



The Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback in EFL Students' Speaking Skill: The Students' Responses

Rista Ananda Ningias
Lilia Indriani

Tidar University, Jl. Kapten Suparman No.39, Potrobangsari, Magelang Utara, Kota Magelang, Jawa Tengah 56116, Indonesia
ristaananda2406@gmail.com

Abstract

This article investigates the students' responses toward corrective feedback effectiveness for EFL students' speaking skills that constitute negative feedback. It is the form of linguistic error response toward the learner's error utterance (Zhang & Chatupote, 2014). The most popular corrective feedbacks in teaching speaking are explicit correction, elicitation, and repetition (Muhsin, 2016). This article aimed to analyze the students' responses toward the effectiveness of corrective feedback in increasing EFL students speaking performance. The researcher researched 35 EFL students of the English Department Student at Tidar University. This study applied a quantitative approach in analyzing the data by sending the questionnaire consist of six categories. The researcher used the questionnaire to collect data about the participants' responses towards using corrective feedback in students' speaking performance. The result shows that implementing corrective feedback is effective for increasing EFL students' speaking performance.

Keywords: *Corrective Feedback, Effectiveness, Speaking, EFL Students*

Abstrak

Artikel ini menyelidiki tanggapan siswa terhadap efektivitas umpan balik korektif untuk keterampilan berbicara siswa EFL yang merupakan umpan balik negatif. Ini adalah bentuk respon kesalahan linguistik terhadap kesalahan ucapan pembelajar (Zhang & Chatupote, 2014). Umpan balik korektif yang paling populer dalam pengajaran berbicara adalah koreksi eksplisit, elisitasi, dan pengulangan (Muhsin, 2016). Artikel ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis tanggapan siswa terhadap efektivitas umpan balik korektif dalam meningkatkan kinerja berbicara siswa EFL. Peneliti meneliti 35 mahasiswa EFL dari Jurusan Bahasa Inggris di Universitas Tidar. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kuantitatif dalam menganalisis data dengan mengirimkan kuesioner yang terdiri dari enam kategori. Peneliti menggunakan kuesioner untuk mengumpulkan data tentang tanggapan peserta terhadap penggunaan umpan balik korektif dalam kinerja berbicara siswa. Hasilnya menunjukkan bahwa menerapkan umpan balik korektif efektif untuk meningkatkan kinerja berbicara siswa EFL.

Kata Kunci : *Corrective Feedback, Kefektifan, Berbicara, EFL Students*

Article Info

Naskah Diterima :
2021-06-14

Naskah Direvisi:
2021-06-20

Naskah Disetujui:
2021-06-28

INTRODUCTION

As learners, we have been very familiar with feedback. It makes sense of the information about students and teachers' work they have done, used on improving the quality of their following work (Dawson et al., 2019). As language learners, we are accessing two varieties of input which are positive and negative evidence. The positive evidence tells the learners about what is acceptable in the target language. The negative evidence gives the learners information about incorrectness (Gass, 1997). (Long, 1996) states that there are two kinds of feedback also. There is positive and negative feedback. The definition is almost the same. Negative feedback relates to the students' fault of the utterance and giving correction for students by following an ungrammatical learner system to provide the correct form. Corrective feedback is a kind of negative feedback. It is the form of linguistic error response toward the learner's error utterance (Zhang & Chatupote, 2014). There are six categories of this feedback. They are explicit correction, recasts, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition (Lyster & Ratna, 2013).

The first type of corrective feedback is explicit correction. It illustrates that the students' utterance was wrong, the teacher will provide the correct form (Tedick & Gortari, 1998). For example, the students said, "She eats her favorite food." The teacher then directly said, "Oh, you should say she eats. She eats her favorite food." The second type is called recast. It is the implicit teacher's formulation of all or part of students' utterances (Lyster & Ratna, 2013). For example, the students said, "She eats her favorite food." The teacher directly said, "She eats her favorite food." The next is a clarification request that prompts the students to reform and reformulate or clear up the content of students' utterances (Loewen & Nabei, 2007). Usually, the teachers use a sentence like "Pardon me?" to ask the students to clarify their utterances. The fourth is metalinguistic feedback. This feedback consists of information, comments, or questions to the students' well-formed utterances (Lyster, 2002). The example is "Can you find your error?" There is also elicitation. It is the technique when the teacher uses to bring out the correct form from the students

directly (Muhsin, 2016). The teacher prompts the students to self-correct by restating up to the point of the error. The last is repetition. It means the teacher's repetition of the students' erroneous utterances. Sometimes, they accommodate their intonation to highlight the students' errors. From the six types of correction feedback, recast was the least effective form of feedback. It is in terms of successful uptake and second language acquisition. (Büyükbay & Dabaghi, 2010)

Many analysts have conducted a study on this topic. One of them is the article entitled "Teacher Corrective Feedback Strategies on Students' Speaking Performance and Students' Perceptions Toward Corrective Feedback" written by (Nurmiati, 2017). This article investigates the teacher's corrective feedback strategy. It is to respond to the students' errors and perception toward corrective feedback. The research found that recast is the most used corrective feedback. The students state that it is helpful to know their errors (Nurmiati, 2017). The second study is from (Phuong, T.T., & Huan, 2018) with the article entitled "Teacher Corrective Feedback on Students' Speaking Performance and Their Uptake in EFL Classes." This study provides judgment to the teacher's strategy to deliver corrective feedback to the students. The outcome demonstrates the classroom often uses recast and explicit correction (Phuong, T.T., & Huan, 2018). The other research is from (Muhsin, 2016). The title of his study is "The Effectiveness of Positive Feedback in Teaching Speaking Skill." This study examines the effectiveness of corrective feedback by collecting the students' responses toward corrective feedback provided in the speaking activity. The result demonstrates explicit correction, elicitation, and repetition are the most corrective feedback types to be used. It points out that not all corrective feedback is effective in speaking (Muhsin, 2016). This study will investigate the effectiveness of corrective feedback use in the EFL students' class based on the students' responses. It is also to know the effective type in delivering the corrective feedback and what is needed by the EFL students.

METHODOLOGY

The researcher used the quantitative approach in analyzing the data obtained. It is the method by clarifying a concern or

phenomenon by collecting numerical data and analyzing with the aid of mathematical methods on appropriate statistics (Aliaga & Gunderson, 2002). Descriptive qualitative was conducted in this research that sought to understand critical elements for determining effective corrective feedback in EFL students' speaking based on the students' responses. The objects of this research are the English Department students of Tidar University in the academic year 2020/2021. The research is conducted with 35 students. To get accurate data, the researcher giving them the questionnaire to collect their response toward the effectiveness of corrective feedback. It is one of the effective instruments. If the questionnaire is used in the research project, there will be essential and efficient time and effort into getting the correct format (Gamlem & Smith, 2013). The questionnaire consists of 22 close-ended questions with Likert scale answers. They include all the activities which are shown when the teacher is usually teaching in the classroom. The questionnaires are classified into some criteria like the frequency of feedback, the timing for treating students' errors, the rate of each feedback in which the researcher should address the students' errors.

The questionnaire is adapted from the previous study conducted by (Muhsin, 2016) in his research entitled "The Effectiveness of Positive Feedback in Teaching Speaking Skill." The way to interpret the questionnaire is by finding the mean and standard deviation of each statement to get the information about the average answer of students to create a conclusion. The researcher will analyze the data with SPSS as the tool to determining the result of this study for making an efficient time. There are also question about the rate of corrective feedback whether it is very effective or ineffective for their speaking performance to be better. Below is the questionnaire that the researcher will use.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This part will discuss the findings that the researcher gets from the questioners shared. These findings will be presented in the table after the researcher analyze them use SPSS then will be interpreted in the form paragraph below the table.

How Effective Corrective Feedback for The Students' Speaking

The first is about the rate of feedback effects that the teacher gave in speaking class. There are many types of corrective feedback used by the teacher to correct the students' error utterance. There are explicit correction, recasts, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, repetition, and no corrective feedback. Below is the table of the result from this category.

Table 1. The result of question number 12-18

| | Statistics | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|------|-------|------|------|------|------|
| | P12 | P13 | P14 | P15 | P16 | P17 | P18 |
| Mean | 3.97 | 3.37 | 3.63 | 3.63 | 3.77 | 3.94 | 1.63 |
| Mode | 4 ^a | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| Std. Deviation | 1.043 | .973 | 1.114 | 1.03 | .910 | .938 | .910 |

The table above shows us the most effective type of corrective feedback that the teacher gives. The answer starts from number 1 that represents very ineffective until number 5 that represents very effective. P12 until P18 represent the types of corrective feedback. Start from explicit correction, recasts, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, repetition, and no corrective feedback. From the result, we can analyze that most of the mean is above 3 or 3.5. It means that all the type of corrective feedback is effective in correcting the students' errors. The most effective type is P12 or explicit correction. It is followed by repetition then elicitation. Metalinguistic feedback and clarification request has the same result then followed by recast. The researcher also provides "no corrective feedback" as one of the answer choices. It shows that it indicates an ineffective thing because the mean is just 1.63 from 5. The response above shows that corrective feedback is effective for correcting the students speaking. The students also agree that without corrective feedback, it will be ineffective in learning speaking.

Table 2. Students' responses for question number 7-11

| Statistics | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|------|-------|----------------|------|
| | P7 | P8 | P9 | P10 | P11 |
| Mean | 3.89 | 3.60 | 3.46 | 3.43 | 3.83 |
| Mode | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 ^a | 4 |
| Std. Deviation | 1.078 | .946 | 1.067 | .948 | .857 |

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

The table above shows the result of the fourth category of the question. It is about the type of error that needed to be corrected in students' speaking. There are 5 choices consist of serious, less serious, frequent, infrequent, and individual. All of the results show the number of 3, however, the highest result is in P7. It shows that the mean is 3.89. That means a serious type of error needs to be corrected. The lowest result is showed in the P10. It means that the students think the infrequent error is not too needed to be corrected. The important one is the serious error. After the serious error, the second place is individual then less serious and frequent.

How They Respond about The Use of Corrective Feedback

Table 3. Students' response for question number 1-6

| Statistics | | | | | | |
|----------------|------|------|-------|------|-------|-------|
| | P1 | P2 | P3 | P4 | P5 | P6 |
| Mean | 4.26 | 3.20 | 3.17 | 4.09 | 3.29 | 3.03 |
| Mode | 5 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| Std. Deviation | .886 | .632 | 1.382 | .887 | 1.296 | 1.543 |

The table above shows the students' responses to questions number 1-6. P1 indicates question number 1. It is about their response to teachers' corrective feedback. The average answer is 4.26 from 5. It means that the students agree if there is corrective feedback from the teacher during speaking activity. 5 as the highest score of this questionnaire also becomes the most frequently appear. The standard

deviation is 0.886 which is lower than the mean means the lack of variation of the data. P2 shows the analysis of the second question about how frequently the teachers give corrective feedback. The mean shows 3.20. It means that the frequency is still low or sometimes the teacher gives their students corrective feedback. The mode is 3 and the standard deviation is 0.632. It means most students choose "sometimes" as their answer and the spread of the data is still lack. P3, P4, P5, and P6 are from the third category of the question. It is about the best time to give corrective feedback. There are 4 points such as: as soon as the error is made, after finish speaking, after activities, and at the end of the class. The result shows that correcting students as soon as the error is made has the lowest answer. It means that students disagree about it. The highest answer comes from P4 or after finish speaking. Many students agree about this timing.

The next category is about the students' choices for the best person to correct their error. There are three choices. There are classmates, teachers, and students. The result can be seen in the table below:

Table 4. The result of question number 19-21

| Statistics | | | |
|----------------|----------------|-------|-------|
| | P19 | P20 | P21 |
| Mean | 3.34 | 4.03 | 3.31 |
| Mode | 3 ^a | 5 | 3 |
| Std. Deviation | .998 | 1.424 | 1.022 |

The result of the table above shows that P20 or teachers are the correctors of the error become the highest one. It means that the students more agree and comfortable if their error being corrected by the teacher than the students or their classmates. However, both students and classmates have the score that not too low. There are still around 3. It means that there are also students that more comfortable being corrected by the other students.

From the result of four tables above especially in table P12-P17, we know that the students' responses toward the effectiveness of each type of corrective feedback are very positive. It is because the result of Likert scale

analysis in the table show the number of 3.37 until 3.97 from 5 which mean that they consider corrective feedback as effective for their speaking skill. So, the effectiveness here is based on the students' responses from P12-P17 that require students to rate the number of effectiveness of each type of corrective feedback.

CONCLUSION

From the result that the researcher gathers during the research, the researcher can conclude that corrective feedback is very effective for students' speaking. It is because the data in table 1.1 shows that the mean is above 3 or 3.5 that means the corrective feedback is effective in correcting the students' errors. Most of the students choose the number 4 that represents 'effective' and for no corrective feedback, they choose 1 or 'ineffective'. The result also shows that serious errors become the most needed type of error to be corrected with corrective feedback. The students' response toward corrective feedback is very positive. As can be seen in table 2.1, the students strongly agree with the teacher's corrective feedback given in their speaking activity. They also state that the best time for the teacher to correct their error is after they finish their speaking. There is also the result for the best person in correcting their error because corrective feedback not only can be given by the teacher but also the students or classmates. However, the result still indicates that the teacher is the best person to correct the students' errors. In conclusion, corrective feedback is very effective and important for students to increase their speaking ability and decrease their erroneous, so their speaking will be better and more fluent.

REFERENCES

- Aliaga, M., & Gunderson, B. (2002). *Interactive Statistics*. [Thousand Oaks]. New Jersey: Sage Publications.
- Büyükbay, S., & Dabaghi, A. (2010). The Effectiveness of Repetition as Corrective Feedback. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(3). <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.1.3.181-193>
- Dawson, P., Henderson, M., Mahoney, P., Phillips, M., Ryan, T., Boud, D., & Molloy, E. (2019). What makes for effective feedback: staff and student perspectives. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 44(1), 25–36.
- Gamlem, S., & Smith, K. (2013). Student Perceptions of Classroom Feedback. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 20(2), 150–169.
- Gass, S. M. (1997). *Input, interaction, and the second language learner*. London: Erlbaum.
- Loewen, S., & Nabei. (2007). *Measuring the effects of oral corrective feedback on L2 knowledge*. In A. Mackey (Eds.), *Conversational Interaction in Second Language Acquisition: A Collection of Empirical Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Long, M. (1996). *The Role of Linguistics Environment in Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Academic Press.
- Lyster, R. (2002). *The importance of differentiating negotiation of form and meaning in classroom interaction*. In Burmeister, P., Piske, T. and Rohde, A., (Eds.), *An Integrated View of Language Development: Papers in Honor of Henning Wode*. Germany: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier.
- Lyster, R., & Ratna, L. (2013). Counterpoint Piece: The Case for Variety in Corrective Feedback Research. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 35(1), 167–184.
- Muhsin, A. (2016). The Effectiveness of Positive Feedback in Teaching Speaking Skill. *Lingua Cultura*, 10(1), 25. <https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v10i1.873>
- Nurmiati. (2017). *Teacher ' S Corrective Feedback Strategies on Students ' Speaking Performance and Students ' Perception Toward Corrective Feedback* (Doctoral dissertation, Tanjungpura University)
- Phuong, T.T., & Huan, N. . (2018). Teacher corrective feedback on students' speaking performance and their uptake in EFL classes. *European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 3(3), 573–595.

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1321246>

Tedick, D., & Gortari, B. (1998). Research on Error Correction and Implications for Classroom Teaching. *Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisitio*.

Zhang, S., & Chatupote, M. (2014). Feedback Used in Classrooms with Native English and Non-native English Teacher. *International Journal of English Language Education*, 2(1), 241–258.

APPENDIX

P1: How is your respond about teacher's corrective feedback? (1-5)

P2: How often your lecturer give corrective feedback in your speaking performance? (1-5)

When is the best time to give corrective feedback?

P3: As soon as error are made (1-5)

P4: After finish speaking (1-5)

P5 : After activities (1-5)

P6: The end of the class (1-5)

What is the type of error needed to be corrected in your speaking?

P7: Serious (1-5)

P8: Less serious (1-5)

P9: Frequent (1-5)

P10: Infrequent (1-5)

P11: Individual (1-5)

How was the rate of feedback effectiveness that teacher gave in speaking class?

P12: Explicit Correction (1-5)

P13: Recast (1-5)

P14: Clarification requests (1-5)

P15: Metalinguistic feedback (1-5)

P16: Elicitation (1-5)

P17: Repetition (1-5)

P18: No corrective feedback (1-5)

The Students Respond Should Correct Their Error (1-5)

P19: Classmates (1-5)

P20: Teachers (1-5)

P21: Students (1-5)