

EFL Teachers' Beliefs About Oral Corrective Feedback on Students' Speaking Performance at SMA N 1 Padang

Raisah Aini¹ and Jufrizal²

¹Universitas Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia, ✉ (e-mail), raisah_aini25@yahoo.com

²Universitas Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia, ✉ (e-mail), juf_ely@yahoo.com

Abstract

Oral corrective feedback is really important for teachers in the process of language teaching and learning especially in speaking practice. It is also a type of feedback that have much impact on students' language learning. Although a number of studies have examined in the context of second language teachers' beliefs, but few have investigated in the context of foreign language teachers. To fill this research gap, this study explored EFL teachers' beliefs regarding a number of issues about oral corrective feedback, such as; the role of error correction in language learning, timing of corrective feedback, ways of correction in the classroom setting, types of oral corrective feedback strategies, the types of errors that should be corrected, and focus of speaking aspects. The present research aims to find out EFL teachers' beliefs about oral corrective feedback on students' speaking performance at SMA N 1 Padang. The type of this research was descriptive research. Two EFL teachers participated in this study were selected by using purposive sampling. The data and source of data in this research were EFL teachers' responses and EFL teachers themselves. The research instrument was semi-structured interview guideline. The data was qualitatively analyzed. The result indicated that teachers' beliefs were more dynamic and flexible between those two teachers. Their beliefs that they stated were based on what actually realized in their classroom practice. Moreover, both EFL English teachers shared a half the same beliefs and also a half shared quite little different beliefs in terms of types of oral corrective feedback strategies, types of errors should be corrected, and the focus of speaking aspects.

Keywords: *EFL teachers' beliefs, oral corrective feedback, students' speaking performance*

Introduction

Speaking has a pivotal role in communication of human beings. Through delivering information or knowledge orally, the idea of someone will be directly recognized by the person who accepts the message or recipient. Harmer (2007: 284) proposes that speaking is the ability to speak fluently and presupposes not only knowledge of language features, but also the ability to process information and language 'on the spot'. This also means as the potential to be able to come across the current or present-day language usage. However, speaking is a really complex skill and needs a longer time to expand. In developing speaking skill, practicing as frequently as possible and obtaining an acceptable experience are simply required by most of people.

In EFL teaching and learning context, when students are performing a speaking performance in front of a classroom they usually obtain feedback from their teacher, whether it could be positive or negative feedback. Both of them depend on a teacher's reaction towards students' speaking performance. Oral feedback is one of many communication forms where students receive feedback from their teachers either correct them implicitly or explicitly and also enquire them to clarify what they are speaking.

According to Hattie and Timperley (2007:81,86), feedback is a consequence of performance. In other words, feedback is defined as information delivered by an agent (e.g., teacher, peer, self, etc..) in connection with one's performance and understanding for the purpose to minimize a mismatch between current performance, understandings and a goal. Corrective feedback can emerge whether from teacher or students themselves. It depends on whether the students realize or not about their errors in speaking performance.

However, nativist such as Krashen (1982, in Kim, Ji Hyun, 2004: 2) debates the role of feedback by announcing that error correction is not beneficial for language learning and detrimental for students' affective factor, since it interrupts the flow of discourse that could provide comprehensible input. This dilemma, to certain extent can confuse EFL teacher in operating corrective feedback to the students (Rezaei et al, 2011:21).

When having preliminary research conducted on 18th of July, pre-observation and interview were administered to the teachers for the purpose to recognize the application of oral corrective feedback on students' speaking performance. The teachers informed that students experience errors that provoke teachers doing a correction. They claimed that students committed particular errors such as grammatical, lexical and phonological errors and those errors were unavoidable when they had speaking performance. They believe that oral corrective feedback is useful to improve language development of students. Therefore, teachers sometimes use that in classroom activity.

Meanwhile, they also operated positive feedback towards students' performance frequently. In particular cases, students sometimes realize the errors they made. Hence, they automatically do self-correction in speaking. They added that positive feedback is really important in order to motivate students to gain better improvement at the end. The phenomena seen in the class that teachers' beliefs are still obscure.

The use of oral corrective feedback is open by most of experts on language teaching with some notices. For example, Brown (2001: 288) proposes that too much of negative feedback often induce students to stop their attempts to communicate. On the other hand, engaging too much positive feedback provide to boost the errors of the students that may prompt to inevitable fossilization. Hence, he advocates that teachers must apply a balance of positive feedback to encourage a communication and motivation also corrective feedback to raise awareness to the pivotal errors. Riddell (2001, in Maolida, E. H, 2013: 2) claims that teachers should concentrate correction on particular mistakes, engaging the target language, significant mistakes, and recurrent common mistakes. Hence, a more empirical way by several actual examples or illustrations of those general points on the oral corrective feedback using which is proposed by experts require to be reported. This present research was clearly beneficial for that function.

Meanwhile, Lightbown and Spada (1999:171) assert that corrective feedback is any indication to the learners that their use of the target language indicates incorrect. While corrective feedback is explained more specifically that refers to feedback in which learners build linguistic errors they produce either in their oral or written production in a second language (L2), (Sheen and Ellis, 2011: 593). It can be said that there are many factors that provoke teachers in giving corrective feedback as a response to students' oral language production when they perform speaking. As what Sheen and Ellis already said the factors are more assigned to errors of language rules.

Lyster and Ranta (1997:45) mention that there are three types of linguistic errors, namely; phonological error, lexical error and grammatical error. In the context of foreign language learning, most students frequently encounter errors when producing a language, since the language they learn is not their native language. Therefore, those three types of linguistic errors explained above, students' errors are the starting point for the corrective feedback done by teacher and they are the reason the feedback occurs in the classroom. Thus, teachers have to operate a various corrective feedback based on appropriate manner and should give more thought to the kinds of feedback they give to students when speaking.

Given the significance of corrective feedback provision as one of the main instructional responsibilities of the teacher (Mori, 2011), addressing the EFL teachers' beliefs about unexpected dimensions of teaching including error correction is a serious call. Basturkmen (2012, in Karimi and Asadnia, 2015: 41). In reviewing the research literature, it is noticed that teachers' beliefs were open to be debated.

In the EFL context, teachers' beliefs are literally diverse or unidentified. Consequently, we cannot surely view yet on what happen at a time. Most of existing studies about teachers' beliefs have clearly established in second language teachers. But, a few addressed in foreign language teachers' context. Thus, this research is scientifically needed to conduct for further investigation. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to fill this gap by examining EFL teachers' beliefs about oral corrective feedback on students' speaking performance at SMA N 1 Padang.

Method

Given that this present research aims to investigate EFL teachers' beliefs about oral corrective feedback on students' speaking performance at SMA N 1 Padang, a descriptive qualitative methodology was selected to be implemented in this study. Because it is considered as a more in-depth exploration into the nature of situation or condition and the complex vigorous of EFL teachers' beliefs as well as better explanation for pertinent contextual variables as mentioned by (Richardson & Placier, 2001). Therefore, qualitative method is considered as a convenient approach as it develops with individuals and sets out to grasp and establish beliefs and also experiences of a particular phenomenon (Cohen et al., 2000: 23). The participants involved two English teachers who were selected to participate in this research through purposive sampling. Those teachers teach English lesson at 10th and 11th grade of SMA N 1, Belanti Raya street, Lolong Belanti, North Padang, Padang city, West Sumatera. They were selected because both teachers

had good proficiency and experience. In addition, they were active in engaging students to practice in speaking performance. The data acquired in this research was in form of qualitative data. The data in this research was obtained from EFL teachers' responses. That was because teachers themselves determined as interviewees to acquire their beliefs about oral corrective feedback on students' speaking performance. The sources of data were both of EFL teachers. The data was presented in form of transcription. Semi-structured interview was the chosen instrument in this research. Moreover, this present research was also assisted by audio recording as a second tool.

Results and Discussion

The result of qualitative analysis of the data obtained from the semi-structured interview was presented below. As regards the beliefs about oral corrective feedback, **teacher 1 (WR)** and **teacher 2 (RF)** were asked about the following aspects: the role of error correction in language learning, timing of corrective feedback, ways of correction in the classroom setting, types of oral corrective feedback strategies, the types of errors that should be corrected, and focus of speaking aspects:

Belief 1: The role of error correction in language learning

Researcher : Do you believe that error correction enhances or hinder students' language learning process? Why?

Teacher 1 (WR) Yes, I do. It can boost language learning because it informs the progress of the students, provide evidence of how a language is acquired. In addition, it can expose the strategies used in learning a language.

Teacher 2 (RF) Yes, I do. It can improve students' language learning process. Because, error correction can be beneficial in developing the way how language is being learnt and the language delivered by one speaker can be understood to other speaker. Particularly in speaking performance.

When teacher 1 (WR) was explicitly asked about her beliefs regarding the role of error correction in language learning, she replied that she believed error correction enhances students' learning in which it informed the progress of the students and provided evidence of how a language is acquired. She expressed this idea that in her interview she expressed the error correction had essential role in which it maintains the progress of students that eventually this leads to the determination of certain technique or way which is appropriate to the language learning. She believed that error correction also contributes to the impact of students' language development and how it develops students' behavior through to process the information. Meanwhile **teacher 2**, related to the role of error correction in language learning, she believed that the role of error correction is really important in forming the development of error correction theory and its application in the language learning process. She expressed that students had a good impact for that because it triggers students' knowledge to be more freely declare their mind.

Belief 2 : Timing of corrective feedback

Researcher : What do you think about immediate feedback? Is it appropriate to correct students' error? why?

Teacher 1(WR) Immediate feedback is the way that feedback directly provided to students. Yes, it is. Since it can clarify the performance and augment positive motivational beliefs and self-esteem of students. Furthermore, it also provides information to students about their learning so that in the future they can improve their capability and show a significantly improvement in performance.

Teacher 2 (RF) Immediate feedback is teacher provides the correction after students make a particular error. Yes, it is. Because, by providing immediate feedback, students directly recognize what error they already made and it shares a challenge for students to encounter for replying and interacting of how to behave. Moreover, it also informs to improve students' self-assured.

Regarding the immediate feedback, **teacher 1** believed that it is appropriate to use in correcting students' error. Students will recognize immediately about the mistakes or errors they made in which it unconsciously train students to develop their recognition and inducement for responding the feedback as well as to produce memory robust. Meanwhile **teacher 2** believed that immediate feedback is the feedback that operated directly to the students' error and it was done by teacher for the aim of making language learning more meaningful in which the feedback can be easily administered quickly to students' error or mistake when they are performing the activity. Moreover, immediate feedback can enhance students' self-regulation and help academic performance.

Researcher : What do you think about delayed feedback? Is it appropriate to correct students' error? Why?

Teacher 1 (WR) Delayed feedback is a good way in correcting students' error as it can avoid interrupting fluency practice of the students particularly in big classes.

Teacher 2 (RF) Delayed feedback is the way that teacher gives feedback by keeping a note of language items and present these on white board. Then, students are asked for indicating and discussing language problem together that guided by teacher. Yes, it is. Because it improves for the accuracy.

Regarding to **teacher 1**, she believed that apart from immediate feedback, delayed feedback is also more considerable way to be used in correcting students' error. Since it promotes to the complexity and correctness. Moreover, improvement of long-term memory will be gained for longer period of time. Meanwhile, **teacher 2** believed that she used that in her classroom. Since it enhances the students' readiness and give more explanation and thought. In the case that when feedback happens in a big class. The students have a lot of opportunities from teacher. It is more useful to students' long-term memory. As teacher who the one act more in this situation rather than students' themselves.

Researcher : Do you think that delayed feedback can be more effective than immediate feedback? Why?

Teacher 1 (WR) Yes, it is. Delayed feedback is sometimes more effective in a big classroom because it assists the teachers to correct students without interrupting them while speaking.

Teacher 2 (RF) Yes, it is. Delayed feedback can be more effective than immediate because, it shares the accurateness and students do not feel that their communication is being cutted out.

With regard to the effectiveness of delayed feedback, **teacher 1** believed that it is more appropriate to be applied in the place that in terms of the circumstance situation. In addition, delayed feedback can give more vivid explanation to whole students' engagement available in the classroom. Thus, it becomes alternative choice in open class. Meanwhile, **teacher 2** believed that delayed feedback can be more effective in the classroom. Since it requires a more explanation and All students can participate in this situation as it more appropriate with a large class. She believed that this type of feedback is really beneficial for students' language development because it does not distract students' attention and connection that means it is more meaningful to develop students' thought.

Belief 3 : Ways of correction in the classroom setting

Researcher : Who mostly often provide correction when students speaking? Why do you believe so?

Teacher 1 (WR) The teacher provides corrections for errors done by students. But, sometimes it is probably more effective for students to correct their own mistakes. In order to do this, students and the teacher should have a common shorthand for correcting mistakes.

Teacher 2 (RF) Teacher provides the correction. In particular case, there is a time when students correct their speaking by their own. Because, it depends on the circumstances where in the case that students highly in need of a correction, thus teacher must correct. Otherwise, for the time that they can manage easily, the error correction has no need to operate.

Teacher 1 believed that she was one of the person who in charge of administering correction. Meanwhile, she said that sometimes students did their own correction to their mistakes or errors they made. She gave further explanation that by doing certain way or terms of use of those errors in which students can notice teacher's correction. Meanwhile, **Teacher 2** believed that sometimes teacher provides the correction in the case that students are in need of more explanation and they cannot handle it. She said that teacher as a provider who provide the correction to students. Thus, teacher is really in charge of feedback provider.

Researcher : Do you believe that students have possibility to do self-correction or pair-correction when they have speaking performance? Why?

Teacher 1 (WR) Yes, I do. I support that self-correction shows comprehension of the language. It creates awareness of the language produced and certainly become more self-sufficient speakers. Consequently, it drives students to be more confident as well.

Teacher 2 (RF) Yes, I do. They have a possibility to do self-correction rather than pair-correction that less function. Because, self-correction leads to the awareness of students.

Teacher 1 believed that in her classroom, students were frequently tendency to correct their own errors since they are really active and fully participate in speaking. Besides, they are autonomously in charge of their task. Thus, it will lead to their determination. Meanwhile, **teacher 2** believed that self-correction occurred in her classroom. She also believed that self-correction has more beneficial sides that shares the state of familiarity in which students will really acquire it as well as enhance the feeling of self-assertive and assurance.

Belief 4 : Types of oral corrective feedback strategies

Researcher : What are the effective strategies of providing oral corrective feedback to your students? Why do you believe so?

Teacher 1 (WR) The effective strategies are repetition, that is to reinforce what is already being said. Contradict the message and make the speaker seem untruthful. Substitution, that is take the place of words. Compliment a verbal message. Accenting, that is underline or highlight a certain point in the message.

Teacher 2 (RF) The effective strategies are elicitation, paralinguistic signal, and explicit correction. Because, those really take more use than others.

Teacher 1 believed that there were a few of effective strategies of providing oral corrective feedback to students in her classroom. Those were repeat the student's error while highlighting the error by means of emphatic stress, substitution, and also accenting, in which teacher emphasizes a particular sound of words that contain an error. Meanwhile, **teacher 2** believed that she used direct error correction, prompts students to self-correct and any kind of gesture and sign. Those were the effective strategies she provided in correcting students' errors. Not to mention other strategies that also promote another alternative, she believed that other strategies can usually be used in certain situation.

Researcher : Do you think that non-verbal signal or gesture is also important to be used to indicate students' errors? why do you believe so?

Teacher 1 (WR) Yes, I do. Since it exposes the process of shared cues among people, including frequency of glances, blink rate, gestures, facial expressions, postures, and so on.

Teacher 2 (RF) Yes, I do. They are completely important in indicating students' errors because, they eventually fulfill or express the message of the idea of correcting the error.

Regarding the paralinguistic signals, **teacher 1** believed that the non-verbal signal or gesture is really essential to be operated for indicating students' errors to fulfilling the message or idea or information related to error correction in order that the message can be understood and delivered clearly to students. Meanwhile, **teacher 2** believed that paralinguistic signals entirely contributed a lot and facilitated more significant contribution in helping teacher delivers an appropriate manner to correct students' error made. Moreover, by doing any kind of gesture, intonation, signs, and so on, the idea for indicating the errors are really delivered and understood.

Belief 5 : The types of errors that should be corrected

Researcher : What type of errors do you believe that you often concentrate on? Why?

Teacher 1 (WR) grammatical one. Because it is a set of norms or rules of a language should or should not be used.

Teacher 2 (RF) Phonological and grammatical errors. Because, both of them frequently occur in students' speaking performance.

Teacher 1 believed that the type of error that must concentrate on is grammatical one. She believed that grammar is the rule of language that basically refer to on how it is used and realized in the sentences. Meanwhile, **teacher 2** stated to her beliefs about the type of errors she concentrated on, teacher was more focus on the grammatical and phonological error that students were tendency to produce when having speaking performance in the classroom.

Belief 6 : The focus of speaking aspects

Researcher : What aspects do you believe that you should focus on, when providing oral corrective feedback to your students while speaking? Why do you think so?

Teacher 1 (WR) Target achievement, content, and form. In addition, fluency is also considered focus when they are speaking.

Teacher 2 (RF) The aspects are fluency and pronunciation.

Teacher 1 believed that the aspects of speaking she focused on were a lot. It depends on the target evaluation of speaking. She said that what students are really delivered on the message that they made and performed. Moreover, how they sound the words correctly and how they arrange the sentences in a good form. Meanwhile, **teacher 2** believed that when she evaluates students' speaking, the aspects that she focuses on are on how students deliver an appropriate sound of words in order that what their meaning of message are understandable by their partner of speaking or others and how they deliver the information quickly without having to stop and pause a lot.

As can be seen from the result above, regarding to beliefs both EFL English teachers shared a half the same beliefs and also a half shared quite little different beliefs in terms of types of oral corrective feedback strategies, types of errors should be corrected, and the focus of speaking aspects. **Teacher 1 and teacher 2** had their own beliefs that more dynamic. Their beliefs that they stated were based on what actually realized in their classroom practice and it was adapted based on the methodological perspective they believed that

was more agreed with the communicative language teaching. Moreover, these beliefs were more refer to the beliefs as contextually situated meaning emerging in certain sense-making activity that based on the theory of sociocultural approach (Negueruela-Azarola, 2011: 368)

The implication of the findings based on school settings are those result can enrich the knowledge of teachers' beliefs about oral corrective feedback and how teachers can administer appropriately those strategies of oral corrective feedback based on some certain considerations and determinations of students need of corrections. This research was limited to 2 EFL English teachers teaching at senior high school 1 Padang. It might be extended to include a large number of teachers teaching at junior or senior high schools located in different region or city. In this sense, although the present research was qualitative descriptive approach, the future researches could examine how EFL teachers' beliefs can inform their oral corrective feedback practices in students' speaking performance and open possible disparity between teacher beliefs and their actual oral corrective feedback practices in students' speaking performance.

Conclusions

Drawing on the data from interview, this present research summarizes EFL teacher' beliefs about oral corrective feedback on students' speaking performance. This research contributes to the knowledge of language teachers' oral corrective feedback beliefs by expanding the research focus on students' speaking performance. Although the previous research attempted to identify ESL teachers' beliefs about oral corrective feedback, but a few has not explored yet in the context of EFL teachers. Thus, this research is to find out the result based on that reason.

This present research contributes a highlight for the next researcher to comprehend discipline related to this study particularly in the science of English language teaching and learning. The implication of this present research is completely beneficial to guide teachers how to provide an effective oral corrective feedback as well as enhance the science of English teachers' beliefs about oral corrective feedback.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to my advisor for kind advice and help throughout my study. Besides, I am indebted to my lovely parents for their continuous support and encouragement for my pursuit. Finally, I would like to thank my college mates who also help and support me in accomplishing this study. Thus, without their help above this assignment cannot be accomplished.

References

- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. NY: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching* (4th ed.). Essex: Pearson Education.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of educational research*, 77(1), 81-112.
- Kim, Ji Hyun. "Issues of corrective feedback in second language acquisition." (2004): 1-24.
- Karimi, M. N., & Asadnia, F. (2015). EFL Teachers' Beliefs about Oral Corrective Feedback and Their Feedback-Providing Practices across Learners' Proficiency Levels. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, 34(2), 39-68.
- Lightbown, P. M. and Spada, N. (1999). *How languages are learned*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 37 - 66.
- Maolida, E. H. (2013). Oral corrective feedback and learner uptake in a young learner EFL classroom. *A case study in an English course in Bandung*.
- Mori, R. (2011). Teacher cognition in corrective feedback in Japan. *System*, 39(4), 451-467.
- Negueruela-Azarola, E. (2011). Beliefs as conceptualizing activity: A dialectical approach for the second language classroom. *System*, 39(3), 359-369.
- Rezaei, S, Mozaffari, F & Hatef, A. (2011). Corrective Feedback in SLA: Classroom Practice and Future Directions. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 1(1), pp. 21-29.
- Sheen, Y., & Ellis, R. (2011). Corrective feedback in language teaching. In E. Hinkel (Ed), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp.593-607). New York: Routledge.