It will disturb the student's concentration. The student will get shocked, shy,nervous, and afraid to speak more.
Recast	It doesn't blamethe student's error exactly. It doesn't seem too embarrassing. It doesn't spoil the atmosphere. The conversation will go smoothly, enjoy, and conformable.	-
Clarification Request	It sounds more polite.	It is too ambiguous to understand what the lecturer's mean It makes the student confused. The students can't get the point of error. Some studentswill notrealize that they produced an error.
Metalinguistic Feedback	The student can get more knowledgefrom the lecturer's comment and information. Easy to find the error. Easy to correct the error under the lecturer's clue.	It makes the student confused. It sounds little weird.
Elicitation	It showsthe studentsthe part of theirerror that needs to be corrected It is effective way to elicit the student to think deeply.	The student will be confused. It takes a longer time to think. Not all students are clever enough to correct the errorby themselves.
Repetition	The student will know the part of error that should be corrected. It is effective way to allow the student to think deeply.	The student will be confused and nervous. It feels like the lecturer is mocking atthe students' error. It takes a longer time to think.

From the data obtained, **80% of female students agree to Metalinguistic Feedback**. They said that Metalinguistic Feedback can make the them recall their knowledge and they can increase their knowledge in English. Metalinguistic feedback type is also challenging and let the student to think deeper. Female student 3 said, *"It allows me to correct my error by myself without given the correction by the lecturer. I also can realize the error quickly and I can correct it easily with the lecturer's clue."*

Another 2 types of the highest rank are **explicit correction** and **recast**which account **66%** of the female student. For**explicit correction**, they said that it helps them know the error and correction clearly, so both error and the correction will be understood and remembered easily.For**recast**, it makes the conversation go smoothly, enjoy, comfortable, so the students do notshy away to talk more and be more confident in developing conversation skills. For instance, female student 2said, *"If the lecturer corrects my errors naturally through this type, I will feel comfortable and it doesn't make me shy away to talk more".*Female student 4, said*"To be corrected by using this type is just like questioning to follow the flow of conversation. The lecturer seems interacting with the conversation, so the conversation runs smoothly.Even though the trulyquestioning from the lecturer is to correct my error but it doesn't mess the conversation".*

The last preferred types are **Clarification Request (59%)** and **Repetition (53%).**For **Clarification Request,**most of them stated that clarification request is ambiguous to understand what the lecturer's mean. They think that what the lecturer's mean is different with the student's mean. Female student 4 said*, "The truly, I'm not understand what lecturer's mean when he said "Pardon me" or "Sorry" or something like that. I think it was ambiguous. I will suppose it by another mean, and maybe it will be different with the lecturer's mean.* Another student also thinks that she produced an error, but the lecturer's mean is that the student's utterance is not clear enough rather thanher words contain an error.For **Repetition**, they said that this type will make them confused and nervous, becauserepeating and emphasizing the part of error feels like the lecturer is mocking at their error. Female student 1 said,*"It seems like the lecturer is mocking at me".*

CONCLUSION

Based on the data which has been collected, it shows that some of the male students' preferences are different from the female students' preferences for the OCF types. Explicit Correction becomes the most prefer type of OCF byall male students and Metalinguistic Feedback becomes the most favored by the female students.Whereas, the most unwanted type for both male and female students is Clarification Request.

All male students preferred to have **explicit correction** because they wanted the lecturer to correct their errors immediately and provide the correction clearly. For them, explicit correction is something to the point so that it doesn't take a longer time to think about the error part or correction form. They also claim that explicit correction is easy to be comprehended, understood, and recognized.

The majority of female students preferredto **MetalinguisticFeedback** which encouragesthem to do self-correction under the lecturer's clue. The lecturer gives some cluesin order to notice the students to their errors and encourage them to do self-correction. Student will recall his/her background knowledge to fix the error which he/she has produced. However, thelecturer should give enough time to the students to think and connect their background knowledge to their error in order tocorrect it by himself/herself. When the students correct their errorby recalling their background knowledge that they already haveand make a connection to the error they made, it can be considered as meaningful learning.

For both male and female students,**Clarification Request** is beingthe last preferred type of OCF. For them, this type is the most ambiguous typeto grasp what the lecturer's mean. They think that what the lecturer's mean can be different with what the student's mean. For instance, the lecturer uses phrases *"Pardon me?"* or *"Sorry?"* to warn the students, the student will think that he/she produced an error, but the lecture will have a different mean, or may be the lecturer's mean is that the student's utterance is not clear enough rather than his/her words contains the error words. Thus, this type is the most ambiguous type to be recognized.

Hence, to make the teaching and learning process can be done meaningfully, the lecturers shouldconsider students' preferences, especially in giving corrective feedback to students' error, because it can minimize themismatch between students' perception and lecturers' perception in teaching and learning process. Hopefully, it canhelp the students to do corrections to their errors and have meaningful learning which can be very beneficial for them.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

and suggestion. We are also grateful for the first-year students of English Education Department of Sebelas Maret University for their willingness to become the participant for this study.

REFERENCES

Brown, H. Douglas. (2004). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices.* United States: Longman.

Creswell, John W. (2014). *Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches Second Edition*. Boston: Sage Publications Inc.

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development. *L2 Journal,* 1, 3-18.

Fauziati, Endang. (2016). *Applied Linguistics: Principles of Foreign Language Teaching, Learning, and Researching.* Surakarta: Era Pustaka Utama.

Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible Learning: A Synthesis of Over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement.* New York: Routledge.

Hattie, J., &Timperlay, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research, 77*(1), 81-112.

Harward, Stan., Peterson, Nancy., Korth, Byran., Wimmer, Jennifer., Wilcox, Brad., Morrison, T. G., Black, Sharon., Simmerman, Sue., & Pierce, Linda. (2014). Writing Instruction in Elementary Classrooms: Why Teachers Engage or Do Not Engage Students in Writing. *Literacy Research and Instruction 53*, 205-224.

Havnes, A., Smith, K., Dysthe, O., &Ludvigsen, K. (2012). Formative Assessment and Feedback: Making learning visible. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 38*, 21-27.

James, C. (1998). *Errors in Language Learning and Use: Exploring Error Analysis.* London: Longman.

Katayama, A. (2007). Students' Perceptions toward Corrective Feedback to Oral Errors. *AsianEFL Journal,* 9, 289-305.

Khorshidi, Elaheh. &Rassaei, Ehsan. (2013). The Effects of Learners' Gender on Their Preferences for Corrective Feedback. *Journal of Studies in Learning and Teaching English,* 1 (4), 71 – 83.

Lumetta, H. Jennie. (2004). *Feedback for Learners: Effective Techniques and Strategies.* University of Illions.

Lyster, R. &Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake: Negotiation of Form in Communicative Classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 0(1), 37-66.

Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral Corrective Feedback in Second Language Classrooms. *Language Teaching, 46*(1), 1-40.

Miles, M. B., &Hubberman, A. M. (1984). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. California: SAGE Publication.

Nunan, D. (1995). *Language Teaching Methodology: A Textbook for Teachers*. London, UK: Prentice Hall.

Ortega, Lourdes. (2009). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Hodder Education.

Pirhonen, Noora. (2016). *Students' Perceptions about the Use of Oral Corrective Feedback in EFL Classrooms.* University of Jyvaskyla.

Russell, Jacquelyn & Spada, Nina. (2006). The Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback for Second Language Acquisition: A Meta-analysis of the Research. In Norris John; Ortega, Lourdes (eds.). *Synthesizing Research on Language Learning and Teaching*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 131-164.

Yule, George. (2010). *The Study of Language (4th Edition).* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.