Tutors' Corrective Feedback and Students' Preferences in an English Course at *Kampung Inggris* Pare, Indonesia

Shinta Amalia Maghfiroh[1], Sri Wahyuni[2], Agus Edi Winarto[3]

[1, 2, 3] IAIN Kediri, Indonesia

[1]shintaamalia32@gmail.com,[2]wahyu_uni78@yahoo.com,[3]agusediwinarto@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aimed to identify the kinds of corrective feedback that tutors and students most frequently utilize. The research design used in this study was qualitative, involving two English tutors and twenty students from an English course institution. To collect data, the researcher conducted observations of six class interaction meetings. Then, the researcher distributed questionnaires via Google Form to students through WhatsApp and interviewed two tutors. Data analysis involved summarizing, reducing, displaying, interpreting and representing the data. The results showed that English tutors in *Kampung Inggris* gave recast more often than other corrective feedback due to the students' preference for receiving corrective feedback. However, two types of corrective feedback that often used after recast were repetition and paralinguistic. Unfortunately, these two types of corrective feedback were not well-received by students. In fact, forty percent and forty four percent of participants disagreed, respectively. Tutors should consider these findings to minimize misunderstandings, enhance the learning process, and improve students' speaking skills without causing them to feel discouraged or offended by corrective feedback.

Keywords: *Corrective Feedback; Speaking skill; Students' Preferences.*

INTRODUCTION

Giving correction feedback during the students' performance in speaking class when the students made mistakes sounds common (Askew, 2000). There are six types of teacher feedback in speaking class. The first is recast. Recast is inserting content words from the previous incorrect utterance then changing and correcting the utterance in some way. The second is repetition. The corrector repeats the learner utterance highlighting the error by means of emphatic stress. The third is clarification request. The corrector clarifies what the learner said. The fourth is explicit correction. The corrector identifies the error and provides the correction. The next is elicitation. The corrector repeats part of the learner utterance but not the erroneous part and uses rising intonation to signal the learner should complete it. The last is paralinguistic signal. The corrector uses a gesture or facial expression to indicate that the learner has made an error (Ellis, 2009).

The corrective feedback is given by tutors when students practice English in class, and each tutor has different tendencies. Some use repetition as feedback

(Behroozi and Karimnia, 2017; Laeli & Setiawan, 2019). Others use rearrangement (Syakira and Nur, 2021; Mulyani et al., 2022; Faris and Budiarti, 2023). While other tutors prefer explicit types of feedback to increase students' awareness of its corrective nature (Ha, Xuan V et al. 2021).

From the students' point of view, providing feedback is beneficial in developing English language practice. Students mentioned three benefits of feedback: increasing students' knowledge, improving students' speaking ability, and avoiding the fossilization of students' mistakes (Mulyani et al., 2022). The students also found the corrective feedback from the tutors very helpful. They believed that it contributed to their overall English improvement as the tutors corrected explicitly and provided hints or clues to help with recall (Syakira and Nur, 2021).

However, there is still a gap regarding student tendencies. Amalia et al. (2019) said that although lecturers tend to provide explicit correction in giving feedback, female students prefer to receive Metalinguistic Feedback, which motivates them to practice self-correction, and recast, which does not deter them. Even some female students believe that receiving explicit correction is harmful because they believe that placing the blame for a student's errors directly in front of their peers can cause shock, embarrassment, anxiety, and fear as well as interfere with their ability to concentrate. Conversely, lecturers frequently employ reordering, restating, and clarification. However, because they can examine the error and determine the right phrase for it, students usually prefer getting feedback on their mistakes repeated. (Laeli and Setiawan, 2019). Similarly, tutors choose explicitness to increase students' awareness of its corrective nature. However, students prefer metalinguistic comments and elicitation because it can help students understand errors and have the opportunity to self-correct (Ha. et al., 2021).

Recently, several studies have revealed that CF makes students more anxious, confused, and shaky (Mufidah, 2018) and negatively impacts students' oral fluency practice (Tesnim, 2019). Some students also explicitly stated that they did not expect oral correction because they felt emotionally intimidated when corrected and believed they would improve in the target language without feedback (Sakiroglu, 2020). The psychological aspect, namely anger, shows that a third of students agree that they feel angry when they do not understand the tutor's correction (Hartono et al., 2022). There was even a video that went viral on social media about a student who cursed and spoke harshly to the tutor because the student did not accept the reprimand delivered by the tutor (www.medcom.id, 2023).

Thus, these problems were investigated in this study, which also examined students' preferences for corrective feedback in one of the English courses at *Kampung Inggris*, as well as the kinds of corrective feedback that are frequently employed by English tutors.

METHOD

The research design used in this study is qualitative. This qualitative research employed the case study design, which is a comprehensive, in-depth examination of a person or social unit in which the researcher aims to look into all of the significant factors in the subject's development (Syakira and Nur, 2022). Thus, this study concentrated on gaining a comprehensive understanding of the corrective feedback teachers utilize and the students's preferences regarding the input they receive to fix their errors.

In collecting data, the researcher used observation, interviews, and questionnaires as the instruments of this study. The observation guide used indicators based on those proposed by Ellis (2009: 9) with types of oral corrective feedback. Those are recast, explicit correction, repetition, clarification request, elicitation, and paralinguistic signals. Also used some questions related to the study to identify the types of corrective feedback used by tutors on students' speaking performance.

The researcher also used structured interviews to obtain accurate data and to support the observational data regarding the types of oral corrective feedback used by English tutors in one of the English courses in *Kampung Inggris*. The researcher interviewed two English tutors by asking the first question, and after the tutor answered, the researcher asked the following question based on the tutor's answer related to corrective feedback activities in the classroom. Meanwhile, the questionnaire data was collected by distributing Google Forms to the participants which are ten randomly selected students. There are six statements that students should choose whether agree, disagree, strongly agree and strongly disagree which is arranged based on indicator that proposed by Ellis (2009).

In collecting data in the field, the researcher took several steps. Firstly, the researcher observed the online classroom activities to find out the type of corrective feedback used by the tutors towards the students' performance. Secondly, the researcher interviewed the tutors about the types of corrective feedback they used to correct students' mistakes in speaking class. The interview sessions were asked and answered in English because the tutors and the researcher actively use English in their daily basis, which minimizes misunderstandings. Finally, the researcher distributed questionnaires to the students to get the students' preferences about the corrective feedback used by the tutors.

In analyzing the data from questionnaire, the responses from the students were included into content analysis and the results were quantified in tables presented. Content analysis is a set of analytical procedures that span from impressionistic, intuitive, interpretive analysis to systemic and scientific textual assessment (Elo and Kyngas, 2008). Since content analysis is a structured and replicable method, the data needs to be compressed and concluded through the objective and systematic identification from many phrases of text into fewer content classifications based on specific coding rules (Stemler,2001).

In analyzing the data from interview and observation, researchers used data analysis techniques according to Miles and Huberman (1994), which is involving three steps: data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawing/verification. Data reduction means summarizing by choosing the basic things, focusing on important things and looking for the themes and patterns. Firstly, the researcher collects data about the use of corrective feedback by the tutor and the students' preferences in Speaking Class at one of English Course in *Kampung Inggris* through observation, interview and distributing questionnaire. The researcher then transcribes the data. The irrelevant data, which are not related to research questions, is discarded. The irrelevant data is the data no relation with the theme of the study but related to the research. Next, after collecting and reducing the data, the researcher displays those data in the form of descriptive.

In the process of the reducing and displaying the data, it is based on the formulation of the research problem. This study's problem formulations are: 1) how do tutors provide oral corrective feedback in speaking classes? 2)What are the students'

reactions and preferences regarding the use of corrective feedback in the classroom? This step is done by presenting a set of information that is structured and possibility of drawing conclusions, because the data obtains during the process of qualitative research usually in the form of narrative, thus requiring simplification without reducing its contents. After displaying the data, a conclusion is drawn. Conclusion is verified as the analyst proceeds.

The conclusion drawing is started after the data are collected by making temporary conclusion. In the other words, it can be said that the conclusion is analyzed continuously and verified the validity to get the perfect conclusion about the using of Corrective Feedback by the tutors and the students' preferences in Speaking Class at one of English Course in *Kampung Inggris*.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

A. Types of Tutor Corrective Feedback

The total number of tutor's corrective feedback was calculated to get the results. It discusses how many feedback are in the form of recast, repetition, explicit correction, clarification request, elicitation, and paralinguistic. The data on the types of tutor corrective feedback in speaking activities is presented below:

Table 1. Types of Feedback

No.	Types of Feedback	Frequency			Percentage (%)
		Tutor 1	Tutor 2	Total	
1.	Recast	11	9	20	40.82
2.	Repetition	7	7	14	28.57
3.	Elicitation	-	2	2	4.1
4.	Explicit Correction	2	1	3	6.12
5.	Clarification Request	2	2	4	8.16
6.	Paralinguistic	-	6	6	12.24
Total		22	27	49	-

Table 1 displays the number of corrective feedback given by tutors in classroom interactions, as well as the overall distribution of each type of feedback. According to the table above, the first rank of the most frequently used corrective feedback by tutors is recast. It was used twenty times by the tutors in three meetings (40.82%). They were followed by repetition (28.57%) as the second rank and paralinguistic (12.24%) as the third rank of the tutors commonly used corrective feedback. The other three types of corrective feedback (elicitation, request for clarification, and explicit correction) had a frequency of less than five times. Tutor 2 showed the highest total frequency of giving feedback and applying all types of corrective feedback. Tutor 1 followed suit by giving twenty direct corrective feedbacks, although he did not demonstrate elicitation and paralinguistic signal.

Based on the interview with tutor 1, usually repeating the student's mistake and emphasizing it by using question intonation such as saying that it is wrong (repetition) because repetition of errors is a direct clue for students to correct their mistakes more easily (Behroozi et al., A. 2017). If after repetition, students still cannot correct their

own mistakes, then Tutor 1 will repeat it in the correct form, or it can be said that he uses recast. This can be seen in the following interview transcript:

> *"Sometimes I directly correct when they make mistakes, sometimes I write down their mistakes, and then when they finish speaking, I read the error and then give the correct also. I usually repeat the student's mistake using question intonation to let them clear and correct it. However, if they still do not know their mistakes and how to fix them, I will repeat their sentences with the correct ones."*

Based on the interview with tutor 2, who teaches grammar for speaking, there are several ways to give feedback. She often directly repeats the wrong form with the correct form (recast), sometimes focusing only on the error because it is feared that students cannot correct their mistakes and will hinder their language learning process (Tasdemir and Arslan, 2018). She also sometimes only uses expressions to state that it is wrong, it leads the students to correct it (paralinguistic signal); on the other time, she questions what they say (repetition). This can be seen in the following interview transcript excerpt:

> *"Sometimes, I directly repeat the incorrect form with the correct form. Sometimes, it just focuses on the mistakes. I often only use expressions to express that that is incorrect, so they must fix it. Sometimes, I also question them again about what they said."*

After conducting the interviews, the researcher found that the tutors used corrective feedback on students' speaking performance differently based on the students themselves. The tutors mostly correct the pronunciation and pronunciation and grammatical structure of the student's speaking performance. Tutor 1 used recast to correct students' utterances in speaking performance, and Tutor 2 used recast, paralinguistic signal, and repetition to correct students' utterances in speaking performance. Based on these findings, English tutors often use repetition, recast, and paralinguistic signal as corrective feedback in correcting students' utterances in speaking activities.

B. Students' Preferences for Corrective Feedback

This section reveals students' responses to questions about the types of oral error corrective feedback they prefer. The students were given explanations and examples of the six types of oral error corrective feedback described by Ellis (2009:9) on a Likert scale in the questionnaire. They had to select one of four options: 1. strongly agree, 2. agree, 3. disagree, and 4. strongly disagree.

Table 2. Students' Preferences

Kind of Feedback	Students Answer								Total
	SA		A		D		SD		
Recast	11	52%	13	44%	1	4%	0	%	100%
Explicit	4	16%	11	44%	9	36%	1	4%	100%
Clarification request	1	4%	14	56%	9	36%	1	4%	100%
Elicitation	1	4%	11	44%	13	52%	0	%	100%
Repetition	0	%	12	48%	11	44%	2	8%	100%
Paralinguistic	0	%	10	40%	10	40%	5	20%	100%

The following table shows the questionnaire results of the second research question:

Table 2 shows the percentage of each type of oral corrective feedback. Based on the highest percentage, it can be seen that most students strongly agree to choose recast (52%), and this is in line with the corrective feedback given by tutor one and tutor 2 (40.82%) so that tutors and students both have perspectives in providing feedback. However, this is inversely proportional to repetition and paralinguistic signal. While tutors often provide repetition (28.57%) and paralinguistic signal (12.24%) to give feedback, no students strongly agreed to choose repetition and paralinguistic signal (0%).

This result can be used as reference point for correcting students' spoken errors effectively. Understanding the preferences of tutors and students, as well as knowing the most appropriate type of oral corrective feedback, is essential when implementing oral corrective feedback in the classroom. Tutors and lecturers should consider students' preferences and use appropriate techniques. Surveying students' preferences can help identify their expectations and make corrective feedback more convenient and motivating for classroom practice (Amalia., et al., 2019; Alkhammash et al., 2019; Nuramalia, 2019).

CONCLUSION

Recast, repetition and paralinguistic signal are the corrective feedback used by the English tutors in *Kampung Inggris*. It is aligned with the students' preferences that choose recast as the strongly agree option even though the students sometimes do not like to receive the repetition and paralinguistic signal as corrective feedback. Thus, the tutors need to minimize misunderstandings, maximize the learning process, and improve students' speaking skills without making students depressed and offended by getting corrective feedback.

As a suggestion for future research, instructors or lecturers can be involved in this study as subjects other than students. This will provide a better understanding by linking and comparing the preferences of students and lecturers for oral error corrective feedback. Furthermore, to reduce confusion between types of error corrective feedback, future research could show participants videos of different types of error corrective feedback before they fill out the questionnaire. This strategy can help participants understand the distinctions between the error and corrective feedback might happen in speaking class, and they can choose which type of corrective feedback they prefer. In this study, subject interviews can be conducted to broaden the researcher's perspective on their preference for corrective feedback.

REFERENCES

Amalia, Z. D. H., Fauziati, E., Marmanto, S. (2019). Male and Female Students' Preferences on the Oral Corrective Feedback in English as Foreign Language (EFL) Speaking Classroom. *Humaniora,* 10(1), 25-33.

Askew, S. (Ed.). (2000). Feedback for Learning (1st ed.). *Routledge.* https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203017678

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development. *L2 Journal*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.5070/l2.v1i1.9054

Ellis, R. (2017). Oral Corrective Feedback in L2 Classrooms: What We Know So Far. In H. Nassaji& E. Kartchava (Eds.), *Corrective Feedback in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (1st ed., p. 16). New York: *Routledge.*

Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The Qualitative Content Analysis Process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing,* 62(1), 107-115.

Fadilah, A. E., Anugerahwati, M., &Prayogo, J. A. (2017). EFL Students' Preferences for Oral Corrective Feedback in Speaking Instruction. In *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora* (Vol. 5, Issue 2). http://journal.um.ac.id/index.php/jphpISSN:2338-8110/eISSN:2442-3890

Faris, I. N. I., & Budiarti, D. (2023). How Teachers in an Informal English Training Institution Treat Young Learners' Oral Errors. *LLT Journal: Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, *26*(1), 304–313. https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v26i1.5341

Hartono, D., Basthomi, Y., Widiastuti, O., &Prastiyowati, S. (2022). The Impacts of Teacher's Oral Corrective Feedback to Students' Psychological Domain:A Study on EFL Speech Production. *Cogent Education*, *9*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2152619

Ha, Xuan V., Nguyen, Loc T and Hung, Bui Phu. (2021). Oral Corrective Feedback in English as a Foreign Language Classrooms: A Teaching and Learning Perspective. *Heliyon.* Vol 7

Laeli, A. F., Setiawan, S. (2019). Oral Corrective Feedback in Speaking Class: Its Frequency, Students' Perceptions, and Preference. Exposure: *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris,* 8(2), 257.

Li, F., Feng, Z. Hou, Y. (2020). Case Study on Effectiveness of Oral Corrective Feedback in the Second Language Classrooms in Second Language Acquisition: *International Journal of Arts and Commerce*, 9(7), 22-29.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M. (1994). Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook. *Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications*

Maizola, S. (2016). Teachers' Oral Corrective Feedbak on Students' Dialogue Performance at Senior High School PGRI 1 Padang.*A thesis in College of Teacher Training and Education (STKIP) PGRI Padang.*

Mufidah, Zahratul. (2018). The Impact of Oral Corrective Feedback on the Level of Language Anxiety. 10.2991/iconelt-17.2018.48.

Mulyani, Sri. et al. (2022). Student's Perceptions Toward Oral Corrective Feedback in a Speaking Class: *Eternal.* Vol 8 no.1. https://doi.org/10.24252/Eternal.V81.2022.A12

Rahimi, M. & Sobhani, A. (2015). Teachers' Different Types of Feedback on Iranian EFL learners "Speaking Errors and Their Impact on the Students" Uptake of TheCorrect Forms. Research Papers in Language Teaching and Learning. *Holonic Open University.*

Stemler, S. (2001). An Overview of Content Analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 7(17), 137-146

Syakira, S., Sahril Nur. (2021). Learners' Perceptions on the Use of Oral Corrective Feedback in One-to-One EFL Classroom. Eralingua: *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Asing dan Sastra.* Vol.6, No.2.

Tesnim, Ounis. (2019). Oral Corrective Feedback and Its Impact on Learners' Speaking Skills: Tunisian EFL Students as a Case Study: *International Journal of Language and Linguistics.* Vol. 7, No. 3 pp. 138-149.

UnsalSakiroglu, Hulya. (2020). Oral Corrective Feedback Preferences of University Students in English Communication Classes: *International Journal of Research in Education and Science.* 6. 172. 10.46328/ijres.v6i1.806.